Part V: **Agency**

Elisabet Carbó-Catalan and Reine Meylaerts

Translation Policies in the *Longue Durée*: From the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation to UNESCO

In its diverse manifestations throughout history, culture has been used for the formation and consolidation of collective identities (Thiesse 1999). Its potential to enhance political projects has justified governments' interest in implementing cultural policies and developing paths for cultural projection abroad. The latter can be accomplished through government bodies, but also through specialised national institutions or government representations in international organisations. As part of such cultural policies, translation offers a privileged vantage point from which we might analyse the preconceptions and values guiding the ways actors conceive of relations between different cultures, how power relations between cultures are manifested and (re)negotiated, and the ways images for foreign projection (Dumont 2018) are conveyed through translations, to name but a few examples.

In this contribution, we address the case of two related intergovernmental institutions that have engaged in the field of translation: the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation (1926–1946, IIIC from now on) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (1946-, UNESCO from now on). Created with similar aims but in different periods, the two share the overall goal of fostering mutual understanding and ultimately ensuring world peace through their actions in the cultural and intellectual domains. We set our focus on these intergovernmental actors to highlight the role of governments and international organisations in what the sociologist of literature Pascale Casanova called the World Republic of Letters (1999), emphasising the features and specificities of their engagement in this field.

In this chapter, we first describe the relationship between the IIIC and UNESCO in order to justify our choice of addressing the two together through a *longue durée* approach. Second, we describe our understanding of "translation policy" as a concept, to then provide an overview of the translation policy set

Note: This paper has been published within the framework of the ERC St Grant *Social Network of the Past. Mapping Hispanic and Lusophone Modernity (1896–1959)*, led by Diana Roig-Sanz (grant agreement 803860). The authors wish to thank the anonymous reviewers and editors of this volume who contributed to improving this chapter with their thoughtful comments.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110740301-013

forth by the IIIC and ultimately retrace some of its features in the UNESCO's translation policy.

1 Introduction: Continuities and Discontinuities Between the IIIC and UNESCO

The International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was formally founded in Paris under the auspices of the League of Nations in 1926. In a period still marked by the consequences of World War I, the IIIC was constituted with the goal of fostering mutual understanding and maintaining world peace through the promotion of intellectual and cultural relations in a variety of domains, spanning from education and museology to literature and libraries (Renoliet 1999). The IIIC functioned as the executive branch for a group of institutions that came to be known as the Organization of Intellectual Cooperation, which included – in addition to the IIIC in Paris – the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC), based in Geneva, and a number of National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation.[1] They worked in collaboration: the ICIC had deliberative functions, that is, it was in charge of decision making, while the IIIC carried out executive tasks, and the National Committees ensured proper coordination between each national field and the Paris and Geneva headquarters. According to their functioning, these institutions can be addressed in isolation, as they involved different actors and were characterised by their own internal dynamics (Mitchell 2006). We focus our analysis on the IIIC, but its relations with the other actors working in the field of intellectual cooperation must be taken into account, which is why we will often refer to the ICIC as well, although it is not our main object of research.

The IIIC was active from the '20s to mid-'40s, when the outbreak of World War II battered the League of Nations (LoN) and its specialised bodies. Indeed, the IIIC ceased its activities with the occupation of Paris and remained dormant during the war. Despite an attempt to resume activities between 1945 and 1946 by creating an international centre of intellectual cooperation in Havana, this project never came to life. With the new international order emerging after World War II marked by the hegemony of the United States, and lacking active

1 In addition to the mentioned organisations, this umbrella term also included specialised bodies such as the International Museums Office and the International Educational Cinematographic Institute.

support from the French government, whose interests and possibilities had radically changed since the 1920s, the IIIC was ultimately replaced by the UNESCO. A resolution that formally recognized the continuities between both institutions was signed in 1946, agreeing to "ensure, under the UNESCO'S responsibilities and through the appropriate measures, the continuity of [the IIIC's] work since 1924 in terms of assets, personnel, and the IIIC's work program" (Renoliet 1999, 178).

The emphasis on the (dis)continuities between the two institutions has transformed over the years, with their relationship being a matter of history, but also a matter related to memory, that is, to the discourses and representations of history. In light of the outbreak of World War II, it was generally assumed that the League of Nations and its specialised bodies had failed in their mission to keep the peace. As a result, the legitimation of postwar institutions, namely the United Nations and UNESCO, relied on rejecting the League of Nations' and the IIIC's legacy from a discursive point of view: postwar institutions needed to be associated with a fresh start to avoid being discredited. Today, the fact that the UNESCO is "the material and the spiritual heir" (Renoliet 1999) of the IIIC is often acknowledged, sometimes as a way of legitimising the former by appealing to its precursor. In any case, the UNESCO's debt to its prewar predecessor has rarely been examined in detail, with few exceptions, such as the contributions read at the international conference "60 ans d'histoire de l'UNESCO" ("Sixty Years of UNESCO History"), held in Paris in 2005, and in Jo-Ann Pemberton's analysis of the core ideas upholding intellectual cooperation both at the IIIC and UNESCO (2012).

We intend to partially fill this gap by addressing the two in the *longue durée*. Instead of a binary narrative that would characterise both institutions in terms of failure or success, our approach focuses on their continuities and discontinuities. The IIIC's involvement in the field of translation is here examined through the close reading of archive material, but our analysis moves beyond the analysis of single episodes in the short term. Our analysis aims at shedding light on the evolution, reshaping, and reformulating of practices and values. To do so, we study the IIIC's incursions in the field of translation in relation to UNESCO's translation policy. In other words, this is a relational analysis based on a *longue durée* approach that aims to shed light on the history of both institutions: the IIIC's history is the UNESCO's prehistory, and its analysis contributes to understanding the UNESCO's current functioning. Likewise, the UNESCO's functioning is a way of examining and reevaluating the outcomes and impact of the IIIC's work.

Any relational analysis of the IIIC and UNESCO needs to take into account the features they share and those that distinguish them – and numerous lines of

continuity can be traced between the IIIC and UNESCO. We may draw from Bourdieu's field theory to describe the two as actors occupying similar positions in the heteronomous pole of the literary field (Bourdieu 1992). Situated at the very crossroads between politics and culture, we may address them from their cultural dimension, considering them as performers of cultural mediation (Roig-Sanz and Meylaerts 2018) and as actors embedded in the transnational cultural space (Boschetti 2010). At the same time, if we consider their political dimension, their intergovernmental character and their power to enhance visibility and garner prestige would cast them as actors that contribute to deploying strategies of cultural diplomacy. In this framework, the book functions as a diplomatic object (Hauser et al. 2011) and as an aesthetic product. Culture, in a broad sense, can function as a source of soft power (Nye 2004), while cultural mediators working within or in collaboration with these institutions may also act as (in)formal diplomats. Notably, the two bodies under study pursued several common tasks, such as the revision of textbooks, promotion of international exchanges between universities, exploration of issues related to copyright law, and coordination of libraries and archives.

Nevertheless, such continuities would by no means imply that the two bodies did not have major differences. Profound historical changes distinguish their chronologic frameworks in terms of geopolitics, the role of literature and of the intellectual in society, as well as in the functioning of their communications and publishing industries. Several statutory points mark clear differences between the UNESCO and the IIIC: first, the UNESCO aimed to develop less elitist cooperation by prioritising the cultural over the intellectual, given that elitism was often considered one of the IIIC's flaws:

> Two visions and two eras stand in opposition behind these acronyms: the UNESCO, inspired in the Anglo-Saxon and representing the twentieth century, is marked by more massive dissemination of knowledge, while the French-inspired OCI is anchored in the early twentieth century, in which elites were charged with guiding the people. (Renoliet 1999, 325)[2]

UNESCO sought deeper involvement from governments in order to overcome the long-standing ambiguity that characterised the IIIC, in which it was often unclear whether members were representing their countries per se or were

2 "Deux visions et deux époques s'opposent derrière ces deux sigles: à une UNESCO d'inspiration anglo-saxonne et représentative du second XXe siècle marqué par une diffusion plus massive des connaissances, répond une OCI d'inspiration française ancrée dans le premier XXe siècle qui charge les élites de guider le people."

acting as intellectuals who represented their fields of expertise (Grandjean 2020).[3] While the IIIC was born as an eminently intellectual organisation that later became more enmeshed in political and government matters, the UNESCO was created as an intergovernmental organisation devoted to cultural and intellectual affairs from the start. In addition, the UNESCO has benefitted from greater autonomy than the IIIC did, as the latter worked under the direction and close supervision of the ICIC, with complex relations, considerable rivalry (Grandjean 2018, 380–84), and heavily disparate economic resources (in terms of their quantity and funding source) characterising their relationship.

2 Translation Policies

The global scope and complex structures of both the IIIC and UNESCO entail several methodological challenges that justify their being generally approached from specific disciplines. Today, we have several works at our disposal that have been crucial to recovering the IIIC from oblivion (Iriye 1997; Renoliet 1999; Laqua 2011; Dumont 2013; Grandjean 2018; Herrera León and Wehrli 2019), but most of them seem to address said body from the perspective of the historian of international relations, with the discipline conditioning the research questions and objects of study. The IIIC's activities have rarely been studied from a specifically cultural or literary perspective (Banoun and Poulin 2019; Pita González 2019; Roig-Sanz 2022); conversely, the UNESCO's literary activities have benefitted from more interest over the last few years (Maurel 2001; Giton 2012; Klengel 2018; Brouillette 2019; Intrator 2019; Guerrero 2021). Our contribution to this historic work focuses on translation given its potential to help understand broader cultural policies. We seek to reconstruct the IIIC's and UNESCO's forms of engagement in this field and to explore the ways their procedures and practices shaped specific translation policies.

"Translation policy" is a term that can cover a variety of meanings (see Meylaerts 2011). We understand translation policy here in a broad sense and define it as a series of intentionally coherent values, principles, and decisions made by public or private actors regarding translation and translation-related activities, in

3 More detailed accounts should explore to what extent the consolidation of members as State representatives is not so much a difference between the IIIC and UNESCO as a reflection of the consolidation and institutionalisation of a trend that was already ongoing within the IIIC, which, over the years, seems to have displayed a more and more *realist* approach, to borrow a term from the field of international relations.

order to guide their translation affairs (see also Meylaerts 2011). Policy may manifest itself through activities that promote (or hinder) translation (such as scholarships or prizes), through choices guiding the translation process (e.g. the choice to create a translation series or select a specific genre, but also to apply specific textual translation strategies), and through the actors implementing (or hindering) these translation activities and choices (organisations, institutions, publishers, editors, translators). This understanding is socially oriented and considers strategies of implementation that go beyond the text itself. The study of translation policies constitutes a path to approaching the agency of certain institutions in society, and the study of their design and evolution further sheds light on the diversity of actors involved in any policy making. While the degree of autonomy of single institutions may vary, none is completely self-determined or autonomous. Rather, their actions are the result of a confluence of interests and decisions of a variety of actors, including the people working within the institutions, as well as external actors collaborating with them (which may include government actors, members of the diplomatic corps, and actors from the cultural and the intellectual domains, to name but a few examples). The socially conditioned character of any policy also suggests that they are especially suitable for working within a *longue durée* framework, as changes in policies reflect epochal and structural changes in terms of shared social values.

The IIIC, for instance, was not entrusted with the task of policy making, nor did it possess sovereignty over a given territory. Quite the contrary, it was subordinate to the ICIC, to the League of Nations, and to national governments. A priori, the IIIC's main task was to implement the ICIC's decisions, and its agency was limited by several factors: the rivalry between the IIIC and the ICIC, with the former pushing to obtain more faculties while the latter feared being outshined, the IIIC's precarious finances, the economic context, and the power struggles between countries at the League of Nations. However, it did enjoy some degree of autonomy for policymaking of its own. As we shall demonstrate, the IIIC's executive tasks allowed for a field of possibilities regarding the ways the ICIC's general recommendations or resolutions were to be implemented.

As far as the sources are concerned, to reconstruct the features and understand the values, principles, and decisions guiding the IIIC's translation policy as part of its broader cultural policy, we draw on material from the IIIC's and UNESCO's archives in Paris and from the League of Nations' archive in Geneva. The values, principles, and decisions guiding the IIIC and UNESCO in their translation activities as part of their cultural policies are sometimes explicitly stated in policy documents concerning translation, but can also be reconstructed from other documents, such as minutes from working meetings, internal reports, speeches, and correspondence among members. As described by

González Núñez, practices "help create policy in a very real way, even if this practice is not always explicitly mandated through legal rules" (2016). The relevance we attribute to practices stems from these institutions' specific way of functioning: they share a structure whereby the work relies on collaboration from a great number of external actors consulted as experts for specific projects. Indeed, the IIIC and UNESCO also share "the best networking mechanism" (Omolewa 2007), i.e., national committees, and, as suggested by Omolewa, they can be addressed as networks. If we acknowledge the crucial role of networks in these institutions' functioning, we should also consider such networks when addressing their policies.

3 The IIIC and its Ambitious Translation Policy

To begin our comparison, we will proceed in chronological order and address the IIIC's translation policy first. The IIIC deployed several projects in the field of translation[4] and discussed a far vaster number of possible lines of action, mostly related to the translation of scientific works and the translation of intellectual and literary works.

The IIIC worked in collaboration with the ICIC's University Sub-Committee to address the translation of scientific works. They conducted an enquiry in collaboration with National Committees during 1927, after which they were able to affirm that in a number of countries speaking lesser-known languages the practice of accompanying scientific publications with summaries in wider-spoken languages was already consolidated. Thus, they recommended that countries not familiar with this practice add such summaries, and they encouraged the publication of compendia of analytical summaries in wider-spoken languages, following the example of the *Revues des travaux scientifiques tchécoslovaques-Czechoslovak research work*.[5]

The translation of literary works mainly involved the IIIC's Section of Literary Relations and the ICIC's Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters. The former was first directed by Chilean poet, teacher, and diplomat Gabriela Mistral and then by Franco-Brazilian journalist and writer Dominique Braga. The latter sub-

4 In this chapter, we focus on translation as an object or domain of intervention, and not on the internal practices of translation enacted by the IIIC in its daily affairs, though the latter's relevance must be acknowledged to draw a full picture of this institution's translation policy.

5 Translation of Scientific Works – Report of the Institute of Intellectual Cooperation to the University Sub-Commission. UNOG, 13C/59896/24804.

committee's members included French writer Paul Valéry, Spanish diplomat and writer Salvador de Madariaga, German writer Thomas Mann, Italian historian Pietro Toesca, and the Romanian professor George Oprescu. During the IIIC's early days, several meetings were organised to design an activity program related to translations of literary and intellectual works. In the following pages, we analyse these proposals regardless of whether they were eventually adopted, as it is precisely through the reconstruction of the discussion and negotiation process that the values and principles comprising the IIIC's translation policy can be reconstructed.

3.1 The First Steps: Designing a Program

One of the first documents addressing the potential lines of action in the field of translation is a report that Paul Valéry presented in the Sub-Committee's second session, held on January 12th and 13th of 1926.[6] Drawing on several PEN Club proposals, the poet suggested drafting several lists:

> Catalogues of works for which translation would be particularly desirable, lists of expert, well-read translators, of editors publishing translations, of critics of foreign literatures [. . .] [and] a table of already translated works.[7]

In his opinion, such lists would benefit a variety of actors: publishers could find translation gaps; authors would easily identify translators and publishers and inquire on their skills; translators would benefit from more visibility; and readers (specialists, such as scholars of foreign literatures, but also non-specialists) would easily access information on materials of their interest. However, Valéry did not view all literary circulation as equal. He referred to the list of works recommended for translation as a "repository of transmissible literary values,"[8] which implies that, to him, not all literary works were valuable enough for promotion:

6 Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160.

7 Paul Valéry's report. Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160. The quote in French reads as follows : "des catalogues d'ouvrages dont la traduction serait particulièrement désirable, des listes de traducteurs experts et lettrés, d'éditeurs publiant des traductions, de critiques s'occupant de littératures étrangères [. . .] [et] une table des ouvrages déjà traduits."

8 Paul Valéry's report. Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160.

> It is clear that we should only encourage translations that truly enrich our understanding of a nation, that can tell of its treasures, treasures that nation does not even recognize in itself. Some works are completely vain, while others are so promptly and immediately successful that it's no longer our job to get involved in their destiny.[9]

Those translations deemed as worthy of promotion were those whose interest lied in the facts and ideas conveyed, not in their formal innovation and originality. By the same token, given that "we cannot flatter ourselves with thinking that we might transmit a work's formal values from one language to another,"[10] it was believed that poetry could not be successfully translated.

As can be grasped, the lists Valéry proposed were of different natures: some of them would have been descriptive, functioning as a directory, while others would have a prescriptive nature and could quickly resemble a literary ranking, which could prove tricky for the IIIC, given that its policy was to "avoid attempting to enforce its view; [. . .] seek to co-ordinate what already exists, to bring together elements that at present are isolated, to provide authors and artists with instruments of work, and, lastly, to obtain and supply information."[11] Since determining who would draft this list was also problematic, Valéry proposed entrusting the selection to national delegates, a committee, or an autonomous institution specialised in translation, which would also do the following:

> give grants for the translation and publishing of recommended works, as both translation and publishing are practically indivisible. Beyond the Commission's regulatory and directive function, whose main objective is to equalise, through somewhat artificial means like translation grants, the literary treasures of a diversity of languages, and fill in the often-scandalous gaps, there is room to compensate for the spontaneous translation, publishing, and reprinting of translations.[12]

---

9 Paul Valéry's report. Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160. The French quote reads as follows: "il est clair qu'on ne doit encourager que les traductions qui enrichissent véritablement la connaissance d'une nation, et lui communiquent des trésors qu'elle ne trouve point en soi-même. Il est des œuvres d'un type si banal, et il en est d'autres d'un succès si immédiat et si prompt que ce n'est point notre affaire de nous mêler de leur destinée."

10 Paul Valéry's report. Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160.

11 Commission for Intellectual Cooperation – Composition of Sub-Commissions (Bibliography – Arts and Letters – Academic Relations – Intellectual Property) – Report to the Council on the Seventh Session of the Commission for Intellectual Cooperation held in Paris from January 14–18, 1926. UNOG, 13C/49855/14297.

12 Paul Valéry's report, included in the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Second Session, January 1926. UNOG, 13C/48930/45160: "donner de primes à la traduction et à l'édition des ouvrages recommandés, traduction et édition, car les deux actes sont pratiquement indivisibles. En dehors de l'action régulatrice et directrice de la Commission, dont

This proposal reflects an interventionist, top-down approach to translation and to literary activities as a whole, aiming to facilitate the publication of translations and to fill certain gaps, while explicitly addressing non-commercial production. Although some of his proposals did not see swift adoption, Valéry's report seminally outlined several measures that were further discussed and, in some cases, ultimately implemented. Here, the poet also anticipates ways in which governments might legitimately participate in the literary field – by countering commercial trends and reinforcing what Bourdieu would call the pole of restricted production, that is, the segment of the literary field in which "producers produce for other producers" (1983, 320) and not for the market or mass-audience.

In late 1926, the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters adopted several resolutions that institutionalised translation as a field of intervention. They encouraged the "translation of works of every period (and more particularly of works which appeal only to a public which is too limited to make publication a financial success) [and] the translation of literary works written in the less well-known languages." On the one hand, this resolution solidified the top-down approach that can be gleaned in Valéry's initial report while giving the IIIC a market-correcting role in the sense exposed in the previous paragraph – a role that aligns with the elitist views often attributed to said Parisian institution. On the other hand, the IIIC included the diversification of the literary-marketplace supply within its policy, with special emphasis on peripheral literatures. To fulfil such goals, the Sub-Committee recommended that the National Committees draw annual lists of works suitable for translation and forge an international society or academy of translators.

To implement such resolutions, the IIIC created a Committee of Experts on Translation in 1927.[13] The Committee started its work by drawing from a detailed IIIC report that abundantly described the situation of translation and the potential obstacles of possible lines of action. First, to fulfil the goal of facilitating the

---

l'objet principal est d'égaliser en quelque sorte par des moyens artificiels par des primes à la traduction les trésors de lectures des diverses langues, et de faire combler des lacunes parfois scandaleuses, -il y aurait lieu de récompenser la traduction spontanée, l'édition et la réimpression de traductions."

13 The committee was composed of Valéry Larbaud (French writer and translator), Marike Stiernstedt (Swedish writer), Gabriela Mistral (Chilean poet and diplomat), Anton Kippenberg (German publisher), Enrique Díez Canedo (Spanish writer, translator and literary critic), André Levinson (Russian journalist, writer and drama critic), Serge Elisséeff (Russian-French scholar and Japanologist), and Jean [János] Hankiss (Hungarian professor of literature). Stefan Zweig (Austrian novelist and playwright), Miroslav Haškovec (professor at Brno University), and Edmund Gosse (English poet and critic) were invited but did not attend the meeting.

selection of works for translation, they discussed elaborating lists of books recommended for translation. The experts considered that any list of this kind should be based on national lists compiling bibliographical information on already existing translations, and, since such lists didn't exist, they found that the IIIC's intentions were not readily achievable. However, it was believed that such a list would be extremely useful to further disseminate already translated works, which was the second strategic line envisioned in the report. To this end, the publication of a collection of foreign classics and a popular collection of contemporary works was discussed. Third, the report delved into the need to improve the quality of translations. In light of the previous goals, the committee of experts recommended that a permanent organisation on translation be created to draft a list of translations, pen yearly lists of the best works published in each country, award translation prizes, and publish a gazette on contemporary literature and technical translation problems. To complement such actions, the experts recommended that the office publish a collection of classics as well as a collection of contemporary literature for the general public, study the legal framework for translations, propose common legislation, and explore collaboration with the PEN Club.

The Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters examined the experts' work in its 1927 session[14] but dismissed most of it: they believed it would be impossible to found an office for translation given the Institute's limited resources. Further, they were wary of awarding translation prizes. Instead, they recommended that the IIIC limit itself to studying technical problems in the field of translation and help establish relations between authors, translators, and publishers.[15] The previous recommendations, and the implicit rejection of the experts' most ambitious proposals, must be read in light of the technical reasons mentioned above, but also in terms of the rivalry between the ICIC and the IIIC: the measures that were ultimately approved conferred little agency to the IIIC.

Nevertheless, the experts' proposals became the seeds of some ambitious ventures. In the legal domain, this resolution led to the study of legal obstacles to translation. The IIIC's Legal and Literary Sections and the ICIC worked in collaboration with the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law to examine legislation in copyright law, that is, the existence of bilateral agreements, and also the common ground between the Berne Convention and the Pan-American Conventions. The IIIC also functioned as a consulting office for actors in the literary field with questions regarding copyright law. In the literary domain, several

14 Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Fourth Session, 16–19 July 1927. UNOG, 13C/60957/45160.

15 Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters' Minutes of the Fourth Session, 16–19 July 1927. UNOG, 13C/60957/45160.

projects saw the light as a result of these sessions. From 1929 and 1931, there was an attempt to publish a gazette specialised in translation in collaboration with the International Federation of PEN Clubs and its national branches. Under the title *Cahier des Traductions*, the gazette was to publish lists of the names and addresses of authors, publishers, translators, and critics interested in the circulation of foreign literatures, as well as articles on translation by renowned figures. Although it never saw the light due to funding issues, the massive effort to gather data, in collaboration with PEN Clubs and National Committees on Intellectual Cooperation, reflected the ambitious plans of the IIIC's Literary Section.

3.2 Promoting Literary Circulation through Translation

Among the experts in translation's recommendations, two ventures stand out for their long trajectories, both under the umbrella of the IIIC and the UNESCO. The first, *Index Translationum*, addresses the issue of improving the circulation of preexisting translations, while the second one, the publication of a collection of literary classics, responds to the perceived need to diversify the available translations in the literary marketplace.

The idea of creating a list of published translations had been previously endorsed by organisations such as the International Literary and Artistic Association, the International Federation of PEN Clubs, and the International Federation of Professional Societies of Men of Letters. However, they encountered challenges in doing so because it would have required collaboration from various professional sectors (publishers and librarians, at a minimum) as well as combining data from several countries. This presented a precious opportunity for the IIIC, which was better suited to satisfy this need given its international nature and its global scope in the intellectual domain. The IIIC began by conducting an investigation into translation across 29 countries,[16] which showed that most book catalogues didn't distinguish between translations and originals. To further advance the project, an experts committee was constituted, meeting several times between 1931 and 1932.[17] Thanks to its work, the *Index Translationum* saw the light and became the

16 South Africa, Germany, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cuba, Denmark, Spain, Estonia, the United States, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, India, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, Mexico, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and Ukraine.

17 The committee was composed of Julien Cain (France, administrator of the French National Library and Member of the International Committee of Expert Librarians), Enrique Díez Canedo (Spain, intellectual, translator, and secretary of Madrid's PEN Club), Roberto Forges Davanzati

first international list of published translations, that is, the first international bibliography of translations. Created in 1932, at first the *Index* included Germany, Spain, the United States, France, Great Britain, and Italy as trial countries, covering 14 countries by 1940 (Naravane 1999; Banoun and Poulin 2019). After an interruption during WWII, the UNESCO resumed its publication in 1948, first as a book, then as a compact disc, and ultimately as an online database, and significantly expanded its geographic coverage, thus pushing it to become one of the main resources for scholars studying translation flows, alongside book-industry databases, national databases, and online catalogues from libraries and bookstores (Poupaud, Pym, and Torres Simón 2009). In the meetings held prior to its launch, and throughout its first years of existence, it was generally established that the *Index* would pay special attention to "small countries whose languages are little known."[18] This reflected its participants' common view that the IIIC's policy needed to directly improve knowledge of lesser-known literatures and foster egalitarian relations among actors in the international literary field. Efforts to uphold the *Index*'s representative character and principle of equality can be gleaned in several initial choices: the *Index* was published in the two official languages of the League, French and English, but its name was written in Latin, a dead language, to avoid favouring any other languages. Also, to avoid using a specific language in the categories (author, title, etc.), font selections offered a solution: bold characters were used for the author, small caps for the translation's title, italics for the source title, and so forth. The content of the bibliographical list and its classification also posed several problems. Concerning the types of works it would include, it was decided that the *Index* would mention, in alphabetical order, all the works referenced in national book lists. The IIIC adopted a compilatory role in an attempt to deflect responsibility for any omissions, and also to avoid subjective

(Italy, President of the Italian Society of Authors and Publishers, who was then replaced by M. Pilotti as Italy's National Delegate before the IIIC), Basile Munteano (Romania, essayist, literary critic, and former librarian of the Romanian Academy), Ernst Reinhardt (Switzerland/Germany, administrator or Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler in Leipzig and publisher), Stanley Unwin (England, vice-president of the International Congress of Publishers and publisher), and Z. L. Zaleski (Poland, member of the Translations Commission at the International Literary and Artistic Association, vice-president of the International Federation of Professional Societies of Men of Letters). The committee also involved M. de Montenach as secretary of the ICIC, Attilio Rossi (interim director) on behalf of the IIIC, Dominique Braga as advisor of Literary Relations, and Valerio Jahier as a writer. Jean Belime and Daniel Secretan were also present as secretaries of the IIIC.

18 Letter from Albert Dufour-Feronce (director of the International Bureaux and Intellectual Cooperation Section in Geneva) to IIIC director H. Bonnet, 21 October, 1931. UNESCO, Correspondence, F, IV, 12.

judgments involved in thematic classification (in categories like literature, art, science, etc.). Categorising according to source language or country of origin was also discussed, but the issue was tricky given the mismatch between linguistic and political borders:

> [. . .] At the Boersenverein der deutschen Buchhändler and Deutsche Nationalbibliographie, we have retracted ourselves from any ulterior political motive and would propose that only language can constitute the base of a bibliographical list, as publishing contracts are always understood to cover the whole of a linguistic territory [. . .]. The book trade, as a whole, assumes that the language in which a work appears is what determines its outlet.[19]

Despite this discussion, classification by country was finally adopted for practical reasons: given that the data would come from national institutions it would simplify the work involved. And within each country, translations would be divided according to their source language. In other words, geographic and national principles were important aspects of the IIIC's translation policy, which at the same time confirms and reflects the growing prominence of States within the IIIC. The fact that the discussion between linguistic and national criteria was settled in favour of the national is suggestive of those mechanisms that have historically naturalised the national as a structuring category in the cultural domain.

Despite the egalitarian values guiding the IIIC, the archives show that the *Index* fulfilled specific functions around (power) relations in the literary space. From its very origins, a vivid interest in creating statistics on importing versus exporting and on frequently versus rarely translated authors can be gleaned by studying the IIIC's work meetings. On the one hand, this reflects the way translation export rates may be indicative of a country's hegemony in the cultural field, and, on the other hand, it also reveals how translation emerged as a source of prestige in the internationalist mindset, in which predominantly importing countries were commended for their openness toward and interest in other countries.

---

19 Letter from the Director Committee of the Boersenverein der Deutschen Buchhandler to the IIIC's Executive Committee through Julien Cain, director of the French National Library and director of the Expert's Committee on Translation Bibliography, 3 June 1933. UNESCO, Correspondence, F, IV, 12: "le Boersenverein der deutschen Buchhändler et la Deutsche Nationalbibliographie [. . .] sommes éloignés de toute arrière-pensée politique lorsque nous posons le principe que seule la langue peut constituer la base d'une bibliographie, car les contrats d'édition s'entendent toujours pour l'ensemble d'un territoire linguistique [. . .]. Le commerce du livre, dans son ensemble, part du principe que c'est la langue dans laquelle paraît un ouvrage qui en détermine le débouché [. . .]".

Concurrently, the IIIC also developed initiatives concerning the publication of new translations. As mentioned, among the various measures, the experts in translation recommended the publication of "classic, foreign collections [and] collections of translated contemporary works for broad dissemination." The strategies through which the IIIC sought to diversify the literary market not only concerned the origin of literary works, but also their targets, as its members considered that good translations tended to only be accessible to the elite, while popular editions were rarely published with quality translations of contemporary literature. By seeking to publish "a popular collection of valuable contemporary works in translation," the IIIC sought to move past the prejudiced idea that the masses didn't appreciate good, modern literature, but it also implicitly acknowledged that its other activities did target the elite. Thus, we might nuance the idea that the IIIC was elitist: although the main target was the elite, reaching out to the masses was, to some extent, part of its policy.

Although the publication of literary collections was not among the measures approved by the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters, the idea wasn't all for naught: it was brought up at a meeting of Latin American delegates held in Paris in March 1927 by Chilean poet and diplomat Gabriela Mistral, who was also participating in the discussions about translation as director of the Literary Section. Indeed, she used her double position as Chilean national delegate and section director to consolidate this project. Thanks to the collaboration between Mistral and the Peruvian professor Andrés Belaúnde, the Ibero-American Collection saw the light in 1930 (Pita González 2019). The collection brought together classics and representative works from Latin America, with some 12 volumes published in French translation between 1930 and 1940, when the Second World War interrupted the IIIC's work and left the publication of several volumes that were already underway unfinished.[20] Even though other countries or regions were expected to follow suit, only one other literary collection saw the light, the Japanese one (1936–1938) (Millet 2014).

The Ibero-American Collection offers vast material with which one may reconstruct the IIIC's translation policy. The history of the Ibero-American Series is inextricably bound to the members of its Publishing Committee,[21] who oversaw

20 Among them, *María* by Jorge Isaacs, *O mulato* by Aluísio Azevedo, and *Martín Fierro* by José Hernández. For a complete list of published and unpublished works, see Pita González 2019, 270–72.

21 The committee was chaired by Gonzague De Reynold. Dominique Braga, a French-Brazilian writer and Chief of the Literary Section, acted as secretary general of the Collection, while Valério Jahier served as its secretary. With different degrees of implication, the following actors took part in this committee or collaborated in some way: Gabriela Mistral (Chile), Victor

the various stages of the life cycles of publications, from fundraising to distribution. The published books were penned after Latin American countries' independence, but only by writers who were no longer alive at the time of publication. Choosing texts for publication involved plenty of discussion, given the stalwart objective of balancing literary and political considerations. The collection published fiction (mostly novels) and non-fiction (historical volumes, folklore, and essays), even though its publishing committee insisted on prioritising fiction, as other genres, like historical volumes, posed greater challenges:

> I recently came to know that the Portuguese did not receive Joaquim Felicio dos Santos's book on Diamonds in Brazil at all well, and that they have found me responsible, to an extent, of publishing a work that contains severe opinions on colonial rule.[22]

In a similar vein, Mistral expressed that Spain tried to control historical Hispano-American volumes, even attempting to mutilate Bolívar's letters through Spain's member of the ICIC, Julio Casares: "Every time that a Hispanic-American issue has been brought up, Spain has tried to revise everything being done, even being so imprudent and disagreeable as to try, through Casares's hand, to mutilate Bolívar's letters."[23] As reflected in the previous quotations, publications were carefully monitored by member States so as not to counter national interests or tarnish the nation's image. But political factors were not the only ones influencing the choosing of texts and genres: poetry was excluded from the series given that, according to the chief of the IIIC's Literary Section, Dominique Braga, it was untranslatable without significant loss, an idea already present in Valéry's report. Through this example, we can see how personal opinions shaped the institution's policy, with those behind said policies benefiting from great symbolic

---

Andrés Belaúnde, Gonzalo Zaldumbide (Ecuador); Georges Le Gentil and Ernest Martinenche (both professors at Sorbonne University), Paul Rivet (Musée de l'Homme), Raymond Ronze (a historian specialised in French and Latin American university relations), the brothers Ventura and Francisco García Calderón, and Mariano Brull (Cuba).

22 Letter from Georges Le Gentil to Dominique Braga. 18 April 1932. UNESCO, Correspondence, F, VI, 3: "Je viens d'apprendre indirectement que les Portugais ont très mal accueilli le livre de Joaquim Felicio dos Santos sur les Diamants au Brésil et qu'ils me rendent responsable, dans une certaine mesure, de la publication d'un ouvrage qui renferme des appréciations sévères sur le régime colonial." As a result, Le Gentil requested that a Portuguese member be present in the Publishing Committee to avoid future misunderstandings, thus making explicit the strategic relevance of the experts' origins.

23 "Cada vez que se ha tratado antes de algún asunto hispano-americano, España ha exigido revisar lo que se hace y ha llegado a imprudencias y fealdades como la de pretender, por la mano del señor Casares, mutilar las Cartas de Bolívar": Letter from Gabriela Mistral to Dominique Braga, 26 November 1934. UNESCO, Correspondence, F, VI, 2.

capital (as with Valéry), or occupying key positions in the institution's structure (which was Braga's case).

Various features of the IIIC's translation policy at textual level can be reconstructed by examining the corrections that the Publishing Committee issued for submitted translations. For instance, they prioritised style in the target language ("The translation is clear, smooth, quite French"),[24] as also reflected in the Committee's requests to edit translations that it deemed too literal, or too faithful to the original's style:

> The Committee thus finds it pertinent to ask you [. . .] to revise your text. Please note that that would imply deviating a bit more than you have, perhaps, from a literal translation. You must have wanted, out of faithfulness to the original, to remain very close to the Portuguese language [. . .], thus, we would suggest relying less on the Brazilian text, giving the French language the elegance and literary quality that characterise Nabuco's prose.[25]

While the Publishing Committee operated with a preexisting understanding of what constitutes a good or bad translation, the stylistic criteria for translations remained undefined and instead were rather implicit, as gleaned through the following complaint by a translator who received conflicting suggestions from the two reviewers of his translation:

> This [editing] work often leaves me perplexed; on the one hand, the observations issued by the Brazilian reader would almost literally recreate the text; on the other hand, the French reader would rather have a French phrase with the same meaning, using more fluid and even more correct language. Agreeing with the latter, I cannot always find a solution that would satisfy both parties.[26]

---

24 Letter from Georges Le Gentil to Blaise Briod, 8 November 1929. (UNESCO, Correspondence, F, VI, 3).

25 Letter from Dominique Braga to Victor Orban, 17 February 1931 (UNESCO, Correspondence, F, VI, 3). "Le Comité croit donc devoir vous demander [. . .] de bien vouloir procéder à un travail de révision de votre texte. Remarquez qu'il s'agit avant tout de s'écarter un peu plus peut-être que vous ne l'avez fait de la traduction littérale. Vous avez voulu, certainement par fidélité à l'œuvre originale, rester très près de la langue portugaise. [. . .] il y aurait intérêt à se déprendre maintenant du texte brésilien, de façon à donner dans la langue française l'élégance et la qualité littéraire qui caractérisent la prose de Nabuco."

26 Letter from Manoel Gahisto to the Director of the IIIC, 27 January 1929 (UNESCO, Correspondence, F, VI, 3). "Ce travail [de révision] me laisse souvent perplexe; d'une part, les observations du lecteur brésilien tendent à obtenir une transposition presque littérale du texte; de l'autre, celles du lecteur français tendent à établir une phrase française de même sens, mais d'un langage souvent plus fluide et même plus correct. D'accord avec le dernier, je ne trouve pas toujours aisément la solution convenable pour tous deux."

Just like *Index Translationum*, this collection can also be examined in light of its role in the (re)negotiation of power relations in the cultural field. In the understanding that translation already constitutes a form of consecration of a text, its inclusion in a collection published by an international institution would confer it further value and suggests that it is worthy of international interest. It also tacitly consecrates the text's country of origin, conferring it prestige in the World Republic of Letters.

3.3 Consolidating Translation as a Specialised Activity

By observing the activities described thus far, we may gather that the IIIC ultimately contributed to consolidating translation as a specialised field of activity, raising awareness around translators' work. For example, the IIIC issued a list of recommendations for works related to the *Index Translationum* requesting that publishers always include the name of the translator and the source language's title in their publications. In literary collections published by the IIIC, all translations were signed by their translators, which was not always the case at the time, and translators were often asked to sign review copies of their books, with the translator's symbolic capital being used to promote translations. Beyond these practices, archive material can offer further insights regarding the IIIC's view of translation and its role in the consolidation of this activity. Translation was viewed as the product of the interests of a network of authors, translators, publishers, and readers. Within this network, the IIIC found itself a crucial role in improving the playing field for all of the actors involved in the translation process:

> The writer who wishes to have his work translated doesn't know whom to address to find a qualified translator [. . .] and he doesn't have sufficient means of quality control for this translation, or any protection if his text is betrayed. Meanwhile, the translator isn't protected from the editor's abuse [. . .]. There's no list of books showing the public which foreign works they can read in their own language or in any other language they know. Lastly, the editor has insufficient means for control, nor does he have sufficient access to review organs that might guide his research process to discern which foreign works to translate. [. . .] The current state of translation is unsatisfying, to the author, the translator, the editor, and especially to the readers.[27]

27 Report to the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters on the Committee of Experts in Translation. Note presented by the Institute to the Committee of Experts in Translation, UNOG 13C/60353/24804: "L'écrivain qui veut faire traduire son œuvre ne sait à qui s'adresser pour obtenir un traducteur qualifié [. . .] [et il] ne dispose d'aucun moyen de contrôle suffisant sur la qualité de la traduction, d'aucun moyen de protection si son texte est trahi. De son côté, le traducteur n'est pas protégé contre les abus de l'éditeur [. . .] aucun recueil bibliographique

As the idea of "the editor's abuse" suggests, these interests might be conflicting, and this conflict marks several aspects of the IIIC's translation policy. For example, the perceived problem regarding the quality of the translations available in the market often comes up in the archive documents. Be it because of insufficient skills, time, or compensation, most actors seem to agree upon the need to improve the quality of translations. However, for the IIIC, quality is not just a problem in and of itself, it is also a problem given that bad translations can dampen an author's recognition abroad and therefore counter his interests:

> [Good translations] are quite rare, and often little known [. . .] too many excellent works have not been translated, while certain mediocre works have enjoyed the honor of being translated. It's thus undeniable that certain top works don't enjoy the place they deserve abroad, given their lack of a good translation.[28]

In the IIIC's understanding, the author ought to have the right to control the fate of his work by approving or rejecting the translation. Against this backdrop, the IIIC discussed the creation of a translation-control office, but the idea was ultimately found unviable. Paradoxically, an office specialised in translation would have contributed to the field's professionalisation, even if conceived to protect authors while reinforcing a subservient view of translators. Indeed, the confluence of actors' interests in the literary field often favoured the institutionalisation and professionalisation of translation, although its autonomy remained precarious given that the interests of other players in the game were not always aligned with those of translators. We may read other initiatives in this same light: proposals to improve translations included the awarding of literary prizes for translations and the promotion of translation criticism in magazines, which would have contributed to homogenising certain practices in the field of translation and promoting exchange regarding translation decisions. Building specific value-creation mechanisms would have conferred social prestige to translation, while

---

ne vient renseigner rapidement le public sur les œuvres étrangères qu'il peut lire dans sa propre langue ou dans telle autre qu'il connaît. L'éditeur enfin ne dispose pas des moyens de contrôle et des organes de renseignements suffisants pour le guider dans ses recherches, pour lui indiquer les œuvres étrangères à faire traduire. [. . .] [L]'état actuel de la traduction n'est satisfaisant ni pour l'auteur, ni pour le traducteur, ni pour l'éditeur et ni, en définitive, pour l'ensemble des lecteurs."

28 Report to the Sub-Committee on Arts and Letters on the Committee of Experts in Translation. Note presented by the Institute to the Committee of Experts in Translation, UNOG R1050/13C/60353/24804: "[Les bonnes traductions] sont trop rares, trop peu connues souvent [. . .] trop d'œuvres excellentes demeurent non traduites tandis que certaine littérature médiocre a les honneurs de l'interprétation. Il est indéniable enfin que des chefs d'œuvre n'ont pas à l'étranger la place qui leur revient, faute d'une bonne traduction."

also aiding its constitution as a specialised and differentiated profession in the intellectual field. The goal of improving the quality of translations was thus pursued to fulfil various functions: protecting authors' interests and improving knowledge and understanding among peoples, but also promoting the professionalisation of translators, and therefore the autonomization of translation as a field of activity.

4 Tracing the UNESCO's Translation Policy to the IIIC's Previous Work

UNESCO's early days were largely influenced by the IIIC's legacy. The policy developed by UNESCO in the field of translation throughout its more than 75 years of history can be divided, as is the case with the IIIC, between interventions on a structural level and interventions aimed at publishing new translations.

The UNESCO's maintenance of *Index Translationum* until 2013 attests to the effectiveness of interventions at a structural level: for a long time, it has remained a key resource for professionals and scholars working with translation and foreign literatures, with its infrastructure fulfilling a myriad of functions for multiple actors in the literary field. Legislation on translation constitutes another domain affecting actors in the literary field in various ways. UNESCO has greatly contributed to this domain by advancing copyright law and intellectual property, especially with the adoption of the Universal Copyright Convention in 1952 and its revision in 1971. The IIIC and the ICIC's work in collaboration with the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law built the foundations for these milestones.

Legislation on translation concerning the revision of copyright law also contributed to consolidating translation as a field of expertise. In this spirit, the UNESCO has recommended that professional associations of translators be set up in countries where they don't yet exist, promoted their affiliation to international professional organisations, and created translator-training programs. The UNESCO's role in the professionalisation of translation can also be traced back to the IIIC.

Regarding the promotion of new translations, the UNESCO resumed the publication of literary collections and has created several translation programs that confer grants for translation. In fact, the IIIC's literary collections mark the origins of the UNESCO's Collection of Representative Works (1948–2005). The contrasting elements between the collections published by the IIIC and by the UNESCO reflect the evolution of cultural values, the professionalisation of translation, and the

consolidation of cultural cooperation: in contrast to the IIIC's policy, UNESCO specifically focused on literature, did include poetry in its collections, and has also published living writers. On the other hand, the upholding of certain principles reflects the two bodies' similar agency. Like the IIIC, the UNESCO also delegated decision-making around which works should be translated to national actors, be they members of national committees, national academies, or national chapters of the PEN Club. They also share some shortcomings: a certain Eurocentrism can be gleaned in the directionality of their translations: French was the only target language of the series published by the IIIC, although, at the time of its creation, texts were supposed to be published in English, Italian, and German as well. The UNESCO's Collection of Representative Works was characterised by more geographic variation (it included Arabic, Latin American, Persian, Italian, and Asian series) but the directionality of exchanges remained Eurocentric: while, at first, the UNESCO fostered translations from and into peripheral languages, it ultimately prioritised widely spoken languages as target languages, with English and French being the most frequent by far.

Nonetheless, the fact that the IIIC and the UNESCO published collections of classic or representative works speaks to the internationally accepted view that literature is a way of bringing peoples together and fostering better relations. While it remains true that scholars and historians of cultural diplomacy and intellectual cooperation struggle to find methodologies with which to examine the impact or effects of such projects, their sustained development over the years reflects a consensus regarding their usefulness or, at least, their potential. The latter is also indisputably related to the fact that such collections constitute a two-way transfer of symbolic capital: peripheral countries have found a platform for further visibility, while the IIIC and UNESCO have seen their international character reinforced. The fact that the IIIC's series was created at the request of Latin American delegates, and that the UNESCO's Collection was first confined to Arabic literature[29] in 1948 and then extended to Latin American literatures in 1949, reflects the interest of peripheral countries in these kinds of programs and speaks to the specific ways in which the "periphery" practices cultural diplomacy and cooperation. Regarding the functions fulfilled by these collections, further research might also detail these collections' distribution and circulation. The IIIC's Ibero-American Series paradoxically circulated further within the source literary system (in Latin America) than within the target literary system (in France) (Molloy 1972), which

29 The UNESCO and the Lebanese government agreed upon the establishment of an International Commission for the Translation of Great Books, which would assume direct responsibility for the translation of Western works into Arabic, as well as of Arabic works into English, French, and Spanish.

reflects the international dimension of nation-building processes. According to Gitton, "UNESCO's Collection seems to have touched a restrained elite, Western and westernised, without managing to reach the great public" (Giton 2014), with both assessments suggesting that the circulation of translations published by both institutions, both in geographic and social terms, needs to be critically assessed, as do the social functions they have performed.

5 Conclusions

The notion of translation policy has offered us a key tool to analyse and compare the IIIC and UNESCO's translation practices, as well as the decisions, values and principles behind them. In other words, the concept of translation policy, approached in the *longue durée*, can lead to new lines of research in the history of translation by linking previously isolated actors and phenomena.

The IIIC and UNESCO's translation policies can be characterised by viewing their interventions at a structural level, on the one hand, and at a more concrete level, on the other. At a structural level, both the IIIC and the UNESCO made or have made salient efforts to create or improve the infrastructure required for cultural transfer, with *Index Translationum* and their work around copyright law proffering great examples. Among their concrete practices, several programs to promote translations stand out, although the shortcomings in the circulation of the IIIC and the UNESCO's collections would explain why, today, translation grants constitute the main form of intervention to promote translations. The IIIC and UNESCO's translation policies reflect their evolution in the professionalisation of translation, overcoming the alleged untranslatability of poetry, while consolidating cultural and intellectual cooperation. The latter clearly reflects the ways their policies, understood as forms of agency, are directly tied to their positions in the field.

By reconstructing the IIIC's policy in the field of translation, we have unearthed the ambitious plans, but also the challenges, that this organisation faced in its daily practices. The IIIC's translation policy was designed to improve the circulation and knowledge of lesser-known languages and cultures, although this goal was more often declared than implemented. The inconsistency between the intentions that experts declared in their meetings and the measures that the IIIC ultimately implemented sheds light on the political rather than technical nature of this institution. That being said, the confluence of a variety of actors, from the IIIC's personnel to the ICIC's members, including specialised committees and occasional collaborators, has helped nuance our

understanding of a translation policy as a unified whole. The IIIC's case study shows translation policy in the making, with the values and principles upheld by the IIIC's members and collaborators operating in a delicate balance between the institution's economic possibilities, power relations with the ICIC and the League of Nations, and other related factors. Still, some actors managed to use their positions within the institution to advance their own views, especially Paul Valéry and Gabriela Mistral in the field of translation, thus reflecting the multiple articulations between individual and institutional agency.

In general terms, the IIIC institutionalised literary translation as a way of enhancing mutual understanding between cultures, an aim that has been central to the UNESCO's policy, too. The ways national interests surfaced in the IIIC's project reflect how translation doesn't always necessarily lead to the fulfilment of such idealist aims. Translation emerges as an activity that involves a network of political, economic, and professional interests, which simultaneously favours and limits its autonomy – and this balance is both its strength and its vulnerability. Translation, therefore, emerges as a necessarily international and interdisciplinary affair, with the IIIC and UNESCO's translation policy in the field attesting to their crucial role in the social history of translation. As has been shown, the IIIC and UNESCO have contributed to the autonomization and professionalisation of translation, which suggests that historians of cultural diplomacy and cultural cooperation must seek out such impact in the *longue durée*.

We would like to conclude this chapter by mentioning a few lines of research that would complement and complete our work: 1) textual analysis of translations published by the two organisations, 2) examinations of the IIIC and UNESCO's translation policy in relation to external translation policies, 3) combined analyses of personal and institutional archives in order to reconstruct the personal in the institutional, and 4) diversifying national approaches to the history of international organisations, as well as accounting for other non-state actors' modes of participation, including women, confessional groupings, and substate collectives. The history of the Ibero-American Collection can also be read in relation to the cultural policies deployed by Latin American countries. In other words, these institutions' international policies were deeply interwoven with existing national policies, and the institutions were careful not to tread on or question national priorities.

Archive Material
League of Nations Archive (UNOG)
UNESCO Archive (UNESCO)

Works Cited

Banoun, Bernard, and Isabelle Poulin. "L'âge de la traduction." *Histoire des traductions en langue française. XXe Siècle*. Ed. Bernard Banoun et al. Lagrasse: Verdier, 2019. 47–54.

Boschetti, Anna. *L'espace culturel transnational*. Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2010.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Les Règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* 12. 4–5 (1983): 311–356.

Brouillette, Sarah. *UNESCO and the Fate of the Literary*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Carbó-Catalan, Elisabet, and Diana Roig-Sanz, eds. *Culture as Soft Power. Cultural Relations, Intellectual Cooperation, and Cultural Diplomacy*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2022.

Casanova, Pascale. *La République mondiale des lettres*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.

Dumont, Juliette. *De la coopération intellectuelle à la diplomatie culturelle : Les voies/x de l'Argentine, du Brésil et du Chili (1919–1946)*. Paris: Université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3, 2013.

Dumont, Juliette. *Diplomatie culturelle et fabrique des identités. Argentine, Brésil, Chili (1919–1946)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2018.

Giton, Céline. *La Politique du livre de l'UNESCO (1945–1974)*. Paris: Institut d'Études Politiques de Paris, 2012.

Giton, Céline. "Une démocratisation du livre ? La politique mondiale du livre de l'Unesco, 1945–1974." Comité d'histoire du ministère de la Culture et de la Communication, Centre d'histoire de Sciences-Po Paris, La démocratisation culturelle au fil de l'histoire contemporaine. Paris, 2012–2014. Available: http://chmcc.hypotheses.org/719.

González Núñez, Gabriel. "On Translation Policy." *Target* 28.1 (2016): 87–109.

Grandjean, Martin. *Les réseaux de la coopération intellectuelle. La Société des Nations comme actrice des échanges scientifiques et culturels dans l'entre-deux-guerres*. Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, 2018.

Grandjean, Martin. "A Representative Organization? Ibero-American Networks in the Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations (1922–1939)." *Cultural Organizations, Networks and Mediators in Contemporary Ibero-America*. Eds. Diana Roig-Sanz and Jaume Subirana. New York – London: Routledge, 2020. 65–89.

Guerrero, Gustavo. "Brief History of an Anthology of Mexican Poetry." *Mexican Literature as World Literature*. Ed. Ignacio M. Sánchez Prado. London: Bloomsbury, 2021. 153–169.

Hauser, Claude, et al. *La diplomatie par le livre. Réseaux et circulation internationale de l'imprimé de 1880 à nos jours*. Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2011.

Herrera León, Fabián, and Yannick Wehrli. *América Latina y el internacionalismo ginebrino de entreguerras. Implicaciones y resonancias*. Mexico D.F.: Dirección General del Acervo Histórico Diplomático de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 2019.

Intrator, Miriam. *Books Across Borders: UNESCO and the Politics of Postwar Cultural Reconstruction, 1945–1951*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Iriye, Akira. *Cultural Internationalism and World Order*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Klengel, Susanne. "El derecho a la literatura (mundial y traducida). Sobre el sueño translatológico de la UNESCO." *Re-mapping World Literature: Writing, Book Markets and Epistemologies between Latin America and the Global South*. Ed. Gesine Müller, Jorge J. Locane, and Benjamin Loy. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2018. 131–156.

Laqua, Daniel. "Transnational Intellectual Cooperation, the League of Nations, and the Problem of Order." *Journal of Global History* 6.2 (2011): 223–247.

Maurel, Chloé. *La pensée et l'action de l'UNESCO dans le domaine de la culture, 1946–1974*. Paris: Université de Paris I, 2001.

Meylaerts, Reine. "Translation Policy." *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011. 163–168.

Millet, Lauriane. "Esprit japonais et prémices du multiculturalisme." *Bulletin de l'Institut Pierre Renouvin* 39.1 (2014): 79–90.

Molloy, Sylvia. *La diffusion de la littérature hispano-américaine en France au XXe Siècle*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1972.

Naravane, Vaiju. "Fifty Years of Translation: The Index Translationum Completes a Half Century." *Publishing Research Quarterly* 15.4 (1999): 23–38.

Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

Omolewa, Michael. "UNESCO as a Network." *Paedagogica historica* 43.2 (2007): 211–221.

Pemberton, Jo-Anne. "The Changing Shape of Intellectual Cooperation: From the League of Nations to UNESCO." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 58.1 (2012): 34–50.

Pita González, Alexandra. "América (Latina) en París: Mistral, Reyes y Torres Bodet en la Colección Iberoamericana, 1927–1940." *América Latina y el internacionalismo ginebrino de entreguerras: Implicaciones y resonancias*. Ed. Yannick Wehrli and Fabián Herrera León. Mexico D.F.: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, Dirección General del Acervo Histórico Diplomático, 2019. 241–276.

Poupaud, Sandra, et al. "Finding Translations. On the Use of Bibliographical Databases in Translation History." *Meta* 54.2 (2009): 264–278.

Renoliet, Jean-Jacques. *L'UNESCO oubliée. La Société des Nations et la coopération intellectuelle (1919–1946)*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1999.

Roig-Sanz, Diana. "The International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation: Translation Policies in the Interwar Period (1925–1946)." *The Routledge Handbook of Translation History*. Ed. Christopher Rundle. London: Routledge, 2022. 452–468.

Roig-Sanz, Diana, and Reine Meylaerts, eds. *Literary Translation and Cultural Mediators in "Peripheral" Cultures*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Thiesse, Anne-Marie. *La création des identités nationales*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.