

Note from the Editor-in-Chief

IKER ARRANZ OTAEGUI

Our journal *Territories: A Trans-Cultural Journal for Regional Studies* takes another tiny but important step. With this second issue we want to consolidate the interdisciplinary soul of our publication with an adventurous issue that connects the literary thinking with the historical period of the Cold War. It is important to note that this collection comes in part as a result of the papers we have collected from a conference panel. In 2019, at Georgetown University, we had the chance to discuss in a preliminary way, the topic itself at ACLA conference. The panel, named “Debating (Ultra)Minor/Small and World Literatures in the Age of Cold War”, aimed to cover a more marginal connection between literature and history that nevertheless resulted in a very productive discussion around the limits of canonical literature, and the emerging spaces for literary analysis that *small* and *minor* categories bring to the front. Being the nature of this debate still alive and sparking, this issue wants to contribute to the debate itself. Without settling every single question at a theoretical and practical level, the issue covers an important number of topics and perspectives that analyze how authors, literary works and even their own socio-spatial reality are related to each other with a more pragmatic spirit. The impact of the circumstances, without being deterministic, might bring nuances that classical or canonical theories omit. Therefore, the issue does cover some blind spots that previous scholarly works have obliterated.

We open the issue with a brief but immense piece by Suzanne Jill Levine on censorship and self-translation, specially focused on the South American Boom, which also shows an interesting insight on what was happening outside the iron curtains of the Cold War at that time. Centered at a great extent in Cabrera Infante, Jill Levine describes the evolution of a translation, of the translation of *Tres Tristes Tigres* to be more precise. Taken for granted, given always-already, translations tend to come in a second or third level when it comes down to literary debates. Yet, the very nature of translations –that very betweenness of languages, characters and intimacies –fits perfectly well with the spirit of the Cold War, which more than anything described a subtle split of the Western reality. Levine is able to gather the ups and downs, the repression and censorship, the personal interests of the author(s) to describe a historical moment that will paint accurately the raw reality of the Cold War in some other parts of the world, in a contemporary fashion. The issue takes off in this manner with a quick gaze to South Cone writers in order to gain context, and it is followed by a very convincing piece by Dunia Gras on Emir Rodríguez Monegal’s work from a transatlantic perspective. Professor Gras is able to expand and dig into the literary connections of these south cone writers with the époque of the Cold War. Focused in the legendary publishing adventure of Gallimard, Gras exposes

the different versions, connections, re-elaborations, affirmations and negations, and in sum the controversial but vivid process that any literary production conveys inside, moreover when translations are included. The readings that Monegal completed for Gallimard here are presented as a material that explains further the internal law of translators, and the always complicated relationship with big publishers. Following these two pieces mostly devoted to translations, the issue continues with an interesting piece on Kundera and Ionesco by Professor Maria Lupas, and the very idea of *minor* as a concept to embrace when we are talking about these two authors. Lupas navigates throughout the theoretical apparatus built by Deleuze and Guattari, in order to conclude the belongness of Milan Kundera and Eugene Ionesco's work to this category. Following a strict theoretical plan, Lupas is able to articulate the argument within and without the classical vision of Deleuze and Guattari's category, and their particular reading of Kafka, including vibrant insights in the possibilities that the literature of small nations open in literary criticism. In this direction, Yanli HE provides a theoretical apparatus on how to rethink the very category of small/minor as a Secondary Zone Literature in the next section of this issue. HE is able to discern in this fashion an alternative, a conceptual notion, which covers previously developed ideas in the field, and adds with a smart twist the notion of territoriality with the literary world. A connection, as mentioned above, less common but definitely appealing for the intellectual debate. Once solved the introductory and more theoretical aspects, the issue turns into some interdisciplinary examples of this very connection between territory and literary production: Jonathan Hart, Arpi Movsesian and Iker Arranz present a vision of Canadian, Armenian and Basque literary examples that might shade some light in the discipline. Hart provides a perfect bridging excuse to navigate throughout different intellectual's contributions and the literary diversity of a historical period more defined normally by obscure narratives. Movsesian brings a vibrant text on Armenian literature, its tensions and struggle in the socio-political level that every small or minor culture tends to be trapped on. Finally, Arranz explores the theoretical (dis)connections between Emanuel Levinas and Pío Baroja with regards to the concept of otherness, as a prelude -in the case of Baroja—to the approach to the Other in the era of the Cold War. Finally, the issue includes two different reflexions in the charge of images, literature and territory with the contributions of Lucian Tion on the cinema of the post Berlin Wall collapse, and Michel De Dobbeleer's interesting piece on the Post-Yugoslav and Bulgarian comic production.

In sum, this issue aims to contribute to the effort to rethink territories, spatialities and places from the cross-disciplinary perspective of mingling social sciences and humanities. These two different scopes, separated in classical scholarship, come together in this issue, and they do taking an emblematic historical event that changed the very course of Western civilization.

