

Aušra Jurgutienė

Dr. philol., literary scholar

Institute of Lithuanian Literature and Folklore

E-mail: ausra.jurgutiene@gmail.com

DOI: 10.35539/LTNC.2023.0051.03

The Cold War in the History of Literature

Aukstais karš literatūras vēsturē

Keywords:

Lithuanian literary history,
Soviet occupation,
national disintegration and integration,
comparative historical research

Atslēgvārdi:

Lietuvas literatūras vēsture,
padomju okupācija,
nacionālā disintegrācija un integrācija,
salīdzinošie vēstures pētījumi

Summary

John Neubauer's suggestion to re-evaluate national histories (which he expresses in *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (since 2004) and *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe: A Compendium* (2009)) encouraged me to take another look at the new, more-complicated processes of integration and disintegration in histories of national literature during the Cold War (1946–1991).

For this reason, the focus of my paper will be dual: on the internal hostility of national literary history and the splitting of national self-images caused by the Cold War, and on the need to preserve national memory and self-awareness. I will discuss the ambivalent identity of the Lithuanian literature: how it was disintegrated during the Cold War with the Bolshevik thesis about the existence of two cultures in each national culture, and how it preserved the basic features of integration. Although my research will be mostly based on examples from the history of Lithuanian literature, I believe it can also be relevant for other cultures that survived the Soviet period and ideological censorship. The goal of this article is to discuss how complicated the processes of "junctures and disjunctures" were in Lithuanian literary history during the Soviet occupation, and how they remain relevant in contemporary historiography.

Kopsavilkums

Džona Neibauera (*John Neubauer*) ieteikums pārvērtēt nacionālās vēstures (ko viņš pauž izdevumos *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (2004) un *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe: A Compendium* (2009)) mani ierosināja no jauna paskatīties uz sarežģītajiem integrācijas un disintegrācijas procesiem nacionālo literatūru vēsturēs Aukstā kara laikā (1946–1991). Tādēļ manam rakstam būs divējāds fokuss: uz Aukstā kara izraisīto nacionālās literatūras vēstures iekšējo konfliktu un sašķelto nacionālo paštēlu, kā arī uz nepieciešamību saglabāt tautas atmiņu un pašapzināšanos. Es aplūkošu Lietuvas literatūras vēstures pretrunīgo identitāti: kā tā tika disintegrēta Aukstā kara laikā, sekojot boļševiku tēzei par to, ka katrā nacionālā kultūrā pastāv divas kultūras, un kā tā tomēr saglabāja integrācijas pazīmes. Kaut arī mans pētījums pamatā balstās uz piemēriem no Lietuvas literatūras vēstures, domāju, ka tas var būt aktuāls arī citās kultūrās, kas pārdzīvojušas padomju laikus un ideoloģisko cenzūru. Šī raksta mērķis ir analizēt sarežģītos "savienšanās un atvienšanās" procesus lietuviešu literatūras vēsturē padomju okupācijas laikā un to aktualitāti mūsdienu historiogrāfijā.

After the Cold War (1947–1991), during which the world was divided into two opposing military blocs of the capitalist West and the socialist East, John Neubauer's suggestion to re-evaluate national histories (which he expresses in *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (since 2004) and *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe: A Compendium* (2009)) encouraged me to take another look at the new, more-complicated processes of integration and disintegration in histories of national literature during the Cold War (1946–1991). In the Introduction to *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries, Volume 3* (2007) Neubauer highlighted the positive, nation-integrating impact of European national literary histories, but also their negative, isolating effect that triggered hostility towards national minorities and neighbors:

The national self-images of the last two centuries must be revised today, not only because of globalization and European integration, but above all because they continue to foment alienation, hostility, and aggression against minorities and against neighboring states (Neubauer 2007: 345).

These processes took place somewhat differently in Lithuania during the Cold War, so it is important to analyze their features. It is obvious that the literary history of the occupied Lithuanian nation after its inclusion in the Eastern Bloc lost the purpose of uniting all its citizens and the entirety of Lithuanian culture, as it was split into two separate parts (the communist East and the bourgeois émigré West), and, accordingly, into two opposing literatures (in simple terms, that of Socialist Realism and of decadence). Soviet colonization caused, first of all, internal hostility and aggression in the nation against itself (rather than against minorities and against neighboring states), as the latter were divided into "rotting capitalist countries" and "friendly union of Soviet republics". Standing with the colonizer was called "being in the family of Soviet writers" (Korsakas 1968: 9); such loyalty was very useful for many writers and for Soviet literary historians. Calling themselves progressive anti-fascists, they criticized bourgeois decadents and pushed them to the margins of history: "Having introduced some formal innovations that diversified and expanded the means of artistic expression, the decadent direction of 'pure art' essentially turned the development of Lithuanian poetry on the wrong path of ideological and artistic decline" (Korsakas 1961: 199). The best works written by the émigré writers and poets after 1944 were not mentioned at all in Soviet literary histories.

This internal ideological and aesthetic confrontation, based on the Bolshevik thesis about the existence of two cultures in each national culture, was best illustrated

by the four-volume academic history of Lithuanian literature (*Lietuvių literatūros istorija*, edited by Kostas Korsakas) in Soviet Lithuania. It covers literature from the earliest writings (the 14th century annals of Lithuania) to the latest literary publications in 1967. It was written and published between 1957 and 1968 and encompassed the periods of both Khrushchev's Thaw (1953–1964) and Brezhnev's Stagnation (1964–1985). Ten years later, a typically stagnant and somewhat more concise *Lietuvių literatūros istorija* (History of Lithuanian Literature) in two volumes (edited by Jonas Lankutis) was published between 1979 and 1982. The ideological and methodological structure of its narrative remained the same as that of the history edited by Korsakas. These histories clearly show that during the Cold War there was no fundamental break in the historiography of the literature of the Thaw and the Stagnation period: both were written and edited according to the same principle of loyalty to the Communist Party.

The Soviet histories of Lithuanian literature used identic rhetoric of literary interpretation which softened into ambiguous phrases, both praising the artistry of classical works and criticizing it for its ideological limitations, which Yurchak attributed to "mimetic resistance" (Yurchak 2005: 130). He explained that a "normal" Soviet person was not an ideological fighter, prisoner, or an exile. He did not identify himself with either the ideas of the Communist Party or the opposing ideas of the dissidents. His choice was of a public posture that was neither Soviet nor anti-Soviet, but a-Soviet. This style of "mimetic resistance" was particularly characteristic in the interpretations of the most famous national classics, giving them Sovietic, "historically objective" evaluations. In the Soviet histories of Lithuanian literature, the artistic value of literary classics was praised; at the same time, the necessary ideological criticism was expressed. For example, the poem *Metai* (The Seasons, written 1765–1775 and published 1818) by the first Lithuanian writer and pastor Kristijonas Donelaitis was evaluated positively for being realistic by the standards of Engels ("Donelaitis's realism meets F. Engels's requirement that a realistic work, in addition to the certainty of details, should depict typical characters in typical circumstances" (Korsakas 1957: 297)) and negatively for its religious idealism: "In the poem "The Seasons" Donelaitis depicts the 18th century life of the East Prussian peasants. The poet portrays that life realistically [...]. However, in pursuit of a didactic goal in his work, the poet sometimes moves away from the realistic depiction of the actual life [...]. Didactic, idealistic elements are related to Donelaitis's profession as a clergyman and his Christian worldview. This is where the deep inner contradiction arises between realistic depictions of life and idealistic coverage of some phenomena in Donelaitis's work" (Korsakas 1957: 263). (Here and elsewhere – translations by the author of the article.)

The same "deep inner contradictions" were found in the books of almost all Lithuanian writers who were not Marxists and Communists. In the second Soviet history

of Lithuanian literature (ed. by Lankutis) the boundaries between Socialist Realism and modernist art were blurred as the latter became increasingly widespread in Soviet Lithuanian culture. Dominated by author-centered positivism and vulgar Marxism, the later methodology of historical research made more room for text-oriented literary descriptions, which converged with Russian formalism and new criticism as objective literary theory. In summary, it can be said that the ambiguity and aesopism of the style grew stronger in the second Soviet history of literature (ed. Lankutis); it even became unclear how much ideological criticism was sincere and true and how much was formal and played out. For example, speaking about the connection of Soviet Lithuanian poetry with world literature, the author could not help but pay homage to other Soviet literatures, stating that “today, Lithuanian Soviet poetry has crossed its national borders [...] by adopting the artistic experience of other Soviet peoples [...] Its relationship with world culture is broad and meaningful” (Lankutis 1982: 299).

After more than half of Lithuanian writers had left the Soviet-occupied Lithuania for the USA in 1944, the imperative of writing a parallel history of literature was obvious. As a counterpoint to the ideologically engaged history of literature that Korsakas edited, the exile critic Pranas Naujokaitis published his version of *Lietuvių literatūros istorija* (History of Lithuanian Literature; four volumes, 1972–1975, Chicago), but since he did not have adequate access to sources, his history was quite encyclopedic and did not attract much attention. The émigré writers and critics chose a different and much more successful path: to write a partial history of émigré literature, which was banned in Soviet Lithuania. This was how *Lietuvių literatūra svetur: Antologija 1945–1967* (Lithuanian Literature Abroad: Anthology 1945–1967; 1968) edited by Kazys Bradūnas, and *Lietuvių egzodo literatūra, 1945–1990* (Literature of the Lithuanian Exodus, 1945–1990; 1992) appeared. The latter, edited by Rimvydas Šilbajoris and Bradūnas, took a long time to prepare and was comprehensive and expertly written. Earlier Šilbajoris had also written a short history of Lithuanian émigré literature in English, *Perfection of Exile: Fourteen Contemporary Lithuanian Writers* (1970).

Although the ideological attitudes towards literature dominant in the Soviet literary history were criticized by the émigré scholars and separate émigré histories were written, the latter did not barricade themselves in anti-communism and in a war against a red Lithuania, but discussed and created an overall projection of the national literature which had lived to its historical fulfillment. In his article “A Comprehensive Look at the Literature of Our Exodus,” Juozas Girnius formulated the most important perspective for the future of Lithuanian literature, cherished by numerous émigrés: in the future, the fragmented parts of Lithuanian literature will have to be brought together into a unified national literature, because a common tradition, a common language, and a common Lithuanian reality ensured their internal link:

Lithuanian literature was split into two branches – that of an enslaved land and the free world. Because of entirely different circumstances, they both developed in different directions. But equally integrally, they both belong to our nation and ultimately form a single whole, even though there is a deep internal tension within this whole. [...] Yet basically, both at home and abroad, we are not 'they' and 'they,' but the same 'we,' the children of the same nation fused by centuries (Girnius 1968: 524).

This was also the idea behind the subsequent *Lietuvių egzodo literatūra, 1945–1990* (Literature of the Lithuanian Exodus, 1945–1990) which was started in 1983 and published at the beginning of independence in 1992 as a supposedly supplementary third volume to the Soviet literary history edited by Lankutis:

This work now appears as the third volume of the two-volume *Lietuvių literatūros istorija* published in Vilnius. [...] However, the structural plans of those volumes have not been followed here. The aim was to make the work not monophonic, but polyphonic, to keep it from being boring; it is diverse in its insights and conclusions (Bradūnas, Šilbajoris 1992: 5).

Criticizing the censored and disciplined evaluation of writers in the Soviet literary history, the diaspora openly expressed their goal to integrate that part of national literature which could not be made public in Soviet historiography:

Let this book not create pretentious divisions but rather do what could not be done in Lithuania for a long time – bearing in mind, above all, that just as there is only one Lithuanian language, so is there only one Lithuanian literature (Bradūnas 1992: 20).

The histories of émigré literature were written in a similar spirit to the one that prevailed in the Santara-Šviesa organization founded in the USA in 1953 and in a journal published by it, *Metmenys* (eds. Vytautas Kavolis, Violeta Kelertienė, Rimvydas Šilbajoris, since 1959). "Having realized that the vital centre of Lithuanian literature and the opportunities for its development remained in Lithuania, that in emigration the energy of Lithuanian artistic world is becoming exhausted and sooner or later it will go out, *Metmenys*, *Akiračiai*, *Aidai*, and *Draugas* started reviewing the books of Lithuanian Soviet writers" (Kubilius 1997: 479). It set the task for the Lithuanian diaspora to "turn its face towards Lithuania." Of course, the Lithuanian diaspora was not united: there were many who preferred to deepen the confrontation with Soviet Lithuania, and they were free to express their different opinions.

In Soviet Lithuania it was impossible to publicly express such expectations for a national integration under the conditions of occupation and totalitarianism, but writers and scholars secretly read and circulated the works of the diaspora among their trusted friends. They took a secret interest in exile fiction, poetry, and criticism, finding content that was close to their hearts, fostering the same idea of integration,

seeing authorities of their profession in it and grasping at each word of Greimas, Kavolis, Šilbajoris, Bradūnas, and others.¹

Due to the geopolitical impact of the Cold War, Lithuanian national literature was separated into very different narratives and became alienated from itself. A united national literary history existed only in the vision of writers as a future projection. The opposing geopolitical forces also had a strong impact on all Soviet comparative historical research and comparative literary studies. As opposed to the diaspora, a yet-unseen confrontation of Eastern and Western orientations emerged in Soviet comparative literary studies which refuted all the theories about the synthesis of these orientations in the national culture that had existed from Adam Mickiewicz to Stasys Šalkauskis. Criticism of bourgeois cosmopolitanism fostered militant proletarian internationalism and Russian imperialism throughout Soviet literature and created an ideological propaganda of friendship between the peoples of the USSR. It was supported by programs of literary exchanges, translations, publishing, and communication studies: "An international culture common to all Soviet nations is evolving. The cultural treasury of each nation is increasingly enriched with works of an international character" (Korsakas 1962: 9). It must be acknowledged that Korsakas was partly right, because Russian literature played the roles of mediator and censor in the contact of Lithuanian literature with world literature.

Studies of the so-called great Russian literary influences on Lithuanian literature prevailed: *Tautų draugystė lietuvių ir rusų literatūrose* (The Friendship of Nations in Lithuanian and Russian Literature, 1963), *Majakovskis ir lietuvių literatūra* (Mayakovsky and Lithuanian Literature, 1955) by Petras Užkalnis, *M. Gorkis ir lietuvių literatūra* (M. Gorky and Lithuanian Literature, 1956) by Kazys Umbrasas, etc. All these comparative interpretations, based on the same positive story about the influence of a Russian writer on Lithuanian literature, aimed to disintegrate Lithuanian literature from the inside, integrating it into Russian and Soviet literature and legitimizing the occupation of the country. In this way, the broken ties with Lithuanian emigration were compensated by new ties of friendship with the other Soviet peoples. Later, more substantial works about Russian writers were published: *Levas Tolstojus ir Lietuva* (Leo Tolstoy and Lithuania, 1978) and *Fiodoras Dostojevskis ir Lietuva* (Fyodor Dostoevsky and Lithuania, 1982) by Birutė Baltrušaitytė-Masionienė, *Levo Tolstojaus meno pasaulyje* (In the World of Leo Tolstoy's Art, 1978) by Elena Červinskienė, *Aleksandras Puškinas ir Lietuva* (Aleksandr Pushkin and Lithuania, 1976) by Rimantas Sidaravičius. Kostas Korsakas, director of the Institute of the Lithuanian Language and Literature, was the most

1 I remember Prof. Donatas Sauka (more about him below), who was the supervisor of my coursework at Vilnius University, lending me his copy of the book *Lietuvių literatūra svetur: 1945–1967* (Lithuanian Literature Abroad: 1945–1967; 1968) with a self-made jacket from the *Tiesa* newspaper.

active propagandist of these ideological comparative studies. He came well prepared from the socialist group “The Third Front”, alongside his friends Petras Cvirka, Jonas Šimkus, Antanas Venclova, and others. As early as 1932, Antanas Vaičiulaitis wrote about Korsakas and his literary criticism: “His sympathies are primarily determined not by the artistic aspect of the literary work, but by its ideological side, in this case Marxist-communist. And he does not spare negative epithets of all sorts for writers of a different line – such as outdated, with feet of clay, obsolete, reactionary” (Vaičiulaitis 1992: 547). In his books *Literatūry draugystė* (The Friendship of Literatures, 1962) and *Literatūriniai kontaktai* (Literary Contacts, 1987), Korsakas demonstrated to all literary scholars how the newly-emerged innovative direction in Lithuanian literature – the phenomenon of Soviet literary friendship – should be researched by subordinating it to central Russian literature and literary studies and to the idea of building communism. After the collapse of the USSR, Vytautas Kubilius voiced his negative view on this tradition of comparative literature formed by Russian imperialism:

Comparative studies were dominated by research of the impact of Russian literature in order to demonstrate loyalty and gratitude to the conquerors. [...] Soviet culture, resulting from the concepts of Slavophilism and Bolshevik Marxism, aggressively performed the colonization function on the vast territory of Central-Eastern Europe. However, they did not manage to disperse the autochthonous culture of these nations nor to kill their national languages (Kubilius 1999: 8).

But we should also see some of the most striking examples of resistance to it. Not only Lithuanian literature and Russian literature, but also the history of Western literature (accompanied by ideological interpretation) occupied a very significant place in Soviet educational practices and comparative studies. The contacts of Lithuanian literature with and between Western and Russian literatures often became ideologically ambiguous by mixing Soviet and world literature in one whole:

Lithuanian literature developed not as an isolated and separate phenomenon but as a part of the entire multinational Soviet literature, subordinated to its common laws which were determined by the same socialist order of life, Marxist ideology, and the Communist Party’s uninterrupted line of cultural policy, as it brings all the literatures of the peoples of the USSR in the same direction, atmosphere, and rhythm. [...] During this period, Lithuanian literature was particularly active in trying to perceive itself in the context of world culture, to lean on it, and to establish itself in it (Kubilius 1982: 299).

Since the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) conference in Budapest in 1962, the Iron Curtain between East and West had been torn down with a series of studies of common historical styles in European literature: *Expressionism as an International Literary Phenomenon* (ed. Ulrich Weisstein, 1973); *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages* (ed. Anna Balakian, 1982); *Les Genres en vers des lumières au romantisme* (ed. György M Vajda, 1982); *Les avant-gardes littéraires*

au XXe siècle: Histoire (ed. Jean Weisgerber, 1984); *Les avant-gardes littéraires au XXe siècle: Théorie* (ed. Jean Weisgerber, 1984); *European-Language Writing in Sub-Saharan Africa* (v. 2, ed. Albert Gerard, 1986); *L'époque de la renaissance (1400–1600)*; *L'avènement de l'esprit nouveau (1400–1480)* (eds. Tibor Klaniczay, Eva Kushner, Andre Stegmann, 1987); *Romantic Irony* (ed. Frederick Garber, 1988); etc. This process inevitably affected the openness of comparative research in Soviet Lithuanian.

During the period of Stagnation, two of the most important books in comparative literary studies appeared; they brought Lithuanian literature back from the communist camp to where it had belonged originally. In his book *Lietuvių literatūra ir pasaulinės literatūros procesas* (Lithuanian Literature and the Process of World Literature, 1983), Vytautas Kubilius returned to the traditional Eurocentric comparativism. He expanded and updated it with the latest methodological works by French comparativists A. Guérard, M. F. Guyard, and R. Étiemble, German scholars F. Baldensperger and U. Rukser, Polish comparativist M. Glowński, and American scholars R. Wellek, F. Jost, I. Söter, and H. M. Block. From René Wellek, who impressed him the most, Kubilius borrowed the idea that the function of the receiver, rather than the sender, is more important in literary communication: “[W]orks of art are not the sum of sources and influences: they are whole entities where things taken from elsewhere enter a new structure” (Kubilius 1983: 15). For Kubilius, one of the most important goals of this book was geopolitical. He directed the research of the history of Lithuanian literature away from the ideological theme of the friendship between Soviet peoples and towards the history of Western literature: “[T]he more mature a national literature becomes, the more clearly it perceives itself as a part of world literature” (Kubilius a 1983).

Another famous literary scholar, Donatas Sauka, wrote a book *Fausto amžiaus epilogas* (The Epilogue of the Age of Faust, 1998) which was based on discussions with students of Vilnius University at seminars during the final two decades of Stagnation. The book oscillates between research on literary connection and intellectual biography, and shows the explosive energy with which the Soviet philologist, physically locked in an ideological cage, resisted the regime’s East-oriented literary studies. Sauka showed that there were no iron curtains that could separate Lithuanian literature and literary criticism from European and global literary contexts. He sought to stop the contempt for the West that had been ideologically instilled in several generations, and to show that Lithuanians were fully adequate and resembled other nations whose literatures belonged to the field of classical European culture.

It is important to mention that during the occupation of the Baltic States, as they shared the concern that their nations and languages might be disappearing, literary ties among these states were greatly strengthened. As émigré Estonian

poet Ivar Ivask explained: "We can rest assured about the truth of our claim that since Polish exile literature of the 19th century and since Russian émigré literature of the first half of the 20th century there has never been such a wonderful flourishing of exile literature as the one that took place from 1945 to 1970 among the Baltic emigrants in the West" (Ivask 1973: 2). A similar integration process developed between Soviet Latvian, Estonian, and Lithuanian literatures: "They follow our literary discussions [...] and we all, poets and prose writers, go to Riga and there we are already called by [our] first names, rather than surnames" (Martinaitis 1980: 8).

I have come to a conclusion about the paradox of the Cold War in the history of Lithuanian literature: it existed, separating writers of the same language and literature ideologically, and yet at the same time it did not exist. The passage of time highlights the great merit of the histories of émigré literature: they were written not only as a confrontation, but also as a compensation and as a complement to the Soviet history of national literature. The incitement of class warfare between the writers of Socialist Realism and those who at that time in the Soviet Union were publicly labelled as bourgeois nationalists, fascist collaborators, and decadents, was much more intense in Soviet literary histories, which were influenced by totalitarianism and censorship. However, the idea of national independence and the related national integration processes were secretly cherished in the occupied Lithuania by many writers and critics. There were books published by émigré writers such as Jonas Mekas, Marius Katiliškis, Henrikas Radauskas, and also Vytautas Mačernis who, although he had never left Lithuania, was grouped with the émigré movement, a poet of "earth". After the Soviet censorship was abolished, a wave of émigré literature flooded Lithuanian magazines and publishing houses:

The émigré literature, which suddenly found itself in the center of universal attention as the expression of the nation's interests and unsocialized humanism, pushed into a state of inferiority the country's literary forces, driven by the historic upheaval off the routes of habitual creative thinking and, to a greater or lesser extent, from privileged social status (Kubilius 1997: 480).

After the re-establishment of Lithuanian independence, Kubilius wrote *XX amžiaus literatūra: Lietuvių literatūros istorija* (20th Century Literature: History of Lithuanian Literature, 1995). He did it by himself after he did not succeed in bringing together colleagues from both sides of the Iron Curtain for this substantial work. It was the first history of Lithuanian literature of the 20th century where the two opposing sides that had been divided by the Cold War now met again in a joint narrative.²

2 Even in the English-language edition *Lithuanian Literature*, published in 1997, Soviet and emigration literature were described by separate authors and presented in separate narratives. What is important to us is that the book ends with an article "The Integration of Split Literature" by Kubilius, which discusses the problem of dismantling national literature and re-creating it as a whole.

The beginning of an integrated history of national literature initially sparked a great deal of debate. Within two months after its release, it received more than ten reviews written by writers (Romualdas Lankauskas, Jonas Juškaitis, Sigitas Geda, Judita Vaičiūnaitė, Juozas Aputis, Sigitas Parulskis, Anielius Markevičius) and scholars (Vanda Zaborskaitė, Leonardas Sauka, Albertas Zalatorius, Viktorija Daujotytė, Algis Kalėda, Elena Baliutytė, Donata Mitaitė, Giedrius Viliūnas, Audinga Peluritytė, Marijus Šidlauskas). It was discussed at the Vilnius conference of the World Lithuanian Community in 1997 and by many school teachers across the country. The most heated debates were about the aesthetic and social evaluation of literature, as well as about the rewriting of history, its methodological updating, and whether it can be objective: "A historian must understand that everyone has their own perspective, that stories can be different" (Bumblauskas 1997: 135).

The history of Lithuanian literature of the 20th century written by Kubilius, accompanied by the heated debates, shows that the integration of the literary histories written on both sides of the Iron Curtain during the Cold War still awaits more analytical research. Thus the John Neubauer quote at the beginning of this article should be deconstructed and supplemented as follows: not only the national self-images of the last two centuries must be revised today during our time of globalization and European integration, but so must their ideological destruction during the Cold War as well, when the imperial superiority of Russia over the occupied nations (mixed with proletarian internationalism and the Marxist idea of class struggle) internally divided and endangered the national cultures but still did not achieve its goal. Although this research was based on examples from the history of Lithuanian literature, I hope that it can also be relevant for other cultures that survived the Soviet period and ideological censorship, because "cultures that coexist for a long time in the same state or political system will obviously develop common features" (Bojtár 2007: 425). The main goal was to discuss how an internal aggression (rather than aggression against minorities or neighbours) can be formed in the history of the national literature of a colonized nation – and also how important it is for such national literature to find its own junctions.

Bibliography

- Bojtár, Endre (2007). Pitfalls in Writing a Regional Literary History of East-Central Europe. Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer (eds.). *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries, volume 3: The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 419–429.
- Bradūnas, Kazys (ed.) (1968). *Lietuvių literatūra svetur: Antologija 1945–1967*. Chicago: Draugo spaustuė.
- Bradūnas, Kazys (1992). Įvadiniai žvilgsniai (Introductory glimpses). *Lietuvių egzodo literatūra: 1945–1990*. Chicago: Lituaniistikos institutas, pp. 7–21.
- Bradūnas, Kazys; Šilbajoris, Rimvydas (1992). Redaktorių žodis (Editors' Preface). *Lietuvių egzodo literatūra: 1945–1990*. Chicago: Lituaniistikos institutas, pp. 5–6.
- Bumblauskas, Alfredas (1997). Lituaniistikos tyrinėjimo būdai: Naujos temos ir metodai: II diskusijų stalas. *Lituaniistika XXI amžiaus išvakarėse: Tyrinėjimų prioritetai, metodai ir naujovės*. Vilnius: Pasaulio liuanistų bendrija, pp. 131–143.
- Girnius, Juozas (1968). Visumos žvilgsnis į mūsų egzodo literatūrą. *Lietuvių literatūra svetur, Antologija 1945–1967*. Chicago: Į laisvę fondas, pp. 512–606.
- Ivar, Ivask (1973). Baltų egzilio literatūra. *Aidai*, Nr. 1, pp. 2–10.
- Yurchak, Alexei (2005). *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jakonytė, Loretta (2006). Vytauto Kubiliaus XX amžiaus literatūros recepcija: ginčas dėl literatūros, istorijos ir kritikos, *Colloquia*, Nr. 17, pp. 81–95.
- Korsakas, Kostas (ed.) (1957). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija. Vol. 1*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Korsakas, Kostas (ed.) (1961). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija. Vol. 3*. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Korsakas, Kostas (ed.) (1968). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija. Vol. 4*. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Korsakas, Kostas (1962). *Literatūrų draugystė*. Vilnius: Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.
- Korsakas, Kostas (1987). *Literatūriniai kontaktai*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Kubilius, Vytautas (1982). Šiuolaikinė liuanistų literatūra (bendrieji raidos bruožai 1956–1980). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija. Vol. 2*. Vilnius: Vaga, pp. 287–307.
- Kubilius, Vytautas (1983). *Lietuvių literatūra ir pasaulinės literatūros procesas*. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Kubilius, Vytautas (1995). *XX amžiaus literatūra: Lietuvių literatūros istorija*. Vilnius: Alma littera.
- Kubilius, Vytautas (1997). The Integration of Split Literature. *Lithuanian Literature*. Vilnius: Vaga, pp. 477–508.
- Kubilius, Vytautas (1999). Komparatyvistika atvirame pasaulyje. *Darbai ir dienos*, Nr. 8 (17), pp. 7–15.
- Kulbokas, Vladas (1982). *Lietuvių literatūrinė kritika tremtyje. Vol. 1–2*. Roma: Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademija.
- Lankutis, Jonas (ed.) (1979). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija. Vol. 1*. Vilnius: Vaga.

- Lankutis, Jonas (ed.) (1982). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija*. Vol. 2. Vilnius: Vaga.
- Martinaitis, Marcelijus (1980). Braukiam į Rygą. *Literatūra ir menas*, 19.04., p. 8.
- Naujokaitis, Pranas (1973–1976). *Lietuvių literatūros istorija*. Vol. 1–4. Chicago: JAV.
- LB Kultūros taryba [Published by Foundation for Advancement of Lithuanian Culture].
- Neubauer, John (2007). Introduction. Marcel Cornis-Pope, John Neubauer (eds.). *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries, Vol. 3: The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 345–355.
- Neubauer, John, Török, Borbála Zsuzsanna (Hrsg.) (2009). *The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe: A Compendium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sauka, Donatas (1998). *Fausto amžiaus epilogas*. Vilnius: Tyto alba.
- Speičytė, Brigita (2020). Donato Saukos lyginamosios literatūros mokslo projektas: "programa maximum". *Literatūra*, Nr. 62(1), pp. 34–44.
- Šilbajoris, Rimvydas (1970). *Perfection of Exile: Fourteen Contemporary Lithuanian Writers*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Vaičiulaitis, Antanas (1992). *Knygos ir žmonės*. Vilnius: Vaga.