

In the Public Interest. Censorship and the Social Regulation of Literature in Modern Czech Culture. 1749–2014 is a book that describes, analyses and interprets the role played by censorship and by other institutional and structural mechanisms that have participated in the social regulation of literary communication within the cultural sphere of the historical Czech lands (Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia), which loosely coincide with the borders of the modern Czech Republic. The exposition on the period up to 1918 examines the organization of the supervising censorship bodies in the Habsburg Empire, which included the Czech lands, particularly the activities of the Viennese authorities relating to literary communication within the Czech lands in Czech, German and other languages. Apart from some individual comparative references, however, this book does not focus on conditions in Slovakia, even though it joined the Czech lands to form a single unitary and then federative state in 1918–1939 and 1945–1992, for ever since the time of the Habsburg Empire, Slovakia as a part of Hungary has had its own specific printing rights traditions. Even in the 20th century, however, as part of a common state, in spite of its linguistic, cultural and political similarities it formed its own administrative and cultural unit to such an extent that no exposition of the social regulation of literature and the press in the Czech lands can be superimposed on the Slovak situation in that period.

This book provides the reader with a comprehensive view of the changing faces of censorship and of the regulation of literature as well as the press (with some exceptions, performing arts genres are outside of its purview). The historical period under review is defined on the one end by the beginning of the Enlightenment, during which the focus of institutionalized censorship shifted from the church to the state, and on the other end by the most recent turn of the century, which saw changes in media usage as the internet grew in importance. The internal chronological milestones, dividing the book's exposition into eight sections (1749–1810, 1810–1848, 1848–1863, 1863–1918, 1918–1938, 1938–1949, 1949–1989 and 1989–2014), reflect important changes in censorship practice.

The literary communication standpoint utilized in this book as one of the exposition axes provides a methodological basis for a dynamic conception of the history of the phenomenon of regulation, which can be defined narrowly as institutionalized censorship, or broadly, after Michel Foucault or Pierre Bourdieu, as structural censorship, which is not institutionally based, but performed by the regulatory powers of language and culture. These broad and narrow definitions should not be seen as opposites, but merely as extremes in the complex range of social regulation governing literary communication. The first, narrow view sees censorship as a set of administrative procedures controlling and regulating the literary communication that takes place in the printed media within the sphere of power of a particular social authority, i.e. the state or one of its components (such as the army, educational system), church, municipal authorities, political parties or social movements. At any particular historical time and place several authorities may be

concurrently active, either reinforcing each other's roles or competing and coming into conflict with one other. The book designates this category of regulatory activities as institutionalized censorship. The second, broader standpoint, termed structural regulation in this book, covers phenomena that are not directly associated with the operation of institutions or the legislative framework, but which are linked to the cultural basis behind regulation, i.e. discourse, economic and general social factors. The book conceives social regulation as a set of various regulation activities, regardless of which of the two categories they come under. In both cases, the social regulation is not perceived one-sidedly, but its contradictory character is described: the regulation of literary communication has not only restrictive, but also productive effects. Not only is e.g. the publication of books prohibited, but new communication methods (e.g. samizdat) and the like emerge. The authors of this book sought inspiration in the deconstructivist school of the so-called new censorship, according to which censorship is not bound to any specific institution, legislative measure and so forth, but is dispersed in various places (Richard Burt) and associated with the structure of the literary field (Pierre Bourdieu). One disadvantage of this conception of censorship, however, is the excessive range of the central concept, i.e. that censorship operates as an umbrella term for various regulation processes. Hence the authors find the moderate standpoint expressed by Beate Müller to be congenial, as it distinguishes between censorship itself and structural regulation processes in general.

The introduction to each part of the book comprises an extensive summary (the "overview" chapter) on the changing face of organizational provisions for institutionalized censorship (primarily by the state and to some extent by the church), as well as on its programme, practice and the impact on "high" (belles lettres) and "low" (popular) literature. In these overview chapters the reader will find information on key legal rules and the system of institutions performing censorship supervision, as well as on the thematic, genre, stylistic and linguistic focus of literary censorship, and on those groups of target readers, whose moral, cultural and political integrity was monitored by the censors with particular concern. The overview chapters also present summaries of the reactions that censorship provoked in the literary field, characterize the place assigned to censorship in reflections on literature, culture and society at the time, present the (de)legitimizing discourse on censorship and characterize its criteria, i.e. the cultural, moral, aesthetic, literary, ideological, religious, scientific and political ideas that are promoted by censorship at one time or another. At the same time they observe the way liberal modernist discourse, which considers censorship to be an obstacle to progress and holds that art is to be liberated from any censorship, is confronted with other ideological, cultural and political projects.

The associated case study sections expand the exposition on institutionalized censorship by means of analyses of individual cases. However, they also take into account other forms of exclusion from literary communication and of interfering in the sedimentation of literary memory—changes to texts and the reactions of literary protagonists to them—all within a spectrum ranging from political censorship and moral censorship to structural regulation performed by the regularizing forces of language and culture. Whereas the overview chapters aim for a synthesis of the current state of knowledge and a summary

of the issues involved, the case studies are more in the nature of individual examples and separate analytical and interpretational views, which form a relative whole at the level of the entire book. Both the overview chapters and the case studies are based on a new study of the source base. Hence they deal with press, archive and literary sources, which previous research has neglected. The selective presentation of these sources is also facilitated by a supplementary layer of “infoboxes”, which runs through the overview chapters and includes not only reproduced documents and extracts from texts, but anything else that illustrates the primary text. This includes caricatures, photographs and other visual items, document facsimiles, microstudies of specific manifestations of censorship and the personal stories told both by those who did the censoring and those who were censored (not infrequently one and the same person).

The historical approach primarily focuses on the changing face of censorship and its development and dynamics over time, but also takes note of identical, analogical and latent features. A triad of ideal-types (Max Weber) of censorship can be used to portray these features: 1) The paternalistic type of censorship prevailed during the Enlightenment period (covered by the first part of the book) and the Restoration (covered by the second part). It sees literature as an educational medium, promoting the values involved in the positive development of society. As a rule the censor is a state-nominated expert from within the literary field (e.g. a university professor or poet), while institutionalized censorship supervises the entire range of literary communication, including the economic and distribution aspects. It performs pre-publication censorship and assesses manuscripts before they are printed, hence its joint responsibility for the state of the literary public. Its decision-making is governed by a differentiated idea of the various categories of the public and an endeavour to strictly control the reading matter of the broad masses with little education. 2) The liberal type of censorship predominated under bourgeois liberalism (fourth part), during the lifetime of independent Czechoslovakia 1918–1939 (fifth part) and in the period after the democratic revolution in 1989 (eighth part). It is governed by the principle that every text is permitted unless it is explicitly prohibited. Liberal censorship typically intervenes in literary communication a posteriori (i. e. post-publication censorship) within the distribution process in certain specific cases only. It does not supervise the entirety of literature from the standpoint of a single cultural project, but rather it seeks out and eliminates specific “offending” points in texts. Liberal censorship is the only ideal-type of censorship to be “open” in the sense that it publishes its decisions to the maximum possible extent and hence exposes them to public discussion. In comparison with censorship of a paternalistic nature, however, it tends to punish authors, since it construes unacceptable utterances as criminal offences. 3) The authoritarian type of censorship, imposed under right-wing and left-wing dictatorships (sixth to seventh part), promotes a specific cultural project, which often (historically) emerges as a reaction to liberalism. It models and moulds literary communication as a whole and disciplines the literary public. It includes both pre- and post-publication censorship. It is typified by a high level of dispersal of supervisory activities, both at the stage before the medialization of utterances and at the stage where media communications are distributed. In the authoritarian ideal-type, censorship is hidden and its decisions are not published or discussed. It attracts men and women of letters with its comprehensive conception of

creative work and its emphasis on the productive aspects of regulation, aiming to create a “new” literature, writer and reader. It plays an important role in the internalization of the cultural project that is promoted in this way, and in its appropriation by the individual participants in literary communication.

Part One, 1749–1810

The overview chapter by Michael Wögerbauer, *V zájmu rozumu a spásy duše. Literární cenzura mezi protireformací a osvícenstvím – In the Interest of Reason and the Salvation of the Soul. Literary Censorship Between the Counter-Reformation and the Enlightenment*, deals with literary censorship during the waning Counter-Reformation and the Enlightenment. The period between 1749 and 1810 is characterized by the fairly stable paternalistic approach of the church and state institutions towards run-of-the-mill readers, consisting in supervision of the poorly educated masses’ and “naive” readers’ reading material, as “bad” material could lead them astray. This was also a time when both power structures, i.e. the church and the state, were clashing and negotiating. They were defending their own particular interests, especially in view of the different ideas they had about what reading is (in)appropriate for any particular public. The year which begins this account, 1749, can be characterized as the start of a new era in the Habsburg Empire and the Czech lands: within the framework of extensive administrative reforms, the state censorship committees, which issued state indexes of proscribed books and thus gradually replaced the counter-reformation indexes and censorship performed by missionaries, were either reestablished or restructured in the individual countries of the Empire.

In the situation that arose when compulsory school attendance was introduced and a critical literary public emerged (Jürgen Habermas), the absorption of European Enlightenment ideas from France, Holland and Great Britain was perceived both as an opportunity and as a risk in Central Europe. Literature became an ally of Emperor Joseph II and his successor Leopold II in their promotion of reforms. Like their opponents, both monarchs understood the propaganda value of mass-disseminated printed texts and particularly the brochures which (at least in the towns and cities in view of the growing literacy of the population) were becoming an increasingly important factor in the development of the public sphere. The government started to view these texts as dangerous around the time public opinion was turning against it in 1790.

As church power decreased and the bourgeoisie developed in strength, belles lettres gradually emancipated itself as a subject of censorship oversight from religion and the representation of secular power. At the end of the 18th century we thus commonly come across literary works with no religious or political content in both of the languages of the province, German and Czech. This does not at all mean that art had achieved any aesthetic autonomy, rather, if anything it “patriotically” served to ennoble the nation, which no longer just included the aristocratic representatives of the country, but the entire community living on the territory, regardless of its class or ethnic background.

The first section of the overview chapter defines the territorial limits and the time-frame for this part. It then focuses on discussions of reading and the need to supervise it during the Counter-Reformation and the Enlightenment, which it approaches based on the examples of the Jesuit missionary Antonín Koniáš (1691–1760), who has gone down

in the historical subconscious of Czech society as the negative prototype of the censor, and of the state administration theoretician Joseph von Sonnenfels (probably 1733–1817). The basic context for these discussions, which of course did not necessarily have to take account of actual cultural practice in all respects, is the approach various strata of society at that time had to books. The second section attempts to describe the common features shared by censorship systems from the mid-18th to the early 19th century. Out of all the main issues it focuses on the collaboration between the Viennese centre and the periphery, e.g. Prague. The primary instruments for regulating literary communication were pre-publication censorship, the re-examination of titles already censored and interventions in the operation of the book market (i.e. protectionist measures presenting obstacles to the import of foreign titles).

The following four sections present a diachronic view of the regulation of literature – from the symbiosis of church and state censorship (to 1771) to the Theresian regulation system with a gubernatorial censorship commission (1771–1781) and the Josephine attempt to centralize censorship (1781–1790), finally to the institutional differentiation between education and censorship, which came under the authority of the Police Ministry around 1800. These sections present an overview (based on rare surviving sources) of the organization and practical operation of censorship in Bohemia, particularly in Prague. By means of a separate description of legislative and censorship practice, the exposition attempts to overcome the traditional issue surrounding the examination of Habsburg censorship in the 18th century, when the normative language of legislation (i.e. the ideal notion of “what should be”) is automatically confused with actual censorship practice at a particular place and time. As the overview chapter indicates, some legislative ordinances were not implemented in practice or were only implemented to a limited degree. The archive sources indicate that the centralization of censorship in Vienna, as directed by Joseph II in 1781, was practically never put into effect in Bohemia during Joseph II’s lifetime, and only in the first decades of the 19th century was this centralization of censorship gradually realized.

Case Studies, 1749–1810

The two introductory case studies deal with changing censorship responses to the development of the literary public. The case study by Claire Madl, *Perný rok knížete Fürstenberga. Cenzura a proměna veřejnosti na sklonku vlády Marie Terezie – A Busy Year for Prince Fürstenberg. Censorship and the Changing Face of the Public at the End of Maria Theresa’s Reign*, deals with censorship scandals centring around the figure of the highest political representative of Bohemia (in its provincial sense), Prague Burgrave Prince (Fürst) Karl Egon Fürstenberg. These scandals demonstrate the shift in the performance of censorship away from the exclusivism of written culture and censorship practice, when the censorship authority was integrated within the milieu of elite readers and book professionals, to what was virtually mass written culture, in which the readers were an anonymous group and the target of supervision, while the rational-critical public gradually became independent.

The case study by Michael Wögerbauer, *„Nekonečné literární boje ohrožující společenskou jednotu“. Židé, literární veřejnost a cenzura – “Endless Literary Struggles Endangering*

Social Unity". *Jews, the Literary Public and Censorship*, analyses the way officials dealt with two anti-semitic texts, one in the 1780s and the other around 1812. It shows the changing responses to the question why, in whose interest, and to what extent discourse on the Jewish minority was (not) to be regulated. Supervision of public space was increasingly inspired by the censorship authorities' fears that readers might get some "bad ideas" and so might be incited by media communications to commit violence against the Jewish minority.

The topic of Michael Wögerbauer's study, *„Žádnou pochvalu, nebo odložím své pero navždy.“ Román Karolinens Tagebuch Marie Anny Sagerové, genderová cenzura a mlčení v literárním poli – “No Applause or I Shall Put My Pen Down Forever”. The Novel Karolinens Tagebuch – Caroline's Journal Intime by Maria Anna Sager, Gender Censorship and Silence in the Literary Field*, lies outside the sphere of state censorship. For prose works by Maria Anna Sager (1719–1805) the marginality of women's writing and dissent in relation to unwritten social and literary norms came to be a productive force at different levels of writing and literary communication. This involves the operation of what is known as gender censorship (Barbara Becker-Cantarino) at the level of the female narrator and the novel characters who disturb her in her writing of the diary or even prevent her from doing so, as well as at the level of communication between the author and the critic. The constellation of literary values and reception potential in 1770s Bohemia did not allow Sager's novels to be fully involved in literary communication at that time.

The case study by Václav Smyčka, *Techniky transgrese. Cenzura jako tvůrčí prvek erotismu v románech Johanna Friedricha Ernsta Albrechta – Techniques of Transgression. Censorship As a Creative Element of Eroticism in Novels by Johann Friedrich Ernst Albrecht*, deals with the relationship between prohibition and its transgression, based on the example of the publishing practice and narrative strategies of the doctor, publisher and author of popular novels Johann Friedrich Ernst Albrecht (1752–1814) from the time of his stay in Prague (1789–1795). Albrecht made use of the title of a prohibited novel ("titulonym") to model the reception of subsequent permitted novels. Hence even at the level of the internal economy of the work, the combination of the marked turning of a blind eye and the obsessive verbalization of an experienced passion does not serve to hide the true deposition of the work from censorship and social condemnation, but just the opposite serves as the main deposition, the very eroticism of the work.

Part Two, 1810–1848

The overview chapter by Petr Píša, *V zájmu nevzdělaného čtenáře. Literární cenzura v době restaurace a rozmachu národního hnutí – In the Interest of the Uneducated Reader. Literary Censorship Under the Restoration and the Rise of the National Movement*, presents literary censorship from the promulgation of the key regulation that set out censorship content criteria (1810) to the beginning of the revolution in 1848. This period is characterized both by the efforts of state elites to maintain political stability and restore pre-revolutionary conditions to Europe following the Napoleonic wars, and by the emergence of new schools of thought and ideologies, i.e. liberalism and national movements. The absence of larger institutional or thematic changes in censorship during the first half of the 19th century allows us to structure the text of this chapter on a synchronic basis.

Censorship during the pre-1848 period involved supervision of every manuscript before it was printed and every book imported from abroad. It commented both on the detailed content of the texts under assessment, including the objective accuracy of the information given, and on questions of style and orthography (even in the case of vernacular languages which did not yet have stabilized, universally recognized orthographic rules), as well as on the work as a whole, assessing to what extent the particular text might be necessary and useful for the potential reader. As for periodicals, censorship was also used for the economic regulation of a literary market that had not hitherto been fully developed, because it often refused to grant licences for new titles, to ensure they did not compete with existing periodicals for readers or revenue. Specific assessments of a work's aesthetics or contents depended primarily on the subjective judgement of the censor(s), while any transgression of written or unwritten rules could lead to individual disciplining of the censor in the form of sanctions for the approval of a problematic work. Moreover, space was also left to some extent for the official or unofficial intervention of authors if they did not agree with censorship demands. Censorship was omnipresent and for a long time not questioned in principle by the majority of the population. Rather it remained invisible to the ordinary reader, as alterations were made at the manuscript stage and visible deletions were not retained in printed versions, as occurred in later times.

Regulation of the literary space was not generally questioned even by the Czech national movement, whose programme had more of a tendency to homogenize this space. It was only during the 1830s that it began to artistically split up more prominently due to differing receptions of subjective romanticism. However, the explicitly literary nature of the Czech National Revival explains why censorship interference in Revival literature was perceived in a particularly sensitive manner. Likewise the German-speaking intelligentsia ceased to identify with state efforts to regiment public life and in the spirit of liberal thinking began to call for its share in political participation and for the opportunity to speak out on state administration issues. The liberal movement saw the Austrian censorship system as a synecdoche for the denial of political rights at that time. Hence it was in opposition to the much criticized and ridiculed censorship system that the demand for "freedom of the press" emerged, although this was still compatible with the idea that the articulation of certain topics was inadmissible as an offence against public morality or religion.

This chapter begins with an interpretation of the consequences of the introduction and enforcement of compulsory school attendance for reading culture, with an analysis of the paternalistic view of the censorship regulations of September 1810, as well as an analysis of discourse on censorship and freedom of the press. The number of literate people who only had minimal reading experience increased as time went by. Their relationship to books often remained at the level of naive reading, characterized by absolute faith in the written word. In addition to support for educational literature destined for these new readers, which, like the voice of the priest from the pulpit, would bolster people's basic social and moral convictions or serve to promote economic and technical innovations, the first half of the 19th century was marked by efforts to regulate all popular reading that did not meet this educational function and was thus perceived as merely useless "excitement of the senses".

The second section of the overview chapter focuses on a synchronic view of manuscript and foreign press censorship, as well as other areas of censorship regulation. Based on proscribed book lists, official archive material and other sources, the third section presents an analysis of the subject and genre focus of pre-1848 censorship. This account deals in particular with romantic motifs both in highbrow and popular literature, historical and religious motifs and censorship of public morality, as well as addressing the issue of the extent to which the performance of pre-1848 censorship was affected by the nationalist standpoint. The final section presents an analysis of the consequences of censorship on the literary scene in the first half of the 19th century, primarily in authors', publishers' and readers' strategies for getting round censorship, as well as impacts of a structural nature. It also focuses attention on tendencies of the Czech national movement to self-regulate.

Case Studies, 1810–1848

A quantitative and qualitative analysis of particular aspects of censorship protocols is presented by Hedvika Kuchařová's case study: *Náboženská literatura předbřeznového období pod drobnohledem. Cenzurní protokoly Hieronyma Josepha Zeidlera – Pre-1848 Religious Literature Under the Microscope. The Censorship Protocols of Hieronymus Joseph Zeidler*. A member and later abbot of the Premonstratensian monastery in Prague at Strahov, Hieronymus Joseph Zeidler (1790–1870) was a censor of religious literature between 1823 and 1848. His surviving papers include a number of censorship protocols from the 1823–1834 and 1841–1846 periods. The study focuses both on their quantitative analysis (linguistic and genre composition, ratio of approval-rejection judgements) and on a qualitative analysis of Czech-language prayer books and texts not primarily of a religious nature.

The case study by Petr Píša, „*Aby bez závady prošlo*“. *Strategie Václava Hanky při styku s předbřeznovou cenzurou – “To Get It Through Without Objections”*. *Václav Hanka's Strategy Towards the pre-1848 Censorship*, demonstrates on the basis of publication activity by writer and Slavonic scholar Václav Hanka (1791–1861) possible strategies in situations where the content of a published text clashed with the standards set by Austrian censorship. In the absence of any opportunity to adapt the text to censorship standards (if, for example, it was written in a different historical context and addressed a different public), the role of tactics beyond the text, i.e. within the framework of relations between the editor and the censors, became increasingly important. Possible strategies included negotiating with the censors and taking advantage of informal contacts; resubmitting rejected manuscripts; manipulating censored manuscripts in an effort to defraud; and printing an unapproved work abroad.

The following case study by Petr Píša, „*Žádný nakladatel si na tom netroufá vydělat*“. *Bernard Bolzano mezi státní, církevní a strukturální cenzurou – “No publisher Thinks He Can Make a Profit from That”*. *Bernard Bolzano Between State, Church and Structural Censorship*, focuses on the specific publication opportunities open to philosopher Bernard Bolzano (1781–1848), a dismissed professor of religion at the Prague Philosophical Faculty, as well as on the issue of the impact of censorship measures on the quiet reception of his intellectually original work during the 19th century. As a result of censorship difficulties

the author endeavoured to publish most of his works abroad, and to negotiate with the publishers, although this was complicated among other things by the need to publish his books anonymously. Bolzano's views on the ideal form to be taken by censorship and the distribution of books, expressed in his social utopia *O nejlepší státě – On the Best State*, were clearly inspired by these protracted negotiations.

The forms assumed by state censorship and structural regulation in the case of the collection and publication of folk songs are presented in Lucie Uhlíková's case study: *Duch a povaha národa v písni. Idealizovaný obraz lidové písně v tištěných sbírkách první poloviny 19. století – The Spirit and Nature of the Nation in Song. The Idealized Image of Folk Song in Printed Collections in the First Half of the 19th Century*. The first printed editions of folk songs that were presented to the Bohemian public in the first half of the 19th century were shaped by the moralistically prudish public opinion, the aesthetic evaluation of songs (and particularly their lyrics) and patriotic aims and ideals. Hence on the road between living tradition and publication, songs were subjected to a threefold selection process: the singer considered what to sing to the collector; the collector made a decision whether or not the song is worth recording; the editor took into account the national idea, adherence to social conventions, aesthetic and ethical parameters, the financial and material aspects and not least the demands of the state censor at that time.

Part Three, 1848–1863

The overview chapter by Magdaléna Pokorná, *V zájmu svobody a řádu. Literární cenzura v revoluci a neoabsolutismu – In the Interest of Freedom and Order. Literary Censorship in Revolution and Neo-Absolutism*, focuses on the relatively short and internally disparate period between 1848 and 1863. In relation to the classification of ideal-types used in the book, this period can be understood as the transition between paternalistic and liberal censorship. The sudden abolition of pre-publication censorship in March 1848 brought about a need to find new forms of press regulation involving the activities of writers and the voice of the public. The idea of post-publication censorship with criminal liability for the author or editor, which public opinion inclined towards, was not found to be incompatible by participants in literary communication with the idea of “freedom of speech” as the outcome of the abolition of “censorship”, which at the time was perceived to be only associated with pre-publication censorship of manuscripts, as performed in the pre-revolutionary period. As regards specific measures to implement post-publication censorship in the sense we understand there was no uniform opinion.

During the rise of reaction and neo-absolutism, press policy endeavouring to restore and maintain “order” focused primarily on those forms of literary production that predominated during the revolutionary year – posters, leaflets distributed by news vendors (prohibited in December 1848) and periodicals of a political nature, whose space was increasingly restricted from March 1849 to May 1852 by a system of securities, cautions and licences. Characteristically, the liberal press law measures of March 1849 were not enough for the representatives of state power to discipline the opposition press, so they had to be gradually supplemented by extraordinary measures (from May 1849 to September 1853 in Prague and other towns) and by measures of an extrajudicial nature. Other measures were imposed on inconvenient authors again by extrajudicial means.

Undoubtedly the most famous case of censorship during the period under review is that of journalist Karel Havlíček (1821–1856) and his confinement in Brixen in south Tyrol.

A characteristic feature of the neo-absolutist system of press and literary regulation was the dispersal of censorship among all the participants in literary communication. The post-publication censorship of the 1850s operated with a scale of possible economic and criminal sanctions for authors, editors, publishers, printers and booksellers, while the judgement of publications that were already printed made it impossible to respond to the results of censorship assessment by modifying the text. This resulted in greater pressure on authors, editors and publishers to anticipate censorship restrictions themselves. Ordinances to compulsorily submit printed copies within a certain time before the beginning of distribution also enabled any confiscation to be effectively performed. The repeated increase in the number of confiscations of individual issues of periodicals at the turn of the 1850s and the 1860s must be seen as a symptom of the erosion of this system, as opposition voices were no longer rejected a priori, but only in individual cases when the law was breached. However, it was not until the new press law of December 1862 came into effect in March 1863 that the principle of liberal censorship, typified by the post-publication censorship system backed up by court rulings, was definitively established.

The first section of the overview chapter charts the structural impact of censorship intervention into literary communication. The relaxation of censorship supervision after 1848 led to an increase in readership interest in periodical titles. On the other hand, the result of the increase in censorship restrictions was a decrease in the number of periodicals published and a reduction in their print runs. The legislation and discourse of the late 1840s and the 1850s dealt with in the second section, focused primarily on the issue of censorship supervision of the periodical press, which enjoyed its greatest upswing in the revolutionary year of 1848. Moreover, this section also follows the changing face of censorship legislation and discussion of its possible forms. It leaves out, however, debates in legislative bodies in 1860–1862, which had a direct impact on the form of the new press law (these are not dealt with until the overview chapter on the 1863–1918 period).

The third section of this overview chapter focuses on other fields of literary communication regulation, where the striking changes that took place in the revolutionary year and the ensuing reaction did not appear so dynamic, i.e. with regard to authors, non-periodical publications, distribution, libraries and readers. It also deals with church censorship, which diverged from state censorship in 1848. The following section analyses the content of the foreign and domestic press and the articles in periodicals which censorship focused on, based on censorship lists and individual selected cases. In contrast to the pre-1848 period, the authorities paid less attention to non-periodical publications. Although police supervision focused on a broad range of people representing opposition trends in 1848 and 1849, including a large number of authors writing in Czech, their literary work did not face any direct obstacles unless they were dealing with current political topics.

Case Studies, 1848–1863

The introductory case study by Magdaléna Pokorná, *Historie girondinů a Žižkova smrt. Dva modelové příklady regulace literární komunikace v polovině 19. století* – The History

of the Girondists and Žižka's Death. *Two Model Examples of the Regulation of Literary Communication in the mid-19th Century*, demonstrates based on material from two censorship cases (on the basis of which confiscation orders were made in February 1851) that even after the abolition of pre-publication censorship in 1848, in some cases a paternalistic viewpoint persisted, distinguishing between individual categories of readers in terms of their ability to "correctly" understand potentially dangerous texts. Even though the authorities characterized the Czech translation of Lamartine's *History of the Girondists* (in view of its price, size and demanding nature, targeting the educated reader) as the apotheosis of revolution, they saw the book version of Kolár's *Žižkova smrt – Žižka's Death* as more dangerous in view of its capacity to address the popular masses. This is why the confiscation of Lamartine's work was eventually halted, whereas Kolár's drama remained prohibited.

Another two case studies deal with the fortunes of proscribed authors during the 1850s and their difficult publication conditions. The study by Michal Charypar, *Amnestovaní velezrádci. Spisovatelské podniky J. V. Friče a Karla Sabiny v letech 1854–1861 – Amnestied Traitors. The Writing Enterprises of J. V. Frič and Karel Sabina 1854–1861*, follows the parallel stories of Josef Václav Frič (1829–1890) and Karel Sabina (1813–1877), Czech literati who were involved in the revolution as journalists and writers and who were condemned for their participation in the "May conspiracy" of 1849. Their writing plans often came to nothing, both individually and collectively, not only because of the police supervision that they were subjected to after they were released from prison, but also because of their conflict with the older generation of writers, who did not want the new literary poetics to be promoted. This double pressure led the former to emigrate and the latter to collaborate with the Prague police.

In her study, *„Patří do řad literárního proletariátu“. Literární působení a policejní perzekuce Prokopa Chocholouška v letech 1848–1861 – "He is a Member of the Literary Proletariat". The Literary Activity and Police Persecution of Prokop Chocholoušek 1848–1861*, Magdaléna Pokorná follows the activities of Prokop Chocholoušek (1819–1864), author of historical short stories and novels, and during the 1848–1849 revolution the editor of democratic periodicals. It was for this journalistic activity that Chocholoušek was subsequently persecuted. Even though these sanctions were not directly levied on his fiction work, he was deprived by various official measures and police orders of the opportunity to find employment as an editor and kept outside Prague, the centre of Czech literary life. This deprived him of the opportunity to attempt a career as a freelance writer.

The case study by Magdaléna Pokorná, *„Dobře zvolená a účelně vedená četba působí nanejvýš povzbudivě“. Konflikty Františka Josefa Řezáče kvůli zakládání knihoven a jejich navrhovanému obsahu – "Well Selected and Goal-Directed Reading is Highly Encouraging". František Josef Řezáč's Conflicts Over the Foundation of Libraries and Their Proposed Content*, presents the effects of literary regulation on the activities of priest, educator, writer (inter alia an author of textbooks) and politician František Josef Řezáč (1819–1879) on behalf of Czech education in the 1850s, primarily as regards the establishment of school libraries. His disputes with the Prague police authorities, the Vice-Governor and the archbishop's consistory, to which Řezáč was subordinate, related to his proposed school library book acquisitions. This study shows how the authorities in question followed his publications in Czech and how they feared his influence on the public.

Part Four, 1863–1918

The overview chapter by Michal Charypar, *V zájmu širší a užší vlasti. Literární cenzura v éře měšťanského liberalismu a modernismu – In the Interest of the Broader and Nearer Homeland. Literary Censorship in the Age of Bourgeois Liberalism and Modernism*, presents the operation of literary censorship in the latter half of the 19th century, at a time when the Czech lands were undergoing profound social, political, economic and technical changes. In the context of the multinational Habsburg Empire, the liberal endeavour to secure the rights and freedoms of individuals was also associated with the endeavours of individual national units, which were perceived as indisputable entities, to win their political rights. The idea of political freedom both for individuals and for nations did not rule out demands for national unity in the interests of a “nearer homeland” (i.e. the Czech lands), which could lead to efforts to demonstratively exclude from the national collective those who had transgressed against the “national interests” in some way.

With the stability of the “broader homeland” (the Habsburg Empire) in mind, the state censorship endeavoured to neutralize open national and social conflicts within society and to suppress any trends that might weaken the Habsburg Empire. The press law in effect from March 1863 abolished the licensing system for periodicals and thus restricted the influence of executive power in censorship decision-making in favour of the courts. The system of post-publication censorship came close to the ideal-type of liberal censorship: it evaluated texts in detail, confiscated them if they breached any specific article of the law and required court scrutiny of its own decisions.

Another liberal element in censorship from the 1860s is transparency of execution. Information on confiscations performed was published in official newspapers and in subsequent issues of periodicals affected. Newspaper and magazine publishers could arrange for a second edition of the confiscated issues, leaving out the offending texts or passages, while the editors could choose whether or not to replace the censored text with another or to leave it out without replacing it and to mark it “censored”. This transparency was typically curtailed during the First World War, when we come across a tendency to replace censored articles with other texts so that the censorship was not obvious.

The first section of the overview chapter provides a synchronic view of press legislation and censorship practice. The content criteria and punishments for press offences were determined by the criminal code. Confiscation ordered by the state prosecution or the police authorities had to be subsequently confirmed by the courts. Appeals could be made against court judgements, but in the great majority of cases the courts confirmed confiscation. If a court appeal failed, there was the option of having the text read at a legislative body session and thus immunizing an indicted text. The second section presents discourse on censorship at the time, overlapping with structural regulation in the cultural sphere. It also provides a summary of research sources and available confiscation statistics, as well as presenting confiscations of non-periodical works in German.

The following three sections present a diachronic view of developments in the censorship system, with the primary focus being on non-periodical production in Czech. The first stage, defined as the period between 1863 and 1873, includes a wave of press trials of journalists, beginning in the period of the first constitutional governments, interrupted by the episodic operation of Prussian military censorship in some parts of Bohemia and

Moravia in 1866 and culminating in the period of struggle for the recognition of historical Czech state rights. An important milestone was the blanket introduction of so-called objective criminal proceedings in 1873. To a large extent these put an end to criminal proceedings for individuals involved in press trials, but at the same time they resulted in increased growth in the number of confiscations and the removal of some elements of guarantee involving court scrutiny of censorship decisions. As a type of press trial, objective proceedings had a predominant influence on conditions in journalism and literature up to the beginning of the First World War.

The 1914–1918 period, the final chronological section in the overview chapter, involved reinforcing the existing practice of objective proceedings with the reintroduction of pre-publication censorship and the doubling of the censorship system. This led to a considerable reduction in overall published press volume and an effort to achieve the central direction of political news-reporting. The end of 1918, which concludes this chapter, can thus be perceived as a return to liberal censorship, but this was now performed under the new conditions of the Czechoslovak state.

Case Studies, 1863–1918

The introductory case study by Michal Charypar, *Kauza Arbes. Cenzura jako zkušenost zodpovědného redaktora a jako téma spisovatele – The case of Arbes. Censorship As the Experience of an Editor-in-Chief and As a Subject for a Writer*, analyses the multilevel permeation of Jakub Arbes's life experience, journalistic and writing careers (1840–1914) with censorship. Arbes was the editor-in-chief at *Národní listy*, the primary Czech periodical of its day. At the turn of the 1860s and 1870s he represented this newspaper at press courts and was imprisoned several times. During the 1890s he published extensive non-fiction accounts in which he retrospectively mapped out the interventions made by state censorship on the Czech opposition. Arbes's strategy was to deliberately make use of texts printed earlier and "immunized" sources from official proceedings with state authorities, thus aiming to increase his publications' attractiveness to readers. Hence Arbes's texts are a key source enabling us to gain knowledge of censorship at that time, as well as being a prominent example of liberal-modernist discourse on the rejection of censorship in the name of individual and national freedom.

The following three case studies focus on the issues surrounding the broader social regulation of literature. The study by Michal Charypar, *Vyobcován z národa. Cenzurní aspekty „národního soudu“ nad Karlem Sabinou – Excommunicated from the Nation. Censorship Aspects of the “National Court” Condemning Karel Sabina*, goes over the public scandal that broke out in summer 1872 over the revelation that Karel Sabina (1813–1877) was an informer for the Prague police. Under the judgement of the "national court" – seven representatives of the elite patriotic society from *Národní listy* circles – Sabina was compelled to temporarily emigrate and to cease all official cultural activity. The newspaper campaign against Sabina extended this internal exile to the end of the writer's life, and had a permanently negative effect on his image in Czech culture. The study shows what effects this case had on Sabina's subsequent chances of being published.

The subject of the case study by Markéta Holanová, *Ukrutný konec čtenáře krváků. Kampaň F. A. Urbánka proti kolportážním románům jako případ morální paniky – The Cruel*

End of the Penny Dreadful Reader. František Augustin Urbánek's Campaign Against Street-Peddled Novels As a Case of Moral Panic, is the public campaign against blood and thunder novels which at the time embodied one of the notions of harmful literature in the Czech lands. The campaign against this form of popular literature is interpreted by the study in the spirit of the theories of Stanley Cohen as a case of a moral panic. This study analyses the journalistic campaign led by publisher, editor and bibliographer František Augustin Urbánek (1842–1919) in *Urbánkův věstník bibliografický*. It also analyses the short story by secondary school teacher Václav Špaček, *Knihy ďáblovy – Devil's Books*, which contains an instructive description of the physical and mental effects that the author believes bad reading can have on the “naive reader”.

The study by Věra Brožová, *„Odklizeno bylo vše, co by jen poněkud mohlo zodpovědnost způsobiti“. Regulace fondů žákovských knihoven obecného školství v poslední třetině 19. století – “Everything That Might Even to a Small Extent Have Led to Accountability Was Removed”. The Regulation of Elementary School Pupils' Library Collections in the Last Third of the 19th Century*, follows the regulation of school pupils' library collections by the state and from the standpoint of the teachers themselves, to whom legislation and other binding regulations shifted responsibility for the administration and content of libraries. From 1875 recommendations regarding the composition of library collections were issued by the Prague Youth Literature Scrutiny Committee. Another wave of collection “cleansing” was ordered ten years later by the Ministry of Culture and Education. This study shows the consequences of this “cleansing” of library collections on contemporary educational literary work for children and young people.

The next study by Michal Charypar, *Revolta gestem a myšlenkou. Srovnání konfiskací básnických knih Svatopluka Čecha a S. K. Neumanna – Revolt by Gesture and Thought. A Comparison of the Confiscation of Poetry Books by Svatopluk Čech and S. K. Neumann*, returns to the topic of state censorship. It compares the dual approach to the literary thematization of revolt and the censor's reaction to it. The work of Svatopluk Čech (1846–1908), a poet of a liberal nationalist bent, primarily stressed the nationalist aspect of revolt, whereas the early poetry collections of Stanislav Kostka Neumann (1875–1947), a typical anarchist bohemian, were dominated by social revolt. Evidently the censor found that the political level of revolt played the most important role, with both anarchist and liberal revolt considered in principle equal by the press censorship authorities.

The study by Michal Kosák, *Mezi revoltou a autocenzurou. Příklad Slezských písní Petra Bezruče – Between Revolt and Self-Censorship. The Case of Silesian Songs by Petr Bezruč*, follows the process whereby one of the seminal works of modern Czech poetry, *Slezské písně – Silesian Songs*, a collection of poems by Petr Bezruč (1867–1958), was formed over the long term from the censor's viewpoint. Even the very first submission of Bezruč's poetry to Jan Herben for his periodical *Čas* did not escape the censor's attention when the poems *Den Palackého – Palacký Centenary* and *Škaredý zjev – The Hideous Sight* were confiscated. This censorship indirectly affected subsequent poems, as both Bezruč and the editor Herben developed strategies that attempted to avoid possible new penalties. This combination of state censorship, editorial intervention by Jan Herben and auto-censorship by the poet became an important productive aspect in the creation of *Slezské písně* in its final form.

The case study by Michal Charypar, *Modrý rezervista, rudý anarchist. Střet vojenského a civilního práva v případě Fráni Šrámka – Blue Reservist, Red Anarchist. The Conflict Between Military and Civil Law in the Case of Fráňa Šrámek*, points to the differing criteria of individual state administration bodies in the assessment of anarchist works by poet Fráňa Šrámek (1877–1952). The song *Píšou mi psaní – They Write Me a Letter*, in which Šrámek ironized the call-up order for military exercises, resulted in the conviction of the author by a military court in České Budějovice. The broad medialization of the case, in which the military court came into conflict with the civil censorship authorities, went beyond the realm of the anarchist press. The study also presents the fortunes of the collection *Modrý a rudý – Blue and Red* from its initial confiscation and subsequent immunization to its repeated confiscation during the First World War.

The case study by Daniela Iwashita and Šárka Kořínková, *Už jste hotovi s Apokalypsou? Jakub Deml ve střetech s cenzurou brněnské konzistoře v letech 1905–1913 – Are You Done with the Apocalypse? Jakub Deml in Conflict With the Brno Episcopal Consistory Censorship Between 1905 and 1913*, focuses on the field of church censorship. Jakub Deml (1878–1961), clearly the most prominent representative of Czech Catholic literature, supported a stricter interpretation of contemporary church regulations that demanded Catholic clerics submit all their literary output for pre-publication church censorship. However, repeated intervention by church authorities in Jakub Deml's work ultimately resulted in a blanket ban in 1908 of any subsequent literary work by him. This study also describes Deml's circumvention of this restriction and points out the fact that these prohibitions also played a productive role in the subsequent orientation of the author's work – documents relating to church censorship came to be included in his "diary" books and collages.

The final case study by Blanka Hemelíková, *Smrt hloupého cenzora. K motivům cenzury v satirách Jaroslava Haška – Death of a Stupid Censor. Censorship Motifs in Jaroslav Hašek's Satires*, focuses on the representation of censorship in the short prose works of Jaroslav Hašek (1883–1923), author of the world-famous novel *The Good Soldier Svejk and His Fortunes in the World War*. Motifs that had been focused on by previous authors in their caricatures were enhanced by Hašek to include elements of slapstick comedy. This study presents the most frequent topics associated with censorship to be targeted by Hašek's satires (the hypocrisy of the censors, press courts and confiscation practice). Attention is focused primarily on Hašek's satirical representation of the censors themselves, central among them being the motif of the censor's suicide to "censor" himself. Hašek presented this motif in his satirical stories *O jednom cenzorovi – On One Censor* (1907) and *Svědomitý cenzor Svoboda – The Conscientious Censor Svoboda* (1911).

Part Five, 1918–1938

The overview chapter by Tomáš Pavlíček *V zájmu republiky. Literární cenzura v době avantgard a obrany liberální demokracie – In the Interest of the Republic. Literary Censorship in the Age of the Avant-Garde and in Defence of Liberal Democracy*, deals with the ways in which literary communication was regulated between 1918 and 1938 during the existence of the independent Czechoslovak state (known as the First Republic). In numerous respects this period carries on uninterrupted from the pre-1914 period. However, from the standpoint of its policy and its focus on particular areas (e.g. manifestations of nationalism, political

extremism, foreign policy and the open thematization of human sexuality), the censorship practice of the time is remarkable for a number of features that make it possible to treat the period as distinct for purposes of periodization. In its way the censorship of the period between the two world wars was liberal, with fundamental principles including a total respect for the legislative regulations governing rules of intervention against the periodical press and books, transparency of confiscation practice and the existence of remedial mechanisms. As for non-periodical publications, censorship took the form of post-publication sanctions, i.e. it was not applied directly at the stage before the production and distribution of printed matter. Its effectiveness consisted in particular in the economic effects of confiscation on the newspaper and magazine publishers. The great majority of censorship interventions at that time related to periodicals that were subject to systematic inspection as in previous times. Another significant set of confiscations at that time were leaflets, small pamphlets and other publications up to five print signatures in length, whereas sanctions against more extensive works were less frequent.

The introductory text characterizes literary culture, the forms of state cultural policy, the development of the book market and the distribution of literary texts within library networks. First Republic literary culture was characterized by a high level of modernization, a high educational standard, state support and openness, plurality and the autonomy of artistic schools and aesthetic ideas. All this was reflected in negotiations between the censorship authorities and cultural production. The process of expanding and modernizing the network of public libraries proceeded in accordance with the requirements of educational establishments disseminating literary works of artistic and educational value, as well as educational literature, which had its effect on the make-up of library collections. "Pornographic" works and those deemed "valueless" in terms of their content and literary standard, i.e. primarily popular literature titles, were ruled out. Assessment came under the authority of libraries and library boards, although considerable leeway was left for librarians' individual approaches.

The subsequent account follows developments at the time in legislation, which showed some indications of continuity from the previous period. The Czechoslovak Constitution of 1920 guaranteed freedom of opinion and of the press, but the basis of the legislative framework of censorship practice continued to be the amended Press Law of 1863 (i. e. the Reichsgesetz for Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia) and from 1914 (the Hungarian law for Slovakia and Subcarpathian Ruthenia). A new aggregate press law was not successfully passed throughout the existence of the First Czechoslovak Republic, and only some amendments were made in line with political and social requirements at that time. The newly adopted legal provisions were based in particular on fears that radical revolutionary and nationalistic ideas would spread, state independence would be threatened and its republican constitutional form would be in jeopardy.

As in other stages of liberal censorship, during the interwar period discourse on censorship was marked by the fact that the participants in literary communication were permitted to express an opinion on the existence of censorship, to engage in arguments over it, or to react in various ways to specific reports of individual confiscations or "blunders" in censorship practice. Hence in the First Republic periodical press, it is possible to find a number of polemical debates, legal analyses, fiction texts and other forms of expression,

e.g. caricatures, on the subject of censorship. Their polyphony and often their substantially contradictory views were characteristic. Some of them were then directly associated with efforts to achieve a radical change in the entire censorship system. Several basic ideas can be traced within the discourse on literary censorship. In connection with the ideal of the autonomy of art, some intellectuals formulated a demand for censorship of fiction output to be entrusted into the hands of selected representatives of the cultural community. Another area of debate involved censorship practice abroad (in France, Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany) and the history of the Czech nation. Voices could also be heard demanding the complete abolition of any censorship, as was repeatedly formulated e.g. in circles of communist authors and avant-garde intellectuals (Zdeněk Nejedlý, Stanislav Kostka Neumann and Karel Teige). Individual protests against censorship were often motivated by specific contentious crackdowns, while authors such as Karel Čapek problematized any straightforward view of censorship.

The following synchronic view of censorship interactions reveals the direct effects of confiscation interventions on the literary communication of the time. Attention is paid here to the locations where the censors intervened and to the actual practice involved, as well as the ways to revoke censorship decisions and the strategies put into effect against censorship by authors, publishers and literary distributors. This section, which characterizes the main types of confiscations at that time in accordance with their language and subject, shows that the priority target of Czechoslovak censorship was printed matter in German, as the number of interventions rose during the 1930s in particular (during the interwar period approximately 64 % of all confiscations of non-periodical printed matter), while another large set of foreign language confiscations were publications in Hungarian (approx. 9 %). Printed matter was primarily confiscated that was openly hostile to Czechoslovakia and its national structure, or which breached domestic laws in any other way. A large number of printed items suppressed from the very outset in Czechoslovakia were communist and radical left-wing publications, though from the linguistic standpoint these were a very mixed group, as can only be expected from the international nature of the communist movement (in addition to the predominant Czech and German publications, Hungarian, Polish and of course Russian titles also frequently appear). In addition to these primarily politically motivated prohibitions, erotic literature and its close relatives also regularly figured among the prohibited output. At the very end of the overview chapter, traces of the developing new model of literary culture recorded in documents from that time are presented and outlined in increasing detail as the political crisis unfolded in the latter half of the 1930s, the First Republic came to an end and the transition was subsequently made to an authoritarian regime.

Case Studies, 1918–1938

The introductory case study by Tomáš Pavlíček, *Zákonem proti braku a pornografii. Pokus o ochranu naivního čtenáře v cenzurním systému liberálního typu – The Bill on Trash Literature and Pornography. An Attempt to Keep the Naive Reader Safe in the Liberal Censorship System*, presents the origins of the legislation to protect young readers from “undesirable” literature and the specialist debates that were associated with its drafting. From the early 1920s a special bill was under consideration to suppress trash literature and

pornography, based on the model of similar legislative initiatives in Germany and Austria, with the participation of several ministries and the community of authors and librarians in Czechoslovakia. In contrast to their original intentions, however, the law was ultimately only passed in a very much reduced form, with several parts of the “Small Press Act” (de facto an amended version of the Press Act) of 1933. However, the paragraphs in question were never implemented under the First Republic, and a special judicial cultural body, the Committee to Assess Printed Matter Endangering Young People, was only set up in 1940 and ceased operating a couple of years later.

The following case study deals with two prominent cases that typify the First Republic practice of post-publication censorship with regard to highbrow literary texts. The study by Daniela Iwashita and Šárka Kořínková, *Noli me tangere. Cenzura Zapomenutého světla a dalších textů Jakuba Demla v letech 1929–1935 – Noli me tangere. Censorship of Forgotten Light and Other Texts by Jakub Deml Between 1929 and 1935*, deals with the conflicts between writer Jakub Deml (1878–1961) and the censor between 1929 and 1935. A recapitulation is made of the court case over Deml’s statements on Otokar Březina, which he quoted in a lecture in May 1929, the subsequent confiscation of *Šlépěje XIII. – Footprints XIII.* of spring 1930, which included both these and other comments by Otokar Březina (1868–1929) on President T. G. Masaryk, the Czech intelligentsia and the Jews, while the third part of the study deals with the confiscation of Deml’s prose work *Zapomenuté světlo – Forgotten Light*, presenting one of the most important Czech literary works of the modernist and avant-garde period. This study forwards the proposition that Jakub Deml was not a passive victim of censorship, as he responded to restrictions by increasing his publishing activity and his creative work to achieve more open communication and more effective forms. The outcome was Deml’s crowning work *Mé svědectví o Otokaru Březinovi – My testimony on Otokar Březina* and *Zapomenuté světlo*.

The study by Eduard Burget, *„Ať také jednou z politiky vydělá nakladatel a autor“. Zavřelův Fortinbras v dialogu s cenzurou – “May the Publisher and Author Sometime Earn Something from Politics”. Zavřel’s Fortinbras in Dialogue With Censorship*, deals with the confiscation of the novel *Fortinbras* by dramatist and prose writer František Zavřel (1885–1947). This case came to be one of the symbols of First Republic literary censorship. Zavřel did not conceal his sympathy for Fascism (and after the Second World War he was investigated under suspicion of collaboration), and included a violent act in the plot of his novel against a character based on the foremost representative of the Republic, Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Edvard Beneš. This act of censorship was also reflected in Zavřel’s private life, as the author was deprived of his civil service position due to a media campaign against him. The study shows that Zavřel anticipated confiscation and in subsequent republications of the censored novel actually took advantage of the fact that it was confiscated for marketing purposes.

The study by Tomáš Pavlíček, *Za jeden národ a jednu říši. Německá nacionalistická literatura ve střetu s prvorepublikovou cenzurou – For One Nation and One Reich. German Nationalist Literature in Conflict with First Republic Censorship*, deals with censorship intervention in the sphere of völkisch and Nazi-oriented German-language fiction. It follows both the key authors of this fiction and selected prohibited texts. Whereas in the 1920s it was primarily writers who originally came from the Czech lands but who lived abroad

(particularly in Germany and Austria) who were censored, from the 1930s as political radicalization got under way it was the National Socialists and associated Sudeten German authors who came to the fore. The higher number of sanctions against this literature was accompanied in the last years of the existence of Czechoslovakia by a growing effort on the part of censorship and security bodies to systematically suppress them and to proceed more stringently against the most radical Nazi and anti-Czechoslovak authors (Gottfried Rothacker, Wilhelm Pleyer and Karl Hans Strobl).

The case study by Vendula Trnková, *V republice nevítaným cizincem. Vyhoštění Karla Hanse Strobla – An Alien Citizen Not Welcome to the Republic. The Expulsion of Karl Hans Strobl*, deals with German-language literature, which was a priority target for First Republic censorship. The author analyses acts of censorship around 1933 against a native of Jihlava/Iglau on the border of Bohemia and Moravia, the German-speaking writer Karl Hans Strobl (1877–1946) and his work. These acts, which led to the expulsion of the writer from Czechoslovakia in 1937, are examined both from the viewpoint of the authorities and from that of the writer himself. The author places the trial in the broader context of the defence of Czech statehood in the period of increasing German nationalism and the political mobilization of the German minority in the Czech lands.

The case study by Jiří Soukup, *Beze zbytku a bez přečtení spálit. Brod Kafkovým editorem – Burn It All Without Reading It. Max Brod, Kafka's Editor*, does not so much focus on state censorship as present a specific type of structural regulation for literary communication, characterized in the editorial procedures used by Max Brod (1884–1968), executor of Franz Kafka's (1883–1924) last will regarding his own work. The study shows that in his efforts to present the great epic form of Kafka's works, Brod downplayed their fragmentary nature, thus interfering in their structure, omitting passages which in his opinion or at that time were considered inappropriate or problematic and amending Kafka's work to make it less problematic, more available and attractive for the reader. With these publication activities Brod contributed to the canonization of Kafka's work while going beyond the role of editor towards that of an interpreter and co-author of the published works, thus for a long time co-creating Kafka's image among readers and researchers. This study also presents changing opinions of these editorial procedures by Max Brod.

Part Six, 1938–1949

The overview chapter by Pavel Janáček, Tomáš Pavlíček and Volker Mohn, *V zájmu národa. Literární cenzura v období krize liberalismu a eroze modernity – In the Interest of the Nation. Literary Censorship During the Crisis of Liberalism and the Erosion of Modernity*, deals with literary censorship during the time that is characterized in the Czech history of culture, politics, ideology, mentalities and social practice as the parting with liberalism and liberal democracy. At the end of the 1930s, with some delay Czech society followed developments in other European countries that sought a way out of the “crisis of democracy” and the social and economic problems associated with the Depression in another form of government on a different ideological basis. Several different types of authoritarian regime followed one another on Czech territory between 1938 and 1949. From 1st October 1938 to 14th March 1939 the territory of the old First Republic saw a truncated, economically weakened and politically limited state known as the Second Republic. From 15th March

1939 to 8th May 1945 rump Czechoslovakia (Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia) was occupied by Nazi forces and the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was created there in complete dependence on the policies of Nazi Germany. The period between liberation and the Communist putsch in February 1948 is called the Third Republic, whose political character was strongly influenced by socialist ideas (right-wing parties were not permitted to join the political system at that time). From the Communist take-over on 25th February 1948 we refer to the socialist dictatorship, which took the form of a Stalinist-style totalitarian regime at the turn of the 1940s and 1950s. Despite the deep differences between these regimes and their mutual militant opposition, they shared a rejection of the cultural, legal, economic and social institutions developing in the Czech lands from the mid-19th century on the basis of liberalism. This was also evident in the nature and extent of their literary censorship and its status within literary communication – the changing face of press and literary censorship was held within the confines of this authoritarian model for all of the next fifty years.

In connection with the rapid changes in Czech society between 1938 and 1949, literary censorship always adhered for short periods to various particular criteria, such as the exclusion of socialist or communist, or on the other hand liberal or conservative political thinking from public space, the limitation of avant-garde art or the representation of political conflict. Under the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, these criteria also came to include the aim of limiting Czech national literature and culture, promoted by the occupying German forces (particularly between 1942 and 1944). The domestic censorship system, supported during the years of occupation by the authorities of the partially autonomous Protectorate government, set out the general aim throughout this period to protect and promote national literature as a set of indigenous values. This protection was offered on two sides, the first involving protection of the original national literature from translated book production, a “wave” of which (to use a metaphor common at that time) threatened to overwhelm independent Czech literature, while the other involved protection from “pornography” and trash literature, i.e. popular literature lacking literary value and indifferent to the nation. As a result Czech literature was to be relieved of its “lower” levels, placed at the service of national society and its current cultural programme and closed to the uncontrollable transfer of values from outside.

From the standpoint of the development of state censorship institutions the interval between 1938 and 1949 was a period of transition. At the beginning of the period under review (1938–1939), during the almost six-month Second Republic, the formative goals of authoritarian censorship were achieved on the basis of legal regulations from Masaryk’s Czechoslovakia and the radicalization of liberal censorship instruments. Under German occupation the censorship system began to give rise to institutions of a new, authoritarian type, facilitating the formation of literature as a whole and promoting a particular conception of literature and culture by means of state supervision of the media and the circulation of information. In 1942 a new organizational model for censorship was completed. A central state authority for literature was set up (the Ministry for Popular Enlightenment, Literature Section), which dealt with not only the approval of publishers’ plans and the pre-publication censorship of published texts, but also a number of other tasks which went far beyond the restrictive horizons of liberal censorship. This

institutional model survived the Third Republic (1945–1948) and the arrival of Stalinism after the Communist take-over in February 1948 and operated on the Czech scene until 1953. Its formative ambitions were evident in many ways – from disciplining publishers, influencing their plans and monitoring and rewarding writers to the censorship authority's own publishing operations. The term for this “positive” activity gradually came to be known as “planning”. It signalled (even under the Protectorate) not only the will of the state to mould the future form of literary culture, but also the linkage of the cultural and economic administrations, which was all part of the ongoing centralization and etatization of all spheres of social life. From that time the central planning of literature was based on the central planning of the economy, or to be specific, the economic management of paper, the assignment of which was decided by the Central Literary Authority from 1943.

The overview chapter begins with a discussion of the periodization structure that has been selected. The criterion for defining a period is not a change in power relations, but a change in the nature of the social regulation of literary output. Hence the beginning is considered to be the introduction of pre-publication press censorship at the time preparations were being made for the military defence of the Republic in September 1938, when one of the principles symbolizing the liberal censorship system was breached. On the other hand we finish our account with the establishment in law of the state publishing monopoly in March 1949. The abolition of private publishing, which was one of the consequences of adopting the new publishing act, put a full stop to Third Republic censorship and its social and aesthetic programme.

The second section describes the main features that highlight the changes in literary culture and the adjustment of the literary field throughout the 1938–1949 period. The autonomy of art was weakened as social and political functions were favoured, with subservience to the nation predominating. The following section deals with discourse landmarks in the thinking on censorship. Regardless of the political regime in power at the time, the argument that censorship was of use to culture and society was characteristic of this entire period, as this “national protection” or “cleansing” element in the legitimization of censorship remained part of the discourse even after liberation in 1945.

In subsequent sections of the overview chapter, the changing face of censorship institutions, criteria and practice is followed through three historical periods and political regimes. Under the Second Republic the newly introduced pre-publication censorship served to promote the cultural programme of the unified right wing, whereas the publication platforms of the left wing were suppressed. Under the Protectorate both the Protectorate authorities and the occupation institutions took part in the growing regulation of literary communication on Czech territory. Lists were compiled of proscribed authors, books and periodicals, particularly with “inappropriate” subject matter of a “Marxist” or “anti-Reich” nature, while Nazi policy on Czech literature from 1942 ceased to be based on the previously proclaimed idea of cultural autonomy, as Czech-language book production was stringently curtailed. Under the Third Republic a special model of literary regulation was put in place, protecting highbrow work and national literature. Both left-wing and liberal-left literary elites took over the administrative model for the planning and censorship of literature introduced during the occupation and applied it

to their own literary programme. Highbrow literature remained practically unaffected, while the unsystematic post-publication censorship of the periodical press followed the aim of weakening critical voices in favour of political and social stabilization and bolstering state authority.

The final parts of the overview chapter come back to summarizing the period under review. Attention is first focused on the effects that the transformation of liberal literary censorship into that of an authoritarian type had on the various participants and the situation surrounding literary communication. The final section presents the extent of manipulation and force, which was extreme from the standpoint of the previous long development of culture in Bohemia and Moravia, to which books, book collections and libraries were exposed. This eruption of coercion was a foretaste of the biblioclasm to come under Stalinism.

Case Studies, 1938–1949

The introductory study by Lukáš Borovička, *Republika proti Benjaminu Kličkovi, Benjamin Klička proti republice? Světonázorová struktura trilogie Na vinici Páně a druhorepubliková cenzura – The Republic versus Benjamin Klička, and Benjamin Klička versus the Republic? The Worldview Structure of the In the Vineyard of the Lord Trilogy and Second Republic Censorship*, reconstructs the circumstances surrounding the confiscation of the novel *Na vinici Páně – In the Vineyard of the Lord* by psychological and social novelist Benjamin Klička (1897–1943), which took place in December 1938. The author confronts the worldview of Klička's novel with the ideological criteria of Second Republic censorship, the main focus being on how his prose represents such subjects as Nazism, the nation and state, socialism, T. G. Masaryk and his political programme. The study shows that it is these subjects which most prominently display the difference between the worldview structure of Klička's work and the authoritarian discourses exploding in Czech society as a result of the Munich Agreement.

The short existence of the Second Republic is covered by Pavel Janáček's case study *Doběhnuta dějinami. Reslerova antologie K počtě zbraň praporu! mezi třemi cenzurními systémy – Overtaken by History. Resler's Anthology Present Arms to the Flag! Between Three Censorship Systems*. It follows in microscopic detail the preparations made in 1938 for a representative selection of national political poetry which lawyer, bibliophile and famous stalwart of Czech literary life Kamill Resler (1893–1961) was drawing up for publication from December 1938 to March 1939 in collaboration with publisher Václav Petr. As a result of the German occupation, which took place on 15th March 1939, the book was not printed and the publication did not take place until after the war in 1945. Censorship and social regulation encroached into the publishing plan repeatedly for a period of seven years. Reams of various criteria and interests heaped up over the original publishing plan, compelling the editor to constantly adapt the text and the book (individual poems were subject to pre-publication censorship as soon as they were published in the newspapers and magazines from which Resler picked them). The publication of the anthology was not only held back by regular censorship, but also by the competing interests of other publishers.

The German occupation is spotlighted in the case study by Jakub Říha *Křestný list a protektorátní cenzura. Geneze prvotiny Jiřího Koláře a národně politická poezie – The Birth Certificate and Protectorate Censorship. The Origins of Jiří Kolář's First Work and National Political Poetry*. Based on the example of the first work by the leading representative of postwar Czech culture, poet and artist Jiří Kolář (1914–2002), this study shows the changes that took place in literary censorship at the end of 1940 and the beginning of 1941. This study focuses on three basic questions: it attempts to reconstruct the originally planned form of *Křestný list – The Birth Certificate*; making use of correspondence and surviving typescripts, it considers the nature of censorship interventions; finally, it opens up the question of the influence of censorship on the reception of the work. This study puts forward the hypothesis that external intervention suppressing poems on contemporary themes in particular distorted the original form of the collection, influencing its reception at the time, as well as subsequent literary historical reflections of Kolář's work, as the suppressed strata of poems placed the collection in the mainstream of national defence poetry that predominated at that time.

The next three case studies follow the operation and effects of literary censorship between 1945 and 1949. The study by Pavel Janáček, „*Zatím nelze*“. *Měsíčník Gong a cesta poválečného českého umění od surrealismu k pop-artu – “Not Allowed Yet”. The Monthly Gong and the Road of the Postwar Czech Art from Surrealism to Pop-Art*, shows the results of state regulation on the periodical press for the emerging arts. Based on the example of the rejection of an application made by members of the Gong Brno group of beginner artists – who in private developed a kind of pop art avant la lettre, post-avant-garde project as early as 1943 – for permission to publish an artistic revue for the group, the study presents the literary censorship rules during the Third Republic. These generally prioritized a canon based on the central values of national literature, to the detriment of unrecognized authors. At the end of the study the author raises the question of how the prohibition of the magazine altered literary historical and art historical ideas on literature and art in the mid-1940s and how censorship measures affected the individual careers of the authors concerned: painter Pavel Brázda (1926), critic Jaroslav Dresler (1925–1999) and debutant poet Milan Kundera (1929), who was made famous since the 1960s by his novels *Žert – The Joke* and *Nesnesitelná lehkost bytí – The Unbearable Lightness of Being*.

The study by Zuzana Říhová, „*Zamyslete se však jednu krátkou tichou chvílí nad tou Součkovou*“. *K publikačním osudům Neznámého člověka Milady Součkové – “But Spare a Thought for a Quiet Little Moment for Součková”. On the Publication Story of Unknown Person by Milada Součková*, also follows the fortunes of a work whose publication came up against difficulties both under the Protectorate and the Third Republic. Correspondence is used to recapitulate the publication story behind the modernistic prose work that Milada Součková (1899–1983), a prominent writer of prose, poetry and essays, offered the Melantrich publishers as early as 1943. This study presents the individual and structural reasons that might have been the cause for the novel *Neznámý člověk – Unknown Person* remaining in manuscript form for twenty years after its completion (it first came out in United States in 1962). The author puts forward the hypothesis that the delayed publication of this work might have also been brought about by the growing lack of trust

in Czech culture towards the modernist paradigm, manifesting itself in fatigue over this formal experiment and seeking avenues to the “popular reader”.

The case study by Pavel Kořínek, „*Jako poslední, žádné textové bubliny*“. *Komentovaný seriál jako zkrocený komiks* – “Just Like Last Time, No Text Bubbles”. *The Captioned Series As Tamed Comics*, presents the postwar discourse rejecting the comic strip form, which intensified following the 1948 take-over. The threat of a prohibition on publication made comics artists turn to self-censorship practices, which often affected the very basic characteristics of the genre, i.e. the authors replaced text bubbles inside the pictures by captions outside the image field. This study describes the attempts to introduce pre-publication (self-censoring) changes, as comics were turned into captioned series, using material from the last three episodes of the famous series *Rychlé šípy* – *The Quick Arrows* by Jaroslav Foglar (1907–1999). However, not even this attempt prevented the series by the famous children’s literature author from being prohibited. Its publication was only renewed for a short time at the end of the 1960s.

Part Seven, 1949–1989

The overview chapter by Petr Šámal, *V zájmu pracujícího lidu. Literární cenzura v době centrálního plánování a paralelních oběhů* – *In the Interest of the Working People. Literary Censorship Under Central Planning and Parallel Circulation*, presents the operations of literary censorship under the communist dictatorship, when the literary institutions were meant to take a share in the creation of the “New Man” and the construction of a new, socialist society. A fundamental role was played in the operation of censorship at that time by the fact that the civil rights of individuals and the associated liberal conception of freedom of speech were subject to the authority of the state.

The main principles behind the authoritarian-type literary censorship system that existed throughout the Communist dictatorship were based on the interconnection of the literary and book production planning, management and control processes. Under the conditions of the state publication monopoly there were several points and factors that opened up space for variously motivated pre-publication interventions aiming at the author, the text or subsequently to restrict the circulation of an already published work. All traces of censorship intervention were hidden, as it was not permitted to leave blank spaces in place of removed texts. The very existence of the censorship authority was not enshrined in legislation that was in force and could not be spoken about until the Press Act was passed in 1967.

For the period between 1949 and 1989 (with a short gap of several months during the Prague Spring) we speak of the dispersed censorship system in Czechoslovakia. This term is used to convey the large number of points at which interventions could potentially be made and the variety of censorship situations which concurrently required a certain measure of cooperation and above all a shared objective. The primary feature of the system was its multilevel nature. This can be defined as several censorship foci that formed the backbone of literary supervision. This multilevel system of supervision and regulation comprised approval procedures at the party, government and enterprise level. The supreme ideological and arbitration authority remained the Communist Party Central Committee, while management and planning authority was centred around the

ministry in charge, and the third mainstay of supervision over books was the approvals procedure at individual publishers. As regards the publication of fiction, this was in some cases influenced by the decisions of a select professional organization – the Union of Czechoslovak Authors. Moreover, between 1953 and 1968 there was a special pre-publication censorship office (Hlavní správa tiskového dohledu – Press Supervision Head Administration, later Ústřední publikační správa – Central Publication Administration). Its function was basically that of monitoring (censorship as “monitoring the monitors”, Jerzy Urbański) – investigating potential failures in other components of the dispersed censorship system.

The introductory section of the overview chapter presents a model of literary communication under the communist dictatorship, in which the roles and functions of its participants and institutions are examined in detail from the standpoint of regulation. The aim of this initial section is also to characterize the principles behind the dispersed censorship system in general terms. By applying a synchronic view we achieve a “cross-section” of the dynamic field of censorship interactions, which, as indicated, played out at multiple levels. From the author’s standpoint this meant increased awareness of which subjects and literary devices or poetics were acceptable and which were not. The most frequent target of pre-publication censorship was magazines, on the pages of which the limits of the acceptable were under negotiation. Centralized distribution of books came under the Kniha national enterprise, which was subordinate to the Ministry of Information, then Culture, thus greatly facilitating the coordination of any censorship intervention. A strong effort was made, particularly under Stalinism, to homogenize the readership and ideologically channel the reading of literary works, e.g. via paratexts (book forewords and afterwords). In spite of the complexity of the dispersed censorship system, it included structural gaps (Robert Darnton), that provided space for exceptions, negotiation or circumvention of the firmly established rules.

The subsequent exposition is structured chronologically. The attention of individual sections gradually focuses on those institutions and areas of literary activity of particular importance for the performance of literary censorship at that particular stage, the crucial watershed being not the political take-over of February 1948, but the passage of the 1949 Publishing Act, which nationalized the extensive network of private publishers and defined the state publication monopoly. In the historical exposition section, the circumstances surrounding the creation of the new type of regulation of literary communication are first dealt with. In the first years of the Communist dictatorship the authority of the Communist Party Central Committee Cultural and Propaganda Division grew considerably, as it subsumed other literary censorship institutions and at the same time formed a new supervisory system on its own initiative. The internal chronological structure of the period under review places 1953 in a special position, as this is when the dispersed censorship system stabilized. The key literary censorship body during the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s was the special pre-publication censorship authority (Hlavní správa tiskového dohledu – Press Supervision Head Administration) which (in contrast to e.g. the Soviet Union, Poland and East Germany) only existed in Czechoslovakia between 1953 and 1968. As of the mid-1960s attempts were made to relax the state publishing monopoly and the autonomy of the literary field grew. A separate section is then devoted to the

Prague Spring period, when for several months in 1968 and 1969 the supervision and regulation system that had been built up over such a long period of time de facto collapsed. The final four sections describe first the restoration of the dispersed censorship system that took place as a result of the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 in the early 1970s, followed by the specific features of the normalization model of literary supervision, the focus of literary censorship at that time and strategies to circumvent it. The final part of the overview chapter focuses on literature in parallel circulation and the collapse of the literary censorship system at the end of the 1980s.

Case Studies, 1949–1989

The case study by Petr Šámal, *Je třeba opravit chyby a nedostatky. Literární cenzura a hledání nové literatury v přepracovaných prózách – Mistakes and Shortcomings Need to Be Rectified. Literary Censorship and the Quest for New Literature in Reworked Prose*, follows the implementation of 1950s literary standards, based on the example of the reworking of older works by prewar socialist literature authors Géza Včelička (1901–1966), Vašek Káňa (1905–1985) and T. Svatopluk (1900–1972). In this way the selected authors attempted to adapt their texts to topical requirements at that time. The new motifs, expressive techniques and other changes made by the authors in their works are understood in the study to be manifestations of structural regulation. This case study shows how the changes made by the authors matched the motifs and subjects pursued by other actors in the dispersed censorship system.

The case study by Veronika Jáchimová, *Mezi centrem a periferií. Osobnost a dílo Karla Čapka ve sporech o literární kánon po roce 1948 – Between the Centre and the Periphery. The Life and Work of Karel Čapek in Disputes Over the Literary Canon After 1948*, describes the forms of canonization of Karel Čapek (1890–1938) in Czech literature after 1948, based on disputes between two literary museums. This study characterizes the two predominant Čapek discourses based on the acceptance and rejection polarity: The first one viewed Čapek as a symbol of the Masaryk and Beneš ethos of democratic republicanism, while the other one viewed him as an author in the engaged anti-Fascist mainstream of Czech literature. The second part of the study reconstructs the conflict between the central memory institution (Památník národního písemnictví – Museum of Czech Literature) and a local institute (The Karel Čapek Museum in Malé Svatoňovice).

The operation of the pre-publication censorship authority is dealt with in a study by Petr Šámal, *Cenzorka jako čtenářka. Literární kompetence a zájmy referentky HSTD – The Censor As a Reader. The Literary Competence and Interests of a Press Supervision Head Administration Desk Officer*, in which the author presents the life and career of censor Jarmila Waageová, raising the question of how general rules for assessing books were interpreted by a rank and file censorship staff member, how the censor interpreted particular literary texts and how general instructions were supplemented by individual literary taste. On the basis of early critical texts by Jarmila Waageová (1921–2011), who prior to joining the Press Supervision Head Administration obtained her doctorate from Charles University in the history of literature, her literary preferences are characterized in the study. An analysis is also made of censorship reports, which points out not only the key

subjects and motifs that the censors focused on, but also the arguments they used to back up their prohibitions, e.g. in the case of Josef Škvorecký's first novels.

The case study by Jakub Češka, *Literatura z dosahu politické čteny. Za Hrabalovou variantností a ironií – Literature Out of the Reach of Political Reading. Seeking Hrabal's Variability and Irony*, deals with the ways in which writer Bohumil Hrabal (1914–1997) responded to the suggestions and comments made by various participants in the dispersed censorship system. It highlights the openness of Hrabal's work, which was not closed off to the narrator's distinctive voice as it put forward the author's clear will. This study goes over the twists and turns of Hrabal's publishing history and confirms his willingness to alter his manuscripts on the basis of pre-publication reviewers', editors' and readers' suggestions. It shows how Hrabal's polysemantic prose resists the ideological readings that were not only characteristic of the censors, but also to be found e.g. in underground settings (culminating in the spectacular burning of Hrabal's books on Kampa island in Prague in 1975).

The relaxation and collapse of the dispersed censorship system that took place in the latter half of the 1960s is presented in Veronika Košnarová's case study *Podnikatelský experiment. Návrat románového sešitu v druhé polovině šedesátých let – A Business Experiment. The Return of the Pulp Magazine in the Latter Half of the 1960s*. Based on the example of several pulp serializations of popular literature established in 1968 by the South Bohemian regional publishers Růže in České Budějovice, the overall transformation in the attitude of state institutions and society towards popular culture is traced out, as are the changes in views of the purpose of publishing work and the book as an economic commodity. As normalization set in, however, this type of popular book was again rejected.

The period at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of normalization is dealt with in Jiřina Šmejkalová's study *Andělé bez ráje. Praktiky vylučování z literární komunikace na počátku sedmdesátých let – Angels Without a Heaven. Practices of Exclusion from Literary Communication in the Early 1970s*. The publication prohibition on the travelogue by Miroslav Zikmund (*1919) and Jiří Hanzelka (1920–2003) *Cejlon: ráj bez andělů – Ceylon: Heaven without Angels* was a watershed in the career of both writers and reporters, who were enormously popular at that time in Czechoslovakia. At the same time, however, this was part of a broader process involving the ongoing and largely successful suppression of hundreds of writers and works both from the public arena and subsequently from the cultural canon and the collective memory, which took place following the Soviet invasion. This study presents the various types of literary communication regulation dispersed at various institutional levels and follows the direct and indirect methods and strategies used in state intervention, including the way in which this was transposed onto various fields of discourse.

The case study by Jiří Trávníček, *„Ózetefka“ a jejich „elpéčka“. Prohibita a oddělení zvláštních fondů v době normalizační – OZF and Their LP. Prohibition and the Separation of Special Collections Under Normalization*, summarizes the censorship that was undertaken at libraries in the early 1970s. Attention is then focused on the operation of what were known as special collections (in Czech abbreviated OZF), where prohibited books (LP) were kept. Oral history methods allow the study to reveal the loans system, along with

the circumvention of regulations and the changes which the special collections underwent up until 1990.

The case study by Přemysl Houda, *Písničkář na hranici. Příklad Vladimíra Merty – Singer-Songwriter on the Brink. The Example of Vladimír Merta*, deals with the issues surrounding supervision of the performing arts during the 1970s and 1980s. Taking the example of the leading folk singer Vladimír Merta (*1946), it presents the difficulties the state authorities met with when they attempted to curtail the performances of inconvenient artists. A surprisingly wide space opened up in the final stage of the communist dictatorship for the public performances of singers in the opposition who had not signed Charter 77. This study describes the various strategies used successfully by Merta to get round the prohibitions imposed by individual cultural organizations and authorities in various parts of the state and to earn a living as a professional musician.

Elements of structural regulation in samizdat literature are dealt with in a study by Vladimír Trpka, *„Chyba není ve čtenáři“. Edice Petlice a dvě verze Medvědího románu Jiřího Kratochvila – “The Fault Is Not in the Reader”. Petlice Publishers and Two Versions of The Bear Novel by Jiří Kratochvil*. Kratochvil (*1940), who became well known after 1989 as a prolific prose writer and spokesman for the postmodernist programme in Czech literature, offered the manuscript of *Medvědí román – The Bear Novel* to Edice Petlice in 1983 for dissemination in samizdat form, but they rejected it due to its supposed incomprehensibility, so the author reworked it. This study interprets this rejection as a conflict between two aesthetic discourses in a situation where the publisher had evident authority over that of a neophyte author. The original version of *Medvědí román* came out in 1999 under the title *Urmedvěd – Ur-Bear*. Hence this study also follows the enthusiastic critical reception of the novel, pointing out that Kratochvil thematized the previous rejection of the text in his work.

Another type of structural regulation is examined by Michelle Woods in her study *Václav Havel a skrytá cenzura. Překlad jako ideologická redukce textu – Václav Havel and Covert Censorship. Translation As Ideological Reduction of the Text*. The author shows that English-language productions of Václav Havel's (1936–2011) plays primarily highlighted – in line with the Cold War discourse at that time – the political aspects of Havel's works. In opposition to his instructions, the style of his plays was restricted to the level of easy-to-understand political messages. This study also examines the gender aspect that appeared in directors' attitudes towards the translator Vera Blackwell.

Part Eight, 1989–2014

The overview chapter by Pavel Janáček *V zájmu jednotlivce. Literární cenzura v období neoliberalismu a postmoderny – In the Interest of the Individual. Literary Censorship Under Neoliberalism and Postmodernity*, examines the historical period from the 1989 democratic revolution to the present. The conditions at this time for the publication and circulation of literary texts are the freest in the entire two and a half century period under review in this book. The institutionalized state supervision of the periodic and non-periodic press has currently come close to the ideal type of liberal censorship, whereby the state does not promote any cultural programme by means of censorship apart from the general framework of liberal democratic values. Pre-publication censorship is not applied in any media

system. Several very small, legally defined areas relating to (primarily) marginal, socially rejected or criminal sexual practices and (secondly) that involve racism, antisemitism, xenophobia or promoting or commemorating Nazism and the like have remained under the control of judicial bodies, with the decision-making role entrusted to independent courts. The careful employment of instruments that the state has retained to regulate these areas is in accord with the hegemony of liberal ideology that has been transforming society in Western Europe and the United States since the end of the 1970s, with the emphasis on individual freedom and the individual's responsibility for himself.

The primary features of state censorship since November 1989 have included the complete avoidance of the literary sphere. Throughout this period it has touched neither "highbrow" nor popular literature, with some minor exceptions. This can be seen amongst other things as the culmination of a modernization process in which art and literature in the narrower sense of *belles lettres* have been breaking away since the Enlightenment from the complex of social communications as a relatively autonomous field of social behaviour. The right of artists and art to exceed moral, cultural and ideological boundaries, respect for which has been or still is enforced by society on its members in other spheres, is currently upheld in this autonomous field.

This minimum extent of institutionalized state censorship does not mean that contemporary literary communication is entirely without social regulation. During the post-democratic revolution period we have witnessed a shift in direction from state censorship towards restrictive intervention by non-state participants and from institutionalized censorship to mechanisms of structural regulation for cultural output. Hence the exposition in this section is an inversion of the previous general chapters which dealt primarily with the description of institutions, the regulatory standpoints and practice of pre- and post-publication state literary censorship. This section of the book focuses on the social debate over censorship and manifestations of censorship involving non-state and structural regulation.

The ordinary, albeit miniature and specially developing, system of liberal-style censorship is dealt with in the last overview chapter, but only in a small part of its sections and subsections. In the remaining parts it shows *inter alia* how literary censorship operates through its absence, and how the literary space has responded to the memory of authoritarian censorship following the democratic revolution.

The first section of the overview chapter begins with a designation of the ideological, social and cultural contexts behind the contemporary social regulation of literature, as well as an outline of the features that characterize it within the context of the general hallmarks of the liberal-style censorship model. This involves the shift of focus in social regulation from printing to audiovisual media, decentralization and privatization of censorship activities, a result of which is the proliferation of cases of local censorship disputes with consequences of small import to society as a whole, as well as the increased mobilization of civil and copyright instruments and not least the globalization of censorship both in the sense of extraterritorial intervention into national literary communication and in the sense of efforts to avoid intercultural conflicts in the Czech state through censorship (e.g. in relation to radical Islam). The following two sections deal with events surrounding the transition from a dispersed censorship system to the liberal censorship

system of the 1990s, the removal of the legal foundations of the state printing monopoly and the creation of a new media law. The fourth section on discourse regarding censorship is the only one to be conceived diachronically. It shows the unprecedented strength of the Czech cultural elites' liberal-modernist approaches to freedom of speech and the autonomy of art since November 1989, as well as the slow erosion of this consensus, as manifested in four cases of significance throughout society, involving disputes over the need for state literary, artistic and mass media regulation in the case of a 1991 short story by Slovak postmodernist Martin Kasař (*1968) (*azda*) *Posledná večera* – (*perhaps*) *The Last Evening*; in the wave of moral panic after the arrival of commercial television in 1993; in discussions over the legality of the first complete Czech publication of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in 2000; and in the acceptability of the hip-hop horrorcore genre around 2010. The fifth section charts all the most important cases of post-publication censorship aimed at books (generally of a non-literary nature) in the period from the democratic revolution to the present day. It references also the sporadic cases of interventions against the extreme right-wing periodical press. The next two sections point out the existence of socially important factors and forms of non-state censorship, as well as the structural regulation of literary communication, indicating some of their consequences for contemporary literary work and reception (i.e. the consequences of the postcommunist transformation of the literary market at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s, the literary discussion over political correctness, the consequences of regulating public media broadcasts of literary content, the staging of censorship interventions in the interests of fetishizing a particular book product and for economic profit, and so forth). In the final, eighth section we mention briefly to some aspects visible today of the remediation process, which has been brought on at a global level by the advent of the internet and particularly by World Wide Web applications serving the creation and reception of hypertext documents. In view of the subject of this book, i.e. censorship of printed literature, this section serves the role of symbolic epilogue.

Case Studies, 1989–2014

The study by Stefan Segi, *Oi! na ROI. Texty skupin Orlík a Braník z perspektivy formování vědomí závadnosti na počátku devadesátých let – Oi! to ROI. Lyrics by the Bands Orlík and Braník from the Standpoint of Forming an Awareness of Harmfulness in the Early 1990s*, deals with song lyrics. This is one of the few text or literary genres that is currently subject to post-publication censorship in contemporary Czech literary culture. Based on the example of lyrics from the skinhead groups Orlík and Braník, this study follows the gradual formation of awareness of the harmfulness of some subjects and of extreme right-wing ideological values in public discourse and among artists that took place in the early 1990s. The aim of this analysis of the court proceedings against Braník, who brought out a recording with racist texts, as well as their sound engineer Jiří Mírovský and the music publisher Vladimír Kočandrle, is to examine the process whereby new legal boundaries of freedom of expression in a liberal democratic society were being set out.

The other case studies do not deal with institutionalized state censorship, but follow other forms of social regulation. The effects of the economic situation and changes in intellectual paradigms in the publishing process are dealt with by Roman Kanda's study

Od velkorysých plánů k opozičnímu vzdoru. Publikační návrat Ivana Svitáka po roce 1989 – From Grand Plans to Resistance in Opposition. The Return to Publication of Ivan Sviták After 1989. This follows the erosion of the publishing project of a thirty-volume collected writings of Marxist philosopher and polymath Ivan Sviták (1925–1994), who was well-known particularly during the 1960s and who returned to his homeland in the early 1990s after twenty years of exile in the USA. At this time the Czech book market was undergoing a profound transformation. The economic situation affected publishers as an “invisible” restriction without any institutional basis, so Sviták’s project was never implemented. This study focuses on Sviták’s negotiations with publishing houses and on his efforts to recast economic restrictions as obstacles on the level of ideological censorship.

Another type of structural regulation of literature is dealt with in the study by Stefan Segi *O Honzíkově cestě a liberální cenzuře. Regulace na poli literatury pro děti a mládež – On Johnny’s Journey and Liberal Censorship. Regulation in Children’s and Young Adults’ Literature.* The author returns to censorship of popular books by the leading children’s author Bohumil Říha (1907–1987), which took place during the 1990s and was hitherto interpreted as opportunist ideological self-censorship, showing that the amendments to Říha’s prose work for children do not only consist in the removal of Communist symbols, but also in their adaptation to politically correct points of view. All these text changes relate to mechanisms that predetermine work with reeditions of literary works for children and young adults in general. The key instrument of interpretation in the study is the specification of the special field of children’s reading, in which different rules apply to the treatment of the text than in the case of literature in general.

The study by Lenka Pořízková, *Učebnice jako res publica. Lektorské posudky prostředkem vyjednávání konsenzu – Textbooks As res publica. Reviewers’s Reports As a Means of Negotiating a Consensus,* presents the procedure for assessing and approving textbooks in the modern-day Czech Republic. This shows how, in the period under assessment, criteria of political correctness are applied in discussions over the most varied ideologically, religiously, politically and morally sensitive values and their presentation in the process of education, which within the sphere organized by the Ministry of Education involve religious groups and organizations representing civil society.

Another form of structural regulation is presented in a case study by Karolína Ryvolová *Psaní přes překážky. Role cenzury v procesu utváření romského písemnictví – Writing Despite the Obstacles. The Role of Censorship in the Process of Creating Roma Literature.* Here the author progressively analyses various forms of censorship and regulation that have accompanied the formation of Roma literature as a small ethnic literature within the Czech cultural sphere. She shows that until 1989 it was primarily institutional censorship, shielded by state assimilation policy, that stood in the way of the development of Roma minority literature, but that from its very beginnings Roma literature has come up against structural censorship, which appears in several forms: firstly in a lack of faith in the literary validity of the Romany language, secondly in the prejudices of literary professionals, who reject Roma literary work based on assessments made using the literary criteria of the mature majority literature, and thirdly in the work of associated editors and translators, who have a tendency to stylistically adapt Romany writing to majority output.

The case study by Stefan Segi and Lucie Albrechtová, „*Nebylo by lepší to smazat?*“ *Regulace a autoregulace virtuální dětské pornografie na internetu* – “Wouldn’t It be Better to Delete It?” *Regulation and Self-Regulation of Virtual Child Pornography on the Internet*, shows that at the beginning of the 21st century the supervision of representations of sexuality has shifted to the outermost margins of the literary field, beyond the boundaries of institutionalized literature. This study examines the various levels of regulation of virtual child pornography on the internet. In addition to the legislative framework, it focuses primarily on (self-)regulation within the framework of online discussion sites and blogs, created, managed and visited by the pedophile community, with the emphasis placed on the way the context in which a problematic pornographic text appears actually governs the approach of all the participants towards it. The consequences of this include the fact that the representation of paedophile sexuality in specialized centres permanently reflects the legal boundaries which society places on such expressions, while representations of paedophile sexuality in institutionalized literature are not at all considered or referred to in relation to such boundaries.

Translated by Melvyn Clarke, proof read by David L. Cooper