

Censorship and the Potential Texts in Poland during the Late Communist Period

W. Gardocki

For citation: Gardocki W. Censorship and the Potential Texts in Poland during the Late Communist Period. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2022, vol. 67, issue 3, pp. 863–881. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2022.312>

The article presents the mechanisms of censorship in the 1980s in the People's Republic of Poland as well as its consequences that still affect the present. It examines examples of the works subjected to the control as well as the writers of the period, including those who were banned from printing in the country. It indicates fragments of texts once removed from books and discusses works that could not be published in Poland in the 1980s. References are made to the three literary spheres existing at that time in the People's Republic of Poland: in the first, the "official" one, freedom of speech was significantly limited, and all texts were checked by the Main Office for the Control of Presentations and Public Performances (*Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk*); the second (*drugi obieg*), also described as the free, underground, independent publishing sphere, was not subject to censorship and was illegal, according to the laws in force at that time; the third sphere was *émigré* literature, by which we mean Polish language materials published abroad. The aim of this article is to show the complexity of this situation as well as its consequences for the present day.

Keywords: censorship, unpublished texts, writers, People's Republic of Poland, 1980s.

Цензура и потенциальный текст в польской литературе коммунистического периода

В. Гардоски

Для цитирования: Gardocki W. Censorship and the Potential Texts in Poland during the Late Communist Period // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2022. Т. 67. Вып. 3. С. 863–881. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu02.2022.312>

В статье анализируются механизмы цензуры в 1980-х гг. в Польской Народной Республике, а также ее последствия, сохраняющиеся до настоящего времени. Рассмотрены примеры произведений, подвергшихся контролю, а также рассказано о писателях того периода, в том числе запрещенных к печати в стране. Представлены фрагменты тек-

Wiktoria Gardocki — PhD, University of Białystok, 1, Plac Uniwersytecki, Białystok, 15-420, Poland; w.gardocki@uwb.edu.pl

Виктор Гардоски — PhD, Белостокский университет, Польша, 15-420, Белосток, пл. Университетская, 1; w.gardocki@uwb.edu.pl

The research is financed from the grant received from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education under the "Regional initiative of excellence" programme for the years 2019–2022, project No. 09/RID/2018/19.

Исследование финансируется за счет гранта, полученного от Министерства науки и высшего образования Польши в рамках программы «Региональная инициатива передового опыта» на 2019–2022 гг., проект № 09/RID/2018/19.

© St Petersburg State University, 2022

стов, когда-то изъятых из книг, а также обсуждаются сами произведения, которые не могли быть опубликованы в Польше в 1980-х гг. Делается ссылка на три литературные сферы, существовавшие в то время в Польской Народной Республике. В первой, официальной, свобода слова была существенно ограничена, а все тексты проверялись Главным управлением по контролю над печатью и публичными выступлениями. Вторая сфера описывается как свободная, подпольная, независимая издательская область, которая не подвергалась цензуре и была, согласно действовавшим в то время законам, вне закона. Третьей сферой была эмигрантская литература, под которой понимаются материалы на польском языке, изданные за границей. Таким образом, показана сложность ситуации, а также последствия, которые она имеет до сих пор.

Ключевые слова: цензура, неопубликованные тексты, писатели, Польская Народная Республика, 1980-е гг.

Introduction

How can one talk about a literary history with so many “gaps”? This question seems especially relevant when discussing post-communist countries. Many literary texts are only partially known because of censorship, remaining in readers’ consciousness in their censored form or not remaining at all (as *inedita* — works never published).

This article will address the question of the impact of censorship on literature through examples from Polish literary works of the 1980s. In Poland, during the period in question, three literary spheres existed thanks to an interesting coincidence. In the first, the “official” one, freedom of speech was significantly limited, and all texts were checked by the Main Office for the Control of Presentations and Public Performances (*Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk* [GUKPPiW]), which was also known unofficially as the “Ministry of Truth”. The second (*drugi obieg*), also described as the free, underground, independent publishing sphere established in 1977, was not subject to censorship and was illegal, according to the laws in force at the time. The third sphere was *émigré* literature, by which we mean Polish language materials published abroad. Polish literature has been affected by the consequences of this situation until the present day, which is apparent in both poetry and prose.

Censorship in Poland after 1945

Discussions about the need to introduce preventative censorship in Poland had begun even before the Second World War ended in Europe¹. In 1944, the Censorship Section was created as part of the Department of Public Security. Its name was later changed to the Central Office of the Monitoring of the Publications and Public Performances, and then to

¹ About first years of the operation of GUKPPiW in Poland, see e.g.: *Bates J.* Cenzura w epoce Stalinowskiej // *Teksty Drugie*. 2001. Vol. 1–2. P. 95–120; *Budrowska K.*: 1) *Writers, Literature and Censorship in Poland. 1948–1958*. Berlin, 2020; 2) *Zatrzymane przez cenzurę. Inedita z połowy wieku XX*. Warszawa, 2013; *Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy 1945–1949* / ed. by D. Nałęcz. Warszawa, 1994; *Paczkowski A.* Cenzura 1946–1949: statystyka działalności // *Zeszyty Historyczne*. 1996. Vol. 116. P. 22–57; *Fik M.* Kultura polska po Jałcie. Kronika lat 1944–1981. Warszawa, 1989; *Gogol B.* “Fabryka fałszywych tekstów”. Z działalności Wojewódzkiego Urzędu Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk w Gdańsku w latach 1945–1958. Warszawa, 2012; *Kondek S. A.*: 1) *Papierowa rewolucja. Oficjalny obieg książek w Polsce w latach 1948–1955*. Warszawa, 1999; 2) *Władza i wydawcy: polityczne uwarunkowania produkcji książek w Polsce w latach 1944–1949*. Warszawa, 1993; *Romek Z.*: 1) *Cenzura a nauka historyczna w Polsce 1944–1970*. Warszawa, 2010; 2) *System cenzury PRL* // *Wielka księga cenzury PRL*. Warszawa, 2010.

the Main Office for the Control of Presentations and Public Performances (GUKPPiW). The Russians had quite an important influence on the development of preventative censorship in Poland. Employees of “Glavlit” (Main Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press under the Council of Ministers of the USSR), Petr Gladin and Kazimir Iarmuzh, came to Lublin in 1944 in order to take part in early work, including the creation of documents that would define the scope of the censorship office’s activities². This office was supposed to fall under the jurisdiction of the Central Committee of the Polish Workers’ Party, and then — of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers’ Party (known by its Polish abbreviation KC PZPR).

While censorship fell under the jurisdiction of the Central Committee, other institutions were in turn subordinated to it, such as the Advisory Commission for Publishing at the Ministry of Education, the Department of Literature at the Ministry of Culture and Art³. In the coming years, “delegations” were also formed, such as the Voivodship Office for the Control of Presentations and Public Performances (known by its Polish abbreviation WUKPPiW), which primarily monitored local publications; often, however, it would also receive assignments from headquarters.

It quickly became clear that the GUKPPiW apparatus could not function optimally if private publishers continued to exist alongside state publishing institutions. As a result, official publishing was gradually taken over by the censorship apparatus. The first step to asserting state control over publishing was the introduction of the “cultural resolution”, which was a decree instituting the granting of “concessions for enterprises publishing books and non-periodical printed materials”⁴. Thus, the number of private publishers declined drastically in the late 1940s. The government made decisions about paper allotments, which as it turned out was also a form of censorship. If the authorities did not want a certain book to be published, they simply would not allot the paper necessary to print it⁵. The new policy of the Polish United Workers’ Party assumed the authors of that time would participate as builders of the “new reality”. They were expected to write books in the spirit of socialist realism quickly. Socialist realism only lasted a few years, however, and in the early 1950s its popularity began to wane.

October 1956 (the “Polish Thaw”) brought change to the highest state positions, which was connected with a liberalization of internal politics. The tragic events in Poznań in June of that year had an important impact on this. During the protests, fifty-seven people were killed, or later died of wounds. These events resounded both at home and abroad. In 1956, and the years that followed, books by previously “undesirable” authors were once again published. In the press, for a while, texts by Czesław Miłosz appeared. Since 1951, when Miłosz asked for political asylum in France, he had been a *persona non grata*.

During the post-Thaw period, from 1956 to 1959, the “Ministry of Truth” experienced a crisis caused by an increasing number of censorship activities assigned to it. In effect, if one takes into account the subpar education of its personnel, “the office stopped carrying out some of its functions”⁶. Moreover, after more than a decade, its activities had

² Romek Z. System cenzury PRL. P. 33–35.

³ Kondek S. A. Władza i wydawcy: polityczne uwarunkowania produkcji książek w Polsce w latach 1944–1949. Warszawa, 1993.

⁴ Ibid. P. 202–205.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Pawlicki A. Kompletna szarość. Cenzura w latach 1965–1972. Instytucja i ludzie. Warszawa, 2001. P. 34.

to be legally regulated. In 1964, there was an attempt to do just this. A bill on censorship was proposed by GUKPPiW itself — but in the end was not passed. In 1964–1965, GUKP-PiW was the subject of an audit by the Supreme Audit Office (*Najwyższa Izba Kontroli*), which found serious irregularities. As a result, “new management was appointed to organize the censorship office. It assumed its responsibilities in October 1965”⁷. In 1972, after discussions that had lasted several years, a new GUKPPiW statute was adopted, which was finally supposed to regulate its activities much more assiduously.

In the mid-1970s, principles were introduced that were supposed to be in force until GUKPPiW ceased to exist — according to these, reviews of literary texts were to be prepared, but not fully archived. Instead, collections of censored texts were created, with dates, as a sort of compilation of the most important interventions. These lists, called “Information about Interventions”, would contain changes to texts on that particular date. Thus, next to censors’ opinions about literary works, there were, for example, censored articles from the press, as well as many other texts. Original documents about specific texts were probably destroyed. In short, today it is impossible to retrace, step by step, the activities of GUKPPiW during the years 1945–1989.

The legal basis of GUKPPiW’s activities in the 1980s

On July 31, 1981, new and theoretically more liberal legislation on censorship was introduced in Poland. The name of the censorship office was changed to Main Office of Control of Publications and Public Performances (*Główny Urząd Kontroli Publikacji i Widowisk* [GUKPiW]). The institution’s decisions were finally supposed to be more “transparent”⁸. When the legislation was implemented, personal “registration” was abolished (*zapisy*, also called “directives” — this was about the constantly updated “black list” which contained the names of people and the subjects that were off-limits; censors eliminated any attempt to write about them). It was also at this time that the possibility of appealing decisions of GUKPiW to the Supreme Administrative Court of Poland was introduced as was the marking of the places in texts that had been censored, most often in this way: “[- - -]”⁹. The legislation also contained passages that were so vague that allowed censors who were checking the texts to use the law in any way they pleased — they could prevent a text from being published. As a result, the new law was only superficially liberal. In the end, it was in effect only a few weeks until martial law was declared on December 13, 1981. Under martial law, strict and scrupulous censorship of texts was returned.

This renewed repression paralyzed social communication. The authorities suspended all press activities, with the exception of two publications — *Trybuna Ludu*, an organ of the Polish United Workers’ Party, and *Żołnierz Wolności*, an organ of the Ministry of National Defense. Many writers were interned. The most serious restrictions, however, were not in force during the entire period of martial law. As early as in the first half of 1982, some publishing houses were allowed to resume operations.

Other legal changes took place only after martial law was suspended and then lifted. On July 28, 1983, the law on censorship of July 31, 1981, was amended. The researcher

⁷ Pawlicki A. *Kompletna szarość...* P. 34–36.

⁸ Bates J. From state monopoly to a free market of ideas? Censorship in Poland 1976–1989 // *Critical studies. Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*. 2004. Vol. 22. P. 153.

⁹ *Bafia J. Prawo o cenzurze*. Warszawa, 1983. P. 193.

Zofia Radzikowska noticed that the passages that had been added to the legislation could actually be interpreted any way at all. They related to situations when the text being censored could “threaten state security”, “threaten defense of the state in another way”, or “disseminate content clearly constituting a crime”¹⁰. On the basis of such imprecise regulations, it was actually possible to prevent any literary work or article in the press from being printed. The amended law, which these vague additional passages, was in force until 1988.

Truly liberal changes were introduced into the legislation only on May 29, 1989. It was at that time that the passages about security and national defense cited above were removed¹¹. Even in 1989, it was difficult to foresee the fall of the communist regime in Poland, so when on May 29 of that year the censorship law was amended, it was originally conceived of as part of a planned longer-term project. The situation changed when it became clear that the communist system, both in the USSR itself and other Soviet bloc countries, was in the process of collapsing¹².

In the end, on April 11, 1990, the Sejm passed a new press law, which took effect two months later. This marked the end of over forty-five years of preventative censorship in Poland. GUKPPIW ceased to function on 6 June of that same year. Several months later, the last remaining employment contracts with censors were dissolved.

Archival documents

GUKPPIW's archival documents are kept in Warsaw, in the Central Archives of Modern Records (Archiwum Akt Nowych). Researchers have noted that its materials relating to GUKPPIW are incomplete. Aleksander Pawlicki¹³, for example, points out that the documents probably went missing when the Office was abolished. Kamila Budrowska, on the other hand, points out that “the censorship's documents are incomplete and probably cannot be recovered” since some of them were destroyed in approximately 1989¹⁴. According to the new 2019 inventory of GUKPPIW's documents, there are 7.867 items.

In the 1980s, GUKPPIW would prepare several types of materials, including “Information about current interventions” (issued from 1981 to 1990), “Daily information about interventions” (from 1976–1981), “Monthly information about interventions” (1976–1981, 1981–1989), “Information about interventions in Catholic quarterly and monthly publications” (1976–1981), and “Information about interventions in religious publications” (1982–1985).

A remarkable coincidence: The situation in Polish literature in the 1980s¹⁵

In the 1980s, three publishing spheres existed in Polish literature, as was mentioned above. The first was the official sphere, which was under control of the state that was still

¹⁰ Radzikowska Z. *Historii walki o wolność słowa w Polsce (cenzura PRL w latach 1981–1987)*. Kraków, 1990. P. 10–30.

¹¹ Kamińska K. *Koniec cenzury PRL // Studia Medioznawcze*. 2014. Vol. 3. P. 118.

¹² Romek Z. *System cenzury PRL*. P. 20–21.

¹³ Pawlicki A. *Kompletna szarość*. P. 17.

¹⁴ Budrowska K. *Writers, Literature and Censorship in Poland. 1948–1958*. Berlin, 2020. P. 23–24.

¹⁵ About censorship in Poland in the 80s see e.g.: 1984. *Literatura i kultura schyłkowego PRL-u* / eds K. Budrowska, W. Gardocki, E. Jurkowska. Warszawa, 2015; *Gardocki W. Cenzura wobec literatury polskiej w latach osiemdziesiątych XX wieku*. Warszawa, 2019; *Kropidłowski Z. Ingerencja cenzury w działalności Gdańskiego Dwutygodnika “Gwiazda Morza” w latach 1983–1989 // Niewygodne dla władzy. Ograniczanie*

totalitarian, albeit in the throes of a crisis. In this sphere, the state utilized preventative censorship. The second sphere was the independent one, in which “illegal” periodicals and books were printed and distributed but whose publication censorship surely would not have approved. Finally, the third sphere was that comprised of works published abroad by Polish émigrés. The communist authorities saw these publications as “diversionary”, which is to say simply critical of the system in the People’s Republic of Poland (such as *Kultura* in Paris). The events of 1956 and 1968 (the “March events”) influenced the literature of the 1980s, as well as the events of the 1970s, particularly the second half of the decade. These were reactions to the political and economic crises in Poland. These experiences began to mount. In 1975, writers protested against the changes to the constitution of the Polish People’s Republic — especially those related to the passages about “the leading role of the party” and friendship with the Soviet Union. Literary figures saw these as the loss of national sovereignty, which was already at best questionable. In protest, 59 authors and artists (later a total of 66) signed a document that is known today as “*Memoriał 59*” — the “Memorandum of 59”. Later, in 1976, protests were published in *Kultura* in Paris: first, in the March edition, the “Voice of Solidarity of Polish Writers in Exile” (“Głos solidarności pisarzy polskich na obczyźnie”) was published followed by Władysław Bieńkowski’s “Open Letter to the Authorities of the People’s Republic of Poland” (“List otwarty do władz Polski Ludowej”). As an expression of the society’s disapproval of the changes to the Constitution, the “Polish League for Independence” (*Polskie Porozumienie Niepodległościowe*) was established¹⁶. Later events influencing the nature of Polish literature of the 1980s were the creation of the Workers’ Defense Committee (*Komitet Obrony Robotników*) in 1976 and the emergence of the underground publishing. Many publications came out that were being produced outside the official, censored realm. These included *Zapis*, *Puls*, and *Kultura Niezależna*, as well as publishing houses that produced books, such as the *Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza* (NOWa). In the early 1980s, there were mass social protests during the “carnival” atmosphere of Solidarity. In October 1980, Czesław Miłosz was awarded the Nobel Prize in literature. In late 1981, a martial law was declared in Poland. In the years that followed, Poland experienced social, political, and economic crises, during which the legal regulations related to preventative censorship were changed several times.

Polish literature of the 1980s could not help but refer to the social and economic situation in the country. It was not by chance that some literary works of the period were described as “political”, “occasional” or “ad hoc”. Many texts, especially poetry, were written as a reaction to the events of those years. Stanisław Barańczak did not approve of this classification of those works as responses to the reality that had emerged. Instead, he proposed a category that he called “poetry of testimony and opposition”¹⁷, often translated as the poetry of “witness and opposition”. Poetry written as part of this trend was thus understood as bearing witness to what had happened to preserve the memory of those

wolności słowa na ziemiach polskich w XIX i XX wieku / eds D. Degen, J. Gzella. Toruń, 2009. P. 455–474; Świstak M. Niepolityczne tabu PRL, czyli o cenzurze obyczajowej lat 80 // Przeskoczyć tę studnię strachu: autor i dzieło a cenzura PRL. Kraków, 2010. P. 115–131; Wojślaw J. Miejsce cenzury w ocenach aparatu partyjnego w okresie politycznej konfrontacji lat 1980–1981 // Nie należy dopuszczać do publikacji. Cenzura w PRL. Toruń, 2013. P. 195–216. Kamińska K. Cenzura instytucjonalna w przededniu okrągłego stołu — analiza tematyczna i statystyczna ingerencji // Zakazane i niewygodne. Ograniczenie wolności słowa w XIX i XX wieku. Toruń, 2015. P. 233–244.

¹⁶ Matuszewski R. Literatura polska 1939–1991. Warszawa, 1994. P. 151–152.

¹⁷ Barańczak S. Poeta pamięta: antologia poezji świadectwa i sprzeciwu 1944–1989. Warszawa, 1989.

events and to record facts that were inconvenient to the authorities. This function of the “poetry of testimony and opposition” can be seen, for example, in works of poetry written in reaction to the imposition of martial law in Poland.

Not only poetry but also prose could be accused of exhibiting a “lack of universality” as it contained many allusions to the reality of life in communist Poland. One example of this was a discussion about the condition of Polish literature in the 1980s published in *Tygodnik Powszechny*. Its title spoke volumes: “The Black Hole of the 1980s”, also called the “inter-epoch”. These terms suggest that the final assessment of Polish literature during this period will not be a favorable one. Paradoxically, however, the discussants’ diagnosis was neither clear, nor necessarily negative¹⁸.

Examples

In this part, I will present a few of the censors’ most typical activities undertaken in the 1980s involving literary texts slated to be published in the official sphere in Poland. This classification, of course, does not exhaust the subject. My aim is, however, to present the most important aspects of this process. Surveying the examples below, one should bear in mind the legal conditions prevailing in Poland during the years 1980–1990. These determined how harshly censors would treat a work.

The GUKPPIW feared above all the interpretation of the text itself and its potential reception. This is why censors strove in their work either to remove the undesirable passages or replace them with more “neutral” wording. Political subjects were at the top of the list of those that were “banned” — these included topics related to the current situation in Poland, but also those with historical references and allusions: national uprisings; patriotic, “Romantic” attitudes; the Second World War and occupation. Writers were not normally allowed to broach subjects such as totalitarianism, imprisonment, freedom, the struggle for national liberation, army, and even, in some contexts, good and evil, or God. Even in general terms, these were off-limits since everything was treated as a potential allusion. Also eliminated were “Eastern” themes, such as Russia, the USSR, the East, Siberia, or even words like *cerkiew* [Orthodox church], or polar bears (i. e., an allusion to deportations to Siberia). Specific words and sentences were removed, as well as extensive passages, sometimes several pages long. One need not explain what a huge influence this exerted on a work’s meaning, the author’s style or the flow of narration. If necessary, when censors found a work extremely problematic — i. e., they found it impossible to modify — they simply banned its publication.

The examples above relate to both poetry and prose. The censors strove in this way to shape how the works might be interpreted. The consequences of these activities are still felt today. Here are some of the most important ways:

- the changes introduced into some texts were not withdrawn later, which means that those texts persist in their censored forms;
- many readers are unaware that they are reading texts that were censored;
- the censored texts, in forms imposed by censorship, have become part of the historical literary process, and as a result, it is these versions that are considered by researchers dealing with Polish literary history;

¹⁸ *Tygodnik Powszechny*. 1990. Vol. 13. See also: *Kornhauser J. Międzyepoka*. Kraków, 1995.

- the situation at that time forced authors to make “concessions” to censorship if they wanted to have something published; therefore, when they wrote their works, they could have been subjecting themselves subconsciously to self-censorship, and this process is unfortunately impossible to fully recreate;
- the study of specific works very often requires extensive archival research (not only in the GUKPPiW collection) and, for example, necessitates the comparison of the printed copy of a book with its original typed or handwritten manuscript. Conducting this kind of editorial “investigation” is not possible for every work of literature since the necessary documents are not always available.

Censorship of texts

Removing selected content ranked among censorship’s most frequent activities involving literary texts. Censors would remove specific words, sentences or passages (including paragraphs, but also longer passages that could be several pages long). In some instances, as far as it was possible, words such as “sometimes”, “perhaps”, “rarely”, and “a little” were added to texts in order to soften their tone and indicate that the described phenomena were not the norm in communist Poland. These techniques were especially popular when the authors were referring to Polish politics or the economy. As for literary texts, usually attempts were made to incorporate “minor interventions” (a quotation from GUKPPiW materials. — W. G.) throughout many passages in order to achieve a “softening” of the entire text as the end result. In other words — so that, in the censor’s opinion, the interpretation of the text would not be unequivocal. Every text was “reviewed”, as it were, and often not just by one person. Whether or not it would be published depended on what opinions it contained.

Prose. Before looking at the example of *Obłąd [Insanity]*¹⁹, the censored three-volume novel by Jerzy Krzysztoń, it is worth describing this book in some detail. Its main protagonist is the author’s alter-ego, Krzysztof: the man falls ill with a mental illness and is hospitalized. Considering the setting of the novel — the 1970s — it is easy to find references to the situation in Poland at that time despite the fact that the fictional events taking place in the trilogy published in 1980 represent a product of the mentally ill protagonist’s imagination. Krzysztof’s illness is half symbolic — as implied by the historical figures who appear throughout the work, such as Marshal Józef Piłsudski and Prince Józef Poniatowski. The allusions in the text indicate not only an individual’s drama but also disturbing social and political situations. Not surprisingly, GUKPPiW subjected the work to careful scrutiny.

In the end, *Obłąd* was published in early 1980, although the text had been censored in numerous places. Here are several examples of how its rhythm suffered as well as the nature of the novel’s narration:

Typed manuscript as submitted to GUKPPiW (Archiwum Akt Nowych, signature 3644)	Book as published (Warsaw 1980)
“Jak pan widzi sytuację polityczną w kraju?” “How do you see the political situation in the country?”	“Jak pan widzi sytuację w kraju?” “How do you see the situation in the country?”

¹⁹ Krzysztoń J. *Obłąd*. Warszawa, 1980.

Typed manuscript as submitted to GUKPPiW (Archiwum Akt Nowych, signature 3644)	Book as published (Warsaw 1980)
“Nierozłączne siostry dwie: Naród i UB” ²⁰ . “Two inseparable sisters: the Nation and the UB”	<i>Passage removed</i>
“Ja tam wiem, że w ogóle do ludzi strzelać nie trzeba, a już do swoich żadną miarą” ²¹ . “I know that one shouldn’t shoot at people, and under no circumstances at one’s own people”	<i>Passage removed</i>
“Nie ma wyjścia z domu obłąkanych. Nas oczywiście trzeba zamykać. To jasne. Wszystkie rygle muszą być zawsze w porządku. Zamknąć wszystkich, którzy myślą inaczej, niż myśleć należy. I tak trzymać”. “There is no leaving an insane asylum. Of course, we have to be locked up. That’s clear. All the bolts always have to be in good working order. Lock up everyone who thinks differently from what they are supposed to think. And keep it that way”	“Nie ma wyjścia z domu obłąkanych. Nas oczywiście trzeba zamykać. To jasne. Wszystkie rygle muszą być zawsze w porządku”. “There is no leaving an asylum. Of course, we have to be locked up. That’s clear. All the bolts always have to be in good working order”
“... iż Piłsudski to był wielki Polak oraz, że u nas zmienia się rzeczywistość przez zmianę nazw”. “... that Piłsudski was a great Pole and that in Poland reality is changed by changing names”	<i>Passage removed</i>

Of course, these are only a few of the interventions. In all, in the three volumes there were at least twenty. The pattern repeated itself: in some sentences, single words were removed; elsewhere, entire sentences were removed. All this was done in order to “neutralize” possible allusions. In the end, the censors’ efforts did not bring the desired effect since the book was nevertheless interpreted as an allegory for communist Poland. In 1982, the book’s author committed a suicide. In 1981 and 1983, the censored version of the book was reprinted. The complete, corrected version of the book was published only in 1995.

Another example of “cleansing” a novel of undesirable content, from the censors’ point of view, is *Dobranoc* [*Good Night*]²² by Andrzej Pastuszek. The work, which is a study of alcoholism, showed Polish reality in an absurd, distorting mirror. The fact that the book’s main protagonist was an alcoholic was the censors’ pretext for not approving it. Here are several examples:

Typed manuscript submitted to GUKPPiW (Archiwum Akt Nowych, signature 3644)	Book as published (Warsaw, 1980)
“— Tak kochasz ten kraj? — Nieprzytomnie. I dlatego piję”. “— Do you love this country that much? — Insanely. And that’s why I drink”	“— Tak kochasz ten kraj? — Nieprzytomnie”. “— Do you love this country that much? — Insanely”

²⁰ In Polish, this sentence rhymes. UB is the abbreviation of Urząd Bezpieczeństwa, The Security Office, which was the communist-era secret police.

²¹ This is an allusion to the events of December 1970, when the communist police and military suppressed workers’ protests (14–22 December 1970) in Gdynia, Gdańsk, Elbląg, Szczecin, and elsewhere. About forty people were killed as a result.

²² Pastuszek A. *Dobranoc*. Warszawa, 1980.

Typed manuscript submitted to GUKPPIW (Archiwum Akt Nowych, signature 3644)	Book as published (Warsaw, 1980)
"Seans socjalistyczny" ²³ . "Socialist séance"	"Seans dzisiejszy". "Today's film screening"
"Pięcioletnia biesiada" ²⁴ . "Five-year revelry"	"Wieloletnia biesiada". "Many years of revelry"
"W gazetach przemówienia przerywane burzą oklasków, a oklaski są najbardziej prymitywnym sposobem okazywania uznania". "In newspapers the speeches [when described] are interrupted with ['] a storm of applause ['], and applause is the most primitive method of demonstrating approval"	<i>Passage removed</i>
"... pijacy się boją, muszą mieć mocne ideologiczne oparcie. <...> Tylko choroba może zagwarantować wolność słowa i jasne spojrzenie na cały ten bezsens". "...drunks are afraid, they have to have strong ideological support. <...> Only illness can guarantee freedom of speech and a clear-eyed view of all this nonsense"	"... pijacy się boją, muszą mieć mocne oparcie. <...> Tylko choroba może zagwarantować jasne spojrzenie na cały ten bezsens". "...drunks are afraid, they have to have strong support. <...> Only illness can guarantee a clear-eyed view of all this nonsense"

As we see, just as in the case of *Oblęd*, the censors strove to remove the passages that related to the current situation in Poland, shifting the center of gravity from the present to some vaguer reality. Although the examples given above are of course not all of the instances of censorship's interference in Andrzej Pastuszek's novel, they are probably the most typical, illustrating what kinds of nuances censors needed to detect as they carried out their department's directives. The examples above confirm how important any potential interpretations were for the censors who were checking the texts. They wanted to prevent readers from finding "political" allusions in the book, which of course they failed to do. The book was published once more, in 1981, with the censors' changes preserved. Thus, its full version is not available.

It is worth presenting also an example of a decision by GUKPiW in 1988 regarding *Kokpit (Cockpit)*²⁵ by Jerzy Kosiński, an American author of Polish descent. The journal *Odra* wanted to publish an excerpt from this work. Here is the justification of the censor's decision: "The hero of the action, set probably in Warsaw, is a young employee of the Academy of Sciences, subordinate to the government and party, who is realizing his dream of leaving the country because police terror and a totalitarian government reign here, and people feel hounded and without any prospects" (AAN, GUKPPIW, signature 3959). The censors did not grant permission for that passage to be printed, arguing that its allusions were too transparent.

²³ "Seance" in this case was meant ironically, alluding to the spirit-related "séance" (as in English), rather than to another meaning of the word in Polish meaning — showing of a film. The word "séance" in this context implied that socialism is something that is not real: something flawed, something fake.

²⁴ This is an allusion to the "five-year plan". Beginning in 1956, a series of "five-year plans" were introduced in Poland, whose aim was to help the country's economic development, among other things.

²⁵ Kosiński J. *Cockpit*. London, 1976.

During the 1980s, stories published in the press were often censored. As mentioned above, the content that could lead to “undesirable” interpretations was removed. Any kind of political themes — references to the current situation in Poland — were undesirable. In this respect, writers who wrote prolifically and frequently suffered. Many of their texts were confiscated, or scrupulously censored, during which processes words, sentences, or longer passages were removed. Jerzy Andrzejewski and Marek Nowakowski were two of the most “unprintable” authors. GUKPPiW’s attitude towards them of course also was influenced by their activities outside of the literary field. For example, Andrzejewski, who had been an apologist for the communism early on, changed his stance in the 1950s and became one of its critics. He urged that freedom of speech be defended, and in 1968, during the March events, he stood on the side of those who were striking and politically persecuted. In 1983, after Andrzejewski died, obituaries and texts about him were censored.

Poetry. Censorship of poetry in the 1980s was for a long time associated with the writing of “witness and opposition”, as Stanisław Barańczak called it. The poetry of this period was characterized by its desire to record the dramatic events, hold the guilty to account, and to show what was happening at that time in Poland. Many poets wrote about the situation in the country in a pointed way, often resorting to literalism. If one wanted to describe events such as the imposition of martial law, and those that followed, it was difficult to find a tone that would have been less transparent. Of course, GUKPPiW did not recommend works of poetry for publication that contained unequivocal words, such as “war”, “violence”, “captivity”, “terror”, “lawlessness” and “tanks”.

During this time of social and political crises, which is certainly how the period of martial law can be described, a situation arose in which the censors were above all looking for key words, such as those listed above. At that time, poetry was eliminated from the publishing sphere *en masse*. Some of the works were published underground, or abroad, but not all. Among the most censored poets during the period in question were Tomasz Jastrun, Ryszard Krynicki, Jan Polkowski, and Antoni Pawlak.

The process of censoring a work of poetry had to be very painstaking. Besides key words — in terms of references to the present — censors paid attention to comparisons, metaphors, and allegories. Poetry of “witness and opposition” blossomed in communist Poland around 1980. Although some poems were censored or could not be printed, underground publishing also existed. After the martial law was imposed, poets’ optimism faded. Many writers active in underground publishing were interned at that time, which destabilized the work of the underground publishing houses and printing shops.

Under the conditions of the martial law, censoring poetry became much easier for the censors²⁶. The restrictive principles according to which texts were checked allowed them to prevent works from being published by citing the decree on the imposition of martial law. Here are examples of the reasons given for forbidding publication in the years 1982 and 1983: “It threatens the state’s security interests”; “it incites the overthrow of the constitutional system of the People’s Republic of Poland”; and “takes target at the constitutional principles of the foreign policy of the People’s Republic of Poland and its allies”. These justifications were of course fictitious and could be used for any text that was being censored, including poetry.

²⁶ Radzikowska Z. Historii walki o wolność słowa w Polsce... P. 10–30.

Of course, attempts were made to keep publishing, but under the decree that was declared along with martial law, this proved much more difficult. In addition to the poetic key words that censors were supposed to catch, such as “the East”, “Siberia”, “Russia”, “USSR”, “freedom”, and others mentioned above, new ones were added, such as “doubt”, “violence”, and “awakening” — everything was supposed to be a metaphor for the current situation. Of course, censors looked for any kinds of words related to the military in the texts, such as “soldiers”, “tanks”, “shots”, “curfew”, and “general”, among others. Martial law — at least in poetry — was not supposed to exist.

“Stopping” literary texts in their entirety

When an entire literary text was deemed “unsuitable for printing”, it was “stopped” (*zatrzymany*), to use the terms used in GUKPPiW’s own documents. This meant that the work would be relegated to a “waiting room” for an undefined period of time, and for the time being would not be published. Perhaps the text might be published in the future, if political changes took place and the Polish United Workers’ Party softened its course, at least for a while. This would enable previously unprintable books to be published.

GUKPPiW prepared statistics that recorded how many literary works had not been published or had been censored in a given year. They also included brief explanations, albeit quite general, justifying why this had happened. It is easiest simply to state that all decisions stemmed from political reasons. In other words, content critical of the contemporary situation in Poland was found in “problematic” texts.

Stories published in the press, mentioned earlier, should be recalled here. Stopping their publication was commonplace and unfortunately influenced literary life in Poland in a quantifiable and extremely negative way.

Prose. Among the authors whose prose works could not be printed were: Jerzy Andrzejewski, Bohdan Dzitko, Jan Józef Szczepański, Tadeusz Nowak, Marek Nowakowski, Jan Rybowicz, Tadeusz Siejak, Bogdan Wojdowski, Adam Zagajewski, and many others. In the overwhelming majority of cases, censors had reservations about the stories and did not allow them to be printed in periodicals or in a volume of the author’s works. In two instances, however, involving texts by Dzitko and Szczepański, GUKPPiW banned the publication of the entire text.

Among the reservations censors voiced about Szczepański’s story “Kapitan” (“Captain”), one reads the following opinion: “The author... leads to generalizations that are supposed to convince readers that the system of socialist realism in the People’s Republic of Poland is maintained thanks to terribly demoralized people, whom the system itself in its historical development had led to a complete moral degeneration” (AAN, GUKPPiW, sign. 3932). The censor noticed these generalizations in the main protagonist, Captain Witold Gorski, who during the Suez conflict refused to leave his ship. This theme, as well as other allusions in the story, were interpreted as definitively taking aim at the system in communist Poland. GUKPPiW thus gave the story a negative rating in 1982.

Another interesting example of an entire prose work being halted was *Dostoevsky Died One Hundred Years Ago* [*Sto lat temu umarł Dostojewski*] by Adolf Rudnicki. The censor noted that: “The author believed that the questions that interested Dostoevsky most, *injustice and social evil, were still the cursed problems of our era.*” He also enriched his comment with quotations from Rudnicki: “Poland stopped working. <...> The idea of

work was poisoned. <...> Every so often the country awakes during almost unbearable suffering, [caused by] incompetent or dishonorable politicians, most often both” (AAN, GUKPPIW, sign. 3916). The books were banned from publication in May 1983.

Undesirable themes were noticed not only in works that addressed the political system of the People’s Republic of Poland quite literally. In 1980s, attempts were made to publish several texts depicting a world that approximated that of anti-utopian prose. Those texts, without exception, were perceived by censors as being a parable of communist reality in Poland. It is worth mentioning authors such as Ernest Dyczek and Tadeusz Siejak. Dyczek’s story *Odstrzał* was treated as describing an anti-utopian world in which every once in a while some of its citizens are eliminated (hence the title *Odstrzał*, which is the word denoting culling of wild animals by shooting). The story was banned from publication in 1984 — *nomen omen*. A year later, however, GUKPPIW halted the publication of *Namiot wodza* [*The Leader’s Tent*] by Siejak. In this case, as the censor wrote, “a fundamental part of the work is comprised of a mocking apotheosis of genocide perpetrated by the fantastic [sic.] *Office of Ecological Equilibrium at the Armed Forces Supreme Command*, regulating the processes of relatively swift demographic changes” (AAN, GUKPPIW, sign. 3852).

Poetry. Restrictions on poetry were not weakened at all as a result of the lifting of the martial law. Despite the social and political conditions that were theoretically more favorable, poets had to reckon with the fact that their works, if they related to “socialist reality” in any way, could not be printed.

In April 1981, Julia Hartwig experienced this herself. In her poem titled “What they can [do]”, she wrote: “What can the interrogator and the interrogated say to each other? / Where is the common language through which they could understand each other?” (AAN, GUKPPIW, sign. 3835). In this work, there were no key words this time which usually would have meant that the censor would have to decide against the work. Hartwig, however, alluded to the situation in which oppressed individuals for various reasons would find themselves in Poland at that time, and also those who were unlawfully imprisoned. Ryszard Krynicki’s *Uwielbia mundury* [*Loves Uniforms*] was rooted in similar poetics, though it had just a few words: “Lawlessness loves uniforms / and the robes / of law” (AAN, GUKPPIW, sign. 3882). The poem was supposed to be published in Krynicki’s book *Niepodlegli nicości* [*Independent of Nothingness*], but in 1987 censors did not allow it to be printed, along with several other poems.

In the 1980s, a similar fate awaited the works of other authors, including Stanisław Baliński, Stanisław Barańczak, Lech Dymarski, Tomasz Gluziński, Zbigniew Herbert, Tomasz Jastrun, Wiesław Kazanecki, Urszula Koziół, Ewa Lipska, Bronisław Maj, and Antoni Pawlak. Of course, these are only a few: many more poets’ works were “banned”. Interestingly, the censors also did not allow the printing of literary texts whose authors were no longer alive. For example, in 1985, a poem by Mieczysław Jastrun, who had died in 1983, was prohibited from being published, and, in 1987, so was one by Jan Lechoń, who had been dead since 1956.

Despite the fact that the 1980s was slowly coming to a close, censors continued to monitor poetry of “moral reckoning” with great scrupulousness. These works summarized the preceding decades of communist Poland’s existence, its social and political reality, political persecution, subjugation and what — from the authors’ point of view — was a forced alliance with the USSR. There were several reasons for this. Above all, in the late 1980s, despite the fact that the Polish communist system seemed to be heading towards

collapse, not many people — whether writers or “normal” people — believed that it could finally end. Memories of martial law were still fresh — that brutal, unexpected act of violence destroyed people’s hope that their freedom could be restored.

It was only in 1989, for the last time, as was mentioned earlier, that the legislation on censorship was changed. It proved liberal enough for authors finally to be able to publish their literary works without any serious problems.

A “registration” of name, literary work or subject

Another GUKPPiW’s strategy was called “registration” (*zapis*), which was the term used for adding authors, titles of literary works or subjects to a “black list”. The Polish public, and the rest of the world, found out about the “registrations” in the late 1970s, when the book *Czarna księga cenzury PRL [Black Book of Polish Censorship]*²⁷ came out. It comprised secret documents that had been taken out of Poland by Tomasz Strzyżewski, a former censor from WUKPPiW’s Kraków office. Before these materials came to light, no one had imagined that the scale of censorship was actually this extensive. The book was published first in London by the Aneks publishing house in 1977, then in Poland by the Niezależna Oficyna Wydawnicza in 1981.

Black Book of Polish Censorship contained extensive passages about censorship activities in Poland taken from GUKPPiW documents that had been written out by hand by Strzyżewski. These included the “registrations”, listed by last name: according to these directives, “highlighting” figures like Leszek Kołakowski in publications was forbidden, for example. One could write about Czesław Miłosz at least in specialist texts, but was not to “allow [his work to be] overestimated” (i.e., write positively about it). On the other hand, these lists were supposed to “eliminate” names, such as those of Zygmunt Bauman, Zbigniew Brzeziński, Marian Hemar, and Leopold Tyrmand from the press, radio and television²⁸. This strategy persisted until 1981 when the new legislation on censorship was introduced. It should be stressed, however, that these “registrations” — which are discussed below — were used in the years that followed, albeit in a hidden form. This of course was linked to the social and economic crises that had been sparked by the introduction of the martial law.

Here are several examples. In October 1982, GUKPPiW documents stated that: “...the following titles of books were published in the so-called ‘unofficial sphere’”, i. e., underground, and abroad by émigré publishing houses: *Kompleks polski [The Polish Complex]* and *Mała Apokalipsa [A Minor Apocalypse]* by Tadeusz Konwicki; *Dialogi z Sowietami [Dialogue with the Soviets]* by Stanisław Vincenz, and *Zniewolony umysł [The Captive Mind]* by Czesław Miłosz (AAN, GUKPPiW, sign. 3914). These books were banned in Poland. It was decided not only that they should not be published but that all references to them should be removed. In other words, they were not supposed to exist in the consciousness of readers and researchers. As we know, this strategy could not be one hundred percent effective since independent and émigré publishing also existed, of which GUKPPiW’s employees were also cognizant.

Undoubtedly, the most spectacular instance of a writer’s ban being lifted was when Czesław Miłosz was allowed to publish again. In 1980, Miłosz — who since 1951 had been

²⁷ *Czarna księga cenzury PRL* / ed. by T. Strzyżewski. London, 1977.

²⁸ *Strzyżewski T. Wielka księga cenzury PRL*. Warszawa, 2015. P. 86–87.

living abroad in exile — was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature. As a result, the press was full of articles about the poet, about whom few readers in Poland knew anything, if we are to believe the general opinion at the time. The ironic question “Who is Miłosz?” was posed in the press. Thanks to the fact that he received the Nobel Prize, the poet could visit Poland again for the first time in thirty years, without fearing for his safety. In the months to come, several of Miłosz’s books were published that had previously been banned by censors. Of course, GUKPPiW was critical of the Nobel Prize laureate. Passages from the speech Miłosz’s banquet speech were censored. In it, he spoke about communism (that “absurd doctrine”), underground publishing (“volumes of my poems published by their independent publishing houses are the most valuable volumes on my shelves”) and émigré publishers (GUKPPiW, sign. 3724).

Another form of censorship in this respect was prohibiting the sphere of foreign publications that included texts about Poland. For example, in 1981, it was scrupulously noted that in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (Issues 289, 291–296), *Die Zeit* (Issue 52), *La Stampa* (Issues 294 and 297), *L’Unita* (Issues 294 and 295) — “the legal order and the country’s top leadership were slandered and humiliated; the constitutional principles of the foreign policy of the People’s Republic of Poland and its allies were targeted” (AAN, GUKPPiW, sign. 3913).

Context: *Nouveau roman* and OuLiPo

In the 1950s, in France, an idea emerged that literature should be linked to a literary theory. This gave rise to the “new novel”. *Nouveau roman* was not just a literary experiment. In the eyes of its authors, who were also theoreticians, it seemed this might prove to be a new way to rejuvenate the traditional novel form and the ways of reading. The biggest change was in narration: rather than first-person or third-person, the story was told in the second person. Pioneers of this type of writing included Michel Butor, Alain Robbe-Grillet, and Natalie Sarraute.

As it turned out, the traditional novel form could be revolutionized without using such methods as parody, pastiche or *persiflage*. The new means paradoxically lay within the novel itself, in its “internal self-consciousness”²⁹. In the *nouveau roman*, which has no action, theory is most important: it is not just stating a rule, but also presenting it on the basis of a literary text. A “new novel” presents a theory in which the audience, even if it wanted to, cannot immerse itself. Paradoxically, however, readers can (although they do not have to) identify with the protagonist of a new novel.

Of course, it is not easy to experience an “example novel”, which is why the center of gravity is shifted to theoretical considerations, of which a discerning reader is aware. These are seemingly invisible, but nevertheless determine the plot.

A few years later, a new tendency gained momentum in France, which was the consequence of the *nouveau roman*. The Workshop of Potential Literature (*Ouvroir de la Littérature Potentielle*) was created thanks to Raymond Queneau and François Le Lionnais, and later Italo Calvino and Georges Perec. The writers of this new trend took the “second-person” method of narration from their predecessors, but they imagined literary

²⁹ Głowiński M. Powieść jako metodologia powieści // Intertekstualność, groteska, parabola. Szkice ogólne i interpretacje. Kraków, 2000.

works differently. Suffice it to say that all the most important writers of the workshop were mathematicians. Thus, the novel was supposed to be an example behind which the precisely defined principles, based on the rules of math, were hiding. The writers restricted their own works, which, obviously, impacted the literary work, even during a superficial reading³⁰. The best example of this is *La Disparition* by Georges Perec, in which the letter “e” does not appear.

The *nouveau roman* and OuLiPo were undoubtedly linked by one thing: it was the authors who decided to attempt an exploration of the boundaries of literature by imposing limits on it. What does one do, however, in a situation when these limitations are imposed from above, politically? What can one do, however, if rejecting them is impossible, because the book’s publication, its existence in the literary-historical process, and often the author’s career itself depends on allowing it to be censored? How can one talk about literature when entire works or passages have been lost irretrievably, when the authors had to agree to censors’ interventions? How, in this case, should one write about literary history? Polish writers, from the late 1940s until 1990, were faced with completely different problems from those of French authors, for example. Polish authors were struggling with limitations of a political nature — censorship, whose exact nature depended on the contemporary political atmosphere and legal restrictions, existed, and it was only possible to write in a way that was “well received” by the authorities. The “Ministry of Truth” was a symbol of censorship, which controlled many areas of life, including literature.

These are questions for which it is difficult to find good answers. Nevertheless, even just posing them may encourage people to reflect on what Polish writers had to endure for nearly half a century, what kinds of limitations they struggled with and why this all came to a head in the 1980s. Paradoxically, Polish literature, limited by censorship’s activities, exhibits all the hallmarks of being a “potential” literature. The full versions of texts that were once censored do exist — potentially — in the sense that today one can try to find them and by comparing them with the editions that were mutilated by censors restore them.

The consequences of communist-era censorship in Poland

Writers not only had to contend with censorship. The situation in Poland must have meant that sooner or later, each of them would face the problem of self-censorship. In other words, each writer who was acting under the pressure of censorship in a communist country had to censor himself, if he or she wanted to exist artistically and publish works in the official sphere. Writers had to realize what subjects had to be passed over in silence. As a result, they did not write about what they wanted to write about. Looking back, it is difficult to say how widespread this phenomenon was, since self-censorship is a process that is not quantifiable. From this perspective, too, Polish literature suffered considerably.

If one would like to provide a more complete picture of censorship in Poland during the 1980s, it is necessary also to mention censors themselves. During that time, most of the people working in the censorship apparatus (90.3 %) had a university education (AAN, GUKPPIW, sign. 133). These included graduates of journalism or philology departments, but not exclusively — people who had studied law or economics also worked as censors

³⁰ Roubaud J., Poucel J.-J. Perecquian OULIPO // Yale French Studies. 2004. Vol. 105. P. 100.

for GUKPPiW. These people often chose this career path out of necessity, not having been able to find a better job. Archival research conducted for the current article showed that some individuals had worked for GUKPPiW for over forty years — from the mid 1940s all the way until 1990. Candidates for positions of new censors took part in various types of training: they attended lectures and did practical exercises, which consisted, for example, of censoring a selected poem. After this introductory period, they took an exam conducted by the Qualification Commission. It is interesting to note that censors had access to two versions of Polish history — the official version (the “false” one) and the unofficial version (the “true” one). Practical reasons made this necessary: they had to know what needed to be censored.

As a result of the aforementioned factors, the censorship office’s practices meant that works published in Poland during the 1980s were narratively incomplete: they had been cut, were fragmentary and had been edited contrary to the author’s intention and will. In this article, the author strove to present censorship’s activities through the examples of censored literary texts, censors’ refusal to grant printing permission, and the blacklisting of an author’s name (“registration”). Basic communication between authors and readers was disrupted. These are not just individual cases, but clearly a broad phenomenon. For example, in the early 1980s, just before Solidarity, there were about eight hundred censorship interventions every month³¹. Publishing in Poland was thus being monitored constantly. It was only during social and political crises that censorship adopted a more liberal stance, and content critical of the government could be printed. This is what happened in 1956, for example (during “the Thaw”), and in December 1970. This temporary liberalization was, however, intended to gain short-term benefits and to calm the mood in society.

Censoring a work of literature at the same time enabled to influence how it would be received, for example, by intervening in an interview with the author or a review in the press. Articles in the press often had just as many references to the current situation in Poland as the actual literary text. GUKPPiW adopted a strategy of censoring reviews and information about the authors. Reference books were censored, as were bibliographic compilations and the materials published by the National Library in Warsaw. The official reception of literary texts was thus incomplete. Of course, not all articles would later be published by independent publishers, or abroad. Many of them, like the literary texts, would remain exclusively in archives, without appearing at the moment in literary history as their authors had intended. Thus, these activities of censors had a significant impact on research that was done in the field of Polish literary history. In other words, the narrational gaps in Polish literature of the 1980s, even if we are not fully aware of them, do contribute more generally to the gaps in Polish literary history of that period. Censorship was to blame for this state of affairs.

Editing and textology are at least a partial way out of this impasse. By studying the contents of archives, including GUKPPiW’s documents, and the archival collections of libraries, literature museums, or those pertaining to specific writers, it is possible to restore a literary work in the spirit of the “author’s intention”³². That is why there is so much that remains to be done and corrected in this field. Despite the fact that Polish communist era censorship has not existed for over thirty years, we are still left grappling with its legacy.

³¹ Krajewski A. *Między współpracą a oporem. Twórcy kultury wobec systemu politycznego PRL (1975–1980)*. Warszawa, 2004. P. 497.

³² Loth R. *Podstawowe problemy i pojęcia tekstologii i edytorstwa naukowego*. Warszawa, 2006. P. 57–59.

References

- Bafia J. *Prawo o cenzurze*. Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza, 1983, 239 p.
- Barańczak S. *Przed i po. Szkice o poezji krajowej przełomu lat siedemdziesiątych i osiemdziesiątych*, London, Aneks, 1988, 172 p.
- Bates J. Cenzura w epoce Stalinowskiej, *Teksty Drugie*, 2001, vol. 1–2, pp. 95–120.
- Bates J. From state monopoly to a free market of ideas? Censorship in Poland, 1976–1989. *Critical Studies: Censorship and Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age*, 2004, vol. 27, pp. 141–167.
- Błażejowska J. *Papierowa rewolucja: z dziejów drugiego obiegu wydawniczego w Polsce 1976–1989/1990*. Warszawa, Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2010, 312 p.
- Budrowska K. *Literatura i pisarze wobec cenzury PRL 1948–1958*. Białystok, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 2009, 331 p.
- Budrowska K. *Writers, Literature and Censorship in Poland. 1948–1958*. Berlin, Peter Lang, 2020, 382 p.
- Budrowska K. *Zatrzymane przez cenzurę. Inedita z połowy wieku XX*. Warszawa, IBL PAN, 2013, 370 p.
- Czapliński P. *Ślady przełomu. O prozie polskiej 1976–1996*. Kraków, Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1997, 265 p.
- Czyżak A. *Świadectwo rozproszone: literatura najnowsza wobec przemian*. Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 2015, 276 p.
- Drygalski J., Kwaśniewski J. *(Nie)realny socjalizm*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1992, 339 p.
- Fik M. *Kultura polska po Jalcie. Kronika lat 1944–1981*. Warszawa, NOWA, 1991, 835 p.
- Franaszek A. *Miłosz. Biografia*. Kraków, Znak, 2011, 1104 p.
- Gardocki W. *Cenzura wobec literatury polskiej w latach osiemdziesiątych XX wieku*. Warszawa, IBL PAN, 2019, 262 p.
- Głowiński M. *Intertekstualność, groteska, parabola. Szkice ogólne i interpretacje*. Kraków, Universitas, 2000, 502 p.
- Gogol B. "Fabryka fałszywych tekstów". *Z działalności Wojewódzkiego Urzędu Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk w Gdańsku w latach 1945–1958*, Warszawa, Neriton, 2012, 443 p.
- Kamińska K. Cenzura instytucjonalna w przededniu okrągłego stołu — analiza tematyczna i statystyczna ingerencji. *Zakazane i niewygodne. Ograniczanie wolności słowa w XIX i XX wieku*. Toruń, UMK, 2015, pp. 233–244.
- Kamińska K. Koniec cenzury PRL. *Studia Medioznawcze*, 2014, vol. 3, p. 118.
- Kondek S. A. *Papierowa rewolucja. Oficjalny obieg książek w Polsce w latach 1948–1955*. Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, 1999, 232 p.
- Kondek S. A. *Władza i wydawcy: polityczne uwarunkowania produkcji książek w Polsce w latach 1944–1949*. Warszawa, Biblioteka Narodowa, 1993.
- Kornhauser J. *Międzyepoka*. Kraków, Wydawnictwo Baran i Suszczyński, 1995, 222 p.
- Kosiński J. *Cockpit*. London, Corgi, 1976, 273 p.
- Krajewski A. *Między współpracą a oporem. Twórcy kultury wobec systemu politycznego PRL (1975–1980)*. Warszawa, Trio, 2004, 539 p.
- Kropidłowski Z. Ingerencja cenzury w działalności Gdańskiego Dwutygodnika „Gwiazda Morza” w latach 1983–1989. *Niewygodne dla władzy. Ograniczanie wolności słowa na ziemiach polskich w XIX i XX wieku*. Toruń, UMK, 2009, pp. 455–474.
- Krzysztoń J. *Obłąd*. Warszawa, PIW, 1979. Vol. 1, 263 p.; vol. 2, 385 p.; vol. 3, 349 p.
- Loth R. *Podstawowe problemy i pojęcia tekstologii i edytorstwa naukowego*. Warszawa, IBL PAN, 2006, 199 p.
- Nasiłowska A. *Literatura okresu przejściowego 1975–1996*. Warszawa, PWN, 2006, 250 p.
- Paczkowska A. Cenzura 1946–1949: statystyka działalności. *Zeszyty Historyczne*, 1996, vol. 116, pp. 22–57.
- Pastuszek A. *Dobranoc*. Warszawa, PIW, 1980, 278 p.
- Pawlicki A. *Kompletna szarość. Cenzura w latach 1965–1972. Instytucja i ludzie*. Warszawa, Trio, 2001, 167 p.
- Radzikowska Z. *Z historii walki o wolność słowa w Polsce (cenzura PRL w latach 1981–1987)*. Kraków, Universitas, 1990, 32 p.
- Romek Z. *Cenzura a nauka historyczna w Polsce 1944–1970*. Warszawa, Neriton, 2010, 358 p.
- Roubaud J., Poucel J.-J. *Perequian OULIPO*. *Yale French Studies*, 2004, vol. 105, pp. 99–109.
- Strzyżewski T. *Wielka księga cenzury PRL*. Warszawa, Prohibita, 2015, 580 p.

- Szaruga L. *Wobec totalitaryzmu: kostium kościelny w prozie polskiej*. Wobec cenzury. Szczecin, Ottonianum, 1994, 96 p.
- Świstak M. Niepolityczne tabu PRL, czyli o cenzurze obyczajowej lat 80. *Przeskoczyć tę studnię strachu: autor i dzieło a cenzura PRL*. Kraków, Wydawnictwo UJ, 2010, pp. 115–131.
- Wojsław J. Miejsce cenzury w ocenach aparatu partyjnego w okresie politycznej konfrontacji lat 1980–1981. *Nie należy dopuszczać do publikacji. Cenzura w PRL*. Toruń, UMK, 2013, pp. 195–216.

Статья поступила в редакцию 11 февраля 2022 г.

Рекомендована к печати 8 июня 2022 г.

Received: February 11, 2022

Accepted: June 8, 2022