

Critical Studies

Censorship &
Cultural Regulation in
the Modern Age

Edited by
Beate Møller

Censorship & Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age

Critical Studies

Vol. 22

General Editor
Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz

Assistant Editor
Esther von der Osten-Sacken



Amsterdam - New York, NY 2004

Censorship & Cultural Regulation in the Modern Age

Edited by

Beate Müller

The paper on which this book is printed meets the requirements of “ISO 9706:1994, Information and documentation - Paper for documents - Requirements for permanence”.

ISBN: 90-420-0988-8 (bound)

©Editions Rodopi B.V., Amsterdam – New York, NY 2004

Printed in The Netherlands

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Censorship and Cultural Regulation: Mapping the Territory <i>Beate Müller</i>	1
Preaching and Playing at Paul's: The Puritans, <i>The Puritaine</i> , and the Closure of Paul's Playhouse <i>Enno Ruge</i>	33
The Censorship of Musical Modernism in Germany, 1918–1945 <i>Erik Levi</i>	63
'Anleitung und Kontrolle': Stakuko and the censorship of music in the GDR, 1951–1953 <i>Toby Thacker</i>	87
Film Censorship in a "Clean State": The Case of Klein and Kohlhaase's <i>Berlin um die Ecke</i> <i>Daniela Berghahn</i>	111
From State Monopoly to a Free Market of Ideas? Censorship in Poland, 1976–1989 <i>John M. Bates</i>	141
Performing the Unspeakable: Defeating Censorship in Two Stories by Mario Benedetti <i>Carmen Tisnado</i>	169

Aesopian Strategies of Textual Resistance in the Struggle to Overcome the Censorship of Popular Music in Apartheid South Africa <i>Michael Drewett</i>	189
Representing the Censored Teacher <i>Anne Ruggles Gere</i>	209
Towards a Redefinition of Censorship <i>Helen Freshwater</i>	225
Index of Names	247

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The essays in this volume constitute a selection of papers given at the international conference "Censorship: Phenomenology, Representation, Contexts", which took place at Newcastle upon Tyne in September 2000.

I should like to thank the authors for readily revising their original conference contributions. I am also indebted to the other delegates for their interest and collaboration, to Marieke Schilling of Rodopi, to Myriam Díaz-Diocaretz and Esther von der Osten-Sacken as the series editors of 'Critical Studies', as well as to my colleagues from Newcastle University who supported the conference. Henderson Hall proved to be a fine venue, not only because of its facilities but also because of its helpful and friendly staff.

It would have been impossible to hold this symposium without the financial aid provided by the British Academy and the Small Grants Fund of the University of Newcastle. I should like to thank both for their generosity.

Beate Müller
Newcastle upon Tyne, July 2003

This page intentionally left blank

CENSORSHIP AND CULTURAL REGULATION: MAPPING THE TERRITORY

Beate Müller

The revival of censorship studies over the last two decades is due not only to the implosion of the Soviet bloc and the ensuing release of official records from East European states for research purposes, but also to conceptual changes in our understanding of censorship. Proponents of the so-called 'new censorship' have advocated a view of censorship much broader than the traditional one by insisting that apart from institutionalized, interventionist ('regulatory') censorship, social interaction and communication is affected by 'constitutive', or 'structural' censorship: forms of discourse regulation which influence what can be said by whom, to whom, how, and in which context. However, widening the concept 'censorship' in this way carries the risk of equating censorship with any kind of social control, thus endangering its heuristic potential. The analysis of censorship should adopt Wittgenstein's concept of family resemblance to distinguish between central and peripheral characteristics of censorship, in addition to using the communication model as a systematic basis for censorial practices and effects.

In a recent article, Sophia Rosenfeld stated that "in the realm of theory, there seems no longer to be any consensus about what censorship is".¹ And indeed, literature on censorship published in the last two decades or so is characterized by more diversity than this field of study used to generate. I would not go as far as Robert C. Post who claims that censorship "used to be a very dull subject",² but it is certainly true to say that in the past, censorship did not belong to the intensely disputed topics featuring in debates about, or involving, new and controversial theoretical or methodological approaches to the arts and humanities.

This has changed. Nowadays, we see a proliferation of publications on censorship. Internationally known scholars work in the field,³ high-profile

¹ Rosenfeld, "Writing the History of Censorship in the Age of Enlightenment", p. 217. – I should like to thank Chris Bramall and Alan Menhennet for their comments on this paper.

² Post, "Censorship and Silencing", p. 1.

³ Jan and Aleida Assmann, Robert Darnton, Michael Holquist, Jonathan Dollimore, Stanley Fish, Richard Burt, Andrew Ross or Annabel Patterson, to name but a few.

publishers are producing books about censorship,⁴ even reference works and bibliographies on censorship have come out,⁵ and academic journals are running special editions on it.⁶ Looking at the programmes of academic conferences, one cannot fail to notice dedicated censorship panels, or even entire symposia focusing on censorship alone.⁷ Exhibitions devoted to the subject (and their catalogues) both indicate and reinforce censorship's new appeal.⁸ It looks as if censorship has become a more attractive, a more interesting, and also a more productive area of research.

⁴ Thus, OUP have published the catalogue of the New York Public Library exhibition on censorship, as well as monographs by Sue Curry Jansen and Adam Parkes; CUP have brought out works by Pierre Bourdieu, Lois Potter, and John Russell Stephens; Cornell UP have published Burt's monograph on Jonson; Manchester UP have produced a book by Janet Clare; Chicago UP a collection of essays edited by J. M. Coetzee; Macmillan one by Richard Dutton; Routledge books by Patterson, James C. Robertson, as well as Paul Hyland and Neil Sammells; Johns Hopkins one by Michael G. Levine; Suhrkamp books by Bourdieu and Jörg-Dieter Kogel; and Niemeyer's catalogue features works by John A. McCarthy / Werner von der Ohe, Bodo Plachta, and Beate Müller.

⁵ Cf. Hurwitz, *Historical Dictionary of Censorship in the United States*, Green, *The Encyclopedia of Censorship*, as well as the recent four-volume *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, edited by Jones. Note Frank Hoffmann's bibliography on the subject, *Intellectual Freedom and Censorship*.

⁶ Cf., for instance, the special section "In Tyrannos" by *New Comparison* 7 (Summer 1989), the two special issues on censorship of the *Art Journal* 50. 3 and 50.4 (1991), or *PMLA* 109.1 (1994). And of course, *Index on Censorship* has, ever since its inception in the early 1970s, criticized censorial practices across the world.

⁷ For example, the MLA featured sessions on "Historicizing the New Censorship" (1990), and on "Policing the Aesthetic: Political Criticism and the Public Sphere" (1991). Among recent conferences dedicated to censorship and related issues such as free speech are: "Freedom of Expression in the Late Medieval and Early Modern World (1350–1650)", University of California-Santa Barbara, February 2000; "Silence and Expression: Histories of Permission and Censorship", College Station, Texas, March 2000; "The Boundaries of Freedom of Expression and Order in a Democratic Society", Kent State University, Ohio, May 2000; "Censorship: Phenomenology, Representation, Contexts", University of Newcastle, September 2000; "Zensur im Alten Reich des 18. Jahrhunderts", Wolfenbüttel, Germany, October 2002; "Culture, Censorship and the State in 20th Century Italy", London, October 2002; "'Dort wo man Bücher verbrennt, verbrennt man am Ende auch Menschen': Zensur wider Meinungsfreiheit", Paris, May 2003; "East Germany Revisited: Second East German Studies Conference", Berlin, October 2003.

⁸ Among the larger exhibitions to be mentioned in this context are the 1983 one run by the Berlin Academy of Arts in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Nazi book burnings, "'Das war ein Vorspiel nur ...': Bücherverbrennung Deutschland 1933", and the 1984 New York Public Library one on "Censorship: 500 Years of Conflict".

At first sight, possible reasons for this development are not hard to find, if one adopts a European perspective. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the ensuing implosion of the Soviet bloc, a wealth of official records and other archival material has become available to researchers. This is especially true of the former German Democratic Republic as the only state among the former Warsaw Pact nations which became incorporated into a Western democracy. The post-unification Federal Republic of Germany provided funding and passed legislation to ensure that the GDR's paper legacy – including, of course, anything to do with state censorship – was preserved for posterity and processed for research purposes. That the opening of state archives throughout formerly socialist Europe should have led to a huge increase in publications on censorship in that part of the world can hardly be surprising. But while the availability of new material is certainly one reason for the fact that censorship has become more high-profile, it is not the only one. Looking to the US, Richard Burt has identified another reason: the "right-wing agenda" of the Reagan / Bush administration and its attempts to curb some civil and aesthetic liberties in what Burt termed "the intense, prolonged assault on high and low modes of aesthetic production, circulation, and consumption beginning in the 1980s", which rekindled academic interest in censorship.⁹ Furthermore, growing awareness of and – especially in the American public sphere – debates about issues such as political correctness, 'hate speech', ethnic minorities, pornography, feminism, the canon, or the commodification of art, and the relationship of these topics to free speech and censorship, have led to a surge of academic publications in these fields.¹⁰

Arguably, however, the revival of censorship studies is the product of conceptual changes in our understanding of censorship. There are a number of new epistemological perspectives on the subject. Firstly, the gradual appropriation, especially in the German-speaking academic world, of systems theory as developed by sociologists, into literary studies has led to attempts to comprehend the function of censorship for the literary system within the wider purview of a functionally differentiated modern world, thus encouraging a systematic integration of historical and regional specificities of

⁹ Burt, "Introduction: The 'New' Censorship", p. xi.

¹⁰ E.g. Charles Altieri, *Canons and Consequences*; Jan and Aleida Assmann (eds.), *Kanon und Zensur*; Paul Berman (ed.), *Debating P.C.*; Italo Calvino, *Why Read the Classics?*; Gail Chester / Julienne Dickey (eds.), *Feminism and Censorship*; Elizabeth C. Childs (ed.), *Suspended License*; David Copp / Susan Wendell (eds.), *Pornography and Censorship*; Richard O. Curry (ed.), *Freedom at Risk*; Nat Hentoff, *Free Speech for Me – But Not for Thee*.

censorship.¹¹ Secondly, and more important, the concept of censorship itself, and with it the range of phenomena that are studied as constituting censorship, has experienced a profound change.

Until about twenty years ago, the term 'censorship' was commonly restricted to direct forms of regulatory intervention by political authorities (mostly the state and the church). Apart from self-censorship, two types of censorship were commonly distinguished: pre-publication censorship, or licensing, ie the control of material before it is published, and post-publication censorship, which means curbing the dissemination and reception of material after it has been published. The understanding was that, irrespective of the exact argument brought forward against a given cultural artefact, the intention of the authorities was to safeguard their own power over what went on in the public sphere, and that their motivation was ultimately of an ideological nature, whether the moral, the political, or the ethical dimension was crucial in a given case. Censorship was seen as a set of concrete measures carried out by someone in a position of authority, often someone working for a censorial institution such as the Spanish Inquisition, the 'directeur de la librairie' in conjunction with the Parlement de Paris and the Conseil d'Etat du Roi of the Ancien Régime,¹² the Berlin Ober-Zensur-Kollegium of Restoration Prussia, the Nazis' Reichskulturkammer, the GDR's Ministry of Culture, or the Lord Chamberlain. Research was mostly carried out by historians or literary historians, and was dominated by reconstructions of individual cases of state or church censorship based on official records, by descriptions of censorial institutions, regulations, and practices in concrete historical contexts, or by the analysis of the censorial politics of an era. Literary scholars often focused on the publication history of an author's works, on his or her reactions to experienced censorial intervention

¹¹ The earliest important sociological study of literary censorship is Ulla Otto's monograph on *Die literarische Zensur als Problem der Soziologie der Politik* of 1968. Among more recent contributions to censorship from a systems theory perspective are the following works: Reinhard Aulich, "Elemente einer funktionalen Differenzierung der literarischen Zensur"; Armin Biermann, "Zur sozialen Konstruktion der 'Gefährlichkeit' von Literatur"; Armin Biermann, "Gefährliche Literatur" – Skizze einer Theorie der literarischen Zensur". – For (German) scholars of literature, the studies of the sociologist Niklas Luhmann have proved to be especially influential. For an overview and introduction to systems theory, refer to the special issues "Polysystems Studies" of *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990) and "Systems Theory and Literature" of *EJES* 5.1 (2001).

¹² Cf. Gudrun Gersmann and Christiane Schroeder, "Zensur, Zensoren und Zensierte im Ancien Régime", pp. 134ff.

(including self-censorship), on writers' attempts to circumvent the censor, for instance by employing aesthetic devices such as 'Aesopian' language intended to 'smuggle' contentious ideas into the space between the lines and thus past the censor,¹³ or by finding alternative markets for literary works, whether abroad or in the underground. Implicitly, this kind of research investigates censorship as a form of 'the other' because the censorial contexts under scrutiny are often spatially and temporally remote from that of the scholar, and if one describes societies in which censorship is or was practised in their individual specificity, they are effectively – and unfavourably – contrasted with an implicit or explicit ideal of a society in which there is no censorship.

By contrast, proponents of what has become known as the 'new censorship' would insist that censorship is unavoidable, irrespective of the given socio-political context: "To be for or against censorship as such", Michael Holquist wrote, "is to assume a freedom no one has. Censorship *is*. One can only discriminate among its more and less repressive effects".¹⁴ The distinction now commonly made is that between 'regulatory' and 'constitutive' (or 'structural') censorship.¹⁵ 'Regulatory censorship' corresponds to the traditional remit of the term. It is associated with investigations of institutionalized pre- and post-publication control based on the binary opposition between the censor and the censored, and refers to acts of censorship carried out by what Judith Butler would call a "sovereign subject" who "exercises power instrumentally on another".¹⁶

It is precisely this conventional notion of sovereign agency and censorship as deliberate policy put into practice by those in power that is questioned by postmodern critics. For if

power is instanced as the act of censorship, figured as an efficacious action that one subject performs upon another [...], power is reduced to that which is externally imposed upon a subject. Subjects are understood as outside of power, relaying the effects of power, but not considered one of those effects.¹⁷

¹³ For an analysis of the theory of Aesopian language and its practice in modern Russian literature, cf. Lev Loseff's study *On the Beneficence of Censorship*.

¹⁴ Holquist, "Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship", p. 16.

¹⁵ Rosenfeld, "Writing the History of Censorship", p. 129, *passim*.

¹⁶ Butler, "Ruled Out", p. 256.

¹⁷ Butler, "Ruled Out", p. 247.

Butler borrows the psychoanalytical term 'foreclosure' to describe "a primary form of repression, one that is not performed by a subject but, rather, whose operation makes possible the formation of the subject".¹⁸ This kind of censorship operates "prior to speech – namely, as the constituting norm by which the speakable is differentiated from the unspeakable".¹⁹ In this model, censorship becomes a necessary condition for the formation of a speaking subject. Butler summarizes her views as follows:

Censorship is a productive form of power: it is not merely privative, but formative as well. I want to distinguish this position from the one that would claim that speech is incidental to the aims of censorship. Censorship seeks to produce subjects according to explicit and implicit norms, and this production of the subject has everything to do with the regulation of speech. By the latter, I do not mean to imply that the subject's production is narrowly linked to the regulation of that subject's speech, but rather to the regulation of the social domain of speakable discourse.²⁰

This focus on the relationship of censorial power and the subject, the latter understood as an effect of power rather than the one who wields it or is subordinate to it, indicates the Foucauldian influence that lies behind much of contemporary work on censorship: "Foucault had himself always seen power as productive, as constructing knowledge and social practices. [...] In the new scholarship, censorship is analogously characterized as productive", as Post puts it.²¹ But Foucault, while being "concerned with exploring hidden forms of power and domination" and understanding power as "always constituted and exercised by normative discourses or 'discourse formations'", nevertheless "shied away from labeling as 'censorship' those kinds of social and ideological control exercised by discourse", as Rosenfeld rightly points out.²² I do not think that this is the case solely "because of the overwhelmingly negative connotations traditionally accorded to the term";²³ the word 'power' too conjures up negative associations, and Foucault made it his business to rethink precisely those commonly accepted negative views of power and to overthrow the simplistic equation of power with restriction when he gave 'power' centre-stage position in his work. Foucault did not

¹⁸ Butler, "Ruled Out", p. 255.

¹⁹ Butler, "Ruled Out", p. 255.

²⁰ Butler, "Ruled Out", p. 252.

²¹ Post, "Censorship and Silencing", p. 2.

²² Rosenfeld, "Writing the History of Censorship", p. 126.

²³ Rosenfeld, "Writing the History of Censorship", p. 126.

need 'censorship' as an umbrella term to answer what he himself identified as his central question: how is, in occidental societies, the production of discourses that are held to be true connected with the mechanisms and institutions of power?²⁴

However, that does not mean that he never used the term; he did. For instance, in the first volume of his *Histoire de la sexualité*, Foucault enlists some of the characteristics of power, among them what he calls the logic of censorship, which unites that which has been branded as nonexistent, as forbidden, and as unspeakable in such a way that each becomes the principle and the effect of the other:

La logique de la censure. Cette interdiction est supposée prendre trois formes; affirmer que ça n'est pas permis, empêcher que ça soit dit, nier que ça existe. Formes apparemment difficiles à concilier. Mais c'est là qu'on imagine une sorte de logique en chaîne qui serait caractéristique des mécanismes de censure: elle lie l'inexistant, l'illicite et l'informulable de façon que chacun soit à la fois principe et effet de l'autre: de ce qui est interdit, on ne doit pas parler jusqu'à ce qu'il soit annulé dans le réel; ce qui est inexistant n'a droit à aucune manifestation, même dans l'ordre de la parole qui énonce son inexistence; et ce qu'on doit taire se trouve banni du réel comme ce qui est interdit par excellence.²⁵

The result is a paradox that captures important aspects of censorial activities. Yet we must bear in mind that Foucault does not speak of censorship as such but of the *logic* of censorship, which suggests a metaphorical usage of the term, possibly chosen in the desire to compare some exclusion mechanisms of power to the thinking that lies behind censorial practices. Since for Foucault, power is a highly complex phenomenon, all the exclusion mechanisms he subsumes under the umbrella term of power are merely parts, the sum of which does not make up the whole of power, as power is seen as being also formative and constructive. In the 'new censorship', censorship is treated as being equally complex.

Rather than acting merely as a repressive force employed to curb communication, censorship is regarded as an integral element of communication. The argument put forward is that communication is

²⁴ In the preface to the German edition, Foucault writes: "Es ist das Problem, das fast alle meine Bücher bestimmt: wie ist in den abendländischen Gesellschaften die Produktion von Diskursen, die (zumindest für eine bestimmte Zeit) mit einem Wahrheitswert geladen sind, an die unterschiedlichen Machtmechanismen und -institutionen gebunden?" *Der Wille zum Wissen*, p. 8.

²⁵ Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité*, vol. 1, p. 111. (Emphasis by Foucault.)

dependent on discourses, and no discourse can function without its own rules and norms which govern the discourse and are, therefore, ultimately of a censorial nature. By implication, communication without censorship is effectively impossible, because the structure of a discursive field, while enabling a particular discourse, can only do so at the expense of other, potentially competing discourses which have to be stifled, and consequently censored, in order to allow the field-specific discourse to flourish. Censorship thus becomes ubiquitous, making the identifiable personal censor superfluous.

This view of censorship is based on Pierre Bourdieu's "economy of symbolic exchanges" in which relations of communication, or "linguistic exchanges", are seen as "relations of symbolic power in which the power relations between speakers or their respective groups are actualized".²⁶ Bourdieu stresses the ambiguity of speech acts as both enabling speech and sanctioning or censoring it:

Every speech act and, more generally, every action, is a conjuncture, an encounter between independent causal series. On the one hand, there are the socially constructed dispositions of the linguistic habitus, which imply a certain propensity to speak and to say determinate things (the expressive interest) and a certain capacity to speak, which involves both the linguistic capacity to generate an infinite number of grammatically correct discourses, and the social capacity to use this competence adequately in a determinate situation. On the other hand, there are the structures of the linguistic market, which impose themselves as a system of specific sanctions and censorships.²⁷

It is the professionals who, by virtue of their specific competence, have privileged access to fields such as politics or art where they dominate the field-specific discourse production, thus collaborating in the exclusion or "dispossession of the majority of the people"; the professionals, in turn, must be successfully initiated into the field and its logic, a process which will result in a "*de facto submission* to the values, hierarchies and censorship mechanisms inherent in this field".²⁸ All discourses are regarded by Bourdieu as being characterized by tensions between expression and censorship:

The specialized languages that schools of specialists produce and reproduce through the systematic alteration of the common language are, as with all discourses, the product of

²⁶ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 37.

²⁷ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 37.

²⁸ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p. 175f. (Bourdieu's emphasis).

a *compromise* between an *expressive interest* and a *censorship* constituted by the very structure of the field in which the discourse is produced and circulates.²⁹

The formation of this compromise depends on the "*specific competence* of the producer, and is the product of *strategies of euphemization* that consist in imposing form as well as observing formalities".³⁰ Thus, censorship becomes a very widely applicable term.

But is such a redefinition of censorship productive? One could support this broader understanding of censorship by arguing that the traditional definition of censorship has been enriched by including the notion of structural or constitutive forms of censorship so that the concept can now be employed to analyze conditions of communication permeating all societies and discursive human interaction. Conversely, one could criticize such a wider view of censorship as misleading because it runs the risk of equating very different forms of control by confusing censorship with social norms affecting and controlling communication.³¹ Armin Biermann, for instance, warns against referring to any kind of selection that thematizes one thing and leaves another unsaid as censorship because if the limits of what can be named and said were regarded as the result of censorship, any attempt to make sense would effectively be branded as censorship, which would mean that 'censorship', 'society', 'civilization', and 'culture' would all be rolled into one.³² Even some of those who engage in the 'new censorship' seem to be a little uneasy about some of the implications of using the word 'censorship' in a much broader sense than is usual:

The new scholarship of censorship [...] tends to veer between the concrete mechanisms of silencing and the abstraction of struggle. The result seems to flatten distinctions among kinds of power, implicitly equating suppression of speech caused by state legal

²⁹ Bourdieu, "Censorship and the Imposition of Form", p. 137. (Bourdieu's emphasis).

³⁰ Bourdieu, "Censorship and the Imposition of Form", p. 137. (Bourdieu's emphasis).

³¹ Thus Christoph Guggenbühl, *Zensur und Pressefreiheit*, p. 28.

³² "Treibt man die Ausweitung des Prädikats 'Zensur' ins Extrem, so kann unter 'Zensur' jede vollzogene Selektionsleistung gefaßt werden, die etwas zum Thema macht und anderes am Horizont beläßt, also 'zensiert'. [...] Wenn aber die Grenzen des 'Benennbaren' wie des 'Sagbaren' – und damit bereits jeder Akt der Sinnbildung [...] – Ergebnisse von Zensur sein sollen, dann drohen die Prädikate der Begriffe 'Zensur' und 'Gesellschaft' / 'Zivilisation' / 'Kultur' zusammenzufallen, dann wird 'Zensur' mit 'Gesellschaft' identisch. Mit einem derartig weit gefaßten Zensurbegriff läßt sich – nicht nur wissenschaftlich – nichts mehr anfangen." Biermann, "'Gefährliche Literatur'", p. 2f.

action with that caused by the market, or by the dominance of a particular discourse, or by the institution of criticism itself. It tends also to flatten variations among kinds of struggles, de-emphasizing the difference between, say, the agonism of poets and that of legal aid clients. The challenge is thus how to preserve the analytic force of the new scholarship without sacrificing the values and concerns of more traditional accounts.³³

Analysis of censorship does not become simpler if censorship is identified everywhere; and I doubt whether opening up the flood-gates makes the endeavour more rewarding. The widening of the concept reminds me of the fate of intertextuality. This term, too, became all-encompassing, and we were warned at the time that a concept that is so universal that one cannot even imagine its absence or its counterpart, must needs be of little heuristic potential.³⁴ I suspect that 'censorship' has become such a cheap currency because of its rhetorical value which guarantees attention. Employing a 'sexy' term does not necessarily make the analysis that goes with it any more convincing, especially if the term has been tweaked to fit the bill. For instance, Frederick Schauer's article on "The Ontology of Censorship" is more concerned with exclusions stemming from professionalism in a highly differentiated and specialized society, mechanisms that violate first principles of democratic access, than it is with censorship as such. In concluding that the "language of censorship is thus the language of professionalism, the language of expertise, the language of institutional competence, the language of separation of powers", Schauer over-accentuates similarities between professionalism and censorship, which distracts from his actual focus, namely the relationship between authority, autonomy, and specialization.³⁵ One has to be careful not to over-employ the term 'censorship' because this would, in many cases, obscure rather than illumine history.³⁶ The equation epitomized by the title of Kirsten Hearn's article – "Exclusion is Censorship"

³³ Post, "Censorship and Silencing", p. 4.

³⁴ Manfred Pfister wrote: "Ein Konzept, das so universal ist, daß zu ihm keine Alternative und nicht einmal dessen Negation mehr denkbar ist, ist notwendigerweise von geringem heuristischem Potential für die Analyse und Interpretation". Pfister, "Konzepte der Intertextualität", p. 15.

³⁵ Schauer, "The Ontology of Censorship", p. 162.

³⁶ Enno Ruge's article on the disappearance of the Early Modern London boy acting company 'Children of Paul's' is a case in point: he shows that, contrary to explanations offered in the literature which blame the authorities' intervention, market forces – rather than repression – led to the closure of the company (cf. pp. 33–61).

– is as programmatic for the redefinition of the term 'censorship' that has occurred in recent years, as it is indicative of a certain over-simplification.³⁷

What do we stand to *lose* if we push the meaning of censorship to the limits by suspecting it at work wherever and whenever any kind of social and discursive exclusion occurs? To answer that question, let us consider a few concrete examples of exclusion that some people would call censorship.

Firstly, imagine a writer who lived and worked in the former GDR and who was unable to have a book published because the licensing branch of the Ministry of Culture refused to grant the project their official authorization. Secondly, think of an academic whose work is rejected by the leading journals of the discipline. Thirdly, consider publishing houses such as Penguin or Reclam and the profile of their series of classics, which favours well-known authors and their works over less well-known ones. And fourthly, recall everyday scenes of a child silenced by parental authority.

In my view, only the first of these examples meets all the requirements of the term censorship, because only here do we have the case of an authoritarian intervention by a third party into an act of communication between the sender of a message (the author) and its receiver (the reader), a message intended for the public but prevented from ever reaching it. This is categorically different from the other three cases, which can be analyzed without recourse to the term censorship, whether 'constitutive' or not. The academic whose article is rejected by editorial boards might feel discriminated against, but judgment is passed by peers, not by some outside authority. It is the academics themselves who decide whether a publication is worthy. This is self-regulation of what Bourdieu would describe as a specialist field. The publisher who decides to include canonical writers and works in their programme, at the expense of non-canonical ones, acts out of financial considerations, and the decision certainly reflects and reinforces existing canons. But the policy does not interfere with the rejected texts themselves, nor does it preclude their publication elsewhere – in contrast to the censorial system in the GDR (and other totalitarian states) where publication sometimes hinged upon the excision of contentious passages, and where the rejection of a manuscript by the authorities effectively barred the author from seeking publication anywhere else but in the underground, or abroad. A child's communication is geared towards the private, not the public sphere, with the addressees usually well known to the child; parents typically

³⁷ Hearn, "Exclusion is Censorship".

intervene when privacy is being threatened, for instance by a child's penetrating voice on a bus when other passengers overhear what might well be an embarrassing remark to the parent about a certain fellow passenger. Of course, all four examples illustrate instances of regulation and control of communication, which is indeed typical of censorship. But while censorship always implies the control and regulation of discourses, the reverse is not true because not all such discourse regulation is equivalent to censorship. In my view, it is more productive to appreciate the differences between the four examples of discourse regulation – censorship, self-regulation, canon formation, and social control – than it is to level them.

In order to elaborate on this point, let us look at the relationship between censorship and canon formation more closely. Censorship always implies the existence of a canon, which in turn requires and betrays norms.³⁸ Canon formation is a highly effective mechanism for cultural selection and stabilization.³⁹ Selection implies exclusion, and this similarity between censorship and the canon explains why some scholars working on the canon have also become interested in censorship. Both the canon and censorship distinguish between works that are deemed to be worthy of widespread dissemination and reception, and those that are not. It is true that the analysis of censorial as well as canonical selection and exclusion certainly allows one to gain insight into the cultural practices of a society, into power relations within the cultural field and the public sphere, and into the way the members of a society conceive and relate to their own culture.

But a closer look at censorship and canon formation reveals significant differences between them. Censorship – understood as an authoritarian control over what reaches the public sphere by someone other than the sender and the intended receiver of a message – operates on the basis of official regulation (if not legislation), institutionalization, and administration of the control procedures in place. The censorial watch over conformity to norms, be they of a legal, an aesthetic, or a wider ideological nature, inevitably requires authoritarian, at least hierarchical structures for monitoring purposes, which can be carried out much more easily if the

³⁸ Thus, Rainer Grübel argues: "Die Begriffswörter 'Wert', 'Kanon' und 'Zensur' hängen logisch miteinander zusammen, indem sich ihre Inhalte (von rechts nach links) einschließen oder (von links nach rechts) voraussetzen". Grübel, "Wert, Kanon und Zensur", p. 601.

³⁹ Cf. Hans Günther: "Kanonbildungen zählen zu den stärksten kulturellen Stabilisierungs- und Selektionsmechanismen [...], die wir überhaupt kennen." Günther, "Die Lebensphasen eines Kanons", p. 138.

ensorial steps taken have been documented. It is because of this tendency of censorship towards bureaucracy that we have so many official records of censorship cases in totalitarian societies. The legitimating discourses brought forward in defence of censorship depict censorship as a means of protecting the public from allegedly harmful influences, which means that a monolithic subject and common interests are constructed, thus denying legitimacy to diverging interests of particular audiences.⁴⁰ Censorship therefore is monologic. Of course, censorship employs the canon towards its own ends, and strengthens its existence because it is a useful tool for the censor. The canon can become a weapon for the censor by providing a yardstick against which to measure cultural products; this happened in socialist countries whose authorities stylized 'socialist realism' into a binding formula for artistic production.⁴¹ Censorial judgments thus often reflect values transported through canons.

While canons too are concerned with the preservation of norms, the development and cultivation of canons does not necessarily happen in sanctioned institutions and through authorized personnel. It is true that school and university syllabi, for instance, exist thanks to the stipulations of specialists (education authorities, lecturers), who themselves have been influenced in their judgement by equally canonized traditions as reflected in their own education or professional training and development. But many canons develop by virtue of the reception and interaction of a specific target audience; needless to say, in these days of the commodification of cultural products, marketing strategies do play a role in this process, but they are not always pivotal. Thus, the initial successes of the Beatles or the Rolling Stones surprised the pop music industry as much as the bands whose songs have secured a place in the history of pop music, and need no further approval by professional music critics to maintain their status. What is crucial is that in modern (pluralistic) societies, there is a multiplicity of

⁴⁰ These legitimating discourses betray the pressure those ruling elites wishing to employ censorship have been labouring under in the modern age. Since the French Revolution and the legal innovations that came in its wake, freedom of speech – juxtaposed with censorship – has become fixed as a value in the modern consciousness – so much so that even in modern non-democratic societies that clearly use pre-publication censorship, it is rarely called by its real name. Instead, euphemisms are preferred which bear an uncanny resemblance to Orwellian Newspeak. For instance, in the GDR, the licensing branch of the Ministry of Culture went by the name 'central administration of publishing houses and book trade', and the actual censoring process was known as the 'procedure to obtain permission to print'.

canons which coexist. Teenagers listen to different radio stations than do their parents; most of the blockbuster novels favoured by the reading public (e.g. Stephen King's or J. K. Rowling's novels) are not regarded as sophisticated and 'canonical' by the critics; the specialization of museums and galleries in terms of their collections and exhibitions allows artlovers to indulge their preferences while ignoring art that is less close to their hearts; and nobody who does not like avantgarde music has to attend a John Cage concert. Canons primarily operate by singling out certain works of art as exemplary, and representative of a certain tradition, in order to influence the production and reception of works of art. While canons essentially try to reach a consensus among an audience about the heightened significance and quality of the works concerned, censorship wields bigger clubs – deterral strategies such as bans and showcases intended to mark the no-go-areas the canon has just left aside by focusing its attention elsewhere. It is important to appreciate these differences between censorship and the canon in order to see how they relate to each other and where there are overlaps, rather than trying to subsume the one under the other or to over-accentuate their similarities in an attempt to employ a seemingly all-encompassing umbrella term.

However, quibbling about terminological and typological issues pertaining to various forms of discourse control and their censorial nature, or lack thereof, is not the most productive solution to the analysis of censorship. There are two fundamental problems which have marred research on censorship. If we accept that censorship is a cultural phenomenon that transcends time and place,⁴² we are faced with a multitude of disparate sociopolitical contexts which would have to be compared to each other in order to identify structural similarities and differences with respect to their censorial practices. Such a comparison would enable us to draw more general conclusions about forms and functions of censorship, as well as to draw up a theory of censorship that would accommodate historical specifics. The problem is, of course, that it can be quite difficult to compare concrete historical specifics from various political contexts with one another. Adopting a more abstract approach to describing censorship runs the risk of not faithfully reflecting specific historical circumstances. This dilemma raises two questions: firstly, how

⁴¹ Cf. Hilary Chung (ed.), *In the Party Spirit*.

⁴² Reinhard Aulich speaks of censorship as a "transepocholes Kulturphänomen". Aulich, "Elemente einer funktionalen Differenzierung der literarischen Zensur", p. 183.

could one try to solve the conflict between more general, structural characteristics of censorship, and more context-specific ones; and secondly, how could one avoid levelling the individual details of results gained from the analysis of specific historical and political circumstances while at the same time trying to integrate one's findings into a larger picture?

It might perhaps be a good idea to adopt Wittgenstein's concept of family resemblance for the analysis of forms of cultural regulation such as censorship. Marie-Laure Ryan uses this notion to promote a flexible approach to genres which she metaphorically compares to

clubs imposing a certain number of conditions for membership, but tolerating as quasi-members those individuals who can fulfill only some of the requirements, and who do not seem to fit into any other club. As these quasi-members become more numerous, the conditions for admission may be modified so that they, too, will become full members.⁴³

This model allows us to dispense with any rigid typology of censorship and related kinds of cultural regulation because its flexibility enables us to conceive of censorship as something that can exist to a greater or a lesser extent, and whose face can change in the course of time. By identifying essential elements of censorship, historical developments and local variants can be integrated into the larger picture as optional elements. Thus, if we accept that there are some key characteristics of censorship, as well as less crucial ones, this distinction between core and periphery can help us negotiate the difficult relationship between relatively permanent general principles of censorship and locally (or historically) conditioned characteristics which are *ipso facto* subject to change.

Censorship as a means of controlling communication can itself be understood as involving communicative processes. According to the classical model of communication, there are six factors to be taken into account when analyzing communication: the sender of a message, its receiver, the message itself, the code employed, the channel (or medium), and the context. In my opinion, this communication model is well suited to map censorial actions and reactions systematically. This 'map' is not intended as a means to advocate categorical separation of factors that are relevant to censorship, and often inter-related; rather, the use of the six poles of the communication model in order to represent the various factors that can play a role in censorship, is put forward with a view (1) to provide some orientation when

⁴³ Marie-Laure Ryan, "On the Why, What and How of Generic Taxonomy", p. 118.

talking about the complex issues pertaining to censorship, and (2) to employ this framework as a basis for analyzing the relationship and dependencies between its individual constituents.

If censorial measures are directed against the sender of a message, they can be regarded as strategies *ad personam*. As far as censorship of literature is concerned, all actions taken to threaten, influence, or punish an author come under this heading, whether they be ideologically motivated negotiations with an author about a text, the exertion of psychological pressure, the levying of fines, or the imprisonment, exiling, or even assassination of an unruly author. Obviously, many such measures are intended to deter other authors from overstepping their limits, which means that the censoring of one writer can, at least indirectly, affect other writers too.

Censorial measures aimed at the literary text can take the form of pre-publication censorship, which means that the text is changed before it obtains a licence to go to print, e.g. by excising contentious passages. Whether or not authors are involved in, or informed about this process, depends on the political system. In contrast to what one might expect, excisions carried out without permission are by no means the hallmark of totalitarian states – while in the GDR, writers had to agree to suggested alterations of their texts, it was in an American edition of Christa Wolf's novel *Kindheitsmuster (A Model Childhood)* that almost all the passages in which Wolf had voiced criticism of the Vietnam War were taken out, although the author, when asked by the publisher for her consent, had refused to authorize the proposed omissions.⁴⁴

Apart from the content of a text, sometimes its code provides censors with ammunition for intervention. When in 1857, six poems from Baudelaire's *Fleurs du Mal* were banned, it was not only their subject matter that was condemned, but also the crude realism of their poetic images and the aestheticization of unorthodox forms of sexuality, although it is of course true to say that the objections to the poems' language merely served to support the accusation that they were a threat to public morality, which

⁴⁴ The edition of *A Model Childhood* in question is the one translated by Ursula Molinaro and Hedwig Rappolt, published by Farrar, Straus and Giroux in New York in 1980. I would like to thank Dr Georgina Paul of Warwick University for alerting me to this case, and for allowing me to read her correspondence with Wolf on this matter.

brings us back to their content.⁴⁵ In the GDR, aesthetic devices which, in the eyes of the cultural administrators, seemed to be irreconcilable with the dogma of socialist realism were deemed undesirable; this concerned many West-European, modernist, and avantgarde techniques.⁴⁶ The term 'formalism', which was particularly popular in the 1950s and 1960s, acted as a catch-all label for anything that was reminiscent of these unwelcome traditions, a similarity which was then construed as grounds for branding a literary text (or a piece of music)⁴⁷ as being decadent, bourgeois, and anti-socialist.⁴⁸

Pre-publication censorship has often been contrasted with post-publication censorship, which comprises all measures aimed at preventing an already printed text from being (further) disseminated. This kind of censorship does not try to alter the text itself but focuses on its potential audience so that one could describe it as a means to steer the reception of a text. For instance, if only a small number of copies of a contentious book is printed, or if the pricing of the book is suitably expensive, or if libraries that buy the book move it into their restricted sections, access to the publication is made more difficult for the reading public. And in political contexts in which the censoring authorities control not only book production but also the content of the print media, the publication of a contentious book could be accompanied by commissioned reviews which act as mouthpieces for the officially favoured view of the book in question, or even as a defence of the

⁴⁵ The sentence against Baudelaire's poems speaks of the corrupting influence of the images, whose coarse realism allegedly stimulated the senses and were offensive: "[...] l'effet funeste des tableaux qu'il présente au lecteur, et qui, dans les pièces incriminées, conduisent nécessairement à l'excitation des sens par un réalisme grossier et offensant pour la pudeur." Autor und Verleger hätten öffentliches Ärgernis erregt und gegen die guten Sitten verstoßen: "[ils] ont commis le délit d'outrage à la morale publique et aux bonnes moeurs." Cf. the section entitled "Le Procès" in Baudelaire, *Oeuvres complètes de Charles Baudelaire. Les Fleurs du Mal*, pp. 337–363; here: p. 357.

⁴⁶ Socialist countries were not original in their rejection of modernist and avantgarde trends in the arts, as Erik Levi's analysis of musical modernism and its standing in the Weimar Republic and in Nazi Germany shows (see pp. 63–85).

⁴⁷ For a discussion of how and why new developments in music, especially atonal music and jazz, were frowned upon in the early years of the GDR, refer to Toby Thacker's essay in this collection (pp. 87–110).

⁴⁸ On the employment of the term 'formalism' as a negative counterpart to socialist realism, see Simone Barck / Martina Langermann / Siegfried Lokatis, "Die DDR – eine verhinderte Literaturgesellschaft", p. 157.

publishing decision of the authorities.⁴⁹ This was standard practice in the GDR.

Klaus Kanzog pointed out that censorship is fixated on the medium used to convey the message which is up for scrutiny.⁵⁰ This is the case because the medium of the message co-determines its effect on the target audience – media differ in terms of their potential outreach. Today, the novel as a genre reaches more readers than poetry does; this would not have been true before the rise of the novel in the eighteenth century. Historically speaking, censors tended to concentrate on the mass media of their days. Thus, if large parts of the population are illiterate, the stage is of particular interest to the censor. Conversely, the potential effect of written texts rises in line with the number of people who are able to read and with the ease with which a text can be reproduced and widely disseminated. The invention of the printing press contributed decisively to the emancipation of censorship from the essentially medieval, inquisitorial persecution of perceived heretics to its development into a modern institution controlling mass-reproducible texts, whether religious or secular. It was only in the 20th century that the new mass medium of film, as well as the new electronic media, led to a shift of the focus of censorial attention away from the printed text to the moving image. Today, film censorship tends to be stricter than controls of book publications – in the United Kingdom, the film industry submits its products to the British Board of Film Classification for approval, but there is no corresponding body for the central policing of books.⁵¹

All censorial actions, whether they concentrate on a writer, his or her text, its code, its recipient, or its medium, need to be seen in their political and historical context because it is this context which structures the way in which censorship can operate, ranging from the legal framework of a given society – especially its constitution, but also its penal code – to the political system in place. In modern democracies, censorship is usually ruled out in the constitution, with possible exceptions reserved for cases in which

⁴⁹ Both apply to the publication history of Volker Braun's *Hinze-Kunze-Roman*. Cf. York-Gothart Mix, *'Ein Oberkunze darf nicht vorkommen'*, p. 26. For information about the literary journals and magazines of the GDR, consult chapter 8 in Simone Barck / Martina Langermann / Siegfried Lokatis, *'Jedes Buch ein Abenteuer'*, pp. 346–401, as well as the monograph *Zwischen 'Mosaik' und 'Einheit'* by the same authors.

⁵⁰ Kanzog, "Zensur, literarische", p. 1003.

⁵¹ The power of the Lord Chamberlain to license plays, based on the Licensing Act of 1737 and the Theatres Act of 1843 which replaced it, was revoked by parliament in 1968.

unhindered publication or dissemination would compromise identifiable individuals or groups within society. Thus, Germany's Basic Law stipulates, in article 5, that there is no censorship, yet curbs the freedom of art and speech by saying that these freedoms find their limitations in the general laws, the protection of minors, and the right to have one's personal honour respected; implicitly, this constitutes a loophole for (post-publication) censorship should any of the above laws be violated.⁵² And the last paragraph of article 5 which states that the freedom of teaching does not exempt those teaching from their obligation to be loyal to the constitution, allowed the West German government in the 1970s, at the height of hysterical fear of left-wing terrorism resulting from the Red Army Faction's bombing campaigns, abductions, and assassinations, to prevent graduates who had been identified as socialists or Marxists from becoming school teachers, or entering other branches of the public sector as civil servants.⁵³ But while this policy arguably constitutes censorship of unwelcome political convictions by punishing those who hold them, there is no provision for preventing the self-same views from entering the public sphere because the phrase in article 5 – 'There is no censorship' – forbids licensing by state authorities, as does the preceding guarantee of the freedom of the press. Conversely, the GDR's constitution effectively allowed pre-publication censorship: firstly, it prescribed the protection and promotion of socialist culture, as well as the fight against the 'imperialist un-culture'; secondly, freedom of speech (article 27) was not to extend to the state's socialist principles and institutions; and thirdly, freedom of speech was curbed by various laws, for example § 106 of the penal code which outlawed political agitation against the state ('staatsfeindliche Hetze').⁵⁴ This led to the strategic criminalization of unruly regime critics. Checking whether the activities of writers could be seen as illegal is an aim expressed in many documents written by the Ministry of State Security. The logical consequence of the restriction of freedom of speech to statements conforming to socialism is the attempt to police conformity – hence censorship and its institutional infrastructure. These examples go to show that the sociopolitical context determines the scope for

⁵² For a discussion of the legal issues involved, see Helmut K. J. Ridder, "Bemerkungen eines Juristen zum Zensurproblem".

⁵³ The infamous 'decree against radicals' ('Radikalerlaß') underlying this policy was effectively based on the aforementioned passage in the Basic Law.

⁵⁴ Cf. Joachim Walther, *Sicherungsbereich Literatur*, p. 436. For an annotated copy of the GDR's constitutions, cf. Herwig Roggemann, *Die DDR-Verfassungen*.

ensorship in many ways – censorship is not above politics but a means thereto, and censorial decisions are bound to reflect the concerns of the political elite.⁵⁵

Apart from mapping censorial actions, the communication model can be employed for reactions against censorship on the part of those affected by censorship, such as the writers or the reading public. Censorship is truly 'interactive' in that censorial measures taken will rebound, and these reactions will themselves trigger further steps. In the following, I shall outline possible actions an author who is exposed to censorship could take, and how they can be grouped around the six poles of the communication model.⁵⁶

One possible reaction for a writer confronted with censorship is to coordinate his or her actions with colleagues similarly affected. Demonstrating solidarity with other writers is one such strategy; this would encompass, for example, the drawing up or signing of petitions and open letters which criticize the censorial practices suffered by others. When Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in May 1967, addressed an open letter to the fourth congress of the Soviet Writers' Union in which he demanded that censorship be discussed at the conference, about one hundred of his colleagues agreed with him, most of them publicly.⁵⁷ Another famous example of publicly declared solidarity amongst writers in support of a colleague is the protest of many authors against the expatriation of Wolf Biermann by the GDR authorities in November 1976, which is now widely regarded as a watershed in the GDR's history of cultural politics because the incident led to a lasting rupture of relations between the authorities and the writers.⁵⁸ However, non-public support of colleagues through friendship, critical acclaim, financial help etc can be equally valuable to the recipient.

⁵⁵ Daniela Berghahn shows how, in 1966, almost the entire feature film production of the DEFA was banned in the wake of the infamous 11th Plenum of December 1965, which initiated a cultural and political backlash (cf. pp. 111–139). See also Karen Ruoff Kramer, "Representations of Work in the Forbidden DEFA Films of 1965".

⁵⁶ This orientation towards those affected by censorship ties in with Helen Freshwater's demand to give greater scope to the experience of those censored (cf. pp. 225–245).

⁵⁷ For a copy of Solzhenitsyn's letter, as well as reactions to it by other Soviet writers, cf. Leopold Labeledz (ed.), *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 110–130.

⁵⁸ For an analysis of the significance of the so-called 'Biermann affair', cf. Ian Wallace, "The Politics of Confrontation"; David Bathrick, *The Powers of Speech*, p. 27ff; Wolfgang Emmerich, *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, p. 246ff.

A different way of reacting against censorship is a writer's attempt to use literary texts to let off steam by depicting and criticizing censorship aesthetically.⁵⁹ A famous example of a complex literary representation of censorship is Mikhail Bulgakov's novel *The Master and Margarita*.⁶⁰ In this book, 1930s Moscow experiences a visitation by the devil who wreaks havoc in the city but also frees the 'Master', the author of an unpublished and unpublishable novel on Jesus Christ, from the asylum to which he had been committed after having destroyed his own manuscript in response to the fierce criticism provoked by the printing of a small excerpt from the novel in a journal. The devil reunites the Master with his lover Margarita – only to take their lives, and then resurrect them in a place of eternal peace and happiness. However, in this new form of existence, the Master realizes that he is forgetting the text of his novel. Thus, it seems that Bulgakov is saying that Stalinist Russia is no place for an unorthodox writer – both he and his work go to hell. This kind of process whereby political criticism is encoded in the literary text is called "Aesopian language", which Lev Loseff defines as "a special literary system, one whose structure allows interaction between author and reader at the same time that it conceals inadmissible [sic] content from the censor".⁶¹ The indeterminacy of literary language lends itself to political allusions, allegories, parables, irony and other such forms of coded expression which cannot easily be pinned down to any one meaning so that the Aesopian texts might well escape censorship.⁶² (This indeterminacy is, of course, a double-edged sword: it allows critics to read non-Aesopian texts as if they were fables.) Irrespective of how ingenious 'double-speak' might be at

⁵⁹ Note that the fictional representation of censorship is not a prerogative of writers threatened by censorship. Narrated censorship can also be found in the novels of authors living and working in the so-called 'free' world. However, a comparative analysis of the ways in which the censorship motif is being employed by both groups of writers shows interesting differences: while authors affected by censorial regimes tend to portray fictional writer figures trying to complete and publish their works against the odds, authors from democratic political backgrounds usually tell stories of threats posed to already existing masterpieces of world literature, thus emphasizing the reception, rather than the production of literature. For a discussion of the literary representation of censorship in novels from both democratic and non-democratic political contexts, cf. Beate Müller, "Spannung durch Zensur".

⁶⁰ Bulgakov worked on his masterpiece from 1929 until his death in 1940, but the book was not published until 1967.

⁶¹ Lev Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. x.

⁶² Of course, such Aesopian encoding is not restricted to literary texts, as is shown by Michael Drewett's analysis of South African pop music under apartheid (cf. pp. 189–207).

times, one must be careful not to exculpate censorship on account of its alleged stimulating effects for creative invention – literary productivity takes place despite, not because of censorship.⁶³ Apart from aesthetically representing and criticizing censorship, many writers have addressed censorship in non-fictional texts too – one might mention Milton's *Areopagitica*, Jean Paul's *Freiheits-Büchlein*, George Orwell's essay "The Prevention of Literature", Günter de Bruyn's and Christoph Hein's speeches condemning censorship at the X. Congress of the GDR Writers' Union (1987), or Jurek Becker's public lectures in Frankfurt (1989), and many others.

The intensity with which censorship is carried out can depend on the medium chosen by a writer. Therefore, the decision to use a particular medium can also be a reaction of the author to the censorial system experienced. Thus, when his film script *Jacob the Liar* was rejected by the DEFA in 1966, Jurek Becker decided to rewrite the story in the form of a novel. The book was published in 1969 and heralded the breakthrough for Becker as a novelist. The international critical acclaim which greeted the book ironically contributed to the DEFA's realization of the film version in 1974, a product for which Becker was awarded the most prestigious prize for the arts of the GDR, the 'Nationalpreis', in the following year.

In a sociopolitical context in which censorship is practised by the authorities, a writer must always have two distinct groups of recipients in mind: the intended reading public, and the 'professional' readers involved in the censoring process. The conventional assumption that censors are easily deceived because they are mere bureaucrats without a shred of poetry in their bones, is quite wrong. In the GDR, publishing houses mediated between the writers and the Ministry of Culture, which meant that the rejection of manuscripts for ideological reasons was sometimes carried out by the publisher, and not always on behalf of the Ministry alone. Publishers' in-house reports on submitted manuscripts more often than not show that the editors did understand what the potential contentious issues raised by a text would be. Those professionally involved with books, whether they had a career in the booktrade, in the publishing industry, or in other cultural institutions such as libraries, were not mere administrators or political functionaries. They often had formal qualifications, or at least thorough work

⁶³ For an analysis of the Mario Benedetti's mastery of subversive language, cf. Carmen Tisnado's essay on the Uruguayan writer's works (cf. pp. 169–187).

experience, in their field; some (e.g. Walter Janka) were internationally renowned experts.⁶⁴ Therefore, talks with editors about literary products often took on the character of negotiations in which deals and compromises were sought. It is hardly surprising that some authors tried to play games by inserting exaggerated, highly provocative, but redundant statements into their texts which then served as red herrings to distract the editor from other, more subversive passages, or as pawns for the debate about the text.⁶⁵ The balance a text has to strike between placating the censor and signalling to the readers that it contains encoded messages is a delicate one. The ideal reader would be capable of decoding the literary text and any messages hidden within; whether this works in practice is another matter, one that deserves to be investigated by empirical reader response studies. For authors, one way of clarifying things is to try and meet readers in order to answer questions or discuss issues raised by the literary work. Encounters with professional readers are obviously different from those with the reading public. In the GDR, occasions such as public readings were strictly regulated by the authorities. Stasi informants were requested to report back to the Party about what had been said and discussed, especially when the author concerned was deemed ideologically untrustworthy. Thus, the reception of the readers present at such public readings was interpreted by Stasi officers and party functionaries, a reading process which ultimately fed back into policy decisions concerning the writer(s) in question. Because of the regulation and surveillance of officially existing forums for direct contact between writers and readers, alternative opportunities for such encounters were created. Protestant churches often provided venues for public readings; stratagems to launch a reading with a writer the authorities were suspicious about included

⁶⁴ For instance, Kurt Batt, who was editor-in-chief at the Hinstorff publishing house from 1961 until his sudden death in 1976, held a PhD in German literature. He, together with Konrad Reich as managing director, managed to establish what used to be a provincial publisher as one of the leading publishing houses for contemporary GDR literature. Cf. Kirsten Thietz, "Zwischen Auftrag und Eigensinn". The fates of Wolfgang Harich and Walter Janka, who had been in charge of the literary programme of the Aufbau Verlag and who were imprisoned for their 'counter-revolutionary' activities in 1957, goes to show that courageous editors – Janka had demanded the abolition of censorship – could fall victim to the system they had been playing a part in. For a history of the Aufbau publishing house, cf. Carsten Wurm, *Jeden Tag ein Buch*.

⁶⁵ Cf. Joachim Walther describes such provocative statements as coats he had hung up in the text, and which fitted the censor perfectly; Joachim Seyppel uses the image of a porcelain dog to refer to the same thing. Cf. Ernst Wichner / Herbert Wiesner (eds.), *Zensur in der DDR*, pp. 25–27.

the last-minute replacement of an approved author by a writer habitually frowned upon.

The structure of the literary field, of the public sphere, and the overall political context affect the way writers can relate to a censorial system. For example, in the Federal Republic of Germany, authors who have had one of their works classed as unsuitable for underage readers, can take the case to court; likewise, they can turn to the press to have the case publicized. Neither of these were options in the GDR. But the fact that there were two German countries opened up unique opportunities for the GDR's writers: they could consider publishing and promoting their works in West Germany where they were received with open arms, provided they were perceived, in the West, as being critical of the GDR. From the 1970s onwards, they were increasingly willing to do so without prior approval by the authorities in their own country. Thus, the West German public sphere in effect provided a surrogate public sphere for those who were discriminated against east of the Wall.⁶⁶ The description of the GDR as a 'closed society'⁶⁷ without any public sphere worth the name, a "niche society" in which open criticism was possible in "semiprivate autonomous spaces" only,⁶⁸ might hold true for the majority of the GDR's population. But the situation was very different for internationally known writers who found a substitute public sphere not within the GDR but in the West; this did not preclude their works from fulfilling the function of an "ersatz-journalism"⁶⁹ for their GDR readers. Of course, not every East German writer was so lucky as to be privileged and protected by international reputation. And not every author was willing to play off East German authorities against West German publishers and media. The writers' awareness of the censorial system not only governs the scope of actions that can be taken to react to the status quo, but also has an effect on the creative process because writers will inevitably think of possible reactions by the censors to their work in progress. Consequently, self-

⁶⁶ In other East European states such as Poland, which had no Western 'other', underground publishing played a more significant role than in the GDR. John Bates emphasizes the complex "symbiotic" relationship between the official and the unofficial circulation ('samizdat') in Poland, thus warning against establishing a simplistic binary opposition between the authorized and the unauthorized (cf. pp. 141–167).

⁶⁷ Wolfgang Emmerich uses the popular expression "geschlossene Gesellschaft". Cf. Emmerich, *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, p. 40ff.

⁶⁸ Marc Silberman, "Problematizing the 'Socialist Public Sphere'", p. 26.

⁶⁹ Patricia A. Herminhouse, "Literature as 'Ersatzöffentlichkeit'?", p. 87.

censorship can prevent them from writing daring texts, an indirect form of silencing that is the ultimate goal of censorship: policing the mind rather than its product.⁷⁰ Whether this really works is a question that cannot easily be answered. Where does authorial revision end, and where does censorial excision start? Even authors who say they exercised self-censorship in recognition of potential repressions will not be objective, reliable witnesses to their own creations. For self-censorship is not necessarily a conscious process whereby the writer weighs the pros and cons of including or excluding a possibly contentious passage; the internalization of norms cannot easily be overcome, let alone reversed.⁷¹ And if a text, although completed, is never presented to the authorities, there will not even be a paper trail which might allow a certain degree of insight into changes to the original manuscript. The problem is compounded by the fact that not all self-censorship is induced by a hostile political climate. The ultimate form of self-censorship surely must be the physical destruction of one's own unpublished work. Franz Kafka, who was suffering from severe doubts about the quality of his writing, wanted his friend Max Brod to destroy all his unpublished papers after his death. This example shows that although the political context in which an author has to live and work affects the scope of actions that can be taken by the writer, it cannot always be regarded as their main reason. These limitations of a simple cause-and-effect determinism make the analysis of censorship more challenging: the many factors relevant to censorship – the writer, the text, its code, its medium, the reader, and the context – encourage us to view it as an unstable process of actions and reactions in the struggle for power, publicity, and the privilege to speak out, rather than merely as a repressive tool with predictable results.

⁷⁰ The classic text underlying psychoanalytical studies of self-censorship is Freud's analysis of dreams; cf. Sigmund Freud, *Die Traumdeutung*. For a recent psychoanalytically orientated book on the subject, refer to Michael G. Levine, *Writing Through Repression*.

⁷¹ Anne Ruggles Gere shows the high extent to which female teachers had internalized the values and norms prescribed to them in 19th century America, thus contributing to their own silencing (cf. pp. 209–223).

Bibliography

- Altieri, Charles. *Canons and Consequences. Reflections on the Ethical Force of Imaginative Ideals*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 1990.
- Assmann, Jan and Aleida (eds.). *Kanon und Zensur. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation II*. Munich: Fink, 1987.
- Aulich, Reinhard. "Elemente einer funktionalen Differenzierung der literarischen Zensur. Überlegungen zu Form und Wirksamkeit von Zensur als einer intentional adäquaten Reaktion gegenüber literarischer Kommunikation". *"Unmoralisch an sich ...". Zensur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Herbert G. Göpfert / Erdmann Weyrauch (Wolfenbütteler Schriften zur Geschichte des Buchwesens 13). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988. 177–230.
- Barck, Simone / Martina Langermann / Siegfried Lokatis. "Die DDR – eine verhinderte Literaturgesellschaft". *Die DDR als Geschichte. Fragen – Hypothesen – Perspektiven*. Eds. Jürgen Kocka / Martin Sabrow. (Zeithistorische Studien 2). Berlin: Akademie, 1994, 153–158.
- . *'Jedes Buch ein Abenteuer'. Zensur-System und literarische Öffentlichkeiten in der DDR bis Ende der sechziger Jahre*. (Zeithistorische Studien 9). Berlin: Akademie, 1998.
- (eds.). *Zwischen 'Mosaik' und 'Einheit'. Zeitschriften in der DDR*. Berlin: Links, 1999.
- Bathrick, David. *The Powers of Speech. The Politics of Culture in the GDR*. Lincoln, London: U of Nebraska P, 1995.
- Baudelaire, Charles. *Oeuvres complètes de Charles Baudelaire. Les Fleurs du Mal. Les Épaves*. Notice, notes et éclaircissements de M. Jacques Crépet. Paris: Louis Conard 1930.
- Berman, Paul (ed.). *Debating P.C.. The Controversy over Political Correctness on College Campuses*. New York: Bantam Books, 1992.
- Biermann, Armin. "'Gefährliche Literatur' – Skizze einer Theorie der literarischen Zensur". *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte* 30.1 (1988): 1–28.
- . "Zur sozialen Konstruktion der 'Gefährlichkeit' von Literatur: Beispiele aus der französischen Aufklärung und dem Premier Empire". *Kanon und Zensur. Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation II*. Eds. Aleida and Jan Assmann Munich: Fink, 1987. 212–226.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Censorship and the Imposition of Form". P. B.: *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Oxford: Polity, 1992. 137–159 and 269–276.
- . "Die Zensur." *Soziologische Fragen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1993. ??
- . *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: CUP, 1977.
- Burt, Richard. *Licensed by Authority. Ben Jonson and the Discourses of Censorship*. Ithaca, London: Cornell UP, 1993.
- . *The Administration of Aesthetics. Censorship, Political Criticism, and the Public Sphere*. (Cultural Politics 7). Minneapolis, MN: U of Minneapolis P, 1994.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . "Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor". *Censorship and Silencing. Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 1998. 247–259.
- Calvino, Italo. *Why Read the Classics?* Trans. Martin McLaughlin. London: Jonathan Cape, 1999.
- Censorship. 500 Years of Conflict*. The New York Public Library Exhibition, June 1 – October 15, 1984. Ed. William Zeisel. New York, Oxford: OUP, 1984.
- Chester, Gail / Julienne Dickey (eds.). *Feminism and Censorship. The Current Debate*. Bridport, Dorset: Prism P, 1988.
- Childs, Elizabeth C. (ed.). *Suspended License. Censorship and the Visual Arts*. Seattle, London: U of Washington P, 1997.
- Chung, Hilary (ed.). *In the Party Spirit. Socialist Realism and Literary Practice in the Soviet Union, East Germany and China*. (Critical Studies, 6). Amsterdam, Atlanta/GA: Rodopi, 1996.
- Clare, Janet. *'Art Made Tongue-Tied by Authority'. Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990.
- Coetzee, J. M. *Giving Offense. Essays on Censorship*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
- Copp, David / Susan Wendell (eds.). *Pornography and Censorship*. London: Prometheus Books, 1982.
- Curry, Richard O. (ed.). *Freedom at Risk. Secrecy, Censorship, and Repression in the 1980s*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1988.

- 'Das war ein Vorspiel nur ...'. *Bücherverbrennung Deutschland 1933: Voraussetzungen und Folgen*. Ausstellung der Akademie der Künste vom 8. Mai bis 3. Juli 1983. Berlin, Vienna: Medusa, 1983.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*. London: HarperCollins, 1996.
- Dollimore, Jonathan. *Sex, Literature and Censorship*. Cambridge: Polity, 2001.
- Dutton, Richard. *Mastering the Revels. The Regulations and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
- Emmerich, Wolfgang. *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*. Revised, 2nd ed. Leipzig: Kiepenheuer, 1997.
- Fish, Stanley. "There's No Such Thing as Free Speech, and it's a Good Thing Too". *Debating P.C. The Controversy over Political Correctness on College Campuses*. New York: Bantam, 1992. 231–245.
- Foucault, Michel. *Histoire de la sexualité*. Vol. 1. *La volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1976.
- . *Sexualität und Wahrheit. Der Wille zum Wissen*. Vol. 1. (Suhrkamp taschenbuch wissenschaft 716). Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1998 [1977].
- Freud, Sigmund. *Die Traumdeutung*. [1900]. 8th ed. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1998.
- Gersmann, Gudrun / Christiane Schroeder. "Zensur, Zensoren und Zensierte im Ancien Régime". *'Unmoralisch an sich ...' Zensur im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. Eds. Herbert G. Göpfert / Erdmann Weyrauch. (Wolfenbütteler Schriften zur Geschichte des Buchwesens 13). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988. 119–148.
- Green, Jonathan. *The Encyclopedia of Censorship*. New York: Facts on File, 1990.
- Grübel, Rainer. "Wert, Kanon und Zensur". *Grundzüge der Literaturwissenschaft*. Eds. Heinz Ludwig Arnold / Heinrich Detering. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1999. 601–622.
- Günther, Hans. "Die Lebensphasen eines Kanons – am Beispiel des sozialistischen Realismus". *Kanon und Zensur. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation II*. Eds. Jan and Aleida Assmann. Munich: Fink, 1987. 138–148.
- Guggenbühl, Christoph. *Zensur und Pressefreiheit. Kommunikationskontrolle in Zürich an der Wende zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Zürich: Chronos, 1996.

- Hearn, Kirsten. "Exclusion is Censorship". *Feminism and Censorship. The Current Debate*. Eds. Gail Chester / Julianne Dickey Bridport, Dorset: Prism P, 1988. 212–217.
- Hentoff, Nat. *Free Speech for Me – But Not for Thee. How the Left and Right Censor Each Other*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Herminghouse, Patricia A.. "Literature as 'Ersatzöffentlichkeit'? Censorship and the Displacement of Public Discourse in the GDR". *German Studies Review* 17 (1994): 85–99.
- Hoffmann, Frank. *Intellectual Freedom and Censorship. An Annotated Bibliography*. Metuchen, NJ; London: Scarecrow, 1989.
- Holquist, Michael. "Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship". *PMLA* 109.1 (1994): 14–25.
- Hurwitz, Leon. *Historical Dictionary of Censorship in the United States*. Westport, CN: Greenwood, 1985.
- Hyland, Paul / Neil Sammells (eds.). *Writing and Censorship in Britain*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Jansen, Sue Curry. *Censorship. The Knot that Binds Power and Knowledge*. Oxford: OUP, 1991 [1988].
- Jones, Derek (ed.). *Censorship. A World Encyclopedia*. 4 vols. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2001.
- Kanzog, Klaus. "Zensur, literarische". *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. Eds. Klaus Kanzog / Achim Masser. 2nd ed. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1984. Vol. 4: 998–1049.
- Kogel, Jörg-Dieter (ed.). *Schriftsteller vor Gericht. Verfolgte Literatur aus vier Jahrhunderten*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1996.
- Kramer, Karen Ruoff. "Representations of Work in the Forbidden DEFA Films of 1965". *DEFA. East German Cinema, 1946–1992*. Eds. Seán Allan / John Sandford. New York, Oxford: Berghahn, 1999. 131–145.
- Labeledz, Leopold (ed.). *Solzhenitsyn. A Documentary Record*. 2nd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
- Levine, Michael G. *Writing Through Repression. Literature, Censorship, Psychoanalysis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994.
- Loseff, Lev. *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. (Arbeiten und Texte zur Slavistik 31). Munich: Otto Sagner, 1984.
- McCarthy, John A. / Werner von der Ohe (eds.): *Zensur und Kultur. Zwischen Weimarer Klassik und Weimarer Republik*. (Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur 51) Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1995.

- Mix, York-Gothart. 'Ein Oberkunze darf nicht vorkommen'. *Materialien zur Publikationsgeschichte und Zensur des Hinze-Kunze-Romans von Volker Braun*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993.
- Müller, Beate. "Spannung durch Zensur. Zur Phänomenologie eines Motivs der Gegenwartsprosa in Ost und West". *Spannung. Studien zur englischsprachigen Literatur. Für Ulrich Suerbaum zum 75. Geburtstag*. Eds. Raimund Borgmeier / Peter Wenzel. Trier: WVT, 2001. 213–233.
- (ed.). *Zensur im modernen deutschen Kulturraum*. (Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur 94) Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003.
- Otto, Ulla. *Die literarische Zensur als Problem der Soziologie der Politik*. (Bonner Beiträge zur Soziologie 3). Stuttgart: Enke, 1968.
- Parkes, Adam. *Modernism and the Theater of Censorship*. New York, Oxford: OUP, 1996.
- Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität". *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Eds. Ulrich Broich / Manfred Pfister. (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 35). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1985. 1–30.
- Plachta, Bodo. *Damnatur – Toleratur – Admittitur. Studien und Dokumente zur literarischen Zensur im 18. Jahrhundert*. (Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur 43). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation. The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.
- . *Fables of Power. Aesopian Writing and Political History*. Durham, London: Duke UP, 1991.
- . *Reading Between the Lines*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Post, Robert C. "Censorship and Silencing". *Censorship and Silencing. Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 1998. 1–12.
- Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing. Royalist Literature, 1641–1660*. Cambridge: CUP, 1989.
- Ridder, Helmut K. J.. "Bemerkungen eines Juristen zum Zensurproblem". *Zensur und Selbstzensur in der Literatur*. Eds. Peter Brockmeier / Gerhard R. Kaiser. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1996. 5–24.
- Robertson, James C. *The Hidden Cinema. British Film Censorship in Action, 1913–1972*. New York, London: Routledge, 1989.
- Roggemann, Herwig. *Die DDR-Verfassungen. Einführung in das Verfassungsrecht der DDR. Grundlagen und neuere Entwicklung*. (Die

- Gesetzgebung der sozialistischen Staaten 7). 4th ed. Berlin: Berlin Verlag Arno Spitz, 1989.
- Rosenfeld, Sophia. "Writing the History of Censorship in the Age of Enlightenment." *Postmodernism and the Enlightenment: New Perspectives in 18th Century French Intellectual History*. Ed. Daniel Gordon. London: Routledge, 2001. 217–145.
- Ross, Andrew. "The Fine Art of Regulation." *The Phantom Public Sphere*. Ed. Bruce Robbins. (Cultural Politics 5). Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 1993. 257–268.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. "On the Why, What and How of Generic Taxonomy". *Poetics* 10 (1981): 109–126.
- Schauer, Frederick. "The Ontology of Censorship". *Censorship and Silencing. Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute, 1998. 147–168.
- Silberman, Marc. "Problematizing the 'Socialist Public Sphere'. Concepts and Consequences". *What Remains? East German Culture and the Postwar Public*. Ed. Marc Silberman. Washington: AICGS, 1997. 1–37.
- Stephens, John Russell. *The Censorship of English Drama, 1824–1901*. New York, Cambridge: CUP, 1980.
- Thietz, Kirsten. "Zwischen Auftrag und Eigensinn. Der Hinstorff Verlag in den 60er und 70er Jahren". *LiteraturGesellschaft DDR. Kanonkämpfe und ihre Geschichte(n)*. Eds. Birgit Dahlke / Martina Langermann / Thomas Taterka. Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 2000. 240–274.
- Wallace, Ian. "The Politics of Confrontation. The Biermann Affair and its Consequences". *Geist und Macht. Writers and the State in the GDR*. Eds. Axel Goodbody / Dennis Tate. (German Monitor 29). Amsterdam, Atlanta / GA: Rodopi, 1992. 68–80.
- Walther, Joachim. "Der fünfte Zensor – das MfS als letzte Instanz". *Zensur im modernen deutschen Kulturraum*. Ed. Beate Müller. (Studien und Texte zur Sozialgeschichte der Literatur 94). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003. 131–147.
- Wichner, Ernst / Herbert Wiesner (eds.). *Zensur in der DDR. Geschichte, Praxis und 'Ästhetik' der Behinderung von Literatur. Ausstellungsbuch*. Berlin: Literaturhaus Berlin, 1991.
- Wurm, Carsten. *Jeden Tag ein Buch. 50 Jahre Aufbau-Verlag, 1945–1995*. Berlin: Aufbau, 1995.

This page intentionally left blank

PREACHING AND PLAYING AT PAUL'S: THE PURITANS, *THE PURITAINE*, AND THE CLOSURE OF PAUL'S PLAYHOUSE

Enno Ruge

Literary historians have linked the unexplained closure of Paul's playhouse and the disappearance of the company of boy actors known as the Children of Paul's to a public complaint made by the Puritan preacher W. Crashaw about the anti-puritan satire *The Puritaine* in a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1607. This paper aims to explore whether Crashaw's urging the magistrates to act could have led to an intervention of the authorities. Given the absence of a pervasive and repressive system of censorship and control of stage-plays in Early Modern England and in view of recent theories of censorship, the controversy about *The Puritaine* is examined as part of a struggle over discursive power characteristic of the politics and culture of the time. The play is shown to reflect and comment on the history of this struggle as well as the uneasy coexistence of players and puritans throughout London. It appears, however, that Paul's Boys were silenced neither through repression nor defamatory discourse but through market forces.

In the Hollywood movie *Shakespeare in Love* we see Edmund Tilney, Her Majesty's Master of the Revels, regulator and censor of the drama, marching grim-faced, accompanied by a heavily armed band of militia-men, towards The Curtain to stop the first performance of Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*. He has been tipped off that the players are seriously offending against a regulation for the theatre by bringing a woman on the stage. Tilney is determined to close the place and arrest the culprits. In a film that marvelously combines accurate historical detail with imagination, the Master of the Revels' military intervention certainly belongs to the latter. Not even those critics who regard the Master as the powerful agent of Tudor and Stuart despotism suggest that Tilney or his successors ever appeared in person at a playhouse to silence unruly players by force of arms. His responsibilities did not include the closing of playhouses and the prosecution of offenders. As a censor, the Master of the Revels was responsible for the playscripts which he read and licensed for the stage, sometimes after ordering alterations. The practice of licensing plays, however, was not part of a coherent system of pervasive and repressive government control apprehended by playwrights

and playing companies, as Richard Dutton and others have shown.¹ In addition to patents given to acting companies,² the system of licensing "offered a further measure of protection to the actors and their playwrights" against their numerous enemies, "rather than one of repression."³ According to Dutton, "(t)he position of the Master of the Revels, jealously protecting court privileges as much as he sought to suppress 'dangerous matter,' made him as much a friend of the actors as their overlord."⁴ For Dutton it is even clear that the censor "played a part in fostering the unique vitality of the drama of the period. His 'allowance' made for a range and complexity of expression on the social, political and even religious issues of the day that was remarkable, given the pressures on all sides to enforce conformity or repress comment altogether."⁵ It appears that the suppression of "dangerous matter" in a playscript rarely had any consequences for the companies or the playwrights responsible.⁶ That this was different when a performance caused offence is indicated by several documents of control: players and playwrights were questioned before the Privy Council, imprisoned, threatened with mutilation, and orders were even given to close playhouses. No severe punishments were carried out, however; the playwrights were soon let off the hook and the players were allowed to continue playing.⁷ When orders to close theatres were enforced it was usually because of the plague or a death in the royal family.⁸

¹See e. g. Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 248; see also Dutton, "Censorship"; Dutton, *Buggeswords: Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship*; Burt, *Licensed by Authority*; Finkelppearl, "'The Comedians' Liberty'" and Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*. For a contrasting view see e. g. Wickham, *Early English Stages*, II, 1, p. 94; Clare, 'Art made tongue-tied by authority'. See also Hadfield (ed.), *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*.

²See e. g. the patent given to Leicester's Men in 1574 where the Master of the Revels' "seeing and allowing" of plays is mentioned for the first time. Cf. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, p. 87–88.

³Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 32.

⁴Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 248. Moreover, the fees the companies had to pay in order to obtain a license were a major source of income for the Master.

⁵Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 248.

⁶For possible exceptions see Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 164f.

⁷See e. g. Leeds Barroll's discussion of the performance of Shakespeare's *Richard II* on the eve of the Essex rebellion in his "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time"; on *Eastward Ho!* see Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 171–179; on *The Isle of Dogs* Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p. 299.

⁸See e. g. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p. 336, 341f.

When actors or playwrights got into trouble it was often as a result of a complaint by a notable person who felt offended by a performance.⁹ Literary historians have linked the closure of Paul's playhouse and the disappearance of the Children of Paul's to a public complaint made by the Puritan preacher William Crashaw about the play *The Puritaine or the Widdow of Watling-streete* in a sermon at Paul's Cross in 1607. Crashaw charged the players and their master with slander and libel of the Puritans living in the parishes adjacent to St. Paul's Cathedral. According to Reavley Gair, "Paul's playhouse ceased operation in mid to late 1608, possibly as a direct consequence of Crashawe's attack."¹⁰ Moreover, Andrew Gurr has recently drawn attention to the fact that shortly before the company's end an officer of the Revels office, Edward Kirkham, joined the management of Paul's Boys, and concluded that the Master of the Revels had a hand in the closure of the playhouse.¹¹ In this paper I shall examine Gair's and Gurr's hypotheses. Did Paul's Boys really go too far this time, and what made *The Puritiane* so particularly offensive? Did Crashaw's sermon really lead to Tilney's order to his agent Kirkham to wind up the place or at least to "an offical warning"?¹² Does the end of Paul's Boys mark a significant change in the long Puritan campaign against the stage, anticipating the "victory" of the Puritans?¹³ I am particularly interested in the coexistence of the Puritans and the players in the centre of London in view of the traditional Puritan hostility towards the stage. It is also worthwhile to examine the attitude towards censorship of a group whose members regarded themselves as moral censors of society and whose clergy was under constant pressure to conform, pressure that included censorship.

Given the absence of a pervasive and repressive system of censorship and control of stage-plays in Early Modern England we will need to turn to a more comprehensive concept of censorship in order to address the questions posed above. Proponents of the "New Censorship" such as Richard Burt challenge the traditional assumptions that in Early Modern

⁹See e. g. the affair of Thomas Middleton's *A Game at Chess* in 1624, the performances of which were stopped after the Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, complained. Cf. Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 237–246.

¹⁰*The Children of Paul's*, p. 173.

¹¹*The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 344f.

¹²Gair, *The Children of Paul's*, p. 167.

¹³See Gildersleeve, *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*, p. 3, and Wilson, "The Puritan Attack upon the Stage", p. 408.

England censorship was always confined to authorities such as the court, that it was invariably repressive, and that "authors and critics" always "desired to evade court censorship, never to be its agents."¹⁴ Burt proposes "instead that we think of censorship broadly as a mechanism for legitimating and delegitimizing" discourses or "access to discourse."¹⁵ This means that for him any criticism, including literary criticism, is a form of censorship different only in degree from repressive state control. In our case, then, both the Puritans' attack on the stage and the ridiculing of the Puritans from the stage could be regarded as censorship. In their power struggle each group tries to delegitimize the other's discourse. The question remains, however, to what extent, if any, this struggle over discursive power – which could, with Bourdieu, be referred to as "structural censorship"¹⁶ – can be related to concrete measures of official censorship taken against the antagonists by the authorities while avoiding 'post-modern' relativism.¹⁷ M. Lindsay Kaplan suggests "that we need to situate our examination of state control of poetry within th(e) larger context of language that transgresses the law":¹⁸

While defining a legitimate means of official response to transgressive language, censorship is nevertheless a subcategory of the laws and responses to defamation; as a focus it assumes a very restricted legal, social and political role for literature. When we understand, as contemporaries did, censorship and literature itself in their larger cultural contexts, we can see their participation in the processes of defamatory discourse.¹⁹

¹⁴Burt, *Licensed by Authority*, p. 2–3, 12. See also his "(Un)Censoring in Detail", p. 17–41.

¹⁵Burt, *Licensed by Authority*, p. 12.

¹⁶See Bourdieu, "Censorship and the Imposition of Form", p. 138: "The metaphor of censorship should not mislead: it is the structure of the [discursive] field itself which governs expression by governing both access to expression and the form of expression and not some legal proceeding which has been specially adapted to designate and repress the transgression of a kind of linguistic code."

¹⁷The new scholarship of censorship has been rightly criticized for playing down the impacts of concrete repressive censorship. Like Foucault and Bourdieu, whose works form its theoretical foundation, the New Censorship is said to "veer between the concrete measures of silencing and the abstraction of struggle. The result seems to flatten distinctions among kinds of power, implicitly equating suppression of speech caused by legal action with that caused by the market, or by the dominance of a particular discourse, or by the institution of criticism itself." Post, "Censorship and Silencing", p. 4. Interestingly, several essays in Andrew Hadfield's recent collection *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* focus on actual cases of suppression.

¹⁸Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander*, p. 1.

¹⁹Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander*, p. 2.

We will see that to regard the controversy over Paul's Boys and *The Puritaine* as an episode in the cultural history of defamation in Early Modern England helps to understand it as "a struggle to determine which institution [or group] would have control over dramatic defamation", the state, the theatre or the Puritans, a struggle, however, that could hardly be 'won', since "slander is by nature unstable and draws its power from the inaccessibility of truth and the indeterminacy of language."²⁰

Any scholar concerned with censorship of drama in Elizabethan and Jacobean England will invariably have to say something about the two leading companies of boy actors, even though the period in which the boys seriously competed with the adult companies is relatively short.²¹ These boy companies, usually referred to by the names of the sites of their playhouses as the Blackfriars Children and Paul's Boys, are a necessary part of any discussion of repression. One side-effect of the recent critical interest in censorship of drama in Early Modern England is that we have once more been reminded that a number of well-known plays of the first decade of the 17th century were originally written for and performed by child actors. It cannot be mere coincidence that these children are associated with several of the severest incidents of repression of Early Modern drama. Even though it is unlikely that they found it any easier to evade censorship by the Master of the Revels and thus bring offensive matter on the stage that would normally not have got past him,²² they certainly tested the limits of tolerance more than the adult companies. The repertoires of the two boy companies consisted largely of satires, and offence lies in the nature of this genre. The second Blackfriars Children in particular made satire their speciality, doubtlessly because a certain notoriety promised to draw large audiences.²³ In their case,

²⁰Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander*, p. 93, 92.

²¹After several years of inactivity both companies were revived around 1600. Paul's Boys began to decline around 1606, the Blackfriars Children after 1608 when they had to leave the Blackfriars Theatre. On the boy companies see Hildebrand, *The Child Actors*; Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse*, p. 130–210; Shapiro, *Children of the Revels*; and Gair, *The Children of Paul's*.

²²Gurr suggests that the special status of the theatres as "private" playhouses on anomalous precincts exempted the boy companies not only from the jurisdiction of the city but also, at least for a time, from the control of the Master of the Revels. See Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 337–338. According to Dutton, however, the revived boy companies were subject to Tilney's authority from the beginning. Dutton, "Censorship", p. 296.

²³The aggressive competitiveness of the Blackfriars Children is alluded to in *Hamlet*, 2, 2.

it also attracted the attention of the authorities. Between 1604 and 1608 alone the Blackfriars company got into serious trouble on five occasions. In 1604 Samuel Daniels was called before the Privy Council, because his tragedy *Philotas* was seen as a play about the Essex rebellion, then still a serious matter of state. As a consequence, the boys lost their recently acquired status of members of Queen Anne's household and with it the right to play under the prestigious name of the Children of the Queen's Revels. (They called themselves Children of the Revels afterwards.) Samuel Daniels, the Queen's favourite poet, lost the profitable position of the company's exclusive licenser of plays.²⁴ In the following year, two plays aroused the Privy Council's anger, because they satirized the new King's Scottish followers. Two of the authors of *Eastward Ho!*, Jonson and Chapman, were imprisoned; the third, Marston, fled. John Day, the playwright of the *Isle of Gulls*, was questioned before the Privy Council, and may have been imprisoned.²⁵ Finally, Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, and a lost satire known as the "Scottish Mines play" offended the French ambassador, whose complaint enraged King James so much that he is reported to have "vowed they [the children] should never play more, but should first begg their bred."²⁶

It is typical of the state control of the drama of the period that these theatre scandals had no severe consequences for the Blackfriars Children, who, despite the King's dictum, continued operating after 1608 and even performed three times at court.²⁷ They lost the profitable lease of the Blackfriars playhouse, however, possibly as a consequence of the "Scottish Mines" affair. Although ultimately no-one was punished, the series of scandals made it clear that the "rayling"-plays seriously endangered the relative freedom the theatre enjoyed. In his *Apology for Actors*, the playwright Thomas Heywood deplors "some abuse lately crept into the quality, an inveighing against the state, the court, the law, the citty, and their governements, with the particularizing of private men's humors (yet alive) noble-men, and others." He disapproves of the "liberty which some arrogate to themselves, committing their bitterness, and liberall invectives against all estates, to the mouthes of children, supposing their juniority to be a

²⁴See Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 350.

²⁵See Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 179, Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 351.

²⁶Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, p. 53–54.

²⁷Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 188.

priviledge for any rayling". Worried about his own future as a dramatist, Heywood appeals to "wise and judicial censors, before whom such complaints shall at any time hereafter come" not to "impute these abuses to any transgression in us, who have been carefull and provident to shun the like".²⁸

Although according to Andrew Gurr the second Paul's Boys "always had a concern for respectability" and their plays "never gave much cause for alarm or offence,"²⁹ Heywood's definition of "rayling" could still be applied to those of their plays which satirized "private men's humours," even though they found their victims not at court but in the neighbourhood. If the name of the Children of Paul's invariably crops up in the context of censorship of drama in Renaissance England, however, it is because of the first Paul's Boys company. When in 1590 all theatrical activities at Paul's playhouse came to a halt for almost a decade, it was probably because of the company's involvement in the Martin Marprelate controversy. In this spectacular pamphlet war that took place between 1588 and 1590 a group of Puritan satirists under the pseudonym of Martin Marprelate vigorously attacked the English bishops as "pettie popes" and "anti-christs."³⁰ Although the church authorities acted immediately it proved difficult to seize the authors and their printing press. Probably commissioned by the bishops, several satirists started to counterattack the infamous Martin with pamphlets of their own, among others Thomas Nashe and John Lyly, then also Master and playwright of Paul's Boys. It appears that at some point the theatre joined the anti-Martinist campaign, although there are no extant plays, and no titles are known. The theatrical campaign was stopped soon after it had begun, when in 1589 the Master of the Revels refused to license a series of new plays. John Lyly pleaded that "these comedies might be allowed to be plaid that are pend" in the conviction that Martin would thus "be decyphered, and so perhaps discouraged."³¹ The reason for the ban can only be guessed at; perhaps it was felt that the plays would only exacerbate an already tense

²⁸Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p. 233f. According to Chambers the *Apology* was probably written in 1607 or 1608.

²⁹Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 339.

³⁰Cf. Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, 74–79; Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, p. 62–79; Lake / Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, p. 509–538.

³¹Lyly, *Pappe with an Hatchet*, p. 408.

situation.³² In any case, Tilney alerted the Privy Council, which forbade all performances in the city and set up a new commission of censorship. Two men appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the mayor of London were to assist the Master of the Revels in the business of reading and licensing plays. According to their directions, these men were to

consider of the matters of their [the playing companies'] comedyes and tragedyes, and thereupon to strike oute or reform such partes and matters as they shall fynd unfytt and undecent to be handled in playes, bothe for Divinitie and State, comaunding the said companies of players, in her Majesties name, that they forbear to present and playe publickly anie comedy or tragedy other then suche as they three shall have seene and allowed, which if they shall not observe, they shall then knowe from their Lordships that they shalbe not onely severely punished, but made [in]capable of the exercise of their profession forever hereafter.³³

The potential threat of this commission was extraordinary; it was, after all, the first time that the three authorities responsible for censorship had joined forces. The relatively lenient regulator of the London theatres, who nevertheless represented royal authority, was to collaborate with the London City Council, traditionally hostile to the playing companies,³⁴ and with representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, at that time still responsible for the licensing of printed texts, including playtexts, and known for his uncompromising suppression of seditious writings by recusants and Presbyterians alike. The directions to the commission can thus be read as an attempt to establish a system of total censorship of the London theatres. It might be expected that this marked the beginning of a period of hardship for companies, playwrights and booksellers alike, but as Dutton laconically remarks: "In fact, nothing of the sort happened. This is the first and last we hear of the commission."³⁵ It is nevertheless possible that members of the commission were involved in the first closure of Paul's playhouse, which ceased to operate sometime in 1590. Although quite in accordance with the censorship commission's directions, the dissolution of the Children of Paul's would have been an unusually severe measure,

³²Even if the precise circumstances of the affair are not known, the controversy over the anti-Martin plays supports Kaplan's argument that the state employed slander, too, and that the transgressive language tended to elude its control and become a threat to public order. See Kaplan, *The Culture of Slander*, p. 17, 110.

³³Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, IV, p. 306–307.

³⁴Dutton, "Censorship", p. 294–295.

³⁵Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 78.

considering that the other company involved in the anti-Martinist propaganda, the adult players at The Theatre, were allowed to continue.³⁶ The Children of Paul's were probably not officially closed by the censorship commission, but it is possible, I believe, that what was judged by commission members to be "unfyt and undecent" material in one of Lyly's anti-Martinist satires cost them the favour of the Crown and that the loss of their frequent lucrative appearances at court forced the company out of business.

If we accept the theory that the first Paul's Boys were dissolved because they performed satirical plays ridiculing Puritans, and recall that one of the last plays the second Paul's Boys put on stage before they disappeared forever was also a satire on Puritans, it is tempting to think that what we have here is a case of history repeating itself. We will see that there are indeed significant connections and parallels between the two controversies over Paul's plays. Even though the case for official censorship is much weaker as concerns the second closure, a considerable deal of censorial pressure was exerted around Paul's Church at the time.

Several studies of Renaissance Theatre which take a historical approach place emphasis on the concept of social space.³⁷ In his influential work *The Place of the Stage*, Steven Mullaney argues that the "marginal" situation of the great open-air, "public" theatres in the liberties afforded playwrights and players a great amount of freedom, since they were outside of the City Council's jurisdiction, along with a special critical power, "an uncanny ability to tease out and represent the contradictions of a culture it [the drama] both belonged to and was, to a certain extent, alienated from."³⁸ Popular drama achieved "an ideological liberty of its own" by appropriating "a tradition of cultural license that had always reigned the liberties, but whose subversive potential had remained latent, to an extent mystified or obscured by the ceremonial needs and pretensions of the community."³⁹ Mullaney's claim for the subversive or at least disturbing power of the theatre and his dichotomy of London into two distinct cultural spaces has been challenged on the grounds that all London theatres were part of an Early Modern English

³⁶Dutton, *Mastering the Revels*, p. 76

³⁷See for example the collection *The Theatrical City: Culture*, ed. Smith / Strier / David Bevington.

³⁸Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage*, p.1.

³⁹Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage*, p. 9, 47.

entertainment industry.⁴⁰ As predominantly private businesses, places of commercial exchange, run according to the rules and forces of the market, the public theatres in the liberties around London never enjoyed an "ideological liberty of their own". Their "subversive potential" was at best as "latent" as that of the traditional festive spectacles of "incontinent rule" and limited (and conditioned) by the market. Douglas Bruster posits

that the theaters of Renaissance England (public and private alike) were both responsive and responsible to the desires of their playgoing publics, and were potentially no more marginal a part of London than their publics demanded. Places of business, they regularized and normalized carnival. And although the commercial in no way precludes the marginal or actively ideological, it seems undeniable that in Renaissance London the profit motive claimed a great, even predominant measure of the theaters' practical energy.⁴¹

It is remarkable that none of these critics has much to say about the private indoor playhouses right in the centre of London where the boy actors enjoyed great popularity. For Mullaney they were more an "afterthought than [...] a focus of London's concern."⁴² But they were certainly more than an afterthought of the Court's concern, considering the five repressive actions against the Children of the Revels. Mullaney's claim that the boy companies obviously preferred "contained form(s) of social criticism"⁴³ is hardly convincing. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe the London magistrate and Puritans thought differently about the intramural playhouses than about those outside the city walls. I do not agree with those critics of Mullaney, however, who consider the place of the stage as more or less insignificant.⁴⁴ It is unlikely that the social and cultural spaces where the playhouses of Blackfriars and Paul's were located were totally insignificant factors in their success or notoriety respectively.

The exact location of Paul's playhouse is not known. According to Reavley Gair the theatre was in a private building in the north-west corner of the Chapter House precinct of St. Paul's Cathedral.⁴⁵ Whatever its precise

⁴⁰For criticism of Mullaney see Bruster, *Drama and the Market*, p. 9–10; for a refutation of the idea that the public theatres were powerful centres of ideological critique see Yachnin, "The Powerless Theatre".

⁴¹Bruster, *Drama and the Market*, p. 10.

⁴²Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage*, p. 53.

⁴³Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage*, p. 53.

⁴⁴Bruster, *Drama and the Market*, p. 10.

⁴⁵Gair, *The Children of Paul's*, p. 20, 44–55.

location, it was definitely within the liberty of the Cathedral, exempt from the city's jurisdiction and apparently tolerated by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's. The boys remained choir boys and combined acting with singing; the Master of the Choristers served as the company's manager. Apart from that, there seems to have been no connection between the company and the church. Nothing is known about the Chapter's attitude towards the playing. One wonders why the Church of England had no objection to a commercial playhouse so closely linked with St. Paul's, after all its most important church and the most conspicuous landmark in London. It appears that in Tudor and Stuart London Paul's Church, rapidly dilapidating after the fire of 1561 in which it lost its steeple, was a symbol of many things but very probably not of the authority of the Church of England or its high moral standards. In fact, it had the reputation of being one of London's most notorious meeting places. According to the famous passage from Thomas Dekker's "Paul's Steeples Complaint," you could see

the Knight, the Gull, the Gallant, the upstart, the Gentleman, the Clowne, the Captaine, the Appel-squire, the Lawyer, the Usurer, the Cittizen, the Bankerout, the Scholler, the Begger, the Doctor, the Ideot, the Ruffian, the Cheater, the Puritan, the Cut-throat, the Hye-men, the Low-men, the True-man and the Thiefe: of all trades & professions some, of all Countreyes some [...].⁴⁶

It was a centre of cultural as well as commercial exchange. According to Gair, the "Cathedral, then, functioned as an Elizabethan version of an indoor shopping-mall."⁴⁷ Paul's Church was also a literary market place. There was a long row of book shops in the churchyard; writers frequented the church to do business there with publishers and booksellers and to offer their services. According to Thomas Nashe it was an "Exchange of all authors,"⁴⁸ free-lance writers like Nashe, Lyly, Robert Greene, Thomas Lodge, George Peele in the 1580s and 90s, pamphleteers like Dekker and Thomas Middleton in the early years of the 17th century; some of whom, of course, also wrote plays for Paul's Boys. All attempts of the City and Church authorities to curb the disorderly goings-on at Paul's Church failed.⁴⁹

While the Cathedral was becoming a symbol of the diminishing authority of the Church of England, a new institution of moral authority was

⁴⁶Thomas Dekker, *The Dead Tearme*, p. 51.

⁴⁷Gair, *The Children of Paul's*, p. 31.

⁴⁸Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, p. 42.

⁴⁹See Gair, *The Children of Paul's*, p. 32–33.

emerging nearby: the sermons held at Paul's Cross, situated in the north-east corner of the churchyard, diagonally opposite the playhouse. It was from there that the unruly hustle and bustle in and around the Church was relentlessly criticized, as more and more ardent reformers gained access to what used to be known as the "Bishop of London's 'chair'"⁵⁰ to preach their moral censure to the fallen city. In 1612 Thomas Adams fulminated against

men and women, whose whole employment is to go from their beds to the taphouse, then to the playhouse, where they make a match for the brothel house, and from thence to bed again. To omit those ambulatory Christians, that wear out the pavement of this great temple with their feet, but scarce ever touch the stones of it with their knees; that are never further from God than when they are nearest the church.⁵¹

The scene at Paul's Church and the playhouse in particular epitomized every sin the preachers so relentlessly condemned in their homilies: fashionable clothing, make-up, gluttony and drunkenness, mocking, swearing and blasphemy, usury, adultery, and murder. Not surprisingly, the pulpit of Paul's Cross was one of the centres of the anti-theatrical campaign that accompanied the greatest period of English drama from its beginnings in the 1570s to the closure of the playhouses in 1642. It was from there that one T. W. in 1577 presented a notorious example of Puritan logic:

Looke but uppon the common playes played in London, and see the multitude that flocketh to them and followeth them; beholde the sumptuous Theatre houses, a continual monument of Londons prodigalitie and folly. But I understande they are nowe forbidden bycause of the plague, I like the pollicye well if it holde still, for a disease is but bodged or patched up that is not cured in the cause, and the cause of plagues is sinne, if you looke to it well: and the cause of sinne are playes: therefore the cause of plagues are playes.⁵²

Ironically, the Paul's Cross sermons had something of the theatrical spectacle themselves. "If we look at the scene as a whole, it reminds us of the Elizabethan theatre: groundlings and notables, pit and galleries, and, in the midst, the pulpit as stage. Indeed, it was a theatre [...]."⁵³ A Paul's Cross sermon lasted about two hours, the average length of a play. The spectators flocked to the pulpit to hear the preacher melodramatically describe drastic

⁵⁰Mclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, p. 168.

⁵¹Mclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, p. 126, 233.

⁵²T. W., *sermon preached at Paul's Cross*, sig. C7^v–C8^r.

⁵³Mclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, p. 4. See also p. 166.

examples of sin. Preachers and players competed for the attention of audiences.⁵⁴ It is no surprise, therefore, that the preachers were outraged when writers like Heywood and Ben Jonson suggested that the stage could also serve as a platform of moral instruction:

The licentious Poet and Player together are growne to such impudence, as with shameless Shemai, they teach Nobilitie, Knighthood, grave Matrons & civill citizens, and like Countrey dogs snatch at everie passengers heeles, Yea, Playes are growne now adaies into such high request (*Horresco referens*) as that some prophane persons affirme, they can learne as much both for example and edifying at a Play, as at a sermon. *O tempora, O mores* ... To compare a lascivious Stage to this sacred Pulpit and oracle of truth? To compare a silken counterfeit to a Prophet, to Gods Angell, to his Minister, to the distributor of Gods heavenly mysteries? And to compare the idle and scurrile invention of an illiterate bricklayer to the holy, pure, and powerfull word of God, which is the foode of our soules to eternall salvation?⁵⁵

There was a group of regulars at the sermons who did not have to be reminded that playhouses were better avoided: citizens from the neighbouring parishes, easily recognizable as Puritans.⁵⁶ It was a group regularly ridiculed in the comic stock-figure of the stage-Puritan that could be seen on the stage of Paul's playhouse and elsewhere, whose most famous specimen is, of course, Jonson's *Zeal-of-the-land Busy*. In 1616 Samuel Ward assured the brethren in the audience at the Cross that the satirists would have to answer for this one day:

As for the players, and jesters, and rhymers, & all that rabblement, tell them, thou wilt one day be in earnest with them, and though thou suffer them to persecute thee upon their stages, and shew their wit, and break their jests on thee now thou wilt owe it to them, till they come upon the great stage, before God and all the world.⁵⁷

It might be expected that more preachers like Ward would exploit the public ridiculing of local Puritans to illustrate the dangerous licentiousness of the players. Most anti-theatrical tracts and sermons, however, merely reiterated

⁵⁴Cf. Rozett, *The Doctrine of Election*, p. 19. See also Knapp, "Preachers and Players in Shakespeare's England", p. 29–32.

⁵⁵Robert Milles, *Abrahams Sute for Sodome* (1612). As quoted in Mclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, p. 140. The bricklayer is obviously Ben Jonson.

⁵⁶For an example of the attitude of Puritan citizens to theatres in their vicinity see Pritchard, "Puritans and the Blackfriars Theatre", p. 92–95.

⁵⁷Mclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, 138.

the "old stale argument(s) against the players"⁵⁸ such as the prohibition against men wearing women's garments from Deuteronomy. William Crashaw's sermon preached at the Cross on 14 February 1607 is one of the rare exceptions, not because it could do without the standard arguments against stage-plays (it could not) but because it identified not only the acting company but also a particular play by discussing two of its characters:

Two hypocrites must be brought forth; and how shall they be described but by these names, *Nicolas S. Antlings*, *Simon S. Maryoueries*? Thus hypocrisie a child of hell must bear the names of two Churches of God, and two wherin Gods name is called on publicly euery day in the yeere, and in one of them his blessed word preached euerie day [...]; yet these two, wherin Gods name is thus glorified, and our Church and State honoured shall bee by these miscreants thus dishonoured, and that not on the stage only, but euen in print. Oh what times are wee cast into, that such wickednesse should passe unpunished!⁵⁹

It is not least because of this unusual specification that critics have attributed special censorial power to this sermon. As we have seen, all anti-theatrical criticism can be regarded as structural censorship, but this one may have resulted in actual repressive measures. Crashaw's appeal to "that Magistrate, who [...] takes some iust vengeance on that publike dishonour laid upon our Churches"⁶⁰ may not have fallen on deaf ears. Just what was it that so infuriated Crashaw about this play that he took this unusual and possibly even daring step?

Certainly, *The Puritaine or the Widdow of Watling Streete* contains enough abuse to make a Puritan mad. The title figure, the Widow Plus, and her brother-in-law, Sir Godfrey, embody the stereotype of the hypocritical Puritan citizen-merchant. While the widow is – apparently sincerely – mourning the recent death of her husband, Sir Godfrey reprimands her for not wanting to follow the example of another "wise" and "lustie" widow who married a usurer immediately after her husband's funeral.⁶¹ The Widow Plus in turn reprimands her son Edmund, because he refuses to mourn his father, "that would deceaue all the world to get riches for thee [...] he that so wisely did quite ouer-throw the right heyre of those lands, which now you respect

⁵⁸Jonson, *Bartholmew Fair*, ll. 5, 5, 92.

⁵⁹*The Sermon preached at the Cross*, sig Y2^v.

⁶⁰Crashaw, *The Sermon preached at the Cross*, sig Y2^r

⁶¹*The Puritaine*, sig. A3^v. All quotations are from this edition..

not" (A3^v). Subsequently, the son is told to remember the father as a model of honesty and virtue. Despite this impressive pragmatism and their knowledge of practices of deception, the Puritans become easy victims for the trickster George Py-bord, the play's villain-hero, and his cronies.

Compared to the Widow Plus and Sir Godfrey, their servants, Nicholas Saint-Tantlings and Simon Saint-Mary-Oueries, the two hypocrites whose names particularly enraged Crashaw, are relatively harmless simple minds. Like children they repeat the moral rules they were taught. When one Corporall Oth tries to provoke them by insulting them as "Puritanicall Scrape-shoes" and showers them with oaths, they stoically refuse to answer with curses of their own because they "shall be soundly whipt for swearing." (B3^r) It is not clear whether their numerous word-plays are intended. Nicholas, for example, asks his fellow servants, Simon and Frailtie, to excuse him at Sir Godfrey's with a lie. When asked whether Puritans may lie, Frailtie answers: "O I, we may lie, but we must not sweare." To which Simon adds: "True, wee may lie with our Neighbors wife, but we must not sweare wee did so." The Puritans do not seem to have problems with unconcealed duplicity. It does not take trickery to persuade Nicholas to assist in getting Captaine Idle, the highwayman, out of Marshalsea Prison; it is simply a matter of choosing the right words. The plan to free the Captain involves stealing Sir Godfrey's gold chain. Nicholas, of course, refuses to do it, since he "must not steale, thats the word the literal, thou shalt not steale". When the sly Py-bord suggests that he would "nim" it from his master, he readily agrees (C1^v). It is irrelevant for him that stealing is illegal and that he has to betray Sir Godfrey, as long as he does not have to offend against the Scripture.

Vituperative as these invectives may be, by the time *The Puritaine* was performed they had become quite conventional. From the beginning a term of abuse, "Puritan" had become synonymous with hypocrite, as is indicated by Corporall Oth's observation "tho he be a Puritaine yet he will be a true man" (C1^v). The hypocritical Puritan had become a stock figure of city comedy, just like the gallant and the usurer.⁶² The historian Patrick Collinson concludes from his analysis of contemporary documents that the over-zealous, righteous, hypocritical, and gullible stage-Puritan was not simply a satirical exaggeration, a caricature of the godly that could be seen in London (let alone a realistic portrait), but a literary stereotype invented by

⁶²For examples see Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*; Myers, *Representations and Misrepresentations*; and Holden, *Anti-Puritan Satire*, p. 101–144.

satirical plays, pamphlets and verse.⁶³ We are reminded that no ardent protestant would have referred to himself as Puritan; he would have felt abused by that term.⁶⁴ For Collinson, the stage-Puritan was invented in the satirical counter-campaign against Martin Marprelate,⁶⁵ – a plausible thesis, considering that many of the characteristic plot elements of the genre of the city comedy en vogue in the first decade of the 17th century were derived from coney-catching pamphlets and other popular satirical writings of the 1580s and 90s,⁶⁶ written by pamphleteers like Nashe – some of whom were also involved in the anti-Martinist campaign. Interestingly, the connection between the satirical pamphlets of the 1580s and 1590s and city comedy is acknowledged in *The Puritaine*. George Py-bord, the villain-hero, is an obvious allusion to George Peele,⁶⁷ one of the university wits whose pamphlets and personal waywardness were so well remembered in Jacobean London that in 1605 a compilation of tricks was entered upon the Stationer's Register under the title of *The Merry Conceited Jestes of George Peele*. It has been noted that two of Py-bord's jests in the *Puritaine* can also be found in this compilation.⁶⁸ Like the real George Peele, Py-bord is a "scholler and a

⁶³Collinson, "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism"; "Ecclesiastical Vitriol".

⁶⁴Collinson's provocative hypothesis is based on the concept of a "Calvinist consensus" in the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean period. "Revisionist" historiographers, of whom Collinson is a major exponent, "find the Church at this stage characterized by an evangelical consensus uniting bishops and Puritans, magistrates and ministers, on the importance of preaching, sabbath observance, Calvinist orthodoxy, and opposition to 'popery'. Historians of his camp now use the term 'puritan' very sparingly in order to convey concord rather than conflict as a hallmark of the Church of England in this era." Todd, "Introduction", *Reformation to Revolution*, p. 2. Collinson intends to demonstrate that those Londoners usually referred to as Puritans were not political, religious, or social outsiders but rather well-integrated citizens, at least until the end of James I's reign. Only gradually, he writes, did the Puritans begin to recognize themselves in the negative stigmatization of satire. "In other words, 'Puritans' in Elizabethan and Jacobean England existed by virtue of being perceived to exist, most of all by their enemies, but eventually to themselves and to each other. Puritanism was more of a process and relationship than it was state or entity." "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism", 158. For an important modification of Collinson's argument see Lake / Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, p. 568–570.

⁶⁵Collinson, "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism", p. 167. Collinson was not the first to advance this argument. See e. g. Adkins, "The Genesis of Dramatic Satire Against the Puritans", p. 81–95.

⁶⁶Cf. Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy*, p. 25–26

⁶⁷"Pie-board" is another word for a "peele", a tool used by bakers. See Maxwell, *Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 118.

⁶⁸Christian, "Middleton's Acquaintance with *The Merrie Conceited Jestes of George Peele*." There is some debate about the date of the jestbook. If the compilation was not published before 1607 (the date of the only extant copy), its fictitious trickster, called George Peele, can hardly have

citizen" (B1^f) from Oxford who makes a living by writing satirical pamphlets and plays and has the reputation of a shifty rogue.⁶⁹ As a playwright, however, Py-bord's favourite victims are the local preachers referred to as "Maister Pigman" and "Maister Ful-bellie" (A3^r, B3^v). He is probably the author of a play that has made the local parson rail "againie Plaiers mightily [...], because they brought him drunck vpp'oth Stage once, – as he will bee horribly druncke." (C2^f) Thus, the fictitious George Py-bord shares with the pamphleteers of the 1580s and 90s not only a "disgust with social and moral corruption and folly,"⁷⁰ but also their enmity towards Puritans.⁷¹ If Collinson is right and the stage-Puritan was invented by Martin's enemies, *The Puritaine* represents not only the ongoing controversy between the Puritans and the stage but also the history of the controversy. To recall the anti-Martinists, however, means reviving the memory of their silencing through official censorship and possibly the end of the first Paul's Boys as well. This could provide an explanation of the much-discussed disappointing ending of the *Puritaine*. After having won the spectators' sympathy by deceiving the duplicitous Puritans and booting out the stupid suitors to the widow and her daughters, Py-bord's trickery is unexpectedly discovered by an anonymous "noble-man" just before he can take his prize, one of the widow's daughters. Even if the gentleman's final moral lecturing of the characters can be seen as the conventional ending of a city comedy,⁷² it is quite unusual for the type of comedy preferred at Paul's to let courtiers have the upper hand in the end.⁷³ It is noteworthy that Py-bord is betrayed by one of his disappointed accomplices. This could indicate a censuring of the villain-hero's arrogance, and, by analogy, of the satirists of the 1580s and

been the model for George Py-bord. This would support my argument that a name suggesting the historical George Peele was chosen to link *The Puritaine* with the pamphleteers of the last two decades of the 16th century. Lawrence Manley points out that the urban pamphleteers haunted Jacobean London as literary "ghosts". *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, p. 328f.

⁶⁹On George Peele see Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, p. 57–58. Peele wrote the morality play *The Arraignment of Paris* (1584) for a boy company.

⁷⁰Gibbons, *Jacobean City Comedy*, p. 25.

⁷¹See Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, 142. Nashe reports that a preacher at Paul's Cross preached against him and Lyly because of their anti-Martinist satires. See *ibid.*, p. 42.

⁷²For Theodore B. Leinwand the ending shows that *The Puritaine* "is city comedy fully complicitous with conservative and unimaginative ideology." *The City Staged*, p. 120. Swapan Chakravorty sees the ending as a "parodic twist". For her "the moral endnote is a fake". *Society and Politics*, p. 63.

⁷³Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 242f.

90s.⁷⁴ It could also indicate a point of contact between the playwright's criticism of satirical plays and that of the Puritans.⁷⁵

It is of course tempting to link such criticism of the trickster and satirical playwright who rails against Puritans to the alleged Puritan connections of Thomas Middleton, usually assumed to be the author of *The Puritaine*. But, the play's final shift remains bad stagecraft. This, together with other striking incoherences,⁷⁶ in my view confirms the belief of some scholars that *The Puritaine* is the work of more than one author.⁷⁷ There can be little doubt that Thomas Middleton, at the time Paul's principal dramatist, had a hand in it, but *The Puritaine* seems to be too little of one piece to be entirely his. This is why I have not entered into discussion of Middleton's "Puritanism."⁷⁸

It is possible that *The Puritaine* reminded Crashaw of the Marprelate Controversy, which had in its time alarmed the authorities with consequences for the Puritans as well as the satirists. It was not only the beginning of the stage Puritan's career, a thorn in the flesh of the godly, but also earned the Puritans the label of religious, and by extension, political opponents, even of seditious libellers.⁷⁹ William Crashaw was a moderate Puritan,⁸⁰ that is to say he considered himself to be one of God's Elect and ardently pleaded for further reform of the English Church and English society according to Scripture, but professed to be loyal to the Church of England and its episcopacy. As a "noted and prolific Puritan"⁸¹ he was nonetheless engaged

⁷⁴Chakravorty (*Society and Politics*, p. 65) stresses that Py-bord is a "declassed" gentleman come down in the world, like the pamphleteers of late Elizabethan London, whose disgust of the Puritan family is based rather on his contempt for social upstarts than on moral principles.

⁷⁵Such a convergence of criticism of satire in the case of Ben Jonson is stressed by Collinson, "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism", p. 167, Marcus, "Of Mire and Authorship", and Diehl, "Disciplining Puritans".

⁷⁶See above all the soliloquy of Edmond, the widow's son, at the end of the first scene where he, in the style of Shakespeare's Edmund, announces his intention to seize the family's fortune. This is the last we hear of his plan, and he ceases to play a major part in the play.

⁷⁷ Cf. Brooke (ed.), *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. xxxi; Maxwell, *Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 133–137; and Leggatt, *Citizen Comedy*, p. 74n.

⁷⁸Not much appears to remain of Margot Heinemann's provocative thesis that Middleton was an "oppositional" dramatist who aligned himself with "parliamentary puritanism". See her *Puritanism and Theatre*; and Bawcutt, "Was Middleton a Puritan Dramatist?"

⁷⁹Nicholl, *A Cup of News*, 63.

⁸⁰See Lake, *Anglicans or Puritans?*, p. 8.

⁸¹ Lamburn, "Politics and Religion", p. 67.

in permanent conflict with the propaganda apparatus of the Church of England, whose greatest success had been the implantation of anti-Puritan prejudices in the minds of many Englishmen in the wake of the Marprelate controversy. After the defeat of the Presbyterian platform, even the moderate Puritan clergy found themselves under pressure to conform. They were attacked with the tested defamatory accusations of hypocrisy, overzealousness and separatism, and, ultimately, political subversion. Lyly observed "that to the rule of the Church, the whole state of the Realme is linckt, & that they filching away Bishop by Bishop, seeke to fish for the Crown, and glew to their newe Church their owne conclusions [...]." ⁸² At the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 King James made it clear that he was prepared to support the bishops' policy. "No Bishop, no King," was his formula. ⁸³ Subsequently, many preachers found themselves in a precarious dilemma; while under permanent pressure to conform, they had to protest their loyalty to the bishops, not least to ensure their preaching license and their living. A prolific writer and a poet (though of poems different from his son Richard's), William Crashaw suffered censorship in 1609 when the Archbishop of Canterbury forced him to retract an "erroneous book". ⁸⁴ In a letter he wrote: "The grief and anger that I should be so malitiously traduced by my lords the byshops (whom I honour) hath made me farr out of temper, and put me into an ague, which in these canicular dayes is dangerouse." At the same time, the moderate Puritans had to fight on a second ideological front. After the Hampton Court Conference, disappointed radicals had left England for the continent to protest from there against the Church, and, in keeping with the nature of such conflicts, to agitate above all against the moderate brethren, who in turn did everything to distance themselves from the separatists. It is in this context that Crashaw made a statement to the authorities about what he knew about "the discovery of y^t damnable libell y^e

⁸²Lyly, *Pappe with an Hatchet*, p. 405.

⁸³See Collinson, "The Jacobean Religious Settlement".

⁸⁴*Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v. Crashaw, William, p. 37. Margot Heinemann suggests that the "erroneous book" was Crashaw's translation of a Lollard dialogue, which was suppressed because it could be read as criticism of the bishops. Heinemann also draws attention to Crashaw's association with the Earl of Southampton and Sir Edwin Sandys, who were known to oppose James's policy towards Spain. Even though the connection with these "'dissident'" aristocrats must have made Crashaw suspicious in the eyes of the state and church authorities there is no indication that he sympathized with their alleged political "radicalism". Heinemann, "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture", p. 79f., 85, 66.

Puritanus,"⁸⁵ apparently a pamphlet denouncing Protestants as Papists. Slander and libel, however, were also familiar weapons in the hands of moderate Puritans who liked to present themselves as victims.⁸⁶

Crashaw's sermon – remembered primarily because of its invective against the players taking up only two and a half of the 174 pages of the published version – can be read as another attempt to define his position as a moderate reformer. Typically, the bulk of the sermon is a sustained invective against the Roman Catholics, not merely to extirpate the remnants of this faith in the English Church but also to prove beyond doubt that the charges against Crashaw and his brethren of abuse of the Scripture "in support of Popish doctrines" made by the separatist author of "y^t damnable libel y^e Puritanus"⁸⁷ were totally unsubstantiated. The second largest part of the sermon is subsequently directed against the radical Brownists to make it clear that Crashaw has nothing in common with these enemies of the Church and the Crown. In the light of the sermon the thrust of Py-bord's sneering observation that Nicholas is "worth a hundred Brownists" (F4^v) becomes clear.⁸⁸

It is now generally accepted that the clergymen Maister Pigman and Maister Ful-bellie alluded to are Nicholas Fenton and William Symonds, preachers at St. Antholins in Watling Street and St. Mary Overies in Southwark respectively. Although these churches were known as Puritan strongholds,⁸⁹ Fenton and Symonds were by all appearances moderate reformers. Critics unaware of the distinction between radicals and mainstream Puritans have therefore wondered why these preachers were

⁸⁵*Calendar of State Papers*, p. 536.

⁸⁶In a pamphlet published in 1605, for example, Thomas White, who had joined an exiled community of Brownists but returned later to England disappointed, charges the separatists with "hypocrisie." They are said "to practice that among themselves which they condemn utterly in others, & have amongst themselves open and notorious cousners, and such like offenders." One Daniel Studley is accused of "filthinesse with his wifes daughter" and of "worse carriage" which White is "a shamed to mencyon." White, *A Discoverie of Brownisme*, B1^v, B4^v. This is the same kind of vituperative libel the moderates "condemn utterly" in the separatists and the satirists. Once more, as in the Marprelate controversy, the question springs to mind: who was learning from whom?

⁸⁷*Calendar of State Papers*, p. 535.

⁸⁸This is certainly not "the only clue we have to the party allegiance of the play's 'Puritans'". These words do not point "to the sectaries", as Chakravorty (*Politics and Society*, p. 64) claims, but to their enemies, the moderate Puritans.

⁸⁹Seaver, *The Puritan Lecturships*, p. 199.

chosen as the satire's victims.⁹⁰ It seems their cases were similar to Crashaw's, who made himself their spokesman by attacking the players.⁹¹ At the time of *The Puritaine*, Fenton was under heavy pressure to conform,⁹² and the attack from the stage must have come at a bad time. Although it is quite possible that Fenton or Symonds had provoked the players,⁹³ in my view St. Antholins and St. Mary Overies were chosen for a different reason. Both churches were well-known meeting places of the godly, and were located in Puritan parishes close to notorious playhouses. St Antholin was in Watling Street (the home of the Widow Plus) not far from Paul's Church, and St Mary Overies, later St Saviour and Southwark Cathedral, stood in Southwark close to the public playhouses and bear-baiting arenas – a strikingly similar constellation that is highlighted in the play.⁹⁴ It appears that playing and preaching were practised side by side within and without the city walls. The people of Southwark were not necessarily fonder "of taking liberties"⁹⁵ than those around St. Paul's. A play that draws attention to this uneasy coexistence is thus also a dramatic representation of social space, of the tensions between Puritan parishioners and the theatre in Early Modern London.

It has been said that "the masks of the trickster in the major Paul's comedies had become a metaphor for the subversive indeterminacy of theatrical selves."⁹⁶ The shiftiness and role-playing of the declassed scholar threaten the carefully constructed identities of those he regards as social usurpers, such as the Puritans whose efforts of self-definition (of which the Puritan sermons at the Cross were manifestations) were grounded on the shared fantasy of a simplified identity.⁹⁷ When they are charged with hypocrisy, it does not mean that they actually commit deadly sins. They do nevertheless "practice that among themselves which they condemn utterly in

⁹⁰See e. g. Chakravorty, *Politics and Society*, p. 63.

⁹¹There is nothing to indicate that Crashaw himself was Mr Pigman.

⁹²Seaver, *The Puritan Lecturships*, p. 224

⁹³This is suggested by Maxwell, *Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 123.

⁹⁴The authors could have added St. Anne Blackfriars, also known for its powerful Puritan preacher. See Seaver, *The Puritan Lecturships*, p. 199.

⁹⁵See Twyning, *London Dispossessed*, p. 3: "In early modern London, Bankside, the southside, was synonymous with both strumpet and stage." In *Neighbourhood and Society* Jeremy Boulton stresses the similarities between Southwark and other London parishes (p. 289, 293).

⁹⁶Chakravorty, *Politics and Society*, p. 64.

⁹⁷Cf. Leverenz, *The Language of Puritan Feeling*, p. IX.

others"⁹⁸ when they brand their enemies as hypocritical. It is possible to say that their own defamatory discourse reflects on them, thus undermining their critical position to demand punishment of the players' slander. This is the sore spot touched upon by Py-bord. Preachers and players thus have more in common than meets the eye: both censure a fallen city while being part of it.

It seems unlikely that Crashaw's appeal to the authorities to stop the satires at Paul's Playhouse was effective. Firstly, it is questionable whether he was in any position to demand anything from the Court, Church or City beyond the conventional exhortation of the magistrates to punish sin and restore order with which sermons like this normally ended.⁹⁹ Secondly, satirical representations of Puritans were equally conventional and there is no instance known in which such a portrait could have been the cause of scandal or official censorship. The dedication to Jonson's *Bartholmew Fair* suggests that King James was rather fond of this kind of satire. On the other hand, neither the Church nor the Court appear to have encouraged anti-Puritan satires after the Marprelate controversy. It can be assumed, though, that neither the worldly nor the ecclesiastical authorities had forgotten that a satirical controversy over matters of religion could easily get out of control. Moreover, the authorities seemed to fear staged satires less than those in printed form, as Bishop Bancroft's public ban and burning of satires in 1599 indicates.¹⁰⁰ Writers of religious pamphlets were subject to the strictest censorship of all, as Crashaw's example shows. Perhaps it was this practice that fuelled his anger when he stressed that *The Puritaine* was now available "euen in print."¹⁰¹

Even though it is unlikely that the authorities were prepared to lend a willing ear to Crashaw, his appeal to the magistrates might still have served to put an end to Paul's playhouse. Unnerved by the series of scandals about the railing plays at Blackfriars, the Master of Revels might have thought it wise to silence what was potentially another trouble spot. In his history of the *Shakespearian Playing Companies* Andrew Gurr suggests that in order to

⁹⁸ White, *A Discoverie of Brownisme*, B4^v.

⁹⁹On the separate functions of the offices of minister and magistrate see Lake / Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat*, p. 360 et passim.

¹⁰⁰On the bishops' ban see Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*, p. 198–217. Clegg claims, however, that the ban is not "representative of a widespread, long term, and efficient cultural practice" of literary censorship (p. 217).

¹⁰¹Crashaw, *The Sermon preached at the Cross Sermon*, sig. Y2^f.

achieve this aim Tilney installed an agent in the company's management: the Yeoman of the Revels, Edward Kirkham, who was responsible for the costumes and properties used for court performances. It remains doubtful, however, whether Kirkham was Tilney's subordinate.¹⁰² It appears that he acted as a "theatrical entrepreneur" independently of the Revels Office.¹⁰³ Prior to becoming a master of Paul's Boys he had been a financier of the Blackfriars Children, where he returned in 1608 when they had to give up the Blackfriars theatre. He was thus around when the two most important playhouses occupied by childrens' companies ceased to operate. This is certainly intriguing. It is unlikely, though, that he was "doing his Master's bidding," as Gurr suggests.¹⁰⁴ Kirkham, whom Ben Jonson is reported to have called "a base fellow,"¹⁰⁵ was apparently simply pursuing a chance to fill his pockets. Even Gurr concedes that "Kirkham appears to have had little enthusiasm for much besides taking his winding-up profits."¹⁰⁶ Kirkham's dubious role in the winding-up of the two playhouses points to a more probable cause of the closure of Paul's theatre: the company was no longer capable of holding its own on the London theatre market.¹⁰⁷ In 1609 Edward Pearce, the last Master of the Choristers, was given £20 per annum to ensure that "there might be a Cessation of playeinge & playes to be acted in the [...] howse neere St Paules Church."¹⁰⁸ Nothing could better illustrate the reason why the company ceased playing than this "dead rent" paid to the last Master of Paul's Boys by their competitors – including the leading acting company, the King's Men.

In all probability, then, the end of Paul's Playhouse was not ordered or arranged by the authorities. What we have here is a case of "structural

¹⁰²See Feuillerat (ed.), *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels*, p. 74, 437; Streitberger (ed.), *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts*, p. 163.

¹⁰³Streitberger (ed.), *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts*, p. 163.

¹⁰⁴Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 354.

¹⁰⁵Hildebrand, *The Child Actors*, p. 168. Kirkham was involved in a series of law suits over theatre money.

¹⁰⁶Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, p. 354.

¹⁰⁷The precise circumstances of the company's end are obscure. No performance is recorded after 30 July 1606, and in the following years several of their playbooks were published, including *The Puritaine*, a sure indication of the company's dissolving. It has been suggested that the boys had simply grown old, so that the company lost its special status (Gair, *The Children of Paul's*, p. 172–173). For a convincing refutation of this argument see Shen Lin, "How old were the Children of Paul's?"

¹⁰⁸Gair, *Children of Paul's*, 173.

ensorship." A playing company is silenced, excluded from the discursive field through market forces, not government repression. Thus, the closure of Paul's Playhouse sometime between 1606 and 1608 does not yet indicate the "victory" of Puritanism. It was rather, to use Reavley Gair's words, the "triumph of profit" than of Puritanism. Nevertheless, the controversy between the Puritans and the satirists over *The Puritaine* illustrates the social and religious tensions of early Jacobean London, where players and Puritans not rarely existed side by side. Without doubt, this strange coexistence of Puritans and the theatre at Paul's and elsewhere contributed to the "unique vitality of the drama of the period" rather than weakened it. Crashaw's indignation over the censorship of his religious writings, however, while the players could apparently rail against the brethren as they liked, marks a first crack in his loyalty to the Church of England. But moderate Puritans like him were not yet driven into open opposition, and his protest against *The Puritaine* was, in contrast to what many academic narratives suggest, ultimately ineffective. There was no magistrate to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate slander in order to "take some iust vengeance on that public dishonour laid upon" the Puritan churches. If the balance of power in the discursive struggle between the players and the Puritans was tipped through the disappearance of Paul's Playhouse, it was only slightly, as the remaining playing companies continued to stage anti-Puritan satires. However, the fact that slander against the Puritans was allowed to continue would lead to more slander against the theatre and eventually turn against the Church of England and the state.

Bibliography

- Adkins, Mary G. M. "The Genesis of Dramatic Satire Against the Puritans, as Illustrated in *A Knack to Know a Knave*." *Review of English Studies* 22.86 (1946): 81–95.
- Barroll, Leeds. "A New History for Shakespeare and His Time." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 39 (1988): 441–464.
- Bawcutt, N. W. "Was Middleton a Puritan Dramatist?" *Modern Language Review* 94.4 (1999): 925–939.
- Boulton, Jeremy. *Neighbourhood and Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, "Censorship and the Imposition of Form." *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991. 137–159. ["Censure et mise en forme." *Ce que parler veut dire: l'economie des échanges linguistique*. Paris: Fayard, 1982. 167–205].
- Brooke, C. F. Tucker (ed.). *The Shakespeare Apocrypha. Being a Collection of Fourteen Plays which Have Been Ascribed to Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1908.
- Bruster, Douglas. *Drama and the Market in the Age of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
- Burt, Richard. *Licensed by Authority: Ben Jonson and the Discourses of Censorship*. Ithaca, London: Cornell UP, 1993.
- . "(Un)Censoring in Detail: The Fetish of Censorship in the Early Modern Past and the Postmodern Present." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post (Issues and Debates). Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 17–41.
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series: Reign of James I, 1603–1610*. Ed. Mary A. Green. London: Longman et. al. 1857.
- Chakravorty, Swapan. *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.
- Chambers, E. K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1923.
- Clare, Janet. 'Art made tongue-tied by authority': *Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

- Crashaw, William. *The sermon preached at the Cross, Feb. 14, 1607*. 1608. New York, London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1972.
- Christian, Mildred Gaylor. "Middleton's Acquaintance with *The Merrie Conceited Jests of George Peele*." *PMLA* 50 (1935): 753–760.
- Collinson, Patrick. "The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference." *Before the English Civil War: Essays on Early Stuart Politics and Government*. Ed. Howard Tomlinson. London: Macmillan, 1983. 27–51.
- . "The Theatre Constructs Puritanism." *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London 1576–1649*. Ed. David C. Smith / Richard Strier / David Bevington. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 157–169.
- . "Ecclesiastical Vitriol: Religious Satire in the 1590s and the Invention of Puritanism." *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Ed. John Guy. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 150–170.
- Dekker, Thomas. *The Dead Tearme or Westminster's Complaint for long Vacations and short Termes*. 1608. *The Non-Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*. Vol. IV. Ed. Alexander B. Grosart. New York: Russell and Russell, 1963. 3–84.
- Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. Leslie Stephen, Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder and Co, 1908.
- Diehl, Huston. "Disciplining Puritans and Players: Early Modern English Comedy and the Culture of Reform." *Religion and Literature* 32 (2000): 81–104.
- Dutton, Richard. *Mastering the Revels: The Regulation and Censorship of English Renaissance Drama*. Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1991.
- . "Censorship." *A New History of Early English Drama*. Ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan. New York: Columbia UP, 1997. 287–304.
- . *Buggeswords: Licensing, Censorship, and Authorship in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke, London: Palgrave, 2000.
- Feuillerat, Albert (ed.). *Documents Relating to the Office of the Revels in the Time of Queen Elizabeth* (Materialien zur Kunde des englischen Dramas 21). Louvain: Uystpruyt, 1908.
- Finkelppearl, Philip J. "'The Comedians' Liberty': Censorship and the Jacobean Stage Reconsidered." *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 123–138.
- Gair, Reavley. *The Children of Paul's: The Story of a Theatre Company, 1553–1608*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1982.

- Gibbons, Brian. *Jacobean City Comedy: A Study of Satirical Plays by Jonson, Marston and Middleton*. London: Hart-Davies, 1968.
- Gildersleeve, Virginia Crocheron. *Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1961 [1908].
- Gurr, Andrew. *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.
- Hadfield, Andrew (ed.). *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*. Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 2000.
- Heinemann, Margot. *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- . "Rebel Lords, Popular Playwrights, and Political Culture: Notes on the Jacobean Patronage of the Earl of Southampton." *Yearbook of English Studies: Politics, Patronage, and Literature in England, 1558–1658*. Vol. 21 (1991): 63–86.
- Hildebrand, Harold Newcomb. *The Child Actors: A Chapter in Elizabethan Stage History*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1964.
- Holden, William P. *Anti-Puritan Satire. 1572–1642*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1954.
- Jonson, Ben. *Bartholomew Fair*. Ed. G. R. Hibbard. London: Benn, 1977.
- Kaplan, M. Lindsay. *The Culture of Slander in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Knapp, Jeffrey. "Preachers and Players in Shakespeare's England." *Representations* 44 (1995): 29–59.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans or Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- / with Michael Questier. *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestant, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England*. New Haven, London: Yale UP, 2002.
- Lamburn, David, "Politics and Religion in Early Modern Beverly." *The Reformation in English Towns 1500–1640*. Ed. Patrick Collinson / John Craig. Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1998. 63–78.
- Leggatt, Alexander. *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare*. Toronto, Buffalo: U Toronto P, 1973.
- Leverenz, David. *The Language of Puritan Feeling: An Exploration in Literature, Psychology, and Social History*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers UP, 1980.

- Leinwand, Theodore B. *The City Staged: Jacobean Comedy, 1603–1613*. Madison, Wisconsin: U Wisconsin P, 1986.
- Lyly, John. *Pappe with an Hatchet. The Complete Works of John Lyly*. Ed. R. Warwick Bond. Vol.3. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1902. 393–416.
- Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Marcus, Leah. "Of Mire and Authorship." *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London 1576–1649*. Ed. David C. Smith / Richard Strier / David Bevington. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. 171–181.
- Maxwell, Baldwin. *Studies in the Shakespeare Apocrypha*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1956.
- Mclure, Millar. *The Paul's Cross Sermons, 1534–1642*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 1958.
- Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage. License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Chicago, London: U Chicago P, 1988.
- Myers, Aaron Michael. *Representations and Misrepresentations of the Puritan in Elizabethan Drama*. Diss. Philadelphia, 1931.
- Nicholl, Charles. *A Cup of News: The Life of Thomas Nashe*. London et. al.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Reading and Writing in Early Modern England*. Madison, Wisconsin: U Wisconsin P, 1984.
- Post, Robert C. "Censorship and Silencing." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post (Issues and Debates). Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 1–12.
- Pritchard, Allan. "Puritans and the Blackfriars Theatre: The Case of Mistresses Duck and Drake." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 45 (1994): 92–95.
- The Puritaine or the Widdow of Watling-streete*. Written by W. S. London, 1607. The Tudor Facsimile Reprints. New York: AMS, 1970 [1911].
- Rozett, Martha Tuck. *The Doctrine of Election and the Emergence of Elizabethan Tragedy*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.
- Seaver, Paul S. *The Puritan Lecturships: The Politics of Religious Dissent, 1560–1662*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1970.
- Shapiro, Michael. *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays*. New York: Columbia UP, 1977.
- Shen Lin. "How Old Were the Children of Paul's?" *Theatre Notebook* 45 (1991): 121–131.

- Smith, David C. / Richard Strier / David Bevington (ed.). *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London 1576–1649..* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Smith, Irwin. *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design.* New York: New York UP, 1964.
- Streitberger, W. R. (ed.). *Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603–1642. Malone Society Collections.* Vol. XIII. Oxford: The Malone Society, 1986.
- T. W. *A sermon preached at Paul's Cross, 3 November 1577 by T. W.* 1578. New York, London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1972.
- Thompson, E. N. S. *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1903.
- Todd, Margo (ed.). *Reformation to Revolution: Politics and Religion in Early Modern England (Rewriting Histories).* London: Routledge, 1995.
- Twynning, John. *London Dispossessed: Literature and Social Space in the Early Modern City.* Basingstoke, London: Macmillan, 1998.
- White, Thomas *A Discoverie of Brownisme: or, A briefe declaration of some of the errors and abominations daily practised and increased among the English company of the seperation remayning for the present at Amsterdam in Holland.* London: Fosbroke, 1605.
- Wickham, Glynne. *Early English Stages 1300–1660.* 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Wilson, John Dover. "The Puritan Attack upon the Stage." *The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Vol. VI, Part 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1910. 373–507.
- Yachnin, Paul. "The Powerless Theatre." *Stage-Wrights: Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and the Making of Theatrical Value (New Cultural Studies).* Philadelphia, U Pennsylvania P, 1997. 1–24.

This page intentionally left blank

THE CENSORSHIP OF MUSICAL MODERNISM IN GERMANY, 1918–1945

Erik Levi

Although censorship of the arts was outlawed during the Weimar Republic, modernist composers were subjected to a constant stream of vitriolic criticism from reactionary sections of the German music establishment. In the early 1920s such objections had only limited impact in removing a relatively small number of controversial music-theatre works from public performance. The situation changed at the end of the decade when Alfred Rosenberg's *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* harnessed conservative attitudes in tandem with the Nazi party to successful effect in Thuringia in 1930. Their policies effectively paved the way for the virulent censorship of music that took place after 1933.

During the nineteenth century, composers of operatic and concert music in Germany largely refrained from discussing their political allegiances or ideological viewpoints in public, preferring to let their music speak for itself. There were of course exceptions, most notably Richard Wagner whose writings embraced a wide range of concerns that extended far beyond music and theatre.¹ Yet although the Bayreuth master took great pains to try and disseminate his ideas to the widest possible public, the musicians that followed in his footsteps were reluctant to engage to the same extent in such issues.

All this changed after 1918 and the formation of the Weimar Republic. Now some of the bitterest public battles in the cultural sphere were waged over the question of music. The collapse of the old political order signalled a new cultural environment, which appeared to encourage innovation, a bewildering degree of experimentation and an unprecedented openness to foreign influences. In the opera house, the romantic escapism of

¹ Amongst the most pertinent of Wagner's writings in this instance are the articles *Deutschland und seine Fürsten* (1848), *Die Revolution* (1849), *Die Kunst und die Revolution* (1949), *Das Judentum in der Musik* (1851 rev. 1869), *Preußen und Österreich* (1866) and *Deutsche Kunst und deutsche Politik* (1867/8), and the play *Eine Kapitulation* (1870) targeted against the Parisians suffering in the siege of their city during the Franco-Prussian War.

an earlier era (as represented by Richard Strauss's decadent pre-war operas *Salome*, 1905, *Elektra*, 1909, and *Der Rosenkavalier*, 1911) was to be rejected and replaced by raw social commentary (Alban Berg's *Wozzeck*, 1925, and Kurt Weill's *Mahagonny Songspiel*, 1927), or by manifestations of 'neue Sachlichkeit' [new objectivity] (Paul Hindemith's *Cardillac*, 1925, and *Neues vom Tage*, 1929).

An additional factor in the debate was an increasing belief that music had the potential to be one of the most effective mediums for mobilising political agendas. In particular, there were a number of disillusioned musicians who had been traumatised by the war and by the unstable economic climate of the early 1920s, and had become increasingly attracted to left-wing politics. Amongst the most prominent was Kurt Weill who in the early 1920s joined the Berlin-based Novembergruppe – an association of artists named after the German Revolution of November 1918 whose prime objectives were to demand participation in all activities of importance to the arts, believing that such engagement could help to change society. During this period, Weill, alongside composers such as Max Butting, Heinz Tiessen, Eduard Erdmann, and Stefan Wolpe,² aligned himself closely to socialism³. Amongst the first works that he composed under the influence of the Novembergruppe was the highly charged and defiantly modernist First Symphony (1921) whose inspiration was drawn from music composed for the socialist play *Arbeiter, Bauern und Soldaten – das Erwachen eines Volkes zu Gott* by Johannes Becher.

² Max Butting (1888–1976) joined the Novembergruppe in 1922 and reviewed music for the *Sozialistische Monatshefte* from 1925–1930. After 1950 he became a prominent composer in the GDR. Heinz Tiessen (1887–1971) was active in the Novembergruppe and composed choruses for socialist-aligned choirs. After the Nazis came to power, he remained in Germany but his music was banned. Eduard Erdmann (1896–1958) was a pianist and composer of expressionist sympathies who remained in Germany after 1933. Stefan Wolpe (1902–1972) joined the Novembergruppe in 1923 and later set texts by Erich Kästner and Johannes Becher, Lenin and Mayakovsky. Wolpe left Germany in 1933 initially for Palestine, but emigrated to the United States in 1938.

³ Amongst other modernist composers associated with the Left should be mentioned Erwin Schulhoff (1894–1941) who was resident in Dresden from 1919 to 1923, maintained close contact with Dadaism, and in 1932 wrote the cantata *Das Manifest* to words by Karl Marx. Another important figure was Hanns Eisler (1898–1962) who in 1925 broke with his teacher Arnold Schoenberg rejecting bourgeois genres of music (symphony, quartet etc.) to compose 'applied music' (workers' choruses, mass songs and *Lehrstücke* [didactic teaching pieces]).

Not surprisingly, reactionary musicians viewed modernism with a mixture of alarm and contempt. Yet in the early years of the Republic, organised opposition to such developments remained fragmentary, and was largely confined to the review pages of nationalist and conservative newspapers, or to certain long-established specialist music journals such as the *Zeitschrift für Musik* and the *Allgemeine Musik-Zeitung*. Much of this writing has been chronicled painstakingly in Eckhard John's 1994 study *Musik-Bolschewismus*.⁴ John collates this material to form a fascinating chronological narrative of reactionary criticism between the years 1918 and 1938, illustrating the extent to which various areas of modernism were targeted quite indiscriminately by conservatives who believed it was fatally poisoning German culture. Significantly the critical terminology which was utilised to attack musical modernism often went beyond merely technical or artistic descriptions of allegiance (for instance in describing composers as futurists, atonalists, and expressionists) to embrace a position of ideological opposition (i.e. delineating modernism as an internationalist Jewish conspiracy that promoted Bolshevik and an anti-Germanic ideals).

In many cases the performance of a new and provocative composition stimulated considerable indignation. For example the first production in Stuttgart in June 1921 of Paul Hindemith's satirical music-theatre piece *Das Nusch-Nuschi*, with text by Franz Blei and décor by Oskar Schlemmer, created a veritable scandal. Many critics took great exception to Blei's play about Burmese marionettes which mocked violence at every opportunity and contained a deliberately shocking scene of castration. Equally objectionable, however, was Hindemith's burlesque musical style and his deliberate lampooning of Wagner's *Tristan und Isolde* – one of the hallowed cornerstones of the German romantic tradition.

Writing in the *Neue Musikzeitung*, the musicologist Willibald Nagel argued that "since such thrown-together stuff like this grotesquerie can also inflict serious moral damage, it is necessary in the name of our great and pure art to protest against such bilge. A state theatre is not there to serve the pleasures of a few good-for-nothing louts."⁵ Karl Grunsky, critic of the

⁴ John, *Musik-Bolschewismus. Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland 1918–1938*.

⁵ Nagel, "Paul Hindemith 'Mörder, Hoffnung der Frauen – Das Nusch-Nuschi'," p. 300. "Kann solches zusammengesudelte Zeug, wie diese Groteske, auch schwerlich sittlichen Schaden anrichten, so ist doch um unserer großen und reinen Kunst willen gegen derartiges Geschreibsel

Münchener Abendzeitung, went further than his colleague: "the performance [...] represents a desecration of our artistic citadels. The content is of indescribable vulgarity. Everything which to us is holy is here is dragged through the mud in a spirit that is not German [...] How much longer can we Germans permit such things to be done to us?"⁶

In Nagel's critique of Hindemith, the distinguished German composer Hans Pfitzner was cited for asserting the view that the German public had been "soiled, deceived and trivialised by much of what calls itself recent German music."⁷ In fact Pfitzner had already become the self-styled leader of this reactionary force in German music. In his wartime music-drama *Palestrina* (1917), Pfitzner had fashioned his own libretto from the apocryphal life story of the sixteenth-century Italian composer who had reputedly managed to overturn a ban by the Council of Trent on the polyphonic techniques that had been practised by the old masters for centuries. The intention was to draw unequivocal parallels between this historic event and the current state of German culture. Thus in the music-drama, Pfitzner identified himself as a self-styled Palestrina who was embarking on a similar crusade to save German music from the ravages of modernism. Not surprisingly, Pfitzner, like Wagner, also turned to polemical writing to ensure that his ideas gained greater dissemination. In one of his most widely disseminated essays *Die neue Ästhetik der musikalischen Impotenz* [*The New Aesthetics of Musical Impotence*] (Munich, 1920), Pfitzner had latched onto such pejorative and ideologically-loaded labels as Bolshevism and the internationalist Jewish conspiracy with which to criticise the post-war musical climate in Germany.⁸

öffentlich aufs schärfste zu protestieren. Ein Landestheater ist nicht dazu da, ein paar angefaulten Gesellen zum Gefallen zu dienen."

⁶ "Die Aufführung [...] bedeutete eine Entweihung unserer Kunststätte. Der Inhalt ist von nicht mehr zu beschreibender Gemeinheit. Alles, was uns heilig ist, wird hier von nicht deutschem Geist in den Schlamm gezogen [...] Wie lange werden wir Deutsche uns Derartiges noch gefallen lassen?", quoted in Schubert, Giselher. Liner notes to the CD of Hindemith 'Das Nusch-Nuschi' Wergo WER CD 60146-50 (1988): 6. See also: Laubenthal, *Paul Hindemiths Einakter-Triptychon*.

⁷ "versaut, verdreht und verkitscht sind durch vieles was sich jüngste deutsche Musik nennt".

⁸ See for example the 1926 reprint of this monograph where Pfitzner added the following words: "Das atonalen Chaos, nebst den ihn entsprecheden Formen der anderen Künste ist die künstlerische Parallele zum Bolschewismus, der dem staatlichen Europa droht". Pfitzner, *Gesammelte Schriften* (Band: 2), p. 115.

Inevitably as these terms gained wider critical currency, it was only a matter of time before they would be hijacked by those whose long-term objectives went far beyond the confines of mere cultural debate. 1925 saw the publication of Adolf Hitler's political testament *Mein Kampf*. Although Hitler's frequently cited parochial views on the contemporary cultural scene, borrowing heavily from experts such as Pfitzner and Oswald Spengler, are confined to a relatively small section of the book, the belief that it was the "duty of the Government to save its people from being stampeded into such intellectual madness" marks a new stage in the argument.⁹

Although article 118 of the Constitution of the Weimar Republic outlawed cultural censorship, in practice the situation was more fluid. In fact, legal measures could theoretically be taken against a work or performance if the authorities deemed that it could have a corrupting effect, particularly on young people. At the same time, because of its primarily abstract and emotionally ambiguous nature, it was much more difficult to pinpoint what exactly constituted a corrupting piece of music. For this reason, it is surely significant that the major battles waged against modernist music during the Weimar Republic were concentrated mainly in the opera house and theatre, rather than in the concert hall.

Yet during the early years of the Republic, formalised censorship of music by municipal or state-organised bodies remained a relatively rare occurrence. There were some occasions, however, when a controversial work was banned through the opposition of an individual performer or administrator, or through concerted opposition by protesters. Such action certainly subverted any balanced dissemination of Hindemith's one-act opera *Sancta Susanna*. Based on the play by August Stramm which depicts the sexual arousal of a nun as she experiences an orgasm in front of the crucifix, the opera's subject matter inevitably aroused controversy from the outset. Originally scheduled to be staged as part of a triple bill alongside *Das Nusch-Nuschi* and the opera *Mörder, Hoffnung der Frauen* (text by Oskar Kokoschka) in Stuttgart in 1921, it was withdrawn on the opposition of the theatre's Intendant Albert Kehm who regarded its performance in the largely Catholic city as "being completely out of the question."¹⁰ Although Hindemith appealed to the conductor Fritz Busch to rescind this decision,

⁹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, p. 225.

¹⁰ Finscher, "Einleitung", *Paul Hindemith. Collected Works*, 1/3, p. x.

Busch refused to counter Kehm's objections fearing that fervent advocacy of *Sancta Susanna* might have serious repercussions for his future career.

Despite the fact that Stuttgart rejected *Sancta Susanna*, the opera was eventually produced for the first time at the more artistically enlightened Frankfurt Opera House on 26 March 1922. Nonetheless its performance provoked a scandal, and the theatre administrators were faced with a campaign of fervent opposition to the work, engineered by the Catholic Church in alliance with the right-wing Bühnenvolkesbund. Mounting pressure from these organisations, which included a declaration of protest against Hindemith published in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, forced the theatre onto the back foot. Further performances scheduled during the Easter period were duly cancelled and the opera was permanently removed from the theatre's roster on 20 April. A planned staging in nearby Wiesbaden never materialised because of the furore that had occurred in Frankfurt.

Under these circumstances, any further performances in Germany of *Sancta Susanna* seemed unlikely. Yet the opera was in fact revived once more in Hamburg on 18 January 1925 when it appeared as part of a double-bill together with Stravinsky's *L'histoire du soldat*. This time the authorities tried to quell any public hostility by asking the audience to sign a statement promising not to disturb the performance. Although the opera was received with enthusiasm in some quarters, the theatre was unable to stifle protests from the Church who had now formed an alliance with the right-wing parties DVP (Deutsche Volkspartei) and DNP (Deutschnationale Partei). Subsequently, they raised the issue in the Hamburg Senate with the prime objective of suppressing the work. The tactic soon paid off as the theatre caved in, cancelling any further performances.¹¹

During 1920s the conservative press and right-wing parties developed a more concerted campaign to halt the dissemination of modernism. Perhaps the most provocative activity took place in Weimar where the local Nazis were gaining ascendancy over other right-wing parties in setting the cultural agenda. As early as June 1926, the party formulated a policy document which was presented in the Landtag outlining specific demands for the programme of the forthcoming season at the Deutsche Nationaltheater. Amongst the proposals were the banning of plays by Brecht,

¹¹ However, the DNP failed in its bid to pass a motion through the Hamburg Senate banning the performance of Hindemith's opera. See Finscher, p..xiii.

Toller, Zuckmayer and Werfel, and the suppression of works by Jewish and foreign composers in favour of those of unimpeachable German origin.¹²

While such extreme ideas would never have gained much ground in metropolitan centres during this period, the situation in Weimar seemed to be more adaptable. The theatre's Intendant Franz Ulbrich appeared to sympathise with Nazi sentiments, and went some way towards meeting their requests by assuring them of his decision not to promote music by Jewish composers in future concert and opera programmes. As a consequence, the 1926/7 season already manifested a partial realisation of a Nazi programme of purifying the repertory. In the following season, the Nazis scored a further success by managing to persuade the authorities that Paul Hindemith's opera *Cardillac* should no longer be staged in Weimar.¹³

In Berlin attitudes towards modernism became more polarised at the end of 1925 after the Prussian Academy of Arts decided to appoint Arnold Schoenberg as professor of composition in succession to the recently deceased Busoni. Schoenberg's reputation as a musical iconoclast shocked conservative German musicians, many of whom undoubtedly sympathised with the views of Alfred Heuss, editor of the *Zeitschrift für Musik*, who went so far as to claim that Schoenberg's presence in the German capital represented a threat to the very survival of German music.

The appointment of Arnold Schoenberg as director of one of the three master-classes for composition at the Prussian Academy of Arts strikes a blow against the cause of German music that is so provocative in nature that it would be difficult to imagine anything worse in the present situation. [...] just at the very moment when German music is beginning to recover slowly, one dares to accord this man and his mad theories the highest sanction of the state, publicizes him prominently, and in so doing, makes clear that one cares neither for progress as such, nor above all, for the welfare of German music. And that amounts to a provocation, which is intended as a contest of strength between Germanness and – and now we must be quite frank – the specifically Jewish spirit in music.¹⁴

Just as controversial as Schoenberg's move to Berlin was the much-publicised premiere of the opera *Wozzeck* by his pupil Alban Berg at the Berlin Staatsoper in the same year. Predictably the work provoked a furious

¹² Stenzel, "Das Deutsche Nationaltheater in Weimar", p. 231–232.

¹³ Stenzel, "Das Deutsche Nationaltheater in Weimar", p. 233.

¹⁴ Heuss, "Arnold Schoenberg – Preußischer Kompositionslehrer", p. 584.

chorus of indignation from conservative sections of the press.¹⁵ Outrage was not only targeted against the opera's subject matter and Berg's expressionist musical style, but also at the fact that its technical complexities had necessitated over a hundred rehearsals which had been funded at the taxpayer's expense.¹⁶

Although fear of such protests inhibited other theatres from staging *Wozzeck*, the work was never officially proscribed. One year later, however, a politician intervened directly to suppress further performances of a musical work. On 27 November 1926 the world premiere of Béla Bartók's ballet *The Miraculous Mandarin* was staged at the Cologne Opera House. According to a report published in the *Musikblätter des Anbruch*, the ballet's subject matter – a violent love story between a prostitute and a mysterious stranger that ended in death – provoked uproar from the audience, which continued even after the safety curtain came down.¹⁷ The response from the local press was predictable. In particular the *Katholische Volkszeitung*, the newspaper of the Centre Party, launched a furious attack against the work, condemning both the supposed depravity of the action on stage and the composer's 'radical internationalist style'. Responding to this outburst, Cologne's mayor Konrad Adenauer summoned the conductor Eugen Szenkár to his office the next day, demanding that the work should be withdrawn from the opera house's programmes forthwith.¹⁸

While the guardians of German nationalism believed they were engaged in a mighty *kulturkampf* against modernism, many would doubtless have contented themselves with the knowledge that a high percentage of

¹⁵ Not surprisingly other German theatres proved reluctant to take up *Wozzeck* for a number of years, particularly after the authorities in Prague banned the opera in 1926. Eventually two provincial opera houses in Oldenburg and Essen staged the opera in 1929. After the 1930 economic crisis, however, theatres were even more circumspect about the work. In Braunschweig in 1931, for example, theatre administrators caved in to pressure from right-wing politicians that performances of the opera could not go ahead unless the composer was able to provide proof that he was an Aryan. The final performances of *Wozzeck* in the Weimar Republic took place in Berlin in 1933, much to the consternation of the increasingly influential Nazi press.

¹⁶ The argument that local subsidies were being needlessly wasted on lavish modernist operas gained even wider currency in 1930 after the world premiere in Berlin of Milhaud's *Christophe Colomb*. Those on the right argued that municipal support for a work, composed by a French Jew, amounted to a policy of national conspiracy.

¹⁷ Bónis, "The Miraculous Mandarin", p. 86–87.

¹⁸ Bónis, "The Miraculous Mandarin", p. 181–182. Also see Breuer, "Béla Bartók", p. 47–50, and Gillies, *Bartók Remembered*, p. 111–113.

material by such composers as Schoenberg, Hindemith, Stravinsky and Webern reached a relatively limited audience, and that performances remained confined to a few metropolitan centres. More dangerous, however, was the possibility that a modernist work could attract and contaminate a wider public. In 1927 the Leipzig Opera house mounted the premiere of Ernst Krenek's 'zeitoper' *Jonny spielt auf!*. With its mixture of pseudo-jazz effects and modern stage paraphernalia, this work caused such an immediate sensation that it was given a staggering 421 performances on 45 German-speaking theatres in the 1927/28 season alone. The jazz elements may have helped to secure the work's instant popularity, but the opera's scenario was equally provocative in challenging the outmoded isolationist values of the Central European composer Max in favour of the high-spirited amoral American-Negro jazz violinist Jonny who triumphantly proclaims the dawn of a new era and promises a "journey to unknown land of freedom".¹⁹ Such was the alarm expressed in conservative circles at the opera's denouement that it was clear that the expostulations of a few hardened critics could no longer provide a sufficient challenge to the modernist bandwagon.

It was precisely during the season in which *Jonny* became such a commercial success that the Nazi party began to take a more much active role in the cultural debate, spreading their orbit of influence far beyond the provincial confines of Weimar. In January 1928, for example, Austrian Nazis spearheaded a much-publicised public protest against the first Viennese production of Krenek's opera. The following years witnessed Nazi-inspired disruptions of a number of high-profile music-theatre works by Weill, Schoenberg and Hindemith, while Nazi agitation in the Prussian Parliament certainly hastened the enforced closure of the Berlin's experimental Kroll Opera in 1931.²⁰ Hand-in-hand with these developments came the foundation in 1928 of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur (Fighting League for German Culture) which emerged as the most effective right-wing cultural organisation to mobilise the forces of reaction in the last years of the Weimar Republic.

¹⁹ See for example the words uttered by the chorus in the opera's closing scene: "Die Stunde schlägt der alten Zeit, die neue Zeit bricht jetzt an. Versäumt den Anschluß nicht. Die Überfahrt beginnt ins unbekannte Land der Freiheit." [The hour of the old time has come, the new time is at hand. Don't miss your connection. The journey is beginning to the land of freedom.] Krenek, Ernst *Jonny spielt auf!*, Klavierauszug. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1926, p. 203.

²⁰ For more details of the internal political machinations surrounding the closure of the Kroll Opera see Heyworth, *Otto Klemperer: His Life and Times Volume 1: 1885–1933*, p. 335–379.

Although in its initial stages, the Kampfbund was portrayed as an independent non-party political organisation, its leading protagonist was the Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg who used his newspaper, the *Völkische Beobachter*, to publicise its activities. Drawing its membership primarily from the upper and middle classes, the Kampfbund could be seen as part of a deliberate Nazi-inspired strategy to widen its political appeal and effect the necessary aura of respectability and credibility which would attract enthusiastic support from intellectuals. Accordingly, it was conceived not as a centralised organisation, but rather as a network of semi-autonomous local cultural associations bearing the same name and pursuing similar ideals. The thinking behind this was that by exerting pressure on a local level, the Kampfbund would actually secure more influence in shaping the overall cultural environment of the nation.

The Kampfbund's prime objectives, set out in a document published in January 1929 which bore the signatures of Rosenberg, the anti-Semitic literary historian Adolf Bartels, Hans von Wolzogen, editor of the *Bayreuther Blätter*, Carl von Schirach, the former Intendant of the Deutsche Nationaltheater, and members of the Wagner family amongst others, were to enhance the German people's awareness of the much-vaunted connection between cultural decay and national decline through lectures and concerts, to raise the consciousness of Germanness in the arts, and to promote the work and ideology of German artists who had been silenced or sidelined by the forces of modernism.²¹ In the musical sphere, the Kampfbund drew support

²¹ 'Der Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur hat den Zweck, inmitten des heutigen Kulturverfalles die Werte des deutschen Wesens zu verteidigen und jede arteigene Äußerung kulturellen deutschen Lebens zu fördern. Der Kampfbund setzt sich als Ziel, das deutsche Volk über die Zusammenhänge zwischen Rasse, Kunst und Wissenschaft, sittlichen und willenhaften Werten aufzuklären. Er setzt sich zum Ziel, bedeutende, heute totgeschwiegene Deutsche in Wort und Schrift der Öffentlichkeit näherzubringen und so dem kulturellen Gesamtdeutschtum ohne Berücksichtigung politischer Grenzen zu dienen. Er setzt sich zum Ziel, durch Sammlung aller Kräfte, welche diese Bestrebungen teilen, die Voraussetzung für eine das Volkstum als ersten Wert anerkennende Erziehung in Schule und Hochschule zu schaffen. Er setzt sich namentlich das Ziel, im heranwachsenden Geschlecht aller Schichten des Volkes die Erkenntnis für das Wesen und die Notwendigkeit des Kampfes um die Kultur- und Charakterwerte der Nation zu wecken und den Willen für diesen Kampf um die deutsche Freiheit zu stählen. Eine große Anzahl Männer und Frauen aus allen Kreisen und Berufen hat sich politisch nach jeder Richtung ungebundenbereit erklärt, den Kampf um deutsche Geistesfreiheit und Schöpfungsmöglichkeit zu eröffnen. 'Ein Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur soll geschaffen werden,' *Mitteilungen des Kampfbundes für deutsche Kultur*. 1, January 1929 (Munich) no page numbers. – For a more

from the distinguished musicologist Alfred Heuss, the editor of the *Zeitschrift für Musik*. Heuss publicised the organisation in his own journal in February 1929, urging his readers to join in the fight against 'rootless upstarts'.²² One month later he delivered a public lecture at the University of Munich entitled 'The Crisis of German Music' which targeted modernist composers such as Krenek, Weill and Schoenberg, as well as the pernicious and sensual influence of jazz.

For a brief period prior to 1933, the Kampfbund enjoyed the opportunity to exert direct influence on cultural developments when the National Socialist Wilhelm Frick became minister of the Interior and Culture in a right-wing coalition in the province of Thuringia between January 1930 and April 1931. Frick appointed Hans Severus Ziegler, leader of the Thuringian Kampfbund, to the post of culture, art and theatre secretary, and Ziegler used this position to co-ordinate a purge of modern art and museums. On 5 April 1930, the Ministry passed an Ordinance against Negro Culture, which had been drawn up by Ziegler. Amongst its crude directives was the banning of performances of "jazzband and percussion music, Negro dances and Negro songs" in the interests of preserving the German spirit, and threats to enforce these regulations with the support of the police.²³ Although such measures were hardly necessary in the case of the Deutsche Nationaltheater in Weimar, which by this stage had succumbed almost entirely to Nazi influence, the Ministry went so far as to proscribe any proposed regional performances of the music of Stravinsky and Hindemith, and the screening of

comprehensive analysis of the activities of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur see Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", p. 402–423.

²² "Kreuz und Quer: Ein Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur", *Zeitschrift für Musik* 96 (1929), p. 95.

²³ 'Seit Jahren machen sich fast auf allen kulturellen Gebieten in steigendem Maße fremdrassige Einflüsse geltend, die die sittlichen Kräfte des deutschen Volkstums zu unterwühlen geeignet sind. Einen breiten Raum nehmen dabei die Erzeugnisse ein, die, wie Jazzband- und Schlagzeug-Musik, Negertänze, Negergesänge, Negerstücke, eine Verherrlichung des Negertums darstellen und dem deutschen Kulturempfinden ins Gesicht schlagen. Diese Zersetzungserscheinungen nach Möglichkeit zu unterbinden, liegt im Interesse der Erhaltung und Erstarkung des deutschen Volkstums'. Erlaß IV C II/771, Nr. 53 Wider die Negerkultur für deutsches Volkstum", 5. April 1930. *Amtsblatt des Thüringischen Ministeriums für Volksbildung. Weimar* 9 (1930. 6/1930, 22. April 1930), p. 40–41.

the commercial film of the *Dreigroschenoper* by Kurt Weill and Bertolt Brecht.²⁴

Although these policies were revoked after the collapse of the coalition in 1931, the artistic climate throughout Germany had changed so irrevocably by this stage that a return to the more liberal environment that preceded the devastating Wall Street Crash of 1929 was no longer plausible. Financial exigencies enforced a drastic reduction in the performance and promotion of contemporary operas and orchestral works, and a climate of fear and uncertainty discouraged potentially enterprising organisations from risking anything controversial.²⁵

The situation at this time was admirably summed up by the experiences of the opera composer Kurt Weill. Like Krenek, Weill had been a particular target of Nazi racial and political abuse, especially after the commercial popularity of the *Dreigroschenoper* in 1928. Although this work firmly established Weill's credentials as the major German music-theatre composer of his generation, the reception accorded to his later efforts in the genre was more equivocal. In 1930 Nazi demonstrations in Leipzig succeeded in disrupting performances of his opera *The Rise and Fall of the City of Mahagonny*, thereby discouraging numerous other theatres from taking the work up. A similar fate befell the opera *Die Bürgschaft*. The work was premiered in Berlin in March 1932 but despite some positive critical responses in certain circles, it was only performed for a brief period of time in two other theatres. Weill summed up his despair at this hidden censorship in a letter to the Intendant of the Düsseldorf Theatre:

[...] as you know for years now most German theatre Intendants have been submitting themselves to the role of a censor which doesn't even exist. For years now, that is, at a time when there wasn't the slightest reason to do so, the vast majority of theatre directors have shied away from any decision out of cowardice. In that way they have precipitated the situation in which we find ourselves now [...] It is really incredible what I have experienced in this regard yet again with *Die Bürgschaft*. The directors of almost

²⁴ In 1931, Ziegler published the book *Praktische Kulturarbeit im Dritten Reich. Anregungen und Richtlinien für eine gesunde Volksbildung*. Pages 39–42 provide a foretaste of the inflammatory language employed in his much-publicised pamphlet *Entartete Musik: eine Abrechnung* which accompanied the Degenerate Music Exhibition in Düsseldorf in 1938.

²⁵ A good example of the change of cultural climate can be seen in the programmes of the annual festivals of the Allgemeine Deutsche Musikverein [German Composers Union]. In 1930 out of twenty works, seven were by modernist composers, while in the following year, the number declined to three works out of twenty-three.

all German theatres are more than positive about the work and are convinced of its artistic importance; most are also in favour of performing it. But they don't dare. No one forbids them. But hints are enough to undermine their resolve.²⁶

It was Weill's desire to mount a counter-reaction to the forces that were imposing a censorship by stealth in German theatres during the last years of the Republic. But Weill was swimming against the tide. The increasing influence of the Right can also be manifested in the growing prominence of the Kampfbund which by January 1932 had expanded its membership from 300 to 2100.²⁷ A further significant development was the move of the organisation's main cultural activities from Munich to Berlin where under the aegis of Hans Hinkel, later to become secretary to the Reichskulturkammer [Reichs Chamber of Culture] during the Nazi era, the Kampfbund exerted a much more visible presence on the capital's musical life,²⁸ began publication of its own journal *Deutsche Kultur-Wacht*, and outlined proposals for the structural reform and regulation of the music profession that would gain currency in the early years of the Third Reich.²⁹

The process of hidden censorship that continued unabated during the final years of the Weimar Republic was replaced in 1933 by a more systematic purge of so-called undesirable elements in the music profession. Initially the policy centred around a combination of organised threats and demonstrations which brought about the removal of conductors Fritz Busch, Bruno Walter and Otto Klemperer, and halted the production of the Kurt Weill/ Georg Kaiser play *Der Silbersee*, first performed simultaneously in Leipzig, Magdeburg and Erfurt in February 1933. Following this, the Nazis resorted to a step by step sequence of legal decrees designed to regiment and co-ordinate cultural life. Amongst the most far-reaching measures in the first stages of the regime were the establishment on 13 March and 30 June of the Ministry of Enlightenment and Propaganda whose brief was to supervise all

²⁶ Farneth / Juchem / Stein, *Kurt Weill: A Life in Pictures and Documents*, p. 126.

²⁷ Steinweis, "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism", p. 411.

²⁸ Amongst prominent musicians who supported the Kampfbund at this time were two professors of composition at the Berlin Hochschule für Musik (Paul Graener and Max Trapp), the violin pedagogue Gustav Havemann and the composer Max von Schillings who was President of the Prussian Academy of Arts.

²⁹ Havemann, "Was ich vom Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur für die Musik erwarte", p. 13–14.

elements of national life including the arts,³⁰ and the passing of Civil Service Laws of 7 April³¹ which amongst other things enabled local authorities to dismiss any music conservatory teachers, conductors, singers and orchestral musicians deemed unacceptable to the regime on racial, political and aesthetic grounds.³² On a more specific level, the German Radio issued a decree banning the broadcasting of jazz in 7 June and boycotting recordings of works performed by Jewish or Communist artists.

During the autumn of 1933, further plans to co-ordinate cultural life were unveiled with the inauguration on 22 September of the Reichskulturkammer [Reichs Chamber of Culture] with separate chambers devoted to Film, Theatre, the Visual Arts, Music, the Press and the Radio. Like its sister chambers, the Reichsmusikkammer was conceived as a guild for musicians embracing composers, conductors, soloists, choral singers, orchestral musicians, music teachers and instrument manufacturers. Any person wishing to pursue a professional career in music was obliged to join the Reichsmusikkammer which exercised the right to refuse membership on the grounds of race or perceived political allegiance.

Although officials in the Reichsmusikkammer spent a good deal of time issuing edicts that were ostensibly designed to control the activities of the music profession, censorship issues remained the exclusive province of the Ministry of Propaganda which handed down regulations that were supposed to be implemented through the Chambers. Censorship of operatic repertory was largely effected at the centre of government through the appointment of a Reichsdramaturg whose role was to vet and oversee repertory plans submitted by individual opera houses. Theoretically the task allotted to the Reichsdramaturg should not have been too onerous as the Nazis had already made considerable efforts in 1933 to install politically compliant administrators in every opera house. Controlling material presented by orchestral and chamber music groups proved more intractable, however, since the regime continued to uphold the *Führerprinzip* in the case of conductors, thus allowing them to retain a modicum of freedom in their choice of repertory. Realising that this policy was in danger of falling apart through lack of cohesion and consistency, the Ministry created further

³⁰ 'Erlaß des Reichspräsidenten' and 'Verordnung über die Aufgaben des Reichsministeriums für Volksaufklärung und Propaganda'.

³¹ 'Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums'.

bureaucratic controls of musical activity at regional level with the establishment of music functionaries [Städtische Musikbeauftragte] in 1936, though it remains questionable as to how effectively they carried out their work.

It is interesting to note that for all these attempts to regulate musical activity, whether through decrees or in the creation of co-ordinated bureaucratic organisations, Nazi censorship of musical repertory was a much more haphazard process. Although in 1933, the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur had established its own reading panels for the purposes of approving or rejecting new music, its powers as an arbiter of cultural activity were considerably diminished after the ascendancy of Goebbels's Ministry of Propaganda. While Goebbels held the reins of power in cultural matters, in the early years of the regime, he was far more preoccupied with the written and spoken word than with music. So despite stirring up public demonstrations and passing various intimidating laws, no spectacle on the scale of the much-publicised burning of books on 10 May 1933 was organised in the musical sphere. Controls may well have been in place at both national and regional level to remove works deemed unacceptable to the regime. But it was only after the Ministry of Propaganda established its own music section in 1935 that a more systematic and bureaucratic attempt to censor material was formulated. The inauguration of a Reichsmusikprüfstelle [National Reading Panel] in 1937 should have settled this matter once and for all. Yet in its eight years of existence, the panel only managed to issue four lists of banned music repertory.³³

Probably the most high-profile attempt to publicise the regime's censorial attitudes towards modernist music took place in Düsseldorf in 1938

³² For a more detailed discussion of the purification of German musical life see Levi, *Music in the Third Reich*, p. 39–123.

³³ The first notification of forbidden music was announced in through the bulletin of the Reichsmusikkammer on the 1 September 1938 and was directed primarily against the popular music of the composers Friedrich Holländer and Irving Berlin. See "Unerwünschte Musik", *Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer* 5/17 (1938), p. 61. A further modification of this announcement appeared in the same bulletin in April 1939, see "Anordnung zum Schutze musikalischen Kulturgutes", *Amtliche Mitteilungen der Reichsmusikkammer*, 7 (1939), p. 21–23. At the outbreak of the Second World War, the Reichsmusikprüfstelle issued its first official list of outlawed repertory [Erste Liste unerwünschter musikalischer Werke] followed by a second list in April 1940. As before, the reading panel concentrated their fire against jazz and popular music rather than compositions that manifested elements of modernism. Moreover in wartime, a further purpose of such lists was to proscribe music by composers from enemy countries.

when the 'Entartete Musik' [Degenerate Music] Exhibition was unveiled in conjunction with the first fully co-ordinated National Music Days [Reichsmusiktage]. Modelled on the Degenerate Art exhibition organised in Munich the previous year, its prime objective was to humiliate modernist composers whose work had been widely disseminated during the Weimar Republic. The main body of the exhibition consisted of portraits of proscribed composers supported by crude and condemnatory inscriptions. Amidst selected examples of scores and theoretical books, members of the public were also invited to hear music by Weill, Schoenberg and others in specially constructed listening booths.

Yet although information about the Entartete Musik Exhibition quickly spread beyond Germany's borders, it is significant to note that this event was not organised directly by the Ministry, nor did it enjoy its patronage. Essentially the product of supporters of the hardline Rosenberg wing of the party, it had been conceived by Hans Severus Ziegler, formerly secretary of culture in Frick's Ministry of Interior in the Thuringian local government in 1930, and now Intendant of Weimar's Deutsches Nationaltheater, who wrote an introductory brochure *Entartete Musik: Eine Abrechnung* to accompany the exhibition. Moreover the condemnatory views of Ziegler did not necessarily find widespread approval throughout the musical community. For example, Peter Raabe President of the Reichsmusikkammer, was so infuriated by some of the exhibits that he refused to support or attend the exhibition at its second scheduled location in his home town of Weimar.³⁴

Given the establishment of a national reading panel and the sensationalist denunciatory attitudes publicised in such events as Entartete Musik Exhibition, one might have expected that the Nazis had fully succeeded in banishing the vestiges of modernism that they so abhorred from contemporary German music. Yet the picture is more ambiguous. No doubt, the new regime managed to effect a considerable change in the repertory of opera houses and concert halls after 1933, even though the drift towards conservatism was already in place well before the Third Reich. But with few notable exceptions, the removal of the music by some of the seminal and progressive figures of the Weimar Republic seemed absolute. In many cases, issuing official bans on the performance of such repertoire was deemed unnecessary since the Nazi-installed authorities in various metropolitan

³⁴ Kroll, "Verbotene Musik", p. 314.

centres appeared to be perfectly aware as to what was, and was not, acceptable.

Yet confusions remained. Condemnations of individual figures, whether initiated by the very highest echelons of the Ministry of Propaganda or by zealous opportunists, were inconsistent, and in some cases targeted those who had lent strong support to the regime.³⁵ To a certain extent these contradictions can be explained through the competing vested interests of different Nazi organisations, the inevitable tension that existed between the state and the party, the bitter feuds on cultural matters between Goebbels and Rosenberg, and the desire in certain German cities, including Frankfurt and Hamburg, to retain their own more progressive musical traditions. But it also indicates a considerable degree of ambiguity in questions of musical aesthetics.

Aside from racial issues and political orientation, musical censorship for the Nazis appears to have been almost entirely capricious, contemporary composers being targeted by association rather than by musical orientation. How else does one explain the curious paradox in the reception of the music of Paul Hindemith? Although undoubtedly one of the leading avant-garde composers of the Weimar Republic, by the early 1930s, the composer had moved significantly away from his earlier modernism and was embracing a much more sober conservative musical style, drawing to a certain extent upon the rich heritage of German folk music and baroque chorale – sources deemed extremely palatable to Nazi-orientated musicologists.

Yet after an initial honeymoon period with the regime, Hindemith fell victim to a concerted and ultimately successful campaign of opposition from the Rosenberg wing of the party. Hindemith's chief crime, in their view, was his previous associations with the so-called *Systemzeit*, and no amount of retrenchment on the part of the composer seemed sufficient to exonerate him. The complexities of the relationship between Hindemith and the Nazi regime are too involved to be unravelled here.³⁶ Suffice it to say that in 1936, the

³⁵ In his book *Musikbolschewismus*, Eckhard John reproduces a list of so-called bolshevist musicians emanating from the NS Kulturgemeinde on 26 July 1935 which includes the composer Arnold Ebel and violinist Gustav Havemann, both of whom were highly active members of the Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur in the early years of the regime; cf. p. 360–361.

³⁶ For a more detailed appraisal of Hindemith's relationship with the Nazi regime see Zenck, "Zwischen Boykott und Anpassung an der Charakter der Zeit: Über die Schwierigkeiten eines

Ministry of Propaganda decided to issue a blanket ban on the performance of Hindemith's music in Germany – a ban that was rarely broken until 1945. At the same time, no objection whatsoever was raised against new music that undoubtedly reflected Hindemith's influence. For this reason, works by such composers as Harald Genzmer, Wolfgang Fortner, Hermann Reutter and Karl Höller featured with considerable regularity in orchestral and concert programmes of the period without ever encountering any formal opposition.³⁷

The reception accorded to the music of Igor Stravinsky, one of the other major Aryan modernists of the Weimar Republic, was even more perplexing. Unlike Hindemith, Stravinsky's musical development in the 1930s manifested little significant shift in stylistic emphasis, his commitment to modernism appearing absolute. As is well documented, Stravinsky had enjoyed extensive patronage in the Weimar Republic. In 1931, for instance, the Russian signed a financially prestigious agreement with Schott of Mainz, one of the most influential music publishing houses in Germany. Ultra-conservative opposition to the composer, however, had remained virulent throughout the period. He was denounced (erroneously, as it happens) as a Jew and a degenerate, and the primitive nature of his musical style was deemed un-German. Inevitably Stravinsky's reputation and the dissemination of his music suffered drastically in the purges of 1933. Few musicians were courageous enough to programme or promote his music, and those that did, for example the conductor Erich Kleiber or the critic Hans-Heinz Stuckenschmidt, were publicly denounced.³⁸

Stravinsky's fortunes seem to have changed in 1936, ironically the very year when Hindemith's music was subjected to a national ban. Having previously been ostracised as a pernicious influence on German music, he was now apparently regarded as acceptable, and performances of his most recent works, the Concerto for two Pianos and the theatre piece *Perséphone* ensued without official objection. Admittedly reservations were expressed in

deutschen Komponisten mit dem Dritten Reich", p. 65–129 and Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits*, p. 31–56.

³⁷ See for example Karl Laux's post-war book *Musik und Musiker der Gegenwart* which examines the output of a number of German composers who reached maturity during the 1930s, for example Wolfgang Fortner (p. 97–104), Karl Höller (p. 137–150), Hermann Reutter (p. 203–216), and Hermann Schroeder (p. 217–224).

³⁸ For a comprehensive appraisal of Stravinsky reception during the 1930s see Evans, "Die Rezeption der Musik Igor Strawinskys in Hitlerdeutschland", p. 91–109.

certain circles – the Rosenberg wing of the Party remained hostile, or at best uncomfortable at this relaxation of attitudes. There was also inevitable confusion and embarrassment when it was discovered that Stravinsky's portrait had featured prominently at the 1938 Düsseldorf Exhibition of Degenerate Music, only days after a performance of *Perséphone* had been warmly applauded in Braunschweig.

But what factors had instigated a critical volte-face with regard to Stravinsky's music? Without doubt the composer's political orientation, in particular his admiration for Mussolini and staunch opposition to communism, had helped to secure a partial rehabilitation. In addition, the concept of internationalism, so derided by the Right during the Weimar Republic underwent a shift of emphasis. Whereas previously internationalism was perceived as a threat to national traditions, the Nazis now sought to cement bonds between Aryans from other countries, especially if it could be argued that they respected their own national heritage. Such qualities were frequently emphasised in critical response to some of Stravinsky's recent work. Equally significant was the rather contrived attempt to draw sharp distinctions of quality and outlook between this repertoire and the Stravinsky of the 1920s.

While one should be wary of exaggerating the impact of Stravinsky's rehabilitation on German musical life since performances of his music still remained far less frequent than in the 1920s, the composer's influence on contemporary German music did not subside after 1933. A whole host of composers, from Carl Orff and Werner Egk to Boris Blacher, Cesar Bresgen and Gottfried von Einem, continued to venerate the Russian master and follow his example without apparently arousing vociferous opposition.³⁹ A good illustration of the perceptible musical features associated with Stravinsky can be found in the dislocated jazz-orientated rhythms and sharply defined textures in two orchestral works, Boris Blacher's *Concertante Musik* of 1937 and Gottfried von Einem's *Capriccio* of 1942. Significantly both pieces enjoyed considerable success, receiving repeated performances throughout the Reich. Doubtlessly, critics hearing

³⁹ As late as 1944, the composer Cesar Bresgen, in a personal affidavit published in 1944, declared his loyalty to 'Adolf Hitler and Igor Stravinsky'. See Niessen, *Die deutsche Oper der Gegenwart*, p. 35.

such music would have been perfectly aware of its Stravinskian provenance, yet chose not to draw it to anyone's attention.⁴⁰

Arguably the most extraordinary example of inconsistency with regard to Nazi policy towards modernism relates to composers who subscribed to some degree in writing atonal music. Here one can contrast the fate of members of the Second Viennese School (Schoenberg and his pupils Webern and Berg) with figures whose work is far less well-known. Whereas none of the Second Viennese School could not be tolerated on any account either for racial or stylistic reasons,⁴¹ music by Winfried Zillig and Paul von Klenau utilising a modified version of Schoenbergian twelve-note technique aroused much discussion, but was never subjected to official censure.⁴² Dissonant music by the Hungarian Béla Bartók⁴³ was also performed from time to time, and the Icelandic Jón Leifs who in the 1920s had proposed the development of a specifically Nordic atonal style, played a prominent role in German musical life particularly before 1939.

All along, the Nazis drew on a tendency towards conservatism and nationalism – features that were already in place in discussions on music as far back as 1918. Due to the predominantly abstract nature of music, any all-embracing artistic policy could never have worked. Rather, the decisions, either for exclusion or rehabilitation of certain composers, were almost entirely dictated by external political factors, as opposed to by any questions of aesthetics. Inevitably this further clouds any categorical assessment of the effectiveness of the Nazi ban on modernism – an ambition further thwarted by the intense rivalry between various factions of the party. In fact the

⁴⁰ It should be pointed out, however, that not all works by these two composers received the same degree of approval. For example Blacher's *Geigenmusik in drei Sätzen* (1938), although first performed at the 1938 Reichsmusiktag, drew charges of musical degeneracy from Rosenberg supporters (see Gerigk, "Reichsmusiktag in Düsseldorf", p. 699) while conductor Herbert von Karajan was censured for programming von Einem's jazzy Concerto for Orchestra in 1943; see Osborne, *Herbert von Karajan. A life in music*, p. 166.

⁴¹ Schoenberg was obliged to resign from his position as composition professor at the Prussian Academy of Arts in May 1933. One month later, Webern's *Sechs Stücke für Orchester* was removed from the programme of the 1933 Allgemeine Deutsche Musikverein in Dortmund. Erich Kleiber's valiant performance of excerpts from Berg's opera *Lulu* in Berlin in December 1934 provoked outrage amongst most sectors of the German musical press.

⁴² See also Levi, "Atonality", p. 17–21.

⁴³ For a comprehensive appraisal of the reception of Bartók's music in Nazi Germany see Breuer, "Bartók im Dritten Reich", p. 263–284.

evidence incontrovertibly demonstrates that in certain circumstances token modernism was tolerated provided that:

- a) it suited propaganda purposes of the regime,
- b) that the composer in question was deemed to be of suitable political persuasion, or
- c) had avoided, at the very least, expressing overt opposition to the regime.

Only one factor however remained reasonably consistent from 1933 onwards. Perusing the list of banished composers, from Schoenberg and Weill to practitioners of operetta such as Oscar Straus or Emmerich Kálman, it was clear from the start that artistic policies were largely driven by anti-Semitism. Whether it was modernist or conservative in style, no music by those of Jewish or partially Jewish origin could be tolerated. This therefore remained the only undeviating manifestation of musical censorship throughout the Nazi era.

Bibliography

- Bónis, Ferenc. "The Miraculous Mandarin: The Birth and Vicissitudes of a Masterpiece". *The Stage Works of Béla Bartók*. Ed. Nicholas John. London: John Calder, 1991: 86–87.
- Breuer, János. "Béla Bartók: Der wunderbare Mandarin. Dokumente zur Geschichte der Kölner Uraufführung". *Jahrbuch Peters IV* (1981/2): 43–61.
- . "Bartók im Dritten Reich". *Studia musicologica* 36 (1995): 263–284.
- Evans, Joan. "Die Rezeption der Musik Igor Strawinskys in Hitlerdeutschland". *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 55 (1998): 91–109.
- Farneth, David / Juchem, Elmar / Stein, David. *Kurt Weill: A Life in Pictures and Documents*. London, New York: Thames and Hudson, 2000.
- Finscher Ludwig. "Einleitung". *Paul Hindemith. Collected Works*. 1/3, *Sancta Susanna*. Mainz: Schott, 1975. x–xiii.
- Gerigk, Herbert. "Reichsmusiktage in Düsseldorf". *Die Musik* 30 (1938): 699.
- Gillies, Malcolm. *Bartók Remembered*. London: Faber, 1990.
- Heuss, Alfred. "Arnold Schoenberg – Preußischer Kompositionslehrer". *Zeitschrift für Musik* 92. 10 (1925): 584.
- Heyworth, Peter. *Otto Klemperer: His Life and Times Volume 1: 1885–1933*. Cambridge: Cambridge University P, 1983.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. Trans. James Murphy. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1932.
- John, Eckhard. *Musik-Bolschewismus. Die Politisierung der Musik in Deutschland 1918–1938*. Stuttgart, Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 1994.
- Kater, Michael. *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University P, 2000.
- Krenek, Ernst *Jonny spielt auf!*, Klavierauszug. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1926.
- Kroll, Erwin. "Verbotene Musik". *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 7 (1959): 314.
- Laubenthal, Annegrit. *Paul Hindemiths Einakter-Triptychon*. Tutzing: Schneider, 1986.
- Laux, Karl. *Musik und Musiker der Gegenwart*. Essen: Wilhelm Spael, 1949.
- Levi, Erik. "Atonality, Twelve-tone Music and the Third Reich". *Tempo* 178 (September 1991): 17–21.

- . *Music in the Third Reich*. Basingstoke: Macmillan 1994.
- Nagel, Willibald. "Paul Hindemith 'Mörder, Hoffnung der Frauen – Das Nusch-Nuschi'. Zwei Opern Einakter. Uraufführung im Württ. Landestheater zu Stuttgart am 4. Juni". *Neue Musik-Zeitung* 19 (1921): 300.
- Niessen, Carl. *Die deutsche Oper der Gegenwart*. Regensburg: Bosse, 1944.
- Osborne, Richard. *Herbert von Karajan. A Life in Music*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1998.
- Pfützner, Hans. *Gesammelte Schriften* (Band: 2) Augsburg: Benno Filser-Verlag, 1926.
- Steinweis, Alan E. "Weimar Culture and the Rise of National Socialism: The Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur". *Central European History* 24/4 (1991): 402–423.
- Stenzel, Burkhard. "Das Deutsche Nationaltheater in Weimar. Symbol und Schauplatz kultureller Praktik um 1930". *Weimar 1930. Politik und Kultur im Vorfeld der NS-Diktatur*. Ed. Lothar Ehrlich and Jürgen John. Cologne, Weimar, Vienna: Bohlau Verlag, 1998.
- Zenck, Claudia Maurer. "Zwischen Boykott und Anpassung an der Charakter der Zeit: Über die Schwierigkeiten eines deutschen Komponisten mit dem Dritten Reich". *Hindemith-Jahrbuch* 9 (1980): 65–129 .
- Ziegler, Hans Severus. *Praktische Kulturarbeit im Dritten Reich. Anregungen und Richtlinien für eine gesunde Volksbildung*. Munich: Franz Eher Verlag, 1931.
- . *Entartete Musik: Eine Abrechnung*. Düsseldorf, no publisher, no year. [1938]

This page intentionally left blank

**'ANLEITUNG UND KONTROLLE':
STAKUKO AND THE CENSORSHIP OF MUSIC
IN THE GDR, 1951-1953**

Toby Thacker

The early years of the GDR were marked by optimism and anxiety. The new state was determined to build a humanist musical culture to carry forward the legacy of German musical greatness, and bring this to working people; equally it was fearful of new developments in avant-garde and in popular music, and believed that these were consciously used by Western imperialists to prise the German people from their cultural inheritance, to blunt their sensibilities, and to prepare them for war. This essay explores the theory and practice of musical censorship in the GDR, focusing on the period between August 1951 and December 1953 when music came under the control of the *Staatliche Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten*, or Stakuko. It examines the bureaucratic mechanisms used to try to prevent performance of atonal music and jazz, and suggests that the censorship was in practice largely unsuccessful. The analysis presented here is based on unpublished archival material, and stresses how pedagogy and repression went hand in hand in the censorship of music at this formative stage of the GDR's history.

In the summer of 1951, at the height of its campaign against 'formalism' and 'cosmopolitanism', the ruling Communist Party of the GDR called for the formation of a state commission to have control of all artistic matters. The *Staatliche Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten*, or Stakuko as it became internally known, was formed in response to this demand, and from August 1951 until December 1953, music in the GDR, like the other arts, came under the control of this body. This brief period in the critical early years of the Cold War provides a unique example of the rigorous application of state control to a highly sophisticated musical culture. The section of Germany which was occupied by the Soviet Union after 1945, and which constituted the GDR after October 1949 included after all the birthplaces of Schütz, Bach, Handel, Telemann, and Schumann. In 1950, the 200th anniversary of Bach's death, the GDR proudly proclaimed that it alone could carry forward this musical legacy, and bring it to a wider audience. The new state inherited some of the world's most renowned performing ensembles, like the Berlin State Opera, the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra and Thomanerchor, and the

Dresden State Orchestra and Kreuzchor. This two-and-a-half year period when the GDR attempted to mould its musical culture in full conformity with its political ideals was coincidentally a time of particularly rapid and far-reaching change in musical history. The magnetic tape recorder and long-playing records were revolutionising the recording industry. In July 1951 Schoenberg died, and Pierre Boulez proclaimed the supremacy of Weberian serialism.¹ In May 1953, the Nordwestdeutscher Rundfunk (NWDR) made the first broadcast of electronic music in Germany, and opened an electronic music studio in Cologne.² On the other side of the Atlantic, equally revolutionary developments were taking place in jazz and in popular music.

To date, there is virtually no historiography of Stakuko's involvement with music in the English language; the first book in German touching upon this subject appeared in 1999.³ This neglect is largely the consequence of two factors, firstly the GDR's own rewriting of history in the 1950s, when Stakuko was quietly airbrushed from the record, and secondly a general assumption that the musical culture of the early GDR was more or less a reflection of that in the Soviet Union under Stalin,⁴ a continuation of that in Germany under Hitler, or a mix of the two. I will argue here that this is insufficient, and that the particular musical culture of the early GDR, and the theory and practice of censorship within it, merit consideration on their own terms.

On paper Stakuko was given almost unlimited control over music in the GDR, including broad areas like musical education, broadcasting, publishing,

¹ See Peyser, *Boulez*, pp.72–78.

² See for details, *neues musikfest*. On the later controversy over the opening date of the studio, see Stockhausen to Höller, 1.11.1990. WDR-Historisches-Archiv, Cologne, D1471.

³ zur Weihen, *Komponieren in der DDR*. For a discussion of Stakuko's role in the broader musical evolution of the GDR, see my *Music after Hitler*.

⁴ On Stalinist musical culture see Werth, *Musical Uproar in Moscow*, which provides much verbatim detail of the discussions among Soviet composers and politicians after the Central Committee decree on music of January 1948. On Soviet musical culture in the 1930s, when terms like 'formalism', 'cosmopolitanism', and 'realism' were first applied to music, see Brooke, *The Development of Soviet Music Policy*.

recording, and criticism.⁵ Above all it was to supervise programming, and to make sure that music as an art form was subject to political guidance and control. In practice though it was heavily reliant on other arms of the Party and State apparatus, and on particular individuals within them. At a time when almost all who had been in contact with the West were suspect, it was unsurprising that Stakuko was staffed largely by old KPD men who had spent the Nazi years in concentration camps and prisons, and by young recruits from the SED's newly established training schools. Its Chairman was Helmut Holzhauser, previously Minister for Education in Saxony. The Music Department was run by Rudolf Hartig, and did not include any of the émigrés who dominated the GDR's musical establishment.⁶ Hartig himself had a history of Communist Party involvement dating back to the short-lived Republic of Kurt Eisner in Bavaria at the end of World War One. He had been imprisoned first in the 1920s, and later under Hitler. Since 1945 he had distinguished himself in the reconstruction of culture in Leipzig, particularly in the preparations for the SED's Bach Festival in 1950. Interestingly Hartig was originally a schoolteacher, who had cut his political teeth in the pre-1914 school reform movement.⁷ His own didacticism was entirely at home in the earnest and utterly dedicated atmosphere that prevailed within Stakuko. Between 1951 and 1953, Hartig's office meddled with every conceivable aspect of music in the GDR. His correspondence dealt daily with a mass of different problems, often of a weighty cultural nature, with significant political overtones; he was also drawn into day-to-day practicalities. At one stage in 1953 he was even called upon to make sure that orchestras were playing at concert pitch.⁸

⁵ For an outline of Stakuko's powers and responsibilities, see "Verordnung über die Aufgaben der Staatlichen Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten vom 12.7.1951", *Gesetzblatt der DDR*, (1951), pp.684–685.

⁶ That is to say Ernst Hermann Meyer and Georg Knepler, emigrants to Great Britain, Eberhard Rebling and Nathan Notowicz, emigrants to Holland, and Hanns Eisler and Paul Dessau, emigrants to the USA.

⁷ These biographical details are taken from the 'Rede zur Trauerfeier für den Genossen Rudolf Hartig am 29.11.1962'. Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste, Berlin (hereafter SAdK), Hans-Pischner-Archiv, 740.

⁸ Berufsgruppe Musikinstrumentenmacher in der Handwerkskammer Gross-Berlin to Stakuko, 15.10.1953, and Butting, Akademie der Künste, to Hartig, Stakuko, 18.12.1953. Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen im Bundesarchiv, Berlin (hereafter SAPMO-BArch) DR 1/54.

This brings us to the gap between intention and achievement which characterised everything Stakuko attempted. Hartig's department in Berlin, staffed with only a handful of full-time officials, could not possibly supervise all musical activity in the GDR, and it had to rely heavily in practice on cultural officials working for local government bodies, at first in the *Länder*, and after the reorganisation in 1952, in the *Bezirke*. Paradoxically, Stakuko seems to have lacked final authority in musical matters great and small, and at critical moments did not have the power to overrule other branches of the larger GDR bureaucracy. Matters were not helped by Stakuko's commitment to the principles of 'planned' and 'collective work'.⁹ All sections of Stakuko, including the Music Department, had to produce regular plans. Yearly, quarterly, and monthly plans were not sufficient; Hartig at one point required his senior colleagues to produce them weekly.¹⁰ In the spirit of 'criticism and self-criticism', the same officials had to write reports analysing how well their plans had been implemented. The surviving files provide us with great detail of Stakuko's intentions, and also a running commentary on its own affairs, which reveals an extraordinary oscillation between a frenzied optimism and a bleak sense of depression resulting from the most unsparring analysis of failure.

All State and Party organisations in the early GDR – and Stakuko was no exception to this – worked on the basis of a carefully developed understanding of Marxism-Leninism. Everything Stakuko did was consciously placed in the larger context of German division in the early Cold War. There was no doubt in the minds of Hartig and his officials that in preparation for a future war, the American imperialists were systematically undermining German culture, and debasing German music. Stakuko was to ensure that the GDR carried through its role as the only legitimate inheritor of Germany's great musical tradition, and to take this legacy into a humanist future where high culture would belong to the people. It was therefore vital to prevent the performance and dissemination in the GDR of those kinds of

⁹ The introduction to the Stakuko files in the Bundesarchiv notes: "Nach der 2.Parteikonferenz in Juli 1952 wurden die Prinzipien der kollektiven Arbeit (Dienst- und Arbeitsbesprechungen, Konferenzen, Brigadearbeit), der Planmäßigkeit der Arbeit, der Verantwortlichkeit, der Wissenschaftlichkeit, der Wachsamkeit sowie der Entwicklung von Kritik und Selbstkritik noch stärker betont." Marschall-Reiser, *Findbuch zu Beständen des Bundesarchives*. Bd.70, p.xix.

¹⁰ 'Entwurf: Richtlinien für den Wettbewerb zwischen Darstellende Kunst und Musik', undated, p.1. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

music which, in the eyes of the SED, directly threatened the taste and sensibility of the masses, atonalism and jazz.

These two musical enemies had been publicly identified shortly before Stakuko was founded, by Ernst Hermann Meyer, speaking at the founding congress of the *Verband Deutscher Komponisten* (VDK), the Party organisation formed to represent composers in the GDR, in April 1951. Meyer's view, which was adopted in its entirety by Stakuko, was that the music of the Second Viennese school and its followers presented only a deceptive outward appearance of being progressive and anti-bourgeois. He went further than Hanns Eisler, who famously described Schoenberg as a glorious sunset at the end of the bourgeois era,¹¹ and identified atonal and twelve-tone music as a negation of the content of the German classical tradition, in particular of its relationship with folk music and hence the people. Meyer accepted that Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern had sought a way out of the crisis of capitalism, but argued that they had fallen into hopeless decadence. Their contemporary imitators were the puppets of monopoly capital: "Objectively" he said, "the formalists writing today in accordance with American imperialism are disseminating the barbarity of nihilism".¹²

To prevent this, Stakuko's earliest plans included a commitment to permanent control of theatre and concert programmes throughout the GDR.¹³ These were to "reflect the fight against all kinds of formalism, kitsch and decadence".¹⁴ This would be achieved by a quota system. All performing ensembles were to devote 50% of their programmes to the classics, 25% to contemporary music from the GDR, and the remaining 25% to music from the Soviet Union and the 'peoples' democracies'. They were to avoid playing

¹¹ Eisler, "Arnold Schönberg", p.5. Eisler had in fact communicated the central ideas of this defence of Schoenberg to Meyer in a letter dated 27.8.1951. SAdK Hanns-Eisler-Archiv, Korrespondenz 113.

¹² "Heute verbreiten aber die im Sinne des amerikanischen Imperialismus schaffenden Formalisten objektiv die Barbarei des Nihilismus." Meyer, "Realismus", p.39. This, and other translations here, are the author's.

¹³ "Die Konzert- und Theaterprogramme sind ständig zu kontrollieren". 'Aufgaben aus dem Arbeitsplan der Staatl. Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten für die Zeit vom 1. September 1951 bis zum 31. Dezember 1951', SAPMO-BArch DR 1/141. See also 'Tätigkeitsmerkmale', 28.11.1951, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

¹⁴ "Die Programme müssen den Kampf gegen alle Arten des Formalismus, des Kitsches, und der Dekadenz widerspiegeln". 'Entwurf – Orchesterordnung der DDR', p.3, SAPMO-BArch DR

"formalist" music altogether.¹⁵ Orchestras were required to send in statistical returns to show how closely they were adhering to this.¹⁶ The leading musical ensembles of the GDR were directly responsible to Stakuko, and successive layers of *Land* and *Kreis* musical ensembles were controlled by local cultural officials. This whole scheme was to be realised not through lists of acceptable and unacceptable music, or by laws backed up by police and judiciary, but through education. Stakuko ran programmes of conferences and seminars, regionally, and at national level for orchestral conductors, bandleaders, music critics, and local music officials. These were later backed up by regional inspections, where Stakuko officials toured the ensembles of a given area, looking to see how they were maintaining artistic standards and contributing to the building of socialism through their concert programming. Hartig also demanded regular reports from the regions on the development of their musical life. This was not a censorship exercised through violence or intimidation, but principally through pedagogy. Once musicians, particularly those like conductors in positions of responsibility, could be brought to a full understanding of the societal role of music, they would themselves avoid 'formalism', and perform instead 'realistic' and 'progressive' music. Thus, where musicians were identified as failing in their duties, Stakuko's response was rarely to punish; far more often it was to intensify its educational work.

Stakuko's conferences for musicians and officials were consciously academic occasions. They were devoted largely to lectures on musical history and Marxist theory, which alone could provide an understanding of what music was formalist, and why. From the report of a national conference held for conductors in November 1952 to survey their responsibilities after the SED's announcement of the building of socialism in July we can glean some precise ideas of what music they were expected to avoid. The conductors were told that the Swiss composer Rolf Liebermann's *Sinfonia* had been removed from the programme of the Dresden State Orchestra because he was a "committed twelve-toner" (*ein ausgesprochener '12 Toner'*), and were further instructed to avoid works by composers like Henze and Schoenberg. There is evidence also that Stakuko now intended to go

1/141. See also Hartig, Abteilung Musik, to Sekretariat Herrn Holzhauser, 9.1.1952, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6137.

¹⁵ 'Zum Arbeitsplan IV./51', 21.9.1951, pp.3–4. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/41.

¹⁶ See for example the statistical analysis of the programmes of the Republic's five leading orchestras in 'Arbeitsbericht III/52', 13.10.1952, p.1a. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

further and to try to prevent performance of some late romantic works as well. The conference was told that Stakuko was opposed to the performance of Bruckner symphonies because, with their "underlying mystical tendency", they could no longer be considered to be contributing to the building of socialism.¹⁷ It would appear that this campaign against late-romanticism did not get very far. A Stakuko inspection in early 1953 of the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra was very critical of its performance of works by Bruckner and Reger, but in trying to articulate its hostility to these composers, Stakuko's report ended up in meaningless tautology: "Reger and Bruckner belong to High Romanticism, and with their dense tonal palette, and their complicated themes which often say nothing, they have not much to say to the concert-goer of our times."¹⁸ There is though no evidence to suggest that there was any kind of concerted or successful campaign to remove these much-loved composers from the repertoire of orchestras in the GDR.

Hartig's grandiose schemes for total control of concert programming were never realised. His hopes were frustrated by jurisdictional disputes with other branches of the State and Party apparatus, and at the level of the most important ensembles, by the problems caused by guest conductors, who brought their own programmes with them.¹⁹ At a less exalted level, difficulties were caused by incompetence and overwork. A succession of reports, both from the regions, and written by Hartig himself, confirm that control of programming throughout the GDR was at best patchy and inconsistent. In June 1952, Hartig reorganised his department, noting that

¹⁷ "Wir sind gegen Aufführungen von Bruckner-Sinfonien, sind aber der Meinung, dass das Schaffen Bruckners mit seiner gewissen mystischen Grundtendenz nicht mehr geeignet sein dürfte, viel zur Förderung des Konzertlebens beim Aufbau des Sozialismus beizutragen". 'Referat zur Orchesterleiter-Tagung am 26.11.52, Kritische Beleuchtung der Konzertprogramme der DDR'. SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/279.

¹⁸ "Reger und Bruckner gehören der hohen Romantik an und haben mit ihrer dicken Klangpalette und ihrer komplizierten oft nichtssagenden Thematik dem Konzerthörer unserer Tage nicht viel zu sagen." 'Instrukteureinsatz des Koll. Schott nach Leipzig und Halle', 23.2.1953, p.4. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

¹⁹ 'Erfüllungsbericht des Arbeitsplanes für das III/52', p.1, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20. See also the sarcastic letter from Butting, head of the Sektion Musik at the Akademie der Künste, in July 1953, remarking that they were glad to hear that the Stadt Magistrat was in charge of programming in Berlin, as they had been previously unaware of this! 'Sektion Musik, Aktennotiz, Betr. Berliner Konzertleben', 30.7.1953. SAAdK Max-Butting-Archiv, Korrespondenz Mappe 2: 1952-56.

thus far there had been "virtually no supervision of programmes".²⁰ Alfred Hetschko, who had been in charge of programming,²¹ was replaced by the young Hans-Georg Uszkoreit, who was to play an important role in the musical life of the GDR through the 1950s. Initially it would appear that he did little better than his predecessor. As late as December 1952, Hartig was still arguing with local officials that it was not over-bureaucratic to insist on supervision of all programmes,²² and in May 1953, he confessed that "Hindemith, Henze, Burkhard, Liebermann, Stravinsky, Schoenberg and others" were still being performed.²³ In June, Uszkoreit reported that one of his main priorities, a series of conferences for music critics from all *Bezirke*, had been attended by only 50% of those invited.²⁴ After 17th June, matters deteriorated. A report on that year from Dresden spoke of a "discontinuation" (*Wegfall*) of programme control.²⁵

Matters were more complicated when it came to the censorship of new compositions. Here Stakuko found itself reliant on outsiders, like the VDK and the Academy of the Arts. These organisations, which represented composers in the GDR, had their own mechanisms for control, mainly the technique of professional discussion, and they thoroughly resented Stakuko's interference. Particularly in the light of later criticisms of Stakuko by the composers, we should note that the most important act of musical censorship in the early GDR, the banning of the Brecht/Dessau opera *Das Verhör des Lukullus*, took place in March 1951, shortly before Stakuko was founded. The decision to prohibit performance of Dessau's music because of its "destructive, corrosive dissonances, and mechanical percussion sounds" was taken independently by the SED's leading musicians, Meyer, Knepler, and Notowicz.²⁶ This act of censorship made clearer than any written document

²⁰ "fast keine Beobachtung der Programme". 'Zur Arbeit der Abt. Musik. Schwächen und Mängel', 29.6.1952, p.1. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

²¹ 'Tätigkeitsmerkmale', 28.11.1951. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

²² 'Zum Konzertmeldebogen', 29.12.1952. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

²³ 'Vorlage über die Entwicklung der Musikkultur in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik', p.2. SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/284.

²⁴ 'Bericht über die Erfüllung der Schwerpunktaufgabe der Programm- und Redaktionsabteilung in der HA Musik für den Monat Mai', 1.6.1953. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

²⁵ 'Bericht des Referates Musik über die Erfüllung der Arbeitspläne 1.–4. Quartal 1953, Rat des Bezirkes Dresden, Abteilung Kultur', 26.1.1954. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

²⁶ "Sie [die Musik, T.T.] enthält alle Elemente des Formalismus, zeichnet sich aus durch ein Vorherrschen destruktiver, ätzender Dissonanzen und mechanischer Schlagzeuggeräusche". Untitled note by Meyer, 12.3.1951, SadK Ernst-Hermann-Meyer-Archiv 565. This was also

the boundaries within which composers were confined in the early GDR. Stakuko did though manage to interpose itself as yet another level of bureaucracy in this process, and was involved with the debates on some of the more controversial new compositions of 1952 and 1953.²⁷ After the reorganisation of the Music Department in June 1952, Hartig specifically included the sanctioning of first performances as one of Uszkoreit's responsibilities.²⁸ By commissioning new works, Stakuko also tried to steer composers into particular areas, and conversely to discourage them from others.²⁹ Above all, by intensifying a climate where any new composition that hinted at abstraction or atonality was immediately suspect, Stakuko played a role as a censor. Of the regime's most favoured composers, only Meyer was irreproachable. Eisler, Wagner-Régeny, and Butting, were fiercely criticised, in Eisler's case for spending too long at his desk and not being sufficiently in touch with working people.³⁰ In other respects though, control was curiously inconsistent. One of Stakuko's first moves in 1951 was to ban the circulation of the journal *Melos*, the voice of the West German avant-garde,³¹ but GDR music students were allowed to travel to the

confirmed by Georg Knepler in an interview with the author, 27.5.2001. Knepler also stressed on this occasion that Hanns Eisler was opposed to the decision to censor *Lukullus*.

²⁷ As for example in the case of Jean Kurt Forest's choral cycle *Karl Marx hat gelebt und gelehrt* in 1953, which according to a report by Hartig contained "traits of formalism" ("Merkmale des Formalismus"). 'Vorlage über die Entwicklung der Musikkultur in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik', p.1, SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/284. The VDK's 30-page protocol of its own discussion of this work was sent to Uszkoreit on 7.7.1953. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/41.

²⁸ 'Abteilung Musik Struktur-Plan und Tätigkeiten', 14.7.1952, p.2. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

²⁹ See the plan to help the creation "einer zeitnahen Volksoper" in 'Vorlage die nächsten Aufgabe auf dem Gebiete der Musik', 10.8.1952, p.6, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/141. Stakuko also gave out commissions in the regions, for instance to 6 local composers in Mecklenburg, 'Bericht über die Situation auf dem Gebiet der Musik im Lande Mecklenburg', SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335, and to 13 in Dresden. 'Bericht des Referates Musik über die Erfüllung der Arbeitspläne 1.–4. Quartal 1953, Rat des Bezirkes Dresden, Abteilung Kultur', 26.1.1954, p.5. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

³⁰ See 'Stakuko, Abteilung Musik, Einschätzung des Kongresses der Deutschen Komponisten und Wissenschaftler und der Festtage zeitgenössischer Musik', 11.9.1952, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/7. It is important to distinguish here between 'Kritik und Selbstkritik', which was demanded of all composers, and 'criticism' in its English sense.

³¹ 'Abschriften, Stakuko, Hauptabteilung Darstellende Kunst und Musik', 8.8.1951, and 5.9.1951, and Zentralstelle für wissenschaftliche Literatur to Eisler, 19.10.1951. SAdK Hanns-Eisler-Archiv, Korrespondenz 120.

Darmstadt summer schools throughout the early 1950s, and it appears that contemporary scores from West Germany were available in the GDR.³²

In the end, Stakuko's limited success in this area was due not only to the difficulties of successfully defining which music was 'formalist', but can be attributed to more prosaic factors. Hartig's department was always overburdened, and its cumbersome working methods did not help. Stakuko officials also frequently had to attend Party training courses, and missed a great deal of time at work because of ill health. An internal report at the end of 1952 revealed that absence rates in Hartig's department were running between 22% and 35%.³³

These departmental problems were exposed even more glaringly in the field of light music. The SED's hostility to jazz, and to sentimental German dance music has been well documented,³⁴ but less attention has been paid to the precise mechanisms of censorship operated by Stakuko in this area between 1951 and 1953. These in fact reflect precisely that mix of bureaucratic regulation and pedagogic zeal which characterised Hartig's work with concert music. Stakuko's concern, again building on the theoretical work of Ernst Hermann Meyer, was threefold. Firstly, there was a fear that the unsophisticated musical forms used by commercial dance bands were degrading the sensibilities of the population; secondly a complete abhorrence of the escapist lyrics used for hit songs, which obviously conflicted completely with the broader artistic demand for realism in the GDR; and thirdly a distaste for the wild and unrestrained dancing that seemed to be popular with young people particularly. The SED regarded this music as 'cosmopolitan' and escapist. In drawing on a wide range of international styles and idioms it had lost contact with German folk music; its lyrics, often derived from English or French, were insipid and sentimental. Endless songs about sunny Mediterranean skies, tear-jerkers about seamen going away, and vapid dreams of sentimental love had no place in a society which was building a new socialist humanism; this music was part of a systematic preparation for war. Those West German publishers and record companies which produced this "cheap, revoltingly perfumed mass production" were the

³² On Stakuko and new composition see the detailed analysis in zur Weihen, *Komponieren in der DDR*, pp.124–199.

³³ 'Arbeitsbericht III/52', 13.10.1952, p.8. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20

³⁴ See Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels*; and Thacker, "The fifth column".

agents of American imperialism.³⁵ Stakuko and the SED also saw here continuity with Nazism, and loathed the bland, sentimental music favoured by Goebbels during the war.³⁶ The Party was well aware that dance music was far more popular than symphonic music or opera, and that this was therefore potentially a far greater cultural threat than the arcane complexities of twelve-tone music. The socio-economic analysis of musical history pioneered by Meyer, and developed by other theoreticians in the GDR, had also stressed the role of mechanical reproduction in the popularisation of dance music, and this awareness was reflected in Stakuko's attempts at censorship.

After meeting with Holzhauer, the Chairman of Stakuko, the *Volkspolizei*, and other government ministries,³⁷ Hartig in December 1951 published an order banning the performance of jazz, and demanding that all dance music be stressed by melody rather than by rhythm.³⁸ Through 1952 he worked on a regulation which would control the employment of musicians in dance bands. This proved extremely difficult though, and only in May 1953 was an *Anordnung* published which forbade any private engagement of amateur musicians in the GDR.³⁹ This reflected both trade unionist concern with the competition professional musicians were facing from talented amateurs, and also a misplaced pedagogic belief that academically qualified musicians would desist from playing unsuitable dance music.⁴⁰ When it was finally published, the *Anordnung* was immediately criticised by the FDJ, and Hartig was forced to reconsider it.⁴¹ In the aftermath of the uprising of 17th

³⁵ "billigen, widerlich parfümierten Massenware". Meyer, "Realismus", p.41. See also the draft of an article for the party newspaper *Einheit* by Eberhard Rebling, 'Situation und Perspektive unseres Musiklebens', 25.10.1952, p.6, which crudely summarises this point of view: "Jazz: Kosmopolitische Zersetzung, Gift der amerikanischen Kulturbarbarei am vorherrendsten in der Unterhaltungs- und Tanzmusik." (Jazz: Cosmopolitan decomposition, poison of American cultural barbarism, most prominent in entertainment and dance music.) SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/284.

³⁶ See Butting, "Zur Situation der Unterhaltungsmusik", pp.77–79.

³⁷ 'Protokoll über die Besprechung am 10.10.1951 wegen der Vermittlung von Musikern'. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6137.

³⁸ 'Verfügung vom 5.12.1951', *Neue Zeitung*, 16.2.1952, cited in Käs, "Hot and Sweet", p.255.

³⁹ "Anordnung über die Befugnis von Ausübung von Unterhaltungs- und Tanzmusik vom 27.3.1953", *Zentralblatt der DDR*, (11), 4 April 1953.

⁴⁰ Hartig's faith in this idea is particularly odd when one considers that many jazz musicians at this time, like Stan Kenton (who was known in both East and West Germany), were making a virtue out of technical skill in performance and arrangement.

⁴¹ See "Eine Anordnung, die Unordnung schafft".

June, it was not practical to try to enforce it, and Hartig was still working on a revised version of the *Anordnung* when Stakuko was disbanded.

This means that for practically the whole period of Stakuko's existence, other mechanisms of censorship had to be applied. As far as the live performance of jazz and dance music was concerned, Stakuko relied on much the same means as it used for orchestral music. Above all it sought to educate dance bandleaders, and to get them to censor their own programmes. Through 1952, Stakuko convened a series of regional conferences,⁴² and these serve as classic examples of the working method of the early GDR, encapsulating its ideas of 'collective work', 'criticism and self criticism', and above all, despite a democratic facade, its dedication to 'guidance' and 'control'. The conference managers were to prepare themselves beforehand with a detailed theoretical understanding of the history of dance music, fortified by extensive reading from the works of Marx, Lenin, Zhdanov, and Ernst Hermann Meyer. The agenda for the day's discussion was to be carefully stage-managed, and in some cases recordings were used to provide concrete examples of acceptable and unacceptable dance music. At the end of the conference, a set of previously prepared resolutions was to be presented for unanimous agreement; these were then to be passed on to the local press to ensure that bandleaders publicly presented a united front. They were thus to commit themselves to "the struggle against formalism in the area of music", "the struggle against destructive, cosmopolitan influences in dance music", and to "support for a realistic dance music".⁴³ Obviously these conferences were intended above all to impress on bandleaders their responsibility to censor their own programmes, and to make them aware of what Stakuko considered appropriate music to play. From the report of a conference held in Halle in 1952 it appears that one of Stakuko's demands was simply to get bands to use more strings and less brass.⁴⁴ Interestingly for the historian, many of the bandleaders also used the conferences to communicate the problems they faced on the ground, although this was not what Stakuko wanted to hear. Market forces were at work. Again and again

⁴² 'Zum Arbeitsplan der Staatlichen Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten 1952', 10.12.1952, pp.6–7. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

⁴³ "Kampf gegen den Formalismus auf dem Gebiete der Musik"; "Kampf gegen zersetzende, kosmopolitische Einflüsse in der Tanzmusik"; "Pflege einer realistischen Tanz- und Unterhaltungsmusik". 'Organisationsplan', undated. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133.

⁴⁴ Landesregierung Sachsen-Anhalt, Verwaltung für Kunst, to Stakuko, 19.6.1952. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133.

bandleaders complained that they were under pressure from their audiences to play 'hot'; if they stuck to the older styles preferred by Stakuko they were not engaged for further concerts. It is also clear that many dance evenings were accompanied by violence and rioting.⁴⁵

The extent of Stakuko's failure to control dance music can be judged from complaints which were pouring in to Hartig's office in 1952 and 1953 even as he grappled with the whole problem. Further evidence is provided by the reports sent in from the provinces by his touring staff, and by local cultural officials. From these varied sources it is clear that live performance of American jazz and West German dance music was continuing all over the GDR. There were particular problems in the cities of Saxony and Thuringia, but similar difficulties were reported from many other towns, and from even the smallest villages in the countryside. There was apparently a particular problem in the holiday resorts along the Baltic coast.⁴⁶

Stakuko also failed completely with the censorship of jazz and dance music coming into the GDR from the West. This took two principal forms, sheet music coming through the post, and broadcasts from West German, British, and American radio stations. Both were areas which Stakuko had no direct responsibility for, and which were by their very nature difficult to control. There were literally millions of items coming through the post from West Germany into the GDR in the early 1950s, and it was simply not possible to open each one and scrutinise its contents. West German music publishers at this time distributed sheet music free of charge to dance bands in East and West, primarily as a way of boosting record sales, and Stakuko made no serious effort to prevent this. As far as radio was concerned, the airwaves in Germany in the early 1950s were filled, day and night, with hours and hours of dance music. Listeners in the GDR could also, depending on the vagaries of medium wave reception in particular areas, tune in to broadcasts from other surrounding countries. The most popular stations from abroad were the British-licensed NWDR, and the American-controlled RIAS, both transmitting from West Berlin. The BBC German Service also had a large audience in the GDR, but broadcast less jazz and dance music.

Stakuko worked closely with the State Radio Committee, established in August 1952, to supervise musical broadcasting, but in

⁴⁵ See the report from Butting to Pischner, Staatliches Rundfunkkomitee, 14.11.1952, on conferences held in Gera and Chemnitz. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133.

⁴⁶ 'Bericht über die Arbeit des Referates Musik der Abteilung Kunst und kulturelle Massenarbeit beim Rat des Bezirks Rostock', p.3. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

practice there was little that could be done at this early stage of the GDR's history about dance music on foreign radio stations. Before 1953 there was no systematic jamming of Western broadcasts in the GDR, but American surveys in 1953 reported that listeners there were switching to NWDR because of interference with RIAS transmissions.⁴⁷ Not until 1954, after Stakuko's demise, were there discussions in Berlin between the BBC and West German politicians on this subject.⁴⁸ Even where the SED could jam foreign broadcasts, its preoccupation was with the spoken word. Its first priority was to prevent reception of the news programmes and political broadcasts directed specifically at audiences and officials in the GDR. For all its hostility to jazz and West German dance music, Stakuko had to live with the fact that listeners in the GDR between 1951 and 1953 could listen to as much of this music as they wanted to on the radio.⁴⁹

Matters were only marginally better with the GDR's own broadcasting. GDR radio stations were in direct competition for audiences with stations like RIAS and NWDR, and like them, used music as a 'hook' to attract listeners and expose them to its spoken word programmes. This demanded a populist approach, which could be easily managed with classical music. High quality performances of the German classics by ensembles like the Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra and the Dresden State Orchestra were consciously used to appeal to audiences in West Germany as well as in the GDR. Dance music was always more of a problem; although GDR stations broadcast plenty of 'mass songs' and 'fighting songs', these did not have the appeal of westernised popular music. Typically, Stakuko and the State Radio Committee sought a compromise which would be ideologically sound and educationally uplifting, introducing the series 'Cheerful Classics' (*Heitere*

⁴⁷ Merritt and Merritt, *Public Opinion*, p.222.

⁴⁸ Evidently by this time, NWDR broadcasts were also being jammed. The BBC was told by the adviser to Jakob Kaiser, the Bundesminister für gesamtdeutsche Fragen, that the German Service was "the only Western programme that is and can be consistently heard" in the GDR. Fraser to Thomson, 5.6.1954. BBC Written Archive, Caversham, E1/753/4.

⁴⁹ This begs the question of whether Western stations were consciously using jazz and dance music as a propaganda weapon. During the Stakuko period they were not. Ironically, West German politicians were particularly concerned about the effects of jazz, dance music, and avant-garde music broadcast by RIAS into what they called "the Soviet Zone". See 'Die Propaganda des RIAS und ihre Wirkung in der SBZD', drawn up for the Bundesministerium für gesamtdeutsche Fragen in 1953, which goes into some detail about this. Bundesarchiv Koblenz, B136/2305.

Klassik) to educate audiences away from their love for Western hits.⁵⁰ Like their counterparts in the West, GDR programmers had many hours to fill each day, and dance music was always the easiest and cheapest way to do this. Although there were frequent complaints from hard liners in Stakuko and the VDK about the quality of dance music being broadcast in the GDR, it appears that programmers were left with a significant degree of freedom.⁵¹ Through 1952 there were in particular many disagreements about the Kurt Henkel Orchestra, the GDR's leading radio dance band. These centred on its re-arrangements of West German tunes, and on Henkel's instrumentation. On at least one occasion this led to carefully prepared recordings made by the Orchestra being destroyed, at great cost.⁵²

Stakuko was confronted here with the material problems which dogged all its efforts. If it wished to censor westernised dance music, it had to provide an alternative, and in the early 1950s, the GDR's music publishers and record companies were completely unable to do this. The firm *Lied der Zeit* had restarted record production at Babelsberg and Ehrenfriedersdorf under a licence given to the singer Ernst Busch by the Soviets in 1946.⁵³ The Zone even enjoyed a brief period of supremacy; 250,000 records were produced by *Lied der Zeit* under the Amiga label in 1947, and in 1948 the black American trumpeter Rex Stewart made recordings at the Amiga studios. By 1949 though, *Lied der Zeit* was in a chaotic situation, and the SED was at loggerheads with Ernst Busch. In 1950 the Central Committee decided to form an "artistic council" (*künstlerischer Beirat*) to control *Lied der Zeit*, to include alongside Ernst Busch and his collaborator Hanns Eisler functionaries like Becher, Abusch, and Heymann.⁵⁴ This move coincided with the introduction of long playing records in the West. The GDR, despite its Marxist commitment to the fullest use of technology, was slow to realize

⁵⁰ 'Tonbandabschrift eines Interviews über die Rdf.-Tätigkeit Hans Pischners', p.7. SAdK Hans-Pischner-Archiv, 1117. Pischner was from 1950 in charge of musical programming at the Berliner Rundfunk, and had the most influential role in controlling this through the State Radio Committee.

⁵¹ See for example Meyer's complaint to the VDK about the use of "amerikanischen Hot" to introduce sports programmes on GDR radio in March 1953. 'Protokoll über die Sitzung des gesellschaftlichen Vorstandes am 26.3.1953', p.3. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/41.

⁵² See Priess to Zarnke, Staatliches Rundfunkkomitee, 9.2.1953. SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/284.

⁵³ See Gulynga, "Ernst Busch 1945", pp.1370–1380.

⁵⁴ 'Protokoll Nr.115 der Sitzung des Sekretariats am 16.6.1950', item 9. SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV/2/3A/98.

how far and quickly the old format of the '78' would be superseded, and did not invest in the machinery needed to press LPs. By 1951 it had been completely overtaken, both qualitatively and quantitatively, by the record industry in West Germany. As the SED prioritised heavy industry in 1952, the priority given to consumer products like sheet music and records declined.

Stakuko's earliest plans included a commitment to restructuring the record industry, but it appears to have achieved nothing. By 1952, the GDR was struggling even to make recordings of its own most prestigious performances. Paul Roll, an official from Leipzig, was one of Hartig's most frequent correspondents, bombarding him with complaints and suggestions on a wide range of musical matters; in March 1952 he went above Hartig's head to complain directly to the Central Committee that the recent Beethoven cycle performed by the Gewandhaus Orchestra had not been recorded. He argued that urgent improvements were needed in the recording industry, and that an archive of historically important performances should be set up.⁵⁵ Further warning of the worsening situation came in July, when 250,000 roubles had to be set aside to import records from the Czechoslovak company Supraphon. A plan was set in hand to nationalise *Lied der Zeit*.⁵⁶ A month later Hartig included plans for artistic and technical improvements in record production in another devastating critique of his department's work.⁵⁷ He came back to the problem in October. Although a million records had been produced in the GDR in 1952, Hartig optimistically planned to double this in 1953 with the introduction of new presses, and to start production of LPs as from January 1st.⁵⁸ Hartig's up and coming junior, Uszkoreit, was more in tune with the situation on the ground, and sent Hartig clear warning of the parlous situation out in the provinces early in the new year. Reporting from Rostock, he pointed out that the supply of records was falling well below demand; the local HO-Geschäft had ordered 7,500 records for Christmas 1952, but had received barely 100.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Roll to Rentzsch, Abt. Kultur, ZK, 24.3.1952. See his further letter on 4.7.1952 complaining about the failure to record the recent performance of *Judas Maccabaeus*. SAPMO-BArch DY 30/IV 2/9.06/284.

⁵⁶ 'Bericht über die Arbeit II/1952', 8.7.1952, p.2. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/141.

⁵⁷ 'Vorlage. Die nächsten Aufgaben auf dem Gebiete der Musik', 10.8.1952, p.9. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/141.

⁵⁸ 'Arbeitsbericht III/52', 13.10.1952, p.4. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/20.

⁵⁹ 'Bericht über die Instrukteurfahrt des Kollegen Uszkoreit nach Rostock', 18.2.1953, p.1. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

Stakuko did nationalise the record industry in 1953, creating *VEB Schallplatten*, with its two labels, *Eterna* for serious music, and *Amiga* for popular music, but failed to get LP production going. When Stakuko was disbanded in December 1953, the GDR was completely dependent on imported LPs from West Germany and Czechoslovakia. *Lied der Zeit* was no more successful with printing sheet music. Priority was given to the 'mass songs' and 'fighting songs' favoured by the SED, and attempts to speed up printing of dance music failed. Hartig's correspondence confirmed that there was virtually no GDR produced music available for dance bands to play from.⁶⁰

The effort to generate alternative dance movements, musical forms, and texts was similarly unsuccessful. Hartig in November 1952 created a 'Dance Music Commission' to bring together songwriters, composers, and officials from Stakuko. This body should have embodied all that was best about creative 'collective work' in the GDR, but appears today as little more than a clumsy organ of censorship.⁶¹ Early in 1953 the Dance Music Commission met several times to scrutinise new song lyrics, in an attempt to filter out those considered objectionable. Revealingly, they found very few which were acceptable, and had to reject almost all those submitted, because they typically stood "in relationship to nothing" (*mit nichts in Beziehung stehen*). The titles of some of those they turned down give us some clues as to their thinking. One called *Rosalinde*, presumably a love song, was described as irrelevant to a tractor driver, who instead should have "music full of life and zest".⁶² Another, *In the little pavilion by the sea* (*Im kleinen Pavillion am Meer*), was similarly dismissed.⁶³ The Commission even suggested that a dreamy song about Hawaii should be altered to refer instead to the port of Lübeck.⁶⁴ Unsurprisingly, the main effect of all this censorial activity was to discourage writers and composers in the GDR from even

⁶⁰ For example, Der Rat des Bezirkes Halle, Abt. Kunst u. kulturelle Massenarbeit wrote to Stakuko on 30.3.1953, complaining that only Western music was available locally. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133.

⁶¹ 'Protokoll der ersten Tagung der Kommission "Tanzmusik" am 17.12.1952'. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/240.

⁶² "eine lebensvolle, schwungvolle Musik". 'Protokoll über die Sitzung der Kommission "Tanzmusik" am 8.4.1953', p.2. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/240.

⁶³ 'Protokoll über die Sitzung der Kommission "Tanzmusik" am 16.4.1953'. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/240.

⁶⁴ 'Protokoll der 2. Sitzung der Kommission "Tanzmusik" des Verbandes Deutscher Komponisten und Musikwissenschaftler, 17.3.1953', p.31. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/240.

trying to create new dance music, and this left a vacuum which through the mid-1950s was filled with music from the West.

On the evening of 17th June 1953, members of the Academy of the Arts met, undoubtedly in a state of shock, to formulate a response to the turbulent events of the day. They quickly came up with the line which dominated the cultural reaction to the uprising. It was all Stakuko's fault: the bureaucrats from Stakuko did not understand artists or their creative work, and their heavy-handed interference had generated great discontent. The academicians did not criticise the principles which lay behind Stakuko's attempts at control and regulation, but rather the way that Holzhauer and his colleagues had gone about the task. Having condemned Stakuko for its over-bureaucratic approach, the academicians agreed to set up a committee to review the whole problem.⁶⁵

Over the next few months the SED shored up its position with some careful tactical moves. In the cultural field it created an impression of debate, criticism, and change, while in fact giving little away. Stakuko actually turned out to be very useful, acting as the whipping boy for frustrated artists and intellectuals, and deflecting criticism from more serious issues. One by one, the GDR's cultural organisations turned on Stakuko. The Academy had set the tone, and led the vendetta. The Kulturbund followed on 30th June. Even the VDK joined in, arguing that previous working methods had not contributed to the happiness of artists in their work, but had damaged the reputation of State bodies, something "which in the final analysis leads to the events of a 17th June".⁶⁶

Skillfully, the Party leadership allowed this criticism, which was mainly of Stakuko's over-bureaucratic working methods, to develop into a chorus, leaving the underlying principles of its censorship largely untouched. The organisation was disbanded in December 1953, providing an example of

⁶⁵ 'Aus dem Protokoll der improvisierten erweiterten Präsidiumssitzung, 17. Juni 1953', cited in Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste, *Zwischen Diskussion und Disziplin*, pp.78–79.

⁶⁶ "Die bisherige Arbeitsmethode trägt nicht dazu bei, die Arbeitsfreudigkeit der Kunstschaffenden zu heben, sondern wirkt sich auf das Ansehen der staatlichen Stellen schädigend aus, was dann letzten Endes zu den Ereignissen eines 17. Juni führt." 'Protokoll über die Sitzung des Zentralvorstandes am 10.7.1953', p.2. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/41.

how the Party could respond to criticism and discontent. Accompanied by a rhetoric of artistic freedom, Stakuko was replaced by a new Ministry for Culture, headed by the poet Johannes R. Becher.⁶⁷ The harpsichordist Hans Pischner was installed as his Deputy, with special responsibilities for music. Although Hartig's Department was in fact completely taken over as the Music Department of the new Ministry, the demise of Stakuko did in fact mark the beginning of a painful and protracted liberalisation of the GDR's musical culture. The moment of the most intense censorship was past. The manifesto of the new Ministry set the tone for the new era by referring only indirectly to Stakuko. Max Butting's memoir, completed in June 1954,⁶⁸ followed this trend, and it quickly became the habit in the GDR only to refer to Stakuko in cryptic or veiled allusions. By the late 1950s, Uszkoreit, of all people, was denying that censorship of music had taken place in the early years of the GDR.⁶⁹

It is clear that the practice of musical censorship in the early GDR was wide-ranging in intent, but ineffectual in practice. How should we categorise this paradoxical situation? In his most recent book, Michael Kater wrote that the GDR was "a totalitarian regime, similar in its oppressive nature and censorial intent" to Nazi Germany.⁷⁰ Exploration of this comparison is complicated by the similarities and overlaps in the analytical vocabulary used by both the NSDAP and the SED in their political understanding of musical modernism and jazz. Both parties used ideas of decadence and degeneration very freely in their analysis of music. Terms linked with organic decay and with hygiene were used to signify poles of good and evil, of acceptability and unacceptability. Above all when a vocabulary of criticism and defamation was needed, both parties drew on a

⁶⁷ See "Die Deutsche Akademie der Künste zur Gründung des Ministeriums für Kultur", and Becher, "Programmerklärung des Ministeriums für Kultur", for representative examples of this rhetoric. Ironically Hartig and Uszkoreit had mastered the new language themselves; their final plans at Stakuko were full of comments on over-centralisation, poor communication with musicians, and a lack of artistic involvement. See the 'Abteilung Musik Quartalsarbeitsplan IV/53'. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/7.

⁶⁸ Butting, *Musikgeschichte*.

⁶⁹ In a letter to a citizen in 1957, Uszkoreit, then in charge of music at the Ministry for Culture, denied that there had earlier been a prohibition on jazz in the GDR. Uszkoreit to Dressel, 22.5.1957, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/243. In 1959 Uszkoreit denied that either Orff or Schoenberg were on a prohibited list in the GDR. See the typescript for his article in *Sonntag*, "Mein Schlußwort zur Diskussion über A Melichars 'Musik in der Zwangsjacke'", 6.6.1959, p.4, SAPMO-BArch DR 1/323.

eugenicist discourse, forever associated now with the worst horrors of Nazism. To that extent they appear as part of a wider pattern of Darwinian cultural analysis that developed in the early 20th century. This eugenicist language was though located in different intellectual contexts. The Nazis of course understood these terms in relation to race; 'degenerate' music was produced by Jews and blacks.⁷¹ The SED's musical theorists used these eugenicist terms in a Marxist-Leninist framework. For them, 'degeneracy' was a symptom of bourgeois decay. The increasingly rarified avant-garde music scene centred on Darmstadt, Baden-Baden, and Cologne in the early 1950s exemplified for the SED an estrangement of art from the people. In the case of jazz, what the SED regarded as originally the legitimate articulation of the yearning and suffering of an oppressed sub-proletariat had in its eyes been commodified by the entertainment industry, and placed as a potent weapon in the hands of the imperialists. It saw the West German hit music industry as a continuation of the cynical wartime production of Goebbels' Propaganda Ministry.

Stereotypically, the GDR, like Nazi Germany, is regarded as a police state, and in both cases the existence of a rigorous cultural censorship is invoked as a central part of this identification. Here the differences become more apparent though. Undoubtedly one of the reasons why Stakuko failed to implement its censorship with any great success was because it was actually so hesitant and lenient when it came to punishing transgressors. Stakuko operated more a paternalistic didacticism than a rigid suppression using violence, police, and prisons. Its earnest and scholarly officials thought more of education and teaching than of punishment. Where individuals or groups were identified as breaking accepted codes of behaviour, this was typically attributed not to malevolence but to lack of understanding; Stakuko's role then was not to punish but to teach. In Stakuko's regional inspections this idea recurs frequently. From Bad Salzungen a report tells us that the conductor of the *Kreis* Culture Orchestra was of only "average ability". He seemed unaware of what was described as his "societal work", because he was "not sufficiently guided".⁷² A report from Gera noted that

⁷⁰ Kater, *Composers of the Nazi Era*, p.110.

⁷¹ For a concise expression of these ideas, based on supposedly academic work, see the entry "Musik und Rasse" in a standard work of reference from the Nazi period, *Meyers Lexikon, Band 7*, p.1696.

⁷² "Koll. Bitterlich, der Leiter des Orchesters, ist ein Dirigent von durchschnittlicher Begabung. [...] Es scheint, als ob er seine musikalische Berufung als sein einziges Aufgabenfeld betrachtet und die gesellschaftliche Arbeit zu kurz kommt. Er selbst hat nicht den Blick für politische

although programmes there were being well monitored, the two "first-class" conductors in the area were not yet free from the "trammels of formalism" (*den Hang zum Formalismus*). The remedy suggested was characteristic: they needed strong ideological guidance.⁷³ Stakuko could be pushed too far though. The second conductor of the Thuringian Symphony Orchestra, Wenske, was dismissed for what was described as his "reactionary stance". Apparently during a Stakuko inspection one member of the orchestra had asked whether 'activists' should wear their badges on their black suits during concerts. Wenske had replied in the negative, suggesting instead that the badges should be thrown away and trampled upon.⁷⁴

Even in the most flagrant examples where the prohibition of jazz was flouted by dance bands, the most serious punishment that Stakuko would impose was a three month performance ban. The precise wording of these bans is revealing. One issued in September 1952 banned the Hans Georg During Dance Orchestra from playing in *Kreis Liebenwerda*. The local council justified the ban by referring to "numerous complaints about the bad musical level of your orchestra". Stakuko added a note suggesting that this should be altered to read "musical-ideological".⁷⁵ Where fines were levied on individual musicians, they were relatively small, typically between 30 and 200 marks.⁷⁶ A striking feature of Stakuko's dealings with various dance bands is the truculence of the bandleaders, who do not appear to have been easily intimidated. Several who were reported to Stakuko exploited the chaotic and inconsistent behaviour of various branches of the SED to continue performing after being told not to. Hans-Georg During wrote immediately after being banned from performing to complain that he was being victimised by a local official who was also a rival musician, and wanted in fact to get rid of a competitor.⁷⁷ Even cooperation with the

Notwendigkeiten und wird in seiner Arbeit zu wenig angeleitet." 'Brigadeeinsatz im Kreis Bad Salungen', 18.11.1952. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

⁷³ "sie brauchen eine starke ideologische Anleitung". 'Instrukteureinsatz des Koll. Schott in dem Bezirk Gera und dem Kreis Schleiz', undated. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

⁷⁴ This was only one example illustrating Wenske's "reaktionäre Haltung". See 'Instrukteureinsatz nach Gotha, Arnstadt, Erfurt', 2.2.1953, p.3. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335.

⁷⁵ "zahlreicher Beschwerden über das schlechte musikalische Niveau Ihres Orchesters". Haaf, Rat des Kreises Liebenwerda, to Stakuko, 8.9.1952. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133.

⁷⁶ See for example the 'Bericht des Referates Musik über die Erfüllung der Arbeitspläne 1.-4. Quartal 1953, Rat des Bezirkes Dresden, Abteilung Kultur', 26.1.1954. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/335

⁷⁷ During to Vorsitzender des Rates des Landkreises Liebenwerda, 18.11.1952. SAPMO-BArch DR 1/6133

Volkspolizei was made very difficult because its own social evenings were notorious for their wild music.

Finally, the emphasis on Stakuko's censorship of music here should not obscure the larger role of the organisation in the musical life of the GDR. Hartig's overburdened department devoted far more time to supportive than to repressive work. It organised huge commemorative festivals, concerts in local 'culture houses' and in work places, the publication of literature about music, and it gave practical support to a network of orchestras, operas, and choirs at professional and amateur level. It was utterly serious in its dedication to high artistic standards. Like all censorships, that operated by Stakuko was joyless, narrow-minded, and intolerant. Its rigour was in practice tempered not merely by incompetence, absence from work, and over-bureaucratisation, but by a belief that in the end a whole population could be won around to a new understanding of the role of music in society.

Bibliography

- "Anordnung über die Befugnis von Ausübung von Unterhaltungs- und Tanzmusik vom 27.3.1953". *Zentralblatt der DDR*, (11), 4.4.1953.
- Becher, Johannes R. "Programmerklärung des Ministeriums für Kultur". *Sinn und Form* 2 (1954): 279-321.
- Brooke, Caroline. *The Development of Soviet Music Policy, 1932-1941*. PhD thesis. University of Cambridge, 1999.
- Butting, Max. *Musikgeschichte die ich miterlebte*. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1955.
- Butting, Max. "Zur Situation der Unterhaltungsmusik". *Musik und Gesellschaft* 3 (1951): 77-79.
- "Die Deutsche Akademie der Künste zur Gründung des Ministeriums für Kultur". *Sinn und Form* 1 (1954): 142-145.
- "Eine Anordnung, die Unordnung schafft". *Junge Welt*, 10.5.1953.
- Eisler, Hanns. "Arnold Schönberg". *Sinn und Form* 1 (1955): 5-15.
- Gulynga, Alexander. "Ernst Busch 1945". *Sinn und Form* 4 (1968): 1370-1380.
- Käs, Rudolf. "Hot and Sweet. Jazz im befreiten Land". Glaser, Hermann / von Pufendorf, Lutz / Schöneich, Michael (eds.). *So viel Anfang war nie: Deutsche Städte 1945-49*. Berlin: Siedler, 1989. 250-255.
- Kater, Michael. *Composers of the Nazi Era: Eight Portraits*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Marchall-Reiser, Johanna. *Findbuch zu Beständen des Bundesarchives. Bd.70. Ministerium für Kultur. Teil 1. Staatliche Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten, 1951-1954. Bestand DR 1*. Koblenz: Bundesarchiv, 1999.
- Merritt, Anna and Merritt, Richard (eds.). *Public Opinion in semisovereign Germany: The HICOG Surveys 1949-1955*. Urbana, Chicago, and London: University of Illinois Press, 1980.
- Meyer, Ernst Hermann. "Realismus – die Lebensfrage der deutschen Musik". *Musik und Gesellschaft* 2 (1951): 38-43.
- Meyers Lexikon, Band 7*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut AG, 1938. 1696.
- neues musikfest 1953. 25. bis 28. mai funkhaus köln*. Cologne, 1953.
- Peysen, Joan. *Boulez: Composer, Conductor, Enigma*. London: Cassell, 1977.

- Poiger, Uta. *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 2000.
- Stiftung Archiv der Akademie der Künste, Berlin (ed.). *Zwischen Diskussion und Disziplin: Dokumente zur Geschichte der Akademie der Künste (Ost) 1945/1954 bis 1993*. Berlin: Henschel, 1993.
- Thacker, Toby. *Music after Hitler: Politics, Society, and the Reconstruction of an Art in Germany, 1945-1955*. PhD thesis, Cardiff University, 2002.
- . "The fifth column: dance music in the early German Democratic Republic". Major, Patrick / Osmond, Jonathan (eds.). *The Workers' and Peasants' State: Society and Communism in East Germany under Ulbricht, 1945-1971*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. 227–243.
- "Verordnung über die Aufgaben der Staatlichen Kommission für Kunstangelegenheiten vom 12.7.1951". *Gesetzblatt der DDR* (1951): 684–685.
- zur Weihen, Daniel. *Komponieren in der DDR - Institutionen, Organisationen, und die erste Komponistengeneration bis 1961: Analysen*. (Aus Deutschlands Mitte, Band 29). Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau, 1999.
- Werth, Alexander. *Musical Uproar in Moscow*. London: Turnstile Press, 1949.

FILM CENSORSHIP IN A "CLEAN STATE": THE CASE OF KLEIN AND KOHLHAASE'S *BERLIN UM DIE ECKE*¹

Daniela Berghahn

This article focuses on one of the most spectacular cases of film censorship which occurred in the GDR at and in the wake of the Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED in 1965 and which resulted in the ban of almost the entire year's feature film production. After sketching the complex mechanisms of film control and censorship through the state, the article explores why feature films, notably those belonging to the genre of the *Gegenwartsfilm* (films about contemporary society) emerged as the key target at the Eleventh Plenum. The forbidden films of the mid-sixties supported topical reforms which aimed to restructure GDR society by opening it up towards Western influences. Originally these reforms had been promoted by the Party but by 1965 a political and cultural backlash had occurred so that the liberal attitudes expressed in these films were at odds with the Party's revisionist notion of a "clean state with unshakeable moral standards".

Berlin um die Ecke (Berlin Around the Corner), the fourth 'Berlin-film' made by the director-scriptwriter-duo Gerhard Klein and Wolfgang Kohlhaase, was one of twelve films that fell victim to one of the most ferocious instances of film censorship that ever affected East German film production.² Decisions reached at and in the wake of the Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED in December 1965 – also appropriately referred to as *Kahlschlag* (clearing the ground) – led to the banning or withdrawal of nearly the entire annual production of DEFA's feature film studio and to the suspension from office of several figureheads of the film industry.³ Among them were one of

¹ Honecker, "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees", p. 19; extracts reprinted in Agde, *Kahlschlag*, pp. 238–51.

² The previous three 'Berlin-films' are: *Alarm im Zirkus* (Circus Alarm, 1953), *Berliner Romanze* (A Berlin Romance, 1956) and the popular but controversial film *Berlin – Ecke Schönhauser* (Berlin – Schönhauser Corner, 1956).

³ The additional eleven forbidden films are: Kurt Maetzig, *Das Kaninchen bin ich* (The Rabbit is Me, 1965/1990), Frank Vogel, *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule* (Don't Think I Am Crying, 1965/1990), Herrmann Zschoche, *Karla* (Carla, 1966/1990), Günther Stahnke, *Der Frühling braucht Zeit* (Spring Takes Time, 1965/1990), Egon Günther, *Wenn Du groß bist, lieber Adam* (When You Are Grown up, Dear Adam, 1965/1990), Jürgen Böttcher, *Jahrgang '45* (Born in '45, 1966/1990), Frank Beyer, *Spur der Steine* (Trace of Stones, 1966/1990), Ralf Kirsten, *Der*

DEFA's best-known directors, Frank Beyer, the head of the DEFA studio, Jochen Mückenberger, and even the Minister and Deputy Minister of Culture, Hans Bentzien and Günter Witt.⁴ The grand scale of the censorship as well as the fact that the guardians of socialist film culture in addition to its creators were implicated raises a number of questions that this paper will address. First, in order to be able to understand how the *Kahlschlag*, which had such a devastating effect on East Germany's film industry could come about it is necessary to examine how the mechanisms of film regulation and control could be rendered ineffective prior to the Eleventh Plenum. Second, if we believe the protestations of Klein and Kohlhaase, as well as numerous other prominent filmmakers whose films were banned, that they had no intention of making subversive films but, on the contrary, wanted to further the progress of socialist society by liberating it from the fetters of Stalinism, then how was it possible that their films were so severely attacked for undermining the fundamental principles on which socialist society was based? How was it possible for DEFA filmmakers as well as cultural officials collectively to misjudge the political climate? What factors determined the ideological instability of the political and cultural climate of the early to mid-sixties and led filmmakers to overestimate the boundaries of the permissible? And third, by exploring the censorship history of *Berlin um die Ecke*, which has as yet received comparatively little critical attention, this paper explores in what respects Klein and Kohlhaase's film conflicted with DEFA's mission to create a representative socialist film culture.⁵

verlorene Engel (The Lost Angel, 1966/1971), Kurt Barthel, *Fräulein Schmetterling* (Miss Butterfly, 1966/never released), Hans-Joachim Kasprzik, *Hände hoch – oder ich schieße!* (Hands up – or I'll Shoot, 1966/never released), Egon Schlegel and Dieter Roth, *Ritter des Regens* (Knights of the Rain, 1965, a début film co-produced with the Hochschule für Film und Fernsehen, never released).

⁴ Mückenberger (ed.), *Prädikat: Besonders schädlich*, pp. 355–56.

⁵ In books, articles and dissertations which examine film censorship in the GDR, *Spur der Steine* and *Das Kaninchen bin ich* are by far the most frequently discussed films, cf. for example Mückenberger (ed.), *Prädikat: Besonders schädlich*; Steinborn / von Eichel-Streiber (eds), *Verbotene Filme*; Reid, "Erik Neutsch's *Spur der Steine*"; Berghahn, "Censorship in GDR Cinema"; Feinstein, *The Triumph of the Ordinary*; Feinstein, "Constructing the Mythic Present"; Soldovieri, "Censorship and the Law"; while there exists no chapter-length analysis of *Berlin um die Ecke*, this film is cursorily discussed or documented in the following publications: Richter, "Zwischen Mauerbau und Kahlschlag"; Wischniewski, "Die zornigen jungen Männer"; and Claus, "Rebels with a Cause".

The censorship apparatus

Since in the former GDR the public sphere functioned as a key agent of socialisation and value formation, it was scrupulously guarded by the state. As a result of Lenin's much-cited maxim that film was the most important of all art forms, East German film production was particularly closely regulated. DEFA, or Deutsche Filmaktiengesellschaft, was a state-owned film production and distribution company. Given its monopoly status, the DEFA studios were the only place where filmmakers could work, unless they worked for television. However, television provided no genuine alternative since many of DEFA's films were co-productions with television and, more significantly, television was even more strictly controlled since it came directly under the authority of the Department for Agitation and Propaganda of the Central Committee of the SED.⁶ East German feature film production was both controlled and financed by the *Hauptverwaltung Film*, a department of the Ministry of Culture.⁷ The HV Film had "statutory responsibility to help promote a representative socialist film culture [and] was charged not only with policing the film industry but with ensuring a continuous production of films".⁸ The HV Film was headed by the Deputy Minister of Culture and was home of the state certification board (*Staatliche Filmabnahme*), which had to authorize the cinematic release of all DEFA's films as well as of all imports and exports. While the HV Film was in principle the main agent of film censorship, additional monitoring was provided through the Central Committee's culture unit, *Abteilung Kultur: Sektor Film* (Department of Culture: Film Section). In other words, the HV Film held a somewhat equivocal position in the complex process of film regulation - as became particularly evident in the context of the Eleventh Plenum, when its officials acted less as censors than as mediators between the filmmakers on the one hand and the Party on the other, defending controversial films such as *Das Kaninchen bin ich* and *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule*.⁹

In fact, mediation and negotiation were key aspects of film regulation, which generally ensured that the banning of completed or nearly

⁶ From the 1970s onwards, however, an underground film scene developed outside official channels to which painters, poets, musicians and performance artists contributed, cf. Löser / Fritzsche (eds), *Gegenbilder*.

⁷ The *Staatliche Komitee für Filmwesen* was replaced by the HV Film when the Ministry of Culture was founded in January 1954.

⁸ Soldovieri, "Negotiating Censorship", p. 13.

⁹ For translations of film titles and directors cf. note 3.

completed films could be prevented. Since the HV Film officials closely monitored all of the studio's activities, there were hardly ever any surprises at the final certification stage (*Filmabnahme*), mainly because ample opportunities presented themselves for officials to intercede in the development or production of a film. The first monitoring stage consisted in the HV Film approving DEFA's annual production plans, which would specify how many of the approximately fifteen films made per year would represent a certain genre or theme, such as anti-fascist films, children's films, or films about contemporary society, so-called *Gegenwartsfilme*. The HV Film would then draft a master plan for the entire film industry and submit this to the culture minister, who in turn would incorporate it into a master plan for the entire cultural sector. This needed to be approved by the GDR's highest executive body, the Council of Ministers. Such was the procedural process in theory at least. In practice, in particular controversial projects were immediately referred to the Central Committee's Cultural Section (*Kulturabteilung*) which possessed far greater authority, since its staff worked under the direct supervision of the Politburo.¹⁰ While the procedural details of film control and censorship underwent subtle changes over the years, the overall goal was always the same, namely to ensure that East Germany's film production would reflect what David Bathrick calls the "foundational narratives about the genesis of the German socialist state" and the ever-changing priorities of the cultural agenda.¹¹

During the early sixties, the DEFA feature film studio enjoyed considerable artistic autonomy. Once the production plans had been approved by the HV Film, the subsequent stages of film production from script development through to the rough cut were entirely self-regulated by the DEFA studio. However, the demarcation line between the studio's self-regulatory mechanisms and state control was fluid. One of the reasons for this was the dual role of the HV Film as financier and censor. The other had to do with the close rapport that existed between the studio's agents of self-regulation and the agents of state control: the heart of self-regulation at the DEFA studio were its twenty-seven full-time *Dramaturgen* (dramaturges or script editors). They fulfilled a crucial role in the studio's organisational hierarchy and their status was often comparable to that of the director. Each year they had to vet around two hundred proposals and treatments for films, supervise the development of screenplays, and, being something of an

¹⁰ Cf. Feinstein, *The Triumph of the Ordinary*, p. 40.

¹¹ Bathrick, *The Powers of Speech*, p. 16.

"ideological midwife" to each film,¹² ensure that a film project would pass all the various stages of censorship and would eventually be approved for cinematic release. A good dramaturge was above all a good negotiator, someone who was capable of defending a potentially controversial film against any objections from above. Dramaturges were assigned to the studio's different artistic production groups (*Künstlerische Arbeitsgruppen* or KAGs) and often forged long-standing partnerships with directors and other artistic staff in these groups. The studio's chief dramaturge provided an additional level of mediation and control. The ultimate decision-making power about the production and the studio's approval of the finished film rested solely with the studio director. He had to submit a studio statement (*Stellungnahme*), which included a quality rating (such as 'Prädikat wertvoll') to the HV Film, who in turn could approve the film, demand certain alterations, or ban it. The certification board would usually issue an official rating for the film, which would have repercussions for the film's distribution (nationally and internationally) and was likely to be reflected in film reviews in the national press.¹³ A good rating also resulted in bonus payments to the salaried DEFA dramaturges.¹⁴

Further supervision by the state in the studio was provided by the presence of *informelle Mitarbeiter* (unofficial informants) and other agents of the *Stasi* (secret police). In particular after the Eleventh Plenum, the *Stasi*'s presence in the studio was significantly increased, presumably to prevent a recurrence of such open censorship as the Eleventh Plenum had been in future. It has been suggested that during the seventies and eighties there were around sixty *informelle Mitarbeiter* in the feature film studio alone.¹⁵ They provided the Party with a useful indirect channel for gathering information about all creative and organisational processes in the studio, thus constituting an effective form of pre-censorship. Moreover, they instilled a sense of caution and fear amongst DEFA staff and thus effectively inhibited free expression and promoted self-censorship.

In addition to the diverse mechanisms of control outlined above, the imposition of normative aesthetic codes, notably the doctrine of Socialist Realism, ensured that DEFA's films communicated the desirable values and socio-political identity to its viewers. Since state-imposed aesthetic doctrines and values were to a large extent internalised by GDR artists, a form of self-

¹² Bathrick, *The Powers of Speech*, p. 37.

¹³ Geiss, *Repression und Freiheit*, p. 58.

¹⁴ Soldovieri, "Negotiating Censorship", p. 54, and Schönemann, "Stoffentwicklung", p. 80.

¹⁵ Geiss, *Repression und Freiheit*, p. 58.

ensorship prevailed that was not only far more harmful than the institutional practice of censorship imposed from the top, but also conveyed the misleading impression of a consensus between *Geist und Macht* – between intellect and power. Against this background Erich Honecker's declaration after the *Wende*, "Wir hatten ja keine Zensur [...] Bei uns gibt es sie nur kraft des Bewußtseins", contains more than just a grain of truth.¹⁶ As Frank Beyer, one of DEFA's most famous and prolific film directors, once said: "Die Selbstzensur war tief in uns verwurzelt. Das äußerte sich so, daß wir bestimmte Stoffe gar nicht mehr vorgeschlagen und bestimmte Dinge gar nicht gedreht haben, so daß sie dann auch gar nicht verboten werden konnten."¹⁷

Film production in a politically volatile climate

With such tight mechanisms of state control and self-regulation in place, the banning of nearly an entire year's film production in 1965/66 is hard to explain. Why did nobody within the DEFA studio or the HV Film intervene during the script development or early production stages?

One answer is that the *Kahlschlag* occurred at a critical political juncture when a period of thaw, initiated in the Soviet Union by Khrushchev in 1956 and somewhat half-heartedly adopted by the GDR's leaders, was superseded by a return to the hard line. The development of the films thus occurred in a climate of ideological flux and uncertainty, where "die Kulturpolitik [...] pendelte zwischen der Duldung künstlerischer Experimente und ihrer exemplarischen Unterbindung konzeptionslos hin und her".¹⁸ In other words, the films which were to be forbidden were made not because the sophisticated apparatus of censorship had failed, but because both cultural officials and filmmakers had not fully appreciated the vicissitudes of the political climate during the mid-sixties and had overestimated the degree of ideological latitude.

¹⁶ Cited in Emmerich, *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, p. 52. (We did not have censorship [...] It only existed by virtue of our consciousness.)

¹⁷ Sury, "Schwierigkeiten mit der Wahrheitssuche", p. 15. (Self-censorship was deeply ingrained in us. This became apparent through the fact that there were certain themes that we did not even propose and certain films that we did not make, so that they could not be forbidden in the first place.)

¹⁸ Engler, "Strafgericht über die Moderne", p. 17. (cultural politics oscillated without any clear concept between tolerating some artistic experiments and intercepting others to set a precedent)

That profound errors of judgement regarding the political climate were at the core of the large-scale film censorship of the mid-sixties is most clearly demonstrated by the fate of Frank Beyer's *Spur der Steine*: both the studio directorate and cultural officials had initially hailed this film as a masterpiece of socialist film art, an example of a new type of *Gegenwartsfilm*. It had been nominated for the film festival in Karlovy Vary and shown with great success at the Postdam Workers' Festival in June 1966. Progress, DEFA's film distribution company, planned to release fifty-six copies – by GDR standards a very high number – in cinemas across the country and to give it broad press coverage. Only two days before the film's official premiere, the Politburo and the Central Committee changed their mind about it: a strategy was devised whereby the film would be taken off cinema programmes at short notice. During the film's official premiere in Berlin on 1 July 1966, youth gangs which had been planted in the cinema by the SED's hard-liners disrupted the performance, expressing their indignation at the film's portrayal of society. The only press coverage it received was in *Neues Deutschland* and this fake review, published under a pseudonym, was effectively an extract from the Politburo's directives.¹⁹

When interviewed about the forbidden films upon their release in 1989/90, filmmakers asserted that none of the forbidden films was made in the spirit of opposition to the regime but with the conviction that the time had come to render life under real existing socialism in a more realistic and somewhat more critical way than had hitherto been acceptable. This belief was obviously shared by filmmakers and cultural officials alike. As Wolfgang Kohlhaase, who had scripted several of DEFA's big success stories, stated with reference to his banned film *Berlin um die Ecke*: "Wir haben diesen Film aus einer kritischen Solidarität mit dem Sozialismus heraus gedreht, und wir haben uns maßlos gewundert, dass die Gesellschaft das nicht haben wollte".²⁰

Several factors had encouraged the filmmakers' optimism. In order to counteract the rapidly declining audience numbers for DEFA films in the late fifties and early sixties, the result of increasing competition from television and the loss of audience appeal of films overburdened with Party doctrine, filmmakers and administrators agreed on a strategy that promised to

¹⁹ For a detailed discussion of the censorship history of *Spur der Steine*, cf. Berghahn, "Censorship and GDR Cinema"; Feinstein, *The Triumph of the Ordinary*, pp. 176–93; Feinstein, "Constructing the Mythic Present".

²⁰ Cited in Günther, "Fragen an Egon Günther", [unpaginated]. (The making of this film was driven by a critical solidarity with socialism and we were astounded that society did not want it)

draw in audiences without relinquishing the educational mission of the national film culture: a new type of *Gegenwartsfilm* which examined socialist society more critically and more honestly. In a repressed society, a greater degree of openness and criticism promised to have considerable popular appeal.

Another factor was, rather paradoxically, the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961. The Wall was crucial for the development of the new type of *Gegenwartsfilm* that was inward-looking and dared to be more critical. With the GDR populace practically imprisoned in their own country, the State's power over its citizens had become so complete that a few concessions could be made and, rather ironically, a more liberal atmosphere began to prevail. As Kurt Maetzig, one of DEFA's founding members and best-known directors put it when interviewed upon the release of *Das Kaninchen* after the *Wende*: "Nach dem Mauerbau kam es zu einer gewissen Beruhigung, Stabilisierung des Landes. Wir hielten den Zeitpunkt jetzt für gekommen, uns den inneren Problemen ohne Rücksichtnahme, kritisch und mit prinzipieller Deutlichkeit zu nähern".²¹

Like Maetzig many of the other filmmakers of the forbidden films of the mid-sixties "cited the building of the Wall as the signal that they would now, finally, enjoy a protected discursive space in which critical works of art would no longer be lambasted for playing into the hands of the West".²²

In particular, the year 1963 heralded a number of liberalising and democratising measures in the legal system, the economic sector, and youth culture which pointed towards a greater degree of tolerance and a more open-minded attitude towards Western culture.²³ Significant structural changes in the DEFA studio mirrored the all-embracing reform trend. Following the example of the Polish and Czech film industry, DEFA's management structure was decentralised by the introduction of artistic production groups each consisting of artists, dramaturges and studio officials who worked together on a continuous basis and were in control of their own budgets. "While the ostensible aim of these measures was to further both industrial efficiency and artistic quality, [...] one side effect was a loosening of political

²¹ Maetzig, "Es war, als wenn ein Damoklesschwert", [unpaginated]. (After the erection of the Wall, the situation in the country stabilised and became calmer. We thought the time had come to tackle the problems in our country more critically and more outspokenly).

²² Kramer, "Representations of Work", pp. 132–33.

²³ These measures were in particular the Rechtspflegeerlaß (Resolution on Jurisprudence), the Jugend-Kommuniqué (Youth Communiqué) and the Neue ökonomische System (New Economic System), all of which were introduced in 1963, cf. Mückenberger, *Prädikat: Besonders wertvoll*, pp. 7–21.

supervision of the creative process".²⁴ This was further reinforced by the fact that Wischnewski, DEFA's chief dramaturge, relinquished his post, thus granting the individual artistic production groups even greater autonomy. Empowering the DEFA studio directorate to approve most stages of script development and production without having to refer to the HV Film throughout the development process further facilitated the completion or near completion of films which would otherwise have been subjected to significant alterations, if not outright censorship, at a much earlier stage. This is not to say that the film minister, Günter Witt, was unaware of the films that were being produced in the run-up to the Eleventh Plenum. It has been suggested, however, that a competency conflict as well as Witt's wavering attitude towards some of the forbidden films were to blame for things progressing so far, pushing the boundaries of the permissible beyond the limit.²⁵ Yet the wavering attitude of Witt and others was obviously the result of the ambiguous political climate and the desire shared by artists as well as many bureaucrats to liberate socialism from the horrible deformations which were inflicted upon it by Stalinism, which – despite the de-Stalinisation under Khrushchev – was still deep-rooted in the GDR. And, before the crippling effects of Stalinism could be eliminated in the GDR, the period of thaw came to an end in the Soviet Union when Khrushchev was ousted from power in October 1964 and Brezhnev took over. This resulted in a massive political backlash in the GDR and a re-strengthening of the allegiance with the Soviet bloc.

By that time, the development of the screenplays and scripts of several of the forbidden films was well under way and filmmakers were aware that they were working against the clock, anticipating that the shifted political agenda would soon have repercussions for the cultural sphere. After all, even during the thaw, a number of warning signs had underscored the volatility of the political climate. Just a month after the erection of the Wall, for example, the first significant cultural backlash occurred when an exhibition at the Academy of Arts, "Junge Kunst" (Young Art), met with severe criticism and Kurella, head of the Committee for Culture of the SED, himself took abstract paintings off the wall. Six weeks after the erection of the Wall, Heiner Müller's play *Die Umsiedlerin oder Das Leben auf dem Lande* (The Resettler or Living in the Country) was withdrawn on the night of its première and Müller was expelled from the *Schriftstellerverband*

²⁴ Feinstein, "Constructing the Mythic Present", p. 220.

²⁵ Cf. Feinstein, *The Triumph of the Ordinary*, pp. 165–67.

(Writers' Association). Peter Huchel's dismissal from the post of chief editor of the highly regarded journal *Sinn und Form* in 1962/63 and the controversies sparked by the Kafka conference in Liblice in 1963 are evidence that the cultural climate had not fundamentally changed in the course of de-Stalinisation or as a consequence of the GDR's hermetic isolation from the West. Modernism was still denounced as formalism and thus an expression of bourgeois decadence; alienation, a prominent theme in the works of Kafka, was declared to be an inappropriate topic for art since, allegedly, alienation did not exist in a socialist society. In the sphere of film, too, restrictions persisted and other Soviet bloc countries enjoyed far greater freedom than the GDR. While DEFA directors wanted to emulate Soviet directors like Kalatozov, Tarkovsky and Chukhrai and the New Wave directors in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, among them Wajda, Polanski, Forman and Juráček, cultural officials in the GDR in the early sixties were not ready for such a degree of innovation, one that challenged the Socialist Realist formula. Internationally acclaimed and prize-winning Soviet films such as Tarkovsky's feature film début *Ivan's Childhood* (1962) and Kalatozov's *The Cranes Are Flying* (1957) were controversial in the GDR. Jean Paul Sartre's review of Tarkovsky's début film, in which he singled out the expressionistic and surrealist quality of its symbolism, suddenly disappeared a few hours before it was due to go to print.²⁶ This was only one of the many indications that, compared with the USSR itself and other socialist countries, the thaw had been implemented rather half-heartedly in the GDR and was partly renounced by Ulbricht in his anti-thaw speech in March 1963.

And yet in this climate of ideological instability, DEFA filmmakers saw a window of opportunity and mustered the courage at least to begin to emulate their colleagues across the Eastern borders. Only at or in the aftermath of the Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the SED which convened between 15 and 18 December 1965, did they fathom the full extent of the about-turn.

Of the dozen films which were banned or withdrawn in the context of the Eleventh Plenum only two were actually discussed at the meeting. These were Frank Vogel's *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule* and Kurt Maetzig's *Das Kaninchen bin ich*, whilst Günter Stahnke's film with the prophetic title, *Der Frühling braucht Zeit*, had been screened once in November 1965 and then been recalled. Frank Beyer's *Spur der Steine* was already completed before

²⁶ Netzeband, "Der Winter ist kalt", p. 45.

the *Kahlschlag*, whereas the other forbidden films were still in production at the time of the Plenum. Some were never completed, others were never released, either because the new DEFA studio director, Franz Bruk, who replaced Jochen Mückenberger after his dismissal, pre-empted censorship by not applying to the HV Film for permission to release the films, or because of direct state intervention. Like dangerous ammunition, these films – weapons in the struggle against the class enemy – were put under lock and key in the state film archives. Even the filmmakers were denied access to them until the *Wende*, when a group of filmmakers, critics and film historians put pressure on the cultural functionaries to re-visit the censorship that had been imposed some twenty-four years earlier. A commission was founded which, together with the filmmakers, reconstructed or completed the forbidden films, the majority of which was shown in February 1990 at the *Akademie der Künste* (Academy of Fine Arts) and later at the International Film Festival of Berlin.

While each of the forbidden films has its unique and fascinating case history of censorship, they share certain common denominators: with a few exceptions, they belong to the genre of the *Gegenwartsfilm* which carried the greatest weight since it was by definition suited to promote the state's current socio-political and economic agenda.²⁷ Consequently, nearly all of the forbidden films bear some relation to the reform measures introduced in 1963: *Das Kaninchen bin ich* deals with the reforms in the legal system, while *Der Frühling braucht Zeit* and *Berlin um die Ecke* endorse the reform plans proposed by New Economic System. *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule, Karla, Jahrgang 45*, and *Berlin um die Ecke* are in keeping with the liberal attitude expressed in the 1963 Youth Communiqué which bore the official title "Unserer Jugend mehr Vertrauen und Verantwortung beim umfassenden Aufbau des Sozialismus" (More confidence in and more responsibility for the young generation in achieving the all-encompassing task of building socialism), advocated the development of a distinctive youth culture, and even took a surprisingly permissive stance on issues such as sexual morals, dance and Western beat music, hitherto vilified as an expression of capitalist decadence.²⁸ This seems to suggest that filmmakers were indeed acting in good faith when making the forbidden films for, arguably, all of the films promote topical reforms which promised to re-structure GDR society by opening it up towards Western cultural and

²⁷ DEFA's anti-fascist films enjoyed even greater esteem since they promoted and perpetuated the GDR's myth of origin. Cf. Berghahn, "Liars and Traitors"; Byg, "The Anti-Fascist Tradition"; Mückenberger / Jordan, "Sie sehen selbst, Sie hören selbst...".

²⁸ Extracts cited in Rauhaut, "DDR-Beatmusik", p. 122–33.

economic influences. However, by December 1965, the Party's views on reform had changed so that the liberal attitudes expressed in these films that were to be forbidden were at odds with the Party's revisionist notion of "ein sauberer Staat mit unverrückbaren Maßstäben" (a clean state with unshakeable ethical and moral standards), as described in the Politburo's official report, read by Honecker at the Eleventh Plenum.²⁹ In their zeal to promote reform, filmmakers had also overshot the mark by broaching a number of taboos, showing adolescents in conflict with the generation of their parents or alienated from the socialist collective; the legal and educational systems are presented as encouraging hypocrisy and opportunism, and key figures of society lack the role model qualities expected of the heroes of Socialist Realist texts. Worse still, the films do not offer solutions to the conflicts and contradictions rendered, but leave it to the audience to draw their own conclusions. To expect such a degree of independence and maturity from the audience, the censors felt, was dangerous and unrealistic.³⁰

The case of *Berlin um die Ecke*

Like so many of their colleagues, the director-scriptwriter team Gerhard Klein and Wolfgang Kohlhaase had misjudged the *Zeitgeist* when making *Berlin um die Ecke*. On the one hand, the film has many of the ingredients of a flagship of socialist film culture: following the cultural agenda set at the Bitterfeld Conference of 1959, which prescribed that workers and industrial production should take centre stage in film and literature, its plot focuses on work problems in a Berlin metal processing plant.³¹ It also features stock characters such as Hütte, the anti-fascist around whom the GDR's foundational narratives are constructed, and Paul Krautmann, the dedicated

²⁹ Honecker, "Bericht des Politbüros", p. 19.

³⁰ Cf. the self-criticism of the Deputy Minister of Culture, Günter Witt, at the Eleventh Plenum, where he concedes having made a serious error of judgement about the audience's ability to solve the contradictions and conflicts shown in the film *Das Kaninchen bin ich* by themselves. Witt, "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees", p. 24.

³¹ At the first Bitterfeld Conference in 1959, one hundred and fifty writers and three hundred workers and journalists initiated a cultural revolution in the literary sphere. They envisaged that writers and workers swap places: writers were to work in production whereas workers were encouraged to take up their pens. The second Bitterfeld Conference in 1964 slightly shifted the focus of production-based literature from the simple manual workers to the planners and leaders of socialist enterprises; cf. Emmerich, *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*, pp. 129 and 181.

socialist worker whose entire *raison d'être* revolves around the state-owned enterprise. Moreover, the film is in line with the state-endorsed strategy to develop films which specifically target the youth sector. A strategic document entitled "Entwicklungsstand, Probleme, sowie Hauptaufgaben des Film- und Lichtspielwesens der DDR bis zum Jahre 1970" (the current state, problems and main tasks of film culture in the GDR until 1970) notes: "Da die ästhetische Erziehung der Jugend besondere Aufmerksamkeit erfordert und Jugendliche die Mehrheit des Publikums bilden, müssen deren besondere Interessen in Thematik, Sujet und Genre stärker als bisher berücksichtigt werden".³²

The studio's production plan for 1966 stipulates six films about the young generation in contemporary GDR society, none about the history of the proletarian movement, five anti-fascist films, no science fiction, and three historical films including cinematic adaptations of literature.³³ The depiction of adolescents in films was, in principle, desirable because films were expected to make a significant contribution to the formation of a socialist identity by portraying suitable role models. Following the Youth Communiqué of 1963, this had become an even more pressing goal since the Party wanted to involve young people more actively in the building of the socialist state, culminating in the slogan "Die Mädchen und Jungen von heute werden in wenigen Jahrzehnten die Hausherren des sozialistischen Deutschland sein. Die Stunde der jungen Leute ist gekommen".³⁴

Several of the forbidden films make more or less explicit reference to this slogan – and yet, ideologically, they were off target. The young heroes and heroines portrayed take the official rhetoric at face value and as a result become disillusioned. Karla, the eponymous young teacher in Hermann Zschoche's film, takes up her first teaching position in a small rural school, encouraging her pupils to examine the tenets of real existing socialism critically. She soon realises that her youthful idealism is not welcomed by her superiors. Her boyfriend Kaspar has had to learn his lesson earlier. When he

³² BArch/DR117/A/240 (DEFA Betriebsakten, June 1965). (Since the aesthetic education of our young people requires our particular attention and since young people are the majority of the audience, it will be necessary to take their interests more strongly into account in terms of theme, subject matter and genre).

³³ BArch/DR1/4217/XVI 1965/66 Thematischer Plan 1966 (DEFA Betriebsakten, 30 September 1965)

³⁴ Cited in Rauhaut, "DDR-Beatmusik", p. 53; this quotation is only included in the original version of this article in the first edition of Agde, *Kahlschlag*, but not in the second revised edition. (Within a few decades today's girls and boys will be the patrons of socialist Germany. The hour of the young people has come).

was still working as a journalist, he was asked to write about the crimes of Stalinism – but then the GDR's views on de-Stalinisation changed and he was fired. In Frank Vogel's film *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule*, eighteen-year-old Peter Neumann is asked to write an essay on the topic "Die Republik braucht Dich. Du brauchst die Republik" (The Republic needs you, you need the Republic). When he expresses a rather critical view of socialism, he is expelled from school. Regarding himself as a product of socialism, Peter fails to comprehend how it is possible to have grown up under socialism yet not be a socialist. Maria Morzeck in *Das Kaninchen bin ich*, aged nineteen, is denied a place at university since her brother has been charged with openly provocative behaviour against the state. Her faith in the legal system is shattered when she finds out that the judge who sentenced her brother to three years in prison was pursuing his own opportunistic goals rather than justice.

Similarly, *Berlin um die Ecke* is the story of two adolescents, Olaf and Horst, who are uncomfortably inquisitive about the shortcomings of the Berlin metal processing plant where they are working as members of the *Jugendbrigade* (youth brigade). Aware of the inefficiencies of the production process and the injustices of the wage system, they exploit the flaws in the system to their own advantage. Convinced that the wages of the apprentices in the enterprise are too low compared with those of other workers, Horst and Olaf tamper with the payslips to improve their earnings. When they are found out, they argue that the system invites corruption and that they are not the only ones to bend the rules. As a result of this incident, the team of young workers is disbanded. The editor of the in-house newsletter, Hütte, a representative of the older generation, reports on Olaf's and Horst's misdemeanour in the newsletter. Spurred into action by a sense of injustice, Olaf and Horst want to expose the problems inherent in the planned economy in another way. They find an accomplice in the old metalworker Krautmann, who takes great pride in his work, is continuously concerned with improving the organisational structures within the enterprise and therefore rails against the low work morale and inefficiency in the factory. Though committed to the socialist cause, Paul Krautmann deplores the work ethos in the metal processing plant, where medals and awards are supposed to create a sense of socialist competitiveness and increase productivity in the same way that profits and promotions motivate labourers in the capitalist system. For the young generation, this clearly does not work: when Olaf, Horst and the conscientious Paul Krautmann surpass the production target by 250%, their names are put forward for an award, the honorary title of

Aktivist.³⁵ But when Olaf's and Horst's case is discussed at a trade union meeting, they turn down the honorary title, explaining that through their efficient and hard work they had only intended to demonstrate that the production plans are not based on sound economic calculations and that this nationally-owned enterprise could be much more efficient if the workers did not take unofficial breaks all the time but worked to their full capacity instead.

Such provocative behaviour does not go down well with the older workers in the plant. To committed socialists like Hütte and Krautmann, Horst's and Olaf's attitude is incomprehensible. The conflict between old and young workers does not end here. One day, Horst defaces the factory wall with provocative graffiti: "Wir sind alle Sklaven" (We are all slaves). Hütte immediately suspects that Horst is the culprit, but Horst denies responsibility. Olaf, who believes his friend, retaliates against the injustice done to Horst and one evening waylays Hütte and beats him up in the hallway of his house. Despite the violent attack, Hütte admits him into his flat to talk to him. Hütte, echoing the slogan of the Youth Communiqué, reminds Olaf of the huge burden of responsibility which rests on the young generation: "Die Macht, Junge. Hast Du das begriffen, daß Ihr die Macht habt? Und daß Ihr sie morgen ganz alleine haben werdet?" (The power, boy. Do you understand that you've got the power and that tomorrow, the power will be all yours). When Horst confesses to Olaf that he did actually write the provocative statement on the wall, their friendship ends, not only because Olaf is disappointed in his friend's dishonesty, but also because Olaf's rebellious attitude towards certain aspects of socialism has been superseded by a deeper insight into its merits as well as its shortcomings.

Through the sudden death of his fatherly friend Paul Krautmann, he has come to realise that despite its flaws, socialism is worth fighting for. As a young man of great integrity and perseverance, he has also managed to win the heart of Karin, a singer and aspiring actress at night-time and a kitchen maid in a restaurant during the day, who has recently left her husband. The final scene shows Olaf moving out of his parents' home in order to live with Karin. His transition from adolescence to adulthood is underscored by the gesture of passing on his leather jacket, symbol of youthful rebellion and the

³⁵ This award was an important aspect of the activist movement which was intended to improve socialist competitiveness and was granted in particular to workers or collectives who surpassed their production goals; cf. Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen (ed.), *DDR Handbuch*, "Sozialistischer Wettbewerb, Aktivistebewegung".

influence of Western role models such as Marlon Brando and James Dean, to his younger brother, who had always coveted this prized possession.

Much of the controversy that surrounded Klein and Kohlhaase's film concerned the generational conflict. This was a highly sensitive topic since it belied the official view that old and young agreed upon all fundamental issues in life and shared the common goals of socialism. Yet *Berlin um die Ecke* was seen to tell a different story. In particular the functionary Hütte is the chief antagonist of Olaf and Horst: he accuses the members of the *Jugendbrigade* of crimes against the socialist state and state-owned property and "is portrayed as a fossil, as an intolerant zealot".³⁶ And up to the culmination of the conflict between old and young, the violent encounter between Olaf and Hütte, the audience has little sympathy for this representative of the older generation. However, this scene is crucial for a reassessment of the audience's sympathies towards the representatives of the older and the young generation: not only does the victimisation of Hütte shift the balance in favour of Hütte, the slow-paced depiction of his lonely and impoverished existence evokes a sense of pity. This is reinforced by Hütte's revelation: "Das letzte Mal haben sie mich auf dem Appellplatz geschlagen. Einer, der so jung war wie du. 24. April '45",³⁷ making a laconic reference to his incarceration in a concentration camp, which in the context of East German cinema identifies him as an anti-fascist resistance fighter. Because of his anti-fascist past, the film implies, he deserves respect and Olaf responds accordingly. As Christiane Mückenberger notes, "[w]hen relations [between the generations] have all but reached breaking point, the innate respect of the younger generation for the anti-fascist past of their elders prevents total rupture".³⁸ For Olaf, too, Hütte's revelation about his past is the clue to open up and to cast some light on Horst's family background, which is meant to explain why he became the kind of rebel he is now: an authoritarian father-figure led to Horst's alienation from his own family and made him abscond to the West once he was eighteen, only to return, but still ambivalent about his allegiance to capitalism or socialism.³⁹ As a result of the reciprocal

³⁶ Mückenberger, "The Anti-Fascist Past", p. 72.

³⁷ (The last person to hit me like that was a guard at roll call. He was a young chap like you. That was on 24 April '45)

³⁸ Mückenberger, "The Anti-Fascist Past", p. 71.

³⁹ Horst's ambivalent allegiance is, for example, conveyed in the casual remark that it is common in America for people to go to work by car. A problematic relationship with father-figures or the absence of appropriate father-figures is also a central theme in Klein / Kohlhaase's film *Berlin – Ecke Schönhauser*, where generational and domestic imbalances result in one of the young hero's submission to harmful influences from the West.

revelations, a cautious process of rapprochement between Olaf and Hütte begins. Hütte, the main antagonist of the young generation is after all willing to listen to Olaf, despite having been attacked by him. As a committed socialist, he never forgets his mission – to prepare and to educate the young for the big task ahead of them: today's youth will be the leaders of tomorrow.

Wherever tensions between old and young manifest themselves, there is at least one representative of the older generation who manages to alleviate the conflict. When Horst and Olaf are denied admission to the dance hall, because Horst is not wearing a tie – another token of youthful rebellion – the cloakroom attendant helps out by supplying the indispensable item of clothing for a small fee. When the tenants in Olaf's block of flats complain about Olaf and his friends using the communal laundry room as a workshop to repair their motorbikes, the local policeman tacitly takes sides with the young. Despite proclaiming that it is his task to ensure that the views and interests of the public are respected, he actually forms an allegiance with the young motorbike enthusiasts, seeking their advice on a problem he has with the engine of his own bike.

The closest ally of the young heroes is Paul Krautmann. Modelled on Kohlhaase's father, he is cast in the most favourable light – idealistic and dedicated to his work, humane and open-minded. "Die von uns in diesem Film mit der meisten Liebe behandelte Figur, die uns den wichtigsten Blickpunkt auf unsere heutige Zeit liefern soll, ist der Reparaturschlosser Krautmann", writes the director Klein in a letter to Erwin Geschonneck, one of the GDR's most popular actors, whom he wanted to win for the part of Krautmann.⁴⁰ The character Krautmann is complex and, despite epitomising the virtues of hard work and total commitment to the people-owned enterprise, he is at the same time critical of the shortcomings of the socialist economic system, which he compares with his pre-war experience of the capitalist economy. Due to the problems of the planned economy, the metal plant where Krautmann works is constantly battling with a shortage of materials and literally on his deathbed Krautmann cannot get over the fact that in an enterprise with a workforce of 2,000, bolts of a certain diameter are simply unobtainable. Krautmann is a role model for the young generation and in fact, Olaf's work ethos changes as a result of his friendship with the father-figure Krautmann. When Krautmann suddenly dies, Olaf writes his obituary, addressing his deceased friend directly, which suggests that

⁴⁰ Klein, "Brief an Erwin Geschonneck", [unpaginated]. (The character whom we portrayed with the greatest affection and who provides the most important perspective on our times is metal-worker Krautmann).

dialogue between the generations does exist after all: "Ich denke, Paul, dass du immer noch da sein wirst, wenn wir die Halle neu einrichten, und wenn wir ruhiger geworden sind, weil wir die Sachen besser hinkriegen, und wenn kein Strom mehr verschwendet wird und wenn es 16mm Muttern gibt wie Sand am Meer...".⁴¹ This obituary is a summative expression of a firm belief in the unstoppable progress of socialism, conceding that problems exist but that they will be solved.

The dialectical structure which Klein and Kohlhaase use in the film when dealing with such sensitive issues as conflict and corruption in socialist society was actually in line with the aesthetic agenda set for the *Gegenwartsfilm* in the early sixties. Thematising the existence of conflicts and contradictions was no longer forbidden and artists were encouraged to render topical problems as long as they offered positive solutions. This is precisely what Klein and Kohlhaase do: for example, the generational conflict is not presented as an unbridgeable chasm but as a learning experience on the way to adulthood; the shortcomings of the economy are rendered as evolutionary problems which will eventually be overcome. The superiority of the socialist system is never really called into question. The overall tenor of the film is one of reconciliation and approval. And yet, the censors did not see it this way.

Like Frank Beyer's film *Spur der Steine, Berlin um die Ecke* was nearly finished by the time of the Eleventh Plenum. Shooting the film, including a few interruptions, had taken over twenty months, too long, in other words, to accommodate the volatility of cultural politics. And yet in spite of the massive cultural backlash which occurred, the DEFA studio was optimistic that Beyer's as well as Klein and Kohlhaase's films would pass. The charges brought up against *Das Kaninchen bin ich* and *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule* did not seem to apply. As Wolfgang Kohlhaase recalled in an interview given in 1990:

Immer mehr Filme gerieten in Behinderung und späteres Verbot. Unser Unbehagen wuchs. Aber im Studio gab es die Vorstellung: Da kommen noch zwei Filme, *Spur der Steine* und *Berlin um die Ecke*, denen man nicht unterstellen kann, daß sie sich

⁴¹ (I think, Paul, that you will still be here with us when we refurbish the hall, and when we have calmed down because we have learnt to manage things better, and when we no longer waste electricity and when there will be nuts a dime a dozen)

Randproblemen zuwenden, oder daß sie mit einer gewissen Tristesse auf die Wirklichkeit blicken.⁴²

In fact, both *Spur der Steine* and *Berlin um die Ecke* were in line with the prescribed aesthetics and cultural politics of the GDR, portraying the process of socialist production. Yet rather surprisingly, HV Film found fault with the fourth Berlin film and coerced the Artistic Production Group responsible for the film, KAG Berlin, to abandon the project immediately. In an act of preventive obedience the new DEFA studio director, Bruk, ordered a production stop. *Berlin um die Ecke* was shelved in its rough-cut version. The sound track was not finished and the film music by Georg Katzer had not even been composed yet.

In order to camouflage state censorship as an act of self-regulation which had been achieved through consensus, Jahrow, the head of HV Film's production department, introduced the official statement (*Stellungnahme*) on *Berlin um die Ecke* with the following rhetoric:

Die HV Film des Ministeriums für Kultur stimmt der Auffassung des DEFA-Studios für Spielfilme zu, den Film *Berlin um die Ecke* nicht zur staatlichen Zulassung einzureichen.

Dieser Film ist eindeutig in die Reihe jener Arbeiten einzuordnen, die wegen ihrer antisozialistischen, schädlichen Grundhaltung der Kritik unterzogen und ausgebuht werden mußten. [...] Der Film unterstellt von Anfang bis zum Ende, daß in unserer Republik ein Generationskonflikt besteht, der nicht aufzulösen geht. [...] Junge Arbeiter, deren Hauptheld Olaf ist, werden in diesem Film im Gegensatz zur älteren Generation gezeigt, die diese jungen Menschen übervorteilt, es nicht zuläßt, daß Jugendliche eigene Gedanken vertreten [...]⁴³

Jahrow argues that the film blames the older generation for the political and ideological aberrations of the young because the parents' generation fails to understand and accept "die gerechten Auffassungen [der Jugendlichen]" (the

⁴² Kohlhaase, "Es ging, in der damaligen Diktion", [unpaginated]. (More and more films were intercepted and later forbidden. Our discomfort grew. But in the studio it was felt that there were two films nearing the end of production, *Spur der Steine* and *Berlin um die Ecke*, which could not be charged with dwelling on marginal issues or with casting a gloomy light on reality).

⁴³ Jahrow, "Stellungnahme zu *Berlin um die Ecke*". (The HV Film of the Ministry of Culture endorses the decision of the DEFA feature film studio not to submit *Berlin um die Ecke* to the state licensing board. The film belongs to the group of films which had to be criticised and could not be released because of their anti-socialist and harmful attitude [...] From beginning to end the film insinuates the existence of an irresolvable generational conflict in our Republic.[...] Young workers, represented by the film's hero Olaf, are presented in an antagonistic relationship with the older generation, which is shown to cheat the young people and which does not grant the young the right to their own way of thinking).

just and fair attitudes of the young). If the older generation had made the effort to communicate with Olaf and Horst in order to understand their views, Jahrow argues, Horst would never have been driven to adopting "fascist" attitudes and writing "fascist" graffiti, "Wir sind alle Sklaven" (we are all slaves) on the wall.⁴⁴

The film's portrayal of the young touches upon an issue that was highly sensitive at the time of the Plenum: it advocates tolerance towards a distinctive youth culture with all its paraphernalia such as its own music and dance styles, its own dress codes, sexual morals and attitudes towards work and the socialist collective. In many respects the film endorses precisely those measures of liberalization that were outlined in the Youth Communiqué of a few years earlier. Addressing areas as diverse as literature, dance, sexual morals, and sport, it placed particular emphasis on beat music, a cultural phenomenon that had been hitherto – and would just two years later – again be vilified as an expression of capitalist decadence. Yet for a short while, the GDR's youth could enjoy beat music and even Beatles songs on DT 64, a radio channel targeting the young, and generally benefit from a degree of permissiveness that no longer attempted to seal the GDR off from the trends in Western youth culture. By September 1965, the SED had changed tack: after fans rioted at a Rolling Stones concert at the Berlin Waldbühne, the national press levied a rabble-rousing attack against beat music fans and youth culture at large. Licenses for amateur bands were withdrawn and beat music fans and other rebellious youth suspected of criminal activity were sent to labour camps. Young people with long hair and a Western dress code were denounced as "fascists" and treated as if they were criminals or enemies of the state.⁴⁵ At the Eleventh Plenum Erich Honecker, who was in charge of security matters in the Central Committee and the second man behind Ulbricht at the time, explained in his keynote speech why this clamp-down on youth culture had become necessary:

Unsere DDR ist ein sauberer Staat. In ihr gibt es unverrückbare Maßstäbe der Ethik und Moral, für Anstand und gute Sitte. Unsere Partei tritt entschieden gegen die von den Imperialisten betriebene Propaganda der Unmoral auf, die das Ziel verfolgt, dem Sozialismus Schaden zuzufügen. [...] In den letzten Monaten gab es Vorfälle, die unsere besondere Aufmerksamkeit erforderten. Einzelne Jugendliche schlossen sich zu Gruppen zusammen und begingen kriminelle Handlungen; es gab Vergewaltigungen und Erscheinungen des Rowdytums. Es gibt mehrere Fälle ernster Disziplinerstöße beim Lernen und in der Arbeit. Studenten, die zum Ernteeinsatz waren veranstalteten

⁴⁴ Jahrow, "Stellungnahme zu *Berlin um die Ecke*".

⁴⁵ Dalichow, "Weh Dir, daß Du ein Enkel bist", p. 19.

Saufgelage im Stile westdeutscher reaktionärer Korpsstudenten. [...] Hier zeigt sich wiederum der negative Einfluß von Westfernsehen und Westrundfunk auf Teile unserer Bevölkerung. [...] Den Erscheinungen westlicher Unmoral und Dekadenz wird nicht offen entgegengetreten.⁴⁶

Although Klein and Kohlhaase's film, *Berlin um die Ecke*, does not feature long-haired hippies and hooligans and although the music played in the dance-hall scenes is by no means the kind of beat music considered to be harmful to socialist consciousness, this film was nonetheless implicated in Honecker's attack on youth culture: alongside *Denk bloß nicht, ich heule* and *Jahrgang 45*, *Berlin um die Ecke* was advocating that young people had a right to their own way of life – despite the fact that they, unlike the older generation, could not claim the moral high-ground based on the anti-fascist credentials that legitimated the founders and leaders of the GDR and the generation of the founders at large. And because young people were open to Western influence – thus the argument ran at the Eleventh Plenum – they were endeavouring "im Zuge einer sogenannten Liberalisierung die Deutsche Demokratische Republik von innen her aufzuweichen".⁴⁷ In other words, the liberalisation that affected youth culture as well as culture in general was interpreted as a manifestation of Western ideological subversion: by infiltrating socialist society with a sense of pessimism, by weakening its moral substance through pornography, trash literature and decadent beat music, the class enemy was trying to undermine the foundations of the socialist state. This resulted, as Honecker declared in his speech, in an overriding scepticism and nihilism, in particular amongst the intellectuals and *Kulturschaffenden* (creators of culture). They had, as a result, lost sight of providing young people with appropriate role models in their works of art and, Honecker argued, it was therefore not surprising if 'Jugendliche nicht

⁴⁶ Honecker, "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees", p. 19. (The GDR is a clean state with unshakeable standards of ethics, morality, decency, and good manners. Our Party is vehemently opposed to the imperialist propaganda of immorality, which aims to harm socialism. [...] During the last few months there have been a number of incidents that have put us on the alert. Individual young people have ganged up and committed criminal offences; there have been rapes and other forms of hooliganism. There are several serious violations of discipline in learning and at work. Students participating in volunteer harvest brigades organised drinking bouts like those of West German student duelling societies. [...] Here we can witness again the negative influence which West German television and radio have on certain groups amongst our citizens. [...] Manifestations of Western immorality and decadence are not opposed with a sufficient degree of openness).

⁴⁷ Honecker, "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees", p. 21. (to destabilise the GDR in the course of so-called liberalisation).

mehr wissen, ob sie richtig oder falsch handeln, wenn sie dort Vorbilder suchen'.⁴⁸

HV Film's criticism of the film was also directed at the portrayal of love relationships which were allegedly following a capitalist pattern which reduced love to quick sexual gratification.⁴⁹ A third aspect that Jahrow criticized in his statement concerned the depiction of the working environment in *Berlin um die Ecke*, where committed socialists like Hütte fail to win the support of their colleagues and are isolated; where someone as hard-working as Krautmann wastes his energy in a never-ending fight against low morale and shortage of raw materials. In Jahrow's opinion, Klein and Kohlhaase do not do justice to socialist reality. A sense of pessimism prevails, since the film focuses only on what is grey and bleak, leaving no room for optimism and the belief in progress. Jahrow's summative verdict is an unequivocal condemnation:

Dummheit und Arroganz, besonders der Vertreter der älteren Generation, kapitalistische Unmoral, Verindividualisierung des Menschen, fehlende kollektive Beziehungen, Oberflächlichkeit der Gefühle, Anarchismus in der Arbeit, Unfähigkeit Verantwortlicher, Egoismus [...], Gewinnsucht, Unehrlichkeit, Betrug, Doppelzüngigkeit und ähnliche 'menschliche Eigenschaften' beherrschen in diesem Film, der vorgibt, unsere sozialistische Wirklichkeit nachzuzeichnen, das Bild. [...] Darin liegt die verlogene und antisozialistische Aussage des Films.⁵⁰

The creators of this harmful product did not avail themselves of the opportunity to make the significant alterations to the rough-cut which Bruk had recommended in the light of the Plenum and the preceding censorship of Beyer's *Spur der Steine*. As a result, *Berlin um die Ecke* was consigned to the archives until 1987, when it was shown in its rough-cut form during the celebrations marking the 750th anniversary of the founding of the city of Berlin. Even today, *Berlin um die Ecke* is a film without music, finished but still bearing the visible scars of censorship. Though the film was re-edited in 1990, Kohlhaase decided that there was no point in concealing the film's fate and therefore deliberately retained its somewhat fragmentary form – a

⁴⁸ Honecker, "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees", p. 20. (young people can no longer be certain if it is right or wrong to look for role models there [i.e. in works of art]).

⁴⁹ Jahrow, "Stellungnahme zu *Berlin um die Ecke*", [unpaginated].

⁵⁰ Jahrow, "Stellungnahme zu *Berlin um die Ecke*", [unpaginated]. (Stupidity and arrogance, in particular amongst representatives of the older generation, capitalist immorality, isolating individualism, no sense of collectivism, superficiality of emotions, anarchism in the workplace, incompetence of management, selfishness [...], greed, dishonesty, fraud, hypocrisy and similar

testimony to the filmmakers' courageous resistance to censure.⁵¹ Whilst colleagues like Egon Günther (*Wenn du groß bist, lieber Adam*) and Frank Beyer (*Spur der Steine*) kept changing and re-editing their films in line with the censors' requests, only to find them banned in some form or other eventually, Klein and Kohlhaase stuck to their guns, as scriptwriter Kohlhaase explained retrospectively: "Bestimmte Vorwürfe nicht zu akzeptieren, war für mich wesentlich für meine weitere Arbeitsfähigkeit. Sonst hätte ich etwas von mir selbst verloren".⁵²

Film at the service of politics

The ferocious film censorship that occurred in the context of the Eleventh Plenum highlights the importance assigned to the GDR's national film culture. Although the social conditions of Soviet Russia in 1922 when Lenin declared film to be the most important of all arts, were entirely different from those of the GDR of the sixties, film was accorded a similarly important status.⁵³ Being a form of mass communication, it was considered to be a potentially dangerous weapon of propaganda and mass mobilization, and was therefore hit harder by censorship than other forms or art. For many years to come, DEFA film production was curtailed artistically and financially, resulting in a much reduced annual output. In 1966, only eight feature films were released, just a third of the annual output of the early sixties. And after the Plenum, the DEFA feature film studio never regained the high production figures of earlier times.⁵⁴ Filmmakers had burnt their fingers and were more cautious for a short while. It was certainly not coincidental that the wake of the Eleventh Plenum witnessed the emergence of a politically innocuous and tremendously popular genre – the *Indianerfilm*, DEFA's answer to the American Western.⁵⁵ It was not until the early seventies, following

'human qualities' dominate this film which claims to depict the reality of socialism. [...] That is why the film's message is dishonest and anti-socialist).

⁵¹ Kohlhaase, "Es ging, in der damaligen Diktion", [unpaginated].

⁵² Sylvester, *The Forbidden Films*, [unpaginated]. (In order to preserve my future ability to work it was essential for me not to accept certain charges. Otherwise I would have lost part of myself).

⁵³ Lenin's much-quoted statement is cited in Kenez, *Cinema and Soviet Society*, p. 27.

⁵⁴ Wischnewski, "Die zornigen jungen Männer", p. 358.

⁵⁵ The first *Indianerfilm* which was released in 1966 was Josef Mach's *Die Söhne der großen Bärin* (The Sons of the Big Bear). For more details on this genre, cf. Gemünden, "Zwischen Karl May und Karl Marx".

Honecker's much cited "no-taboo-speech", that a more critical and outspoken film art began to flourish again.

But did cultural officials really fear the subversive power of these twelve forbidden films? Critics and filmmakers alike have suggested that the cultural backlash that occurred at the Eleventh Plenum was in fact a strategy designed to divert attention from the economic problems that besieged the country. Günter Netzeband contends:

Es ging nicht um Kunst, es ging um Politik. Von Anfang an wurde Kunst in den Dienst der Tagespolitik gestellt und daher auch beurteilt. Man konnte nur allzuoft den Eindruck gewinnen, daß Künstler als Prügelknaben erhalten mußten für Vorgänge, die sie nicht zu verantworten hatten, wenn im Staate Krisenentscheidungen sich häuften, die die Macht der Herrscher zu gefährden schienen.⁵⁶

The Eleventh Plenum was originally intended to address the economic situation of the GDR and to assess the viability of the New Economic System. But even before the Central Committee convened on 15 December, it was clear that many aspects of the economic reform had failed to resolve the persistent economic problems since it was not underpinned by the more encompassing measures of decentralisation and democratisation in other spheres that would have been necessary to make it a success. Erich Apel, head of the State Planning Commission and one of the chief architects of the NES, committed suicide on the eve of the Eleventh Plenum, presumably because he foresaw its failure.⁵⁷ Although the GDR's economy still featured on the agenda of the Plenum, debates about film, literature, the arts and media took centre stage, arguably to detract from the country's irresolvable economic problems. The harsh attack on the GDR's cultural instead of its economic production can be explained by the *Stellvertreter Funktion* (replacement function) which art, in particular literature and film, had in the GDR. Art was used to articulate issues which could not be publicly discussed but which were, nonetheless, decoded by a public that was well versed in reading between the lines. The Eleventh Plenum is a prime example: the Party leadership attacked cultural trends and associated them with socio-political issues, such as youth unrest, Western decadence and nihilism. By

⁵⁶ Netzeband, "Der Winter ist kalt" p. 44. (What was at stake was not art but politics. From the very beginning, art was made subservient to day-to-day politics – and judged accordingly. One could not but get the impression that artists served as whipping boys for events which were beyond their sphere of responsibility. This occurred whenever a point of crisis was reached and the State was faced with decisions which jeopardized the power of the leaders).

⁵⁷ Weber, *Geschichte der DDR*, pp. 350–53; Eckert, "Die Volkswirtschaft der DDR".

condemning cultural trends, signals were sent out about wider political and social issues.

The Eleventh Plenum was never forgotten by DEFA filmmakers. Not only because it had such a devastating effect on the film industry, but also because the complex relationship between *Geist und Macht* continued to affect artists and intellectuals until the demise of the GDR in 1989.

Bibliography

- Agde, Günter (ed.). *Kahlschlag: Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED 1965. Studien und Dokumente*. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000 [1991].
- BArch/DR117/A/240 (DEFA Betriebsakten, June 1965).
- BArch/DR1/4217/XVI 1956/66 "Thematischer Plan 1966" (DEFA Betriebsakten, 30 September 1965).
- Bathrick, David. *The Powers of Speech: The Politics of Culture in the GDR*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1995.
- Berghahn, Daniela. "Censorship in GDR Cinema: The Case of *Spur der Steine*." *From Classical Shades to Vickers Victorious*. Eds. Steve Giles / Peter Graves. Bern / Berlin: Lang, 1999. 183–197.
- . "Liars and Traitors: Unheroic Resistance in Antifascist DEFA Films". *Millennial Essays on Film and Other German Studies*. Eds. Daniela Berghahn / Alan Bance. Bern / Berlin: Lang, 2002. 23–39.
- Bundesministerium für innerdeutsche Beziehungen (ed.). *DDR-Handbuch*. Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1985.
- Byg, Barton. "The Anti-Fascist Tradition and GDR Film." *Proceedings, Purdue University Fifth Annual Conference on Film*. West Lafayette: Purdue Office of Publications, 1980. 81–87.
- Claus, Horst. "Rebels with a Cause: The Development of the 'Berlin-Filme' by Gerhard Klein and Wolfgang Kohlhaase." *DEFA: East German Cinema 1946 – 1992*. Eds. Seán Allan / John Sandford. New York / Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999. 93–116.
- Dalichow, Bärbel. "Weh Dir, daß Du ein Enkel bist... Das 11. Plenum der SED 1965 und die Folgen." *Beiträge zur Film- und Fernsehwissenschaft: Der DEFA-Spielfilm der 80er Jahre – Chancen für die 90er?* Eds. Peter Hoff / Dieter Wiedemann. 44 (1992): 16–44.
- Eckert, Detlef. "Die Volkswirtschaft der DDR im Spannungsfeld der Reformen." *Kahlschlag: Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED 1965. Studien und Dokumente*. Ed. Günter Agde. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 1991: 20–31 [not reprinted in 2nd edition].
- Emmerich, Wolfgang. *Kleine Literaturgeschichte der DDR*. Leipzig: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1996.
- Engler, Wolfgang. "Strafgericht über die Moderne. Das 11. Plenum im historischen Rückblick." *Kahlschlag: Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED*

1965. *Studien und Dokumente*. Ed. Günter Agde. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000 [1991]. 16–36.
- Feinstein, Joshua. "Constructing the Mythic Present in East German Cinema." *Central European History* 32:2 (1999): 203–220.
- . *The Triumph of the Ordinary. Depictions of Daily Life in East German Cinema 1949 – 1989*. Chapel Hill / London: U of North Carolina P, 2002.
- Geiss, Axel. *Repression und Freiheit: DEFA-Regisseure zwischen Fremd- und Selbstbestimmung*. Potsdam: Brandenburgische Landeszentrale für politische Bildung, 1997.
- Gemünden, Gerd. "Between Karl May and Karl Marx: The DEFA 'Indianerfilme' (1965–85)." *Film History*, 10 (1998): 399–407.
- Günther, Egon. "Fragen an Egon Günther nach der Voraufführung von Wenn Du groß bist, lieber Adam. 6. 2. 1990." *20. Internationales Forum des jungen Films Berlin 1990*. Info sheet no. 22 [unpaginated].
- Honecker, Erich. "Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees 15. – 18. Dezember 1965. Rede von Genosse Honecker ['Ein sauberer Staat mit unverrückbaren Maßstäben']." BArch (SAPMO), DY30/2/1/338/JIV 2/1–126 No. 2051. [Extracts are reprinted in Agde, *Kahlschlag*, 238–251].
- Jahrow, Franz. "Stellungnahme zu Berlin um die Ecke. Abt. Filmproduktion. 29. 9. 1966." BArch (SAPMO) DR 117 A/0047.
- Jungnickel, Dirk. "Produktionsbedingungen bei der Herstellung von Kinospielefilmene und Fernsehfilmen." *Filmiland DDR*. Eds. Harry Blunk / Dirk Jungnickel. Cologne: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1999: 47–57.
- Kenez, Peter. *Cinema and Soviet Society. From the Revolution to the Death of Stalin*. London / New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 2001.
- Klein, Gerhard. "Brief an Erwin Geschonnek. 29.12.1964." *20. Internationales Forum des jungen Films Berlin*. Info sheet, No. 18 [unpaginated].
- Kohlhaase, Wolfgang. "Es ging, in der damaligen Diktion, um den Schutz des Landes vor dem Unverstand der Filmemacher. Gespräch mit Wolfgang Kohlhaase. 29. 1. 1990." *20. Internationales Forum des jungen Films Berlin*, 1990. Info sheet no. 18 [unpaginated].
- Kramer, Karen Ruoff. "Representation of Work in the Forbidden DEFA Films of 1965." *DEFA: East German Cinema 1946 – 1992*. Eds. Seán Allan / John Sandford. New York / Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999. 131–145.
- Löser, Claus / Karin Fritzsche (eds). *Gegenbilder: Filmische Subversion in der DDR 1976–1989*. Berlin: Janus Press, 1996.

- Maetzig, Kurt. "Es war, als wenn ein Damoklesschwert auf die gesamte Kultur unseres Landes herunterfiel. Gespräch mit Kurt Maetzig." 20. *Internationales Forum des jungen Films Berlin*, 1990, info sheet no. 16 [unpaginated].
- Mückenberger, Christiane (ed). *Prädikat: Besonders schädlich*. Berlin: Henschel Verlag, 1990.
- . "The Anti-fascist Past in DEFA Films." *DEFA: East German Cinema 1946 – 1992*. Eds. Seán Allan / John Sandford. New York / Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999. 58–76.
- . / Günter Jordan. "*Sie sehen selbst, Sie hören selbst...*" *Die DEFA von ihren Anfängen bis 1949*. Marburg: Hitzeroth, 1994.
- Netzband, Günter. "Der Winter ist kalt: Der Aufbruch nach Stalins Tod und die Verbote von Filmen in den 60er Jahren." *Film und Fernsehen*, 8 (1990): 44–48.
- Rauhaut, Michael. "DDR-Beatmusik zwischen Engagement und Repression." *Kahlschlag: Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED 1965. Studien und Dokumente*. Ed. Günter Agde. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000 [1991]. 122–133.
- Reid, J. H. "Erik Neutsch's *Spur der Steine*: The Book, the Play, the Film". *Geist und Macht. Writers and the State in the GDR*. Eds. Axel Goodbody / Alan Tate. Amsterdam, Atlanta/GA: Rodopi, 1992. (German Monitor 29). 58–67.
- Richter, Erika. "Zwischen Mauerbau und Kahlschlag 1961 bis 1965." *Das zweite Leben der Filmstadt Babelsberg: DEFA Spielfilme 1946 – 1992*. Ed. Ralf Schenk. Berlin: Henschel Verlag, 1994. 158–211.
- Schönemann, Sibylle. "Stoffentwicklung im DEFA-Studio für Spielfilme." *Filmland DDR*. Eds. Harry Blunk / Dirk Jungnickel. Cologne: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1999. 71–81.
- Soldovieri, Stefan. *Negotiating Censorship: GDR Film at the Juncture of 1965/66*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1998.
- . "Censorship and the Law: The Case of *Das Kaninchen bin ich*." *DEFA: East German Cinema 1946 – 1992*. Eds. Seán Allan / John Sandford. New York / Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1999. 146–163.
- Sylvester, Regine. *The Forbidden Films*. Munich: Goethe Institute, 1992.
- Steinborn, Bion / Christine von Eichel-Streiber (eds). *Verbotene Filme. Ein Vierteljahrhundert in Zensur versunkene Filmkunst. Film Faust 77* (1990).

- Sury, Alexander. "Schwierigkeiten mit der Wahrheitssuche: Gespräche mit Filmemachern." *Zoom* 9 (1990): 14–21.
- Trampe, Tamara. "Filmmaking after the Wende. A Personal Story." *Moving Images of East Germany: Past and Future of DEFA Film*. Eds. Barton Byg / Betheny Moore. American Institute for Contemporary German Studies, Humanities 12 (2002). 72–84.
- Weber, Hermann. *Geschichte der DDR*. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. 1989 [1985].
- Wischnewski, Klaus. "Die zornigen jungen Männer von Babelsberg." *Kahlschlag: Das 11. Plenum des ZK der SED 1965. Studien und Dokumente*. Ed. Günter Agde. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch Verlag, 2000 [1991]: 355–371.
- Witt, Günter. "Tagungen des Zentralkomitees: Protokoll der 11. Tagung des Zentralkomitees 15. – 18. Dezember 1965." BArch (SAPMO) DY30 IV/2/338. JIV 2/1 – 126 No. 2051 I.23–6.

This page intentionally left blank

FROM STATE MONOPOLY TO A FREE MARKET OF IDEAS? CENSORSHIP IN POLAND, 1976–1989

John M. Bates

The present chapter examines the functioning of official censorship in Poland during the final fourteen years of communist rule. 1976 saw the creation of an underground publishing network, the 'second circulation', which constituted an increasingly serious challenge to the party-state monopoly on information. It is argued, however, that the relationship of state/official to unofficial publishing should not be seen simply as a binary opposition, but that occasionally a 'symbiotic' relationship obtained between the two circulations, as shown by the publication of Czesław Miłosz's and others' works in the 1980s. The rise of Solidarity in August 1980 led directly to the partial dismantling of official censorship through the July 1981 law, which partly restrained the arbitrariness that had characterized censorship operations hitherto, although a situation of pseudo-legality prevailed. The opposition also demonstrated certain restrictive practices, albeit based on collectivist assumptions, whose consequences can still be felt in post-communist Poland.

The final fourteen years of communist rule in Poland provide fascinating material in respect of communication theory. As elsewhere in Eastern Europe before 1990, censorship was subordinate to the will of the communist party (the Polish United Workers Party, or PUP) and its clientele and, at least in theory, brooked no departure from the party line. However, from 1976, when the 'second circulation' of independent publishing arose, a gradual transition is evident from a totalitarian model of information control – a party-state monopoly – to a more pluralistic, open network.

The present paper has as its parameters the years 1976, which saw the creation of a systematic independent publishing network, and 1989, the year of the Round Table talks that marked the beginning of the end of communist monopoly rule in Poland.¹ Within that chronological framework, it seeks to examine a number of related issues. The first is the 'second circulation's' interaction with, and impact upon, the official network,

¹ I am grateful to the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland and the Faculty of Arts Research Committee at the University of Glasgow for providing research funding for this article.

including the censorship apparatus. Secondly, it considers the effect of the 1981 censorship bill upon publishing and censorship itself. Third, censorship practices following the imposition of Martial Law in December 1981 are assessed in relation to several specific cases. The paper seeks particularly to problematize the notion that the 'second circulation' was axiomatically free of censorship. Conversely, it will examine the controlled exposure of censorship in the 1980s as the regime attempted to present it as an inalienable, natural and, indeed, unremarkable fact of life in post-war Poland.

A Brief History of Post-War Polish Censorship

The Bolshevik system of censorship entered Poland shortly after the Red Army in 1944, when the Soviet censorship administration *Glavlit* delegated two of its employees to help Polish communists to regulate publishing. As a result of their assistance, the Central Office of Press Control came into being in early 1945, and by May that same year, the first conference of branch heads took place in Warsaw. In July 1946, the first censorship bill legalized the existence of the Main Office of Control of the Press, Publications and Public Performances (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk – henceforth, GUKP), which continued until abolition in June 1990.²

² All translations, except where indicated, are by the author. Research into censorship under the communists has developed sporadically since 1989. The main archive (Archiwum Akt Nowych, AAN, or New Records Office) is located in Warsaw, although some materials from regional offices survive in local archives, such as Poznań. In Warsaw, the archives contain about 3,500 call numbers (some cover more than a dozen files, each running up to 1,000 sheets). Before the mid-1990s, academics had complete access to materials, but a thirty-year-law was subsequently imposed. The time scales covered by the monographs listed below will indicate that the law operates with some elasticity. Works utilising state archives began to appear only shortly before the fall of communism: Mieczysław Ciećwierz, *Polityka prasowa 1944–1948 (Press Policy 1944–1948)*, Warsaw, PWN, 1989, refers to archival documents from the GUKP, some of which (the protocols of censors' national conferences for the years 1946–1948) have since disappeared. The late theatre critic and academic Marta Fik played a trailblazing role in the early 1990s: a series of six articles entitled 'Z archiwum GUKPPIW' published in *Kwartalnik filmowy* (1993–1995) focused on film censorship during the years 1968–1972; her monograph *Marcowa kultura (The Culture of March 1968)*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Wodnika, 1995, used censorship and party archives to give a more complete picture of that crucial year's events; while the collective work, Joanna Krakowska-Narożniak and Marek Waszkiel (eds), *Teatr drugiego obiegu. Materiały do kroniki teatru stanu wojennego 13 XII 1981–15 XI 1989 (The Theatre of the Second Circulation. Materials for a Chronicle of Theatre During Martial Law, 13 December 1981–15 November 1989)*, Warsaw: Errata, 2000, relied on her personal notes from the GUKP archives for its details of censorship restrictions in the 1980s. The academic Alina Madej has done key

The creation of this central body, to which every publication had to be submitted, represented only one dimension of communist control over publishing and, in fact, any form of public expression. The communists rapidly took over print works and the distribution of paper supplies after WWII, and continually cleared public and academic libraries of reading matter they deemed 'undesirable'. Moreover, although they initially tolerated a tri-partite division of the publishing sector – private (usually pre-war), state and collective – by 1950, private publishers were largely squeezed out of the system as new legislation required all those seeking to publish to apply for licences and submit their annual plans for approval by the communist-controlled Ministry of Culture. The complete state subsidization of publishing rendered readers' actual preferences irrelevant and helped to subordinate literary production to the PUWP's ideological programme. Finally, administrative regulation of artists' activity by means of various 'creative sections', such as in the Writers' Union (ZLP), and ministry-sponsored 'field trips' to industrial sites to encourage them to create works in the spirit of the new socialist realist aesthetic was supplemented by the introduction of Marxist curricula in schools and universities. In reality, however, the communists' totalist aspirations never quite achieved fruition even at the height of Stalinism (1949–1953).

This failure was due to a number of factors, first and foremost the near complete ethnic and religious homogeneity of the Polish populace after

work on the censorship of socialist realist films (some published in *Kwartalnik filmowy*). The other major monographs are: Daria Nałęcz, director of the Polish State Archives, *Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy 1945–1949*, Warsaw: ISP PAN, 1994, comprising an introduction and protocols from national conferences in 1945 and 1949; Stanisław August Kondiak's *Władza i wydawcy. Polityczne uwarunkowania produkcji książek w Polsce w latach 1944–1949 (The Authorities and Publishers. The Political Conditions Governing Book Production in Poland, 1944–1949)*, Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 1993, and *Papierowa rewolucja. Oficjalny obieg książek w Polsce w latach 1948–1955 (The Paper Revolution. The Official Book Circulation in Poland, 1948–1955)*, Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 1999, which look at official practices and restrictions from the perspective offered by Ministry of Culture archives; Aleksander Pawlicki's *Kompletna szarość. Cenzura w latach 1965–1972. Instytucja i ludzie (Utter Dullness. Censorship in the Years 1965–1972. The Institution and People)*; Joanna Hobot's *Gra z cenzurą w poezji Nowej Fali (1968–1976) (Playing with Censorship in the Poetry of the New Wave (1968–1976))*, Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2000, which contains substantial extracts from GUKP documents; and finally, Zbigniew Romek (ed.), *Cenzura w PRL. Relacje historyków (Censorship in People's Poland. Historians' Accounts)*, Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Neriton and Instytut Historii PAN, 2000, a collection of accounts by major historians across the political spectrum on their dealings with censorship. It should be noted that no single scholar has produced monographs on the scale of those by Joachim Walther about the former East Germany or Arlen Bljum, the leading expert on Soviet censorship.

WWII due to resettlement from the former Eastern borderlands, coupled with traditional Polish hostility towards Bolshevism. Secondly, the strength of the Catholic Church and its association with the survival of Polish identity under the Partitions of the nineteenth century guaranteed its status as an alternative source of values. Thirdly, in combination with these two factors, the private nature of most of Polish agriculture, the principal form of employment, ensured that the collectivisation needed to transform Poland into a modern socialist state would be a Sisyphean task. The presence of the non-communist Peasants' Party (PSL), the largest political party immediately after the war, preserved a certain margin of freedom if only for the first few years. Its members vigorously challenged the existence of the GUKP, and often refused to submit publications to censorship scrutiny. Its emasculation after the rigged election of January 1947, in which the communists and their allies officially gained over 80% of the vote, left the way clear for the regimentation of the press and publishing along Stalinist lines.

The processes that saw Władysław Gomułka elevated to First Secretary of the PUWP in October 1956 produced considerable changes in the censorship system also. Censors in the Main Office in Warsaw voted for its dissolution in September that year, leaving supervision of the press to be carried out by an ad hoc committee of high Party officials and newspaper editors during the Hungarian crisis. By the end of the decade, Gomułka's desire to secure his own position led to the dismissal of 'unreliable elements' from both newspapers and the censorship office. In the absence of any clear policy regarding the arts by the party leadership from 1956 onwards, the GUKP often seemed to play a key role of deciding the artistic work's acceptability to the regime. Protests against the repressive practices of censorship consequently formed a staple element of ZLP congresses up to 1980. To all intents, however, censorship itself remained invisible.³

Under Gomułka's successor, Edward Gierek, the GUKP underwent further streamlining, designed to subordinate the system more effectively to the Secretary of the Press Department of the Central Committee. During the 1960s, interested parties had approached the GUKP and its regional branches directly with their instructions/ requests. Particularly in the worsening economic conditions of the late 1970s, the Gierek regime was anxious to

³ Technically, the GUKP's budget had to be approved by a parliamentary commission, to which extent its operations were transparent.

control strictly information provision and procedures.⁴ At the same time, Gierek promoted an image of his rule as a new social contract between the party and populace, according to which negotiation provided the keynote for dealings with writers and other artists. Symptomatic of this approach were two consultative bodies for literary affairs established in the 1970s. At the 1972 ZLP congress in Łódź, the Intervention Commission (Komisja Interwencyjna) had seen the light of day. Placed under the aegis of the Union's Main Executive, it purportedly negotiated directly on behalf of writers with publishers and the GUKP. In this way, it was hoped that political tensions within the Union stemming from writers' anger at the vagaries of censorship might be alleviated. At the 1978 Writers' Union Congress in Katowice, the party representatives announced the creation of the Literary and Publishing Council (Rada Literacko-Wydawnicza), designed to facilitate the passage of 'difficult' texts through the censorship process. Given that the Censorship Office answered solely to the Party, both bodies seem rather to have been additional smokescreens for the censors. Invariably, a trusted Party dignitary chaired the Intervention Commission, seeing its main task as one of testing the political climate for 'controversial' texts. The reality was that if the list of works held up in the GUKP shortened significantly during the late 1970s, it was principally due to the existence of an increasingly important independent publishing network.

The Second Circulation

No scholar has yet provided an adequate definition for the vast quantity of works published underground after 1976.⁵ The use of the term 'second circulation' appears to date from the Association of Polish Journalists' February 1982 Report on the State of Publishing in Poland under Martial Law, but was not usually employed by those involved in underground publishing. They preferred such adjectives as 'unofficial', 'independent' or 'free' to describe their activity, and deliberately shied away from any definition suggesting that their activity was illicit. Instead, the fact that the

⁴ Soviet embassy and consulate officials continued to make direct approaches, however. See Paweł Misior's conversations with former employees of the Cracow censorship office, including the title figure, famous for smuggling documents out to the West in 1977, in *Ja, Tomasz*.

⁵ Magdalena Mikołajczyk, who proposes the term 'illegal', points out that commercial ('sensationalist') and religious literature appeared in the 'second circulation' alongside works of art, video and audio cassette recordings, and posters. Mikołajczyk, *Jak się pisało*, p. 12.

Polish government had signed up to the 1975 Helsinki Final Act, with its guarantees of basic human and civil liberties, informed their view that their activity enjoyed a legal right to exist. Certainly, before the rise of the 'second circulation', censorship was inscribed into the overwhelming majority of texts. Although individual works did circulate in manuscript like Soviet *samizdat* publications (for example, Jacek Kuroń and Karol Modzelewski's renowned *Open Letter to the Party* in the 1960s), the first serious challenge to the Party's monopoly on information and publishing emerged only in the mid-1970s.⁶ The eventual scale, as well as the necessary secrecy surrounding underground publishing and deliberate attempts to mislead the authorities (by providing false data in its publications), has since presented major obstacles to bibliographers and the true extent of underground publishing may never be known.⁷

The periodization of the 'second circulation' is less problematic. Jacek Bocheński, a key figure in underground culture, has suggested a three-stage division: the 1970s as a 'pioneering' phase; 1980–81, when underground publishing underwent massive expansion due to the rise of Solidarity; and the 'underground' era of the 1980s after the declaration of Martial Law (13 December 1981), General Jaruzelski's attempt to restore communist control through the use of military force.⁸ During its 'pioneering' phase, underground publishing took the form of information bulletins disseminated by the Workers' Defence Council (Komitet Obrony Robotników: KOR). The prominent writers Jerzy Andrzejewski and Stanisław Barańczak had helped to found this organization, whose purpose was to collect funds for workers imprisoned and beaten after the protests against government price rises in June 1976. By early 1977, their activity had led to the publication of the first independent literary journal, *Zapis (Recorded Work)*, which comprised almost exclusively works that the censorship office had rejected.

The journal's premise was that it would exist only as long as the writers concerned could not appear in print 'above ground'. In effect, it was a means of exerting pressure upon the authorities, but strictly within the terms of the Helsinki Final Agreement. In other words, those operating within the

⁶ For non-Polish accounts of the 'Second Circulation', see: Świdarska, "Independent Publishing"; Szaruga, "Untergrundpresse".

⁷ The most recent and complete bibliography, running to 6733 entries, is *Bez Cenzury, 1976–1989. Literatura – ruch wydawniczy – teatr (Without Censorship, 1976–1989. Literature – Publishing – Theatre)*. (Ed.) Jerzy Kandziora and Zyta Szymańska. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo IBL, 1999.

⁸ Bocheński, "Potencjał", p. 38.

second circulation refused to consider their actions in any way illegal. The founders of *Zapis* demonstrated this by giving their real names and addresses within the first number. In so doing, they were, of course, laying down a challenge to colleagues who remained within the official circulation, but also gave those colleagues a bargaining chip in their dealings with the political authorities.

The original circulation of *Zapis* was at first miniscule (3–4 copies of badly printed A4 for the first number), but, like the other journals which followed, it received an enormous boost with the arrival of Solidarity, which aided the printing and distribution process. At the beginning, their moral impact far outweighed their statistical significance. If initially *Zapis* had contained previously banned works, with time it began to publish texts specifically written for the new circulation. For young poets, in particular, the second circulation offered considerable advantages over state publishers. Firstly, it greatly accelerated the production schedule (6 months in the underground compared with several years in the state sector).⁹ Secondly, print runs could be superior to state publishers' (2–3000 as against 500–1000).¹⁰ In terms of content, underground publishers naturally enjoyed a monopoly on works hostile to the communist system by such writers as Orwell, Solzhenitsyn, and Koestler.

The political authorities' immediate response to the appearance of the second circulation was to increase drastically the restrictions upon rebellious writers. An infamous censorship blacklist, banning any mention of their names or publications by them, applied originally by the government to signatories of protest letters against changes to the constitution in 1975, included several leading writers active in the underground.¹¹ Over time, the Party began to attempt to separate the 'hard core' of oppositionists from more pliable 'hangers on'. The basis for enabling, or rather impeding, publication 'above ground' thus became exclusively political. Writers who renounced underground activity might be allowed back into official circulation. Insofar as *Zapis*'s original mission had been to achieve that end, this policy met its demands, though returning to the 'official circulation' did not automatically mean an end to collaboration with the underground. At the same time, although the political authorities did not shy away from more brutal means of persuasion, in the main they reached an accommodation with underground

⁹ Szaruga, "Zapis", p. 316.

¹⁰ Friszke, *Opozycja*, p. 441.

¹¹ Strzyżewski, *Czarna*, p. 66–67.

publishing, which commentators have partly attributed to a need to remain on good terms with Western creditors. Indeed, even before the advent of Solidarity, certain writers who had hitherto been unconditionally banned found themselves able to publish articles 'above ground'.

The creation of the Solidarity trade union in August 1980 massively expanded the second circulation's reach. Solidarity set up branch libraries in many factories, which contained not only the union's own bulletins but many underground publications as well. Its main achievement was the passing of the new censorship law of July 1981, which both made censorship visible and partially dismantled the censorship apparatus itself. At approximately the same time the award of the 1980 Nobel Prize for Literature to the renowned émigré poet Czesław Miłosz caught the communist regime off-guard and led to a further relaxation of state controls in the cultural sphere. Throughout the 1970s the regime, in an attempt to underline its more sophisticated approach to cultural affairs, had declared its readiness to promote all works and writers of acknowledged artistic value. The award to Miłosz therefore presented it with a serious challenge: since Miłosz had fled communist Poland in 1950, and had thereafter remained *persona non grata*, publication of his works required a complete *volte-face* on the regime's part. In his case, in effect, the official and unofficial spheres began to play complementary roles with state publishing houses issuing his poetry in large print runs while the underground focused on his still banned 1950s prose works about the imposition of communist rule in Poland (*The Captive Mind*, 1953; *The Seizure of Power*, 1955).¹² Although underground publishers could not compete with the state in satisfying public demands for the laureate's work, the division between the two circulations can be viewed at least notionally as one of anti-communist politics versus apolitical aesthetics.¹³ Equally significant and increasingly important (as I shall argue) in the late 1980s, was Miłosz's 'double existence' – having works that were (from the authorities' perspective) politically unacceptable published underground, yet simultaneously existing in the official circulation.

This state of affairs may be defined as cultural 'symbiosis' and it could assume other forms. Underground publishers might secretly use state

¹² For a fuller consideration of the award's impact, see: Bates, "Approaches", p. 203–204.

¹³ The great majority of prose works published underground came under the heading of political literature, whether written by Polish exiles, or dissidents resident in Poland.

print-works for their own publications.¹⁴ For their part, at least privately during 1980–1981, the political authorities affected a relaxed approach to the ideological problems posed by the underground. At a Politburo meeting of 14 April 1981, Mirosław Mileński suggested a relaxed stance (or political realism) on the part of the Party leadership, when he stated: "confiscation of poor [journalistic] pieces by the censorship office doesn't possess any great significance, because if their authors and those behind them really care about their publication, then they'll appear in the form of illegal publications or else be broadcast over factory radio."¹⁵ Commentators have suggested that even later under the more severe conditions of Martial Law, the authorities tolerated the continued existence of underground publishing on a large scale as a safety valve for public frustration. By 1987, when Gorbachev's policy of *glasnost'* had encouraged liberalization in Poland also, Culture Minister Aleksander Krawczuk could declare at a press conference that "we don't support [the so-called second circulation], nor do we especially pursue it. Nothing bad happens to authors who publish there."¹⁶

This was certainly not the regime's attitude after the suppression of Solidarity in December 1981. Although a liberal approach seemed to prevail in terms of the official publishing schedule, the authorities retaliated against the Writers' and Journalists' unions, in particular. They dissolved the Journalists' Association in 1982 and, failing to coerce the ZLP board into resigning, eventually disbanded the union in August 1983 only to set up a more pliable one a month later.¹⁷ This action signalled a switch to a more aggressive approach to publishing affairs in 1984–1986. The Cultural Department of the Central Committee attempted to purge the annual publishing plan of recalcitrant authors. Accordingly, the question of a text's ability to pass the censor took second place to its author's political affiliations.¹⁸

¹⁴ Jarosław Markiewicz, head of the still extant publisher Przedświt (Daybreak, established 1982), admitted as much in conversation on 11 September 2001.

¹⁵ 'Zatrzymywanie przez cenzurę publikacji niedobrych nie ma większego znaczenia, ponieważ jeśli autorom i inspiratorom zależy na ich publikowaniu, ukazują się w formie druków nielegalnych bądź są nadawane przez radiowęzły zakładowe.' Włodek, *Tajne*, p. 340.

¹⁶ 'Jeśli chodzi o tzw. drugi obieg wydawniczy, to my go nie popieramy, ale i specjalnie nie prześladowujemy. Autorom tam publikującym nic się złego nie dzieje.' Quoted from the underground journal *Wezwanie* (Summons), 13, January 1988, p. 158.

¹⁷ The late Jan Józef Szczepański's *Kadencja* (Term of Office), Cracow: Znak, 1989, remains the definitive account of these events. Szczepański was ZLP chairman in 1980–1983.

¹⁸ This was the gist of Waldemar Świrgoń's statement at a conference of party activists in publishing in June 1983 that 'the ability of a text to satisfy the censorship cannot be a criterion

The declaration of Martial Law initially impeded underground activity. The authorities' use of brute force to repress Solidarity disabused the opposition of any idea that it could reach a compromise with them. It also legitimised the notion of conspiracy as the key means of resistance to state oppression, which in time would stimulate a major expansion of illegal publishing. The deeply polarized climate of the early 1980s reinforced the idea that the place of publication represented an ethical decision: publishing 'above ground' became tantamount to moral compromise, thereby engendering a 'ghetto mentality' amongst sections of the underground by the mid-1980s. Cultural debates were conducted principally on ethical/political rather than aesthetic grounds. One consequence of this situation was that until the latter half of the 1980s, in an echo of the political authorities' own sometime stance, critics tended to judge literary works in ideo-political rather than artistic terms. Indeed, as Przemysław Czapliński has indicated, one of the major strands in underground fictional literature was precisely 'anti-socialist realism'.¹⁹ Dissidents would deal with issues of concern to the political authorities, but simply reverse the key principles — attacking the regime, instead of supporting it. The tendentiousness inherent in such works appeared as transparent as that of the socialist realist trend promoted by the party during the early 1950s.

The polarisation of Polish cultural life under Martial Law according to the contemporaneous stereotypes of slavish regime supporters on the one hand and intransigent oppositionists on the other, contributed to the gradual impoverishment of underground criticism and cultural debate. A kind of 'gentlemen's agreement' operated in the underground, which meant, above all, not exposing the Aesopic strategies²⁰ practised by colleagues in the official circulation, and, in order to deprive the regime of ammunition, not criticizing the views or works of fellow underground writers in print.²¹ Accordingly, supporters of the regime remained the sole legitimate targets for criticism.

for a publisher in deciding whether to publish a book' ('cenzuralność tekstu nie może być dla wydawcy kryterium w sprawie wydania książki'). Quoted from *Wezwanie*, 12, March 1987, p. 85.

¹⁹ Czapliński, "O realizmie", p. 31–32.

²⁰ A proper consideration of Aesopic strategies is beyond the scope of the present article. The textbook study is Lev Loseff's *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner in Kommission, 1984. Szaruga has written the fullest account of the Aesopic use of historical costume by contemporary Polish authors: *Wobec totalitaryzmu – kostium kościelny w prozie. Wobec cenzury (In the Face of Totalitarianism: the Costume of the Church in Prose. In the Face of Censorship)*. Szczecin: Ottonianum, 1994.

²¹ Szaruga, "Zapis", p. 305.

More critical assessment of the achievements of underground literature within the underground itself began to appear only around the mid-1980s.²² Open divisions focusing on ethical questions emerged within the facade of solidarity.

In the first instance, this concerned writers' collaboration with the communist regime. Jacek Trznadel published *Hańba domowa* (*Civil Disgrace*), a series of interviews with contemporary writers about their participation in the socialist realist project of the early 1950s. One interviewee, the poet and essayist Zbigniew Herbert (1924–1998), who had effectively been a non-person during those years, provoked controversy by lambasting his fellow writers and accusing them of venal motives in choosing to serve the communists. His attack also encompassed writers such as Andrzejewski, who later became prime movers in underground culture. Even more problematic was the figure of Józef Mackiewicz (1902–1985), a staunch anti-communist writer from Vilnius, who came to Britain after WWII. Mackiewicz's consistent anti-Bolshevism induced him to collaborate with the Nazis, and subsequently the local non-Communist resistance, or Home Army, sentenced him to death, a decision that was later rescinded. The scholar Włodzimierz Bolecki (writing under the pseudonym Jerzy Malewski) took a controversial line in suggesting that Mackiewicz's collaboration with the German occupier was no more (or less) morally reprehensible than the collusion of Polish intellectuals with the Soviets in Vilnius (and Lviv) up to June 1941.²³ This view struck hard at the residual left-wing sympathies among substantial sections of the underground. Equally, Mackiewicz attacked hallowed national myths, such as the cult of Marshal Piłsudski (1867–1935), the great inter-war leader, or the deference Poles usually accorded the Pope. In short, according to Bolecki, Mackiewicz represented the archetypal free thinker, who challenged the ready-made schemata of Polish traditionalism.²⁴ Such 'individualism', however, remained a rare stance within the underground, whose representatives not unnaturally tended to promote an attitude of collective solidarity against the oppressive state apparatus – for them Mackiewicz remained a divisive figure.

²² The monthly *Kultura Niezależna* often provided some of the most trenchant exchanges, as witness the discussion 'Koniec kultury PRL (The End of the Culture of People's Poland)', 2, październik (October) 1984, p. 15, 17–37; or Michał Beskidzki's criticism of the assumption that independent culture was the only valid form of expression in 'Za rok w Jeruzalem (Next Year in Jerusalem)', 7, March 1985, p. 37–42.

²³ Bolecki (Malewski), "Prawda", p. 58.

²⁴ Bolecki, in conversation with the author, 18 September 2001.

The appearance of the second circulation, while significantly extending the boundaries of cultural freedom, did not automatically entail a culture without constraint. Although it would perhaps be an exaggeration to claim that it practised censorship on a major scale, it is clear that certain taboos existed. Key amongst these was the portrayal of Solidarity figures in negative terms and any open admission of the source of funds (often the CIA). Tadeusz Konwicki claimed his novel *Mala apokalipsa (A Minor Apocalypse)*, 1979) was censored by NOW-a in view of 'certain resemblances' [to key oppositionists].²⁵ Konwicki's agreement to such constraints indicates at least partly the publishing monopoly enjoyed by NOW-a in the underground – he was effectively left without an alternative publisher at that early stage of the underground's development. Yet even in pluralistic times, oppositionist constraints could be felt and, indeed, seen.

The treatment of the activist Anna Walentynowicz is instructive in this respect. Originally a colleague but later a rival of Lech Wałęsa's from the Gdańsk shipyard, she took an intransigent line towards the regime, and was especially critical of Solidarity's decision to negotiate with the government at the Round Table talks of February–April 1989. The Wałęsa camp sought to marginalize her influence by making her a 'non-person'.²⁶ Opposition practices could on occasion resemble those of their political opponents. Formally, however, the latter's were regulated by the liberalising law of July 1981.

The 1981 Censorship Bill and Subsequent Official Practice

Secrecy characterised the activities of the censorship office prior to 1981. As Stefan Kisielewski, a leading columnist for the Catholic newspaper *Tygodnik Powszechny (The Universal Weekly)*, established 1945) once remarked, the censorship system was designed to make the reader believe that authors actually thought as they wrote and to train writers to conform to the authorities' requirements.²⁷ From autumn 1981, at least in theory, authors

²⁵ Konwicki refused to 'name names', describing the censorship as not 'political' in nature, but rather as an issue 'among friends' ('cenzura towarzyska'). Konwicki, *Pamiętam*, p. 107.

²⁶ A film (entitled 'Jimmy Reid in Poland') made by the former trade union activist for STV in early 1989 records one such incident when Wałęsa's entourage warned a Spanish film crew from TVE that talking to Walentynowicz would rule out any access to Wałęsa. Włodzimierz Bolecki confirmed that the entourage also adopted this approach with certain underground journals.

²⁷ Kisielewski, "Przeciw", p. 79–80.

publishing in the official circulation could indicate that they sometimes wrote under duress.

The new censorship bill, which came onto the statutes in October that year, marked a major stage in the transformation of writer-state relations. Solidarity had insisted on the regulation of censorship as one of its original 21 conditions in the Gdańsk agreement of August 1980 – the historic compromise with the government, which legalised the first free trade union in the Soviet bloc. The new legislation struck a compromise between the political authorities' desire to maintain the old system and Solidarity's drive for greater transparency and accountability. For example, the new law placed the GUKP under the supervision of the Council of State (instead of the cabinet) and hence allowed the *Sejm* (the Polish parliament) to exercise some control over its operations. A large number of different kinds of publication were removed from GUKP control altogether, including speeches made in parliament, academic and educational publications, all publications of a religious character published with the agreement of the Church, internal information bulletins, and books by Polish authors written prior to 1918 as well as reprints of works published legally in People's Poland. The bill's single most important innovation was the right of authors to appeal censorship excisions via the Main Office in Warsaw or the Supreme Administrative Court. Where these bodies upheld the original decision, the author enjoyed the right to have each cut clearly marked in his or her text.²⁸

The new bill, in theory, provided for significant curbs on the arbitrariness that had characterized censorship practice hitherto. The removal of reprints of all pre-1918 Polish works and post-1945 domestic texts from the censorship process effectively meant the end of the 'secondary censorship' stage, whereby the desirability of republishing works was assessed from the political perspective – although this has proven difficult to verify from censorship materials in the archives. Under the point of 'internal information bulletins', Solidarity factory brochures could obviate censorship restrictions. Prior to the imposition of Martial Law, the Solidarity weekly *Tygodnik "Solidarność"* managed to overturn two censorship decisions, but these were

²⁸ See the Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty (RFE-RL), 'Situation Report Poland/15', 28 August 1981, p. 6–9.

to prove the only challenges mounted against censorship decisions under the new law.²⁹

Technically, the cuts imposed by the censors were indicated by the presence of square brackets enclosing usually three dots or dashes and sometimes giving the article and clause under which the work was being censored. The second official edition of Teresa Torańska's *Oni (Them)*, a collection of interviews with the old Stalinist elite, which was published in 1990, provides some of the clearest evidence of the new practices.³⁰ Because the communist censorship system ceased to exist during the publication process, Torańska was able to give the passages cut by the censor in an appendix. The interview with Stefan Staszewski, a former member of the Politburo, contained all the cuts required by the censor, each of which offended article 2, clauses 2 and 3. These clauses specified that "in making use of freedom of speech and print in publications and public performances [authors] may not: 2) incite to overthrow, abuse, deride or denigrate the constitutional system of the People's Republic of Poland, 3) attack the constitutional basis of the foreign policy of the People's Republic of Poland or its alliances."³¹ The following quotations – with the cuts being indicated by italics – illustrate the nature of censors' interventions in Staszewski's statements:

(a) Society, too, we don't have to spell it out. Society accepted the authorities, with distrust, disbelief, after a period of struggle and laying down its arms, but it did accept them and its most conscious part, [which] even realised that Poland would not have full sovereignty, *that it was passing from one occupation to another, did not believe that the two occupations – Nazi and Soviet – were equivalent.*

(b) Everything is concealed, *because the Party is ashamed of its own history.*³²

²⁹ The more famous was the reference in a reader's letter to works published by the 'second circulation'. Both challenges occurred in November 1981. RFE-RL, 'RAD Background Report/339 (Poland)', 8 December 1981, p. 7–8.

³⁰ The Warsaw publisher Interpress published the first official edition in 1989. There were four underground editions, an émigré edition published by the London-based Aneks (1985), and English, French and German translations.

³¹ Quoted from: Bafia, *Prawo*, p. 226.

³² Torańska, *Oni*, p. 342, 374. The original Polish versions are, respectively: 'Społeczeństwo, co tu dużo mówić, społeczeństwo – też. Ono tę władzę przyjęło, z niedowierzaniem, nieufnością, po okresie walki i złożeniu broni, ale przyjęło i nawet najbardziej świadoma jego część zdając sobie sprawę, że Polska nie będzie miała pełnej suwerenności, że z jednej okupacji przechodzi w drugą – nie uważała, że obie okupacje – hitlerowska i sowiecka są sobie równorzędnie'; 'Wszystko jest zatajone, bo partia wstydzi się swojej historii.'

The invoking of clauses 2 and 3 is in each case spurious, for Staszewski evidently did not 'incite to overthrow ...' or 'attack the constitutional basis' of the government's foreign policy. The charge of sedition contained in clause 2 moreover required that the requisite articles of the penal code be brought into play. In reality, although censors might purge texts on the grounds of their alleged seditious character, they never followed through the full legal implications. The censorship bill proved therefore to be merely a quasi-legal document, whose provisions were often not taken seriously by the communist authorities. This stance of pseudo-legality was evident among censors even in the months leading up to the promulgation of the new bill, as a speech by M. Wereski, the Head of the Lublin Office, at a meeting of censorship officials on 6 March 1981, indicated:

I believe, comrades, that we should arm ourselves more and more in legal arguments. Not all the provisions of the penal code are going automatically into the new bill, but I think that — for the present — we can make use of many of them. We shall provide lists of those articles which may be violated by the content of publications, but point out that these regulations do not have to provide the grounds for interventions but may serve as an argument in the discussion, an argument used as a warning against the possibility of a crime and against any act which is forbidden by law. After all, the party plenum and the prime minister demand respect for the law, in all its severity.³³

Contrary to the attitude of social responsibility and rational argumentation, which Wereski advised, censorship activity largely retained its former arbitrariness. The crux of the matter lay in the vague formulation of the criteria justifying censorship intervention in article 2 of the bill, particularly the key political clauses 1–3. Dariusz Gałasiński argues persuasively that using the term 'godzić' (which he translates as 'undermine' rather than 'attack') "bans effects of a communicative action, rather than the action itself. In the process, it leaves open the problem of what texts are to be banned."³⁴ In other words, there was no particular category of text that would or would not automatically break the law, all remained equally 'under suspicion' as

³³ 'Sądzę, proszę towarzyszy, że powinniśmy się coraz bardziej uzbroić w argumenty prawne. Nie wszystkie postanowienia kodeksu karnego wchodzą automatycznie do ustawy, ale sądzę, że — na dziś — z wielu można zrobić użytek. Dostarczymy zestaw tych artykułów, które mogą zostać naruszone przez treść publikacji, przy czym przepisy te nie muszą stawać się podstawą ingerencji, ale mogą posłużyć jako argument w dyskusji, argument użyty w formie ostrzeżenia przed popełnieniem przestępstwa, przed czynem zakazanym przez prawo. A przecież i Plenum i premier nakazują przestrzegać prawo — z całą jego surowością.' AAN, GUKP, file 1659, p. 15.

³⁴ Gałasiński, "Silencing", p. 11.

potentially criminal because of their possible 'effect'. Ultimately, the decision as to whether a text was legal lay within the censor's discretion.

Zofia Radzikowska has undertaken the most thorough investigation of the realities of censorship activity in the wake of the 1981 bill (and its amendment of 1981), demonstrating the dubious use of the criteria specified under the second article. Her analysis of *Tygodnik Powszechny* for the month of October in the years 1984–1987 found that clauses 2 and 3 were most frequently employed, although she records that clause 2 seldom stood alone, but was more often supported by clause 1 ("to attack the independence or territorial integrity of the Polish People's Republic") or 6 ("to encourage or approve of the perpetration of a crime").³⁵ Most significantly, she demonstrated the existence of *ad hominem* censorship in relation to the film director Andrzej Wajda, a practice that article 5 of the bill expressly prohibited.³⁶

In truth, the bill provided a smokescreen for the continuation of censorship in the old manner. Censors enjoyed a free hand in interpreting its provisions as an interview with Krzysztof Kozłowski, deputy chief editor of *Tygodnik Powszechny*, in 1985, made plain.³⁷ Although all newspapers were entitled to indicate censorship interventions, in practice only the Catholic press insisted on this right. An internal memorandum by the huge state publishing conglomerate RSW Prasa, which published the vast majority of newspapers in Poland, forbade the non-Catholic press from taking advantage of the same allowance.³⁸ However, even when *Tygodnik Powszechny* editors wished to indicate censorship interventions in an article, they found themselves restricted to a certain number (four at the time of the interview), under threat of the confiscation of the whole piece. The legislation naturally made no mention of such 'norms'. Furthermore, instead of confiscating an

³⁵ Radzikowska, *Z historii*, p. 11, 16. This version of the clauses is from: Schöpflin, *Censorship*, p. 125.

³⁶ Schöpflin, *Censorship*, p. 127, gives the following version of article 5: 'The offices of Regulation of Publications and Performances cannot introduce [general] bans on the publications and performances of the works of specific authors, nor can they publish instructions for interpretation in the representation of events, or the activity of an institution, and of particular people.' The instance Radzikowska notes concerns an article on the 1986 Gdańsk film festival, p. 20.

³⁷ The interview – as usual 'unauthorised' to protect the interviewee – appeared under the title „Mówić możliwie głośno" in the London-based 'irregular quarterly' *Puls* (*Pulse*). The information that follows is drawn largely from this source – except where indicated.

³⁸ Mikołaj Kozakiewicz in the *Ekspres Wieczorny* (*Evening Express*) stated as much in 1987. Cited in *Wezwanie*, 12, March 1987, p. 91.

article, censors could provisionally withdraw it, and as in cases when editors themselves decided to remove articles prior to publication, it could not be signalled as a confiscation.³⁹

In the light of Kozłowski's evidence, it may be said that censorship after 1981 assumed rather a pseudo-transparent and pseudo-legal character. This is indicative of what Tomasz Goban-Klas has termed "the legalistic orientation of Jaruzelski's rule".⁴⁰ Jerzy Bafia's monographs on censorship, *Prawo o cenzurze* (*The Censorship Law*, 1983) and *Prawo o wolności słowa* (*The Freedom of Speech Law*, 1988), exemplify this tendency, indicating that preventive censorship, albeit of a limited kind, existed even in Western democracies such as the USA. Unsurprisingly, Bafia concluded that his chief aim was "to show the order-giving and socially constructive role of the censorship law and thus its subordinate role to the idea of legality in this particular sphere of public life also."⁴¹

The culmination of censorship transparency was undoubtedly the 'duet' conducted in September 1986 between Daniel Passent, a popular columnist of the leading liberal party weekly *Polityka*, and Justyn Sobol, the press spokesman for the GUKP. Passent in his article – entitled "Uświadomiona konieczność (Informed Necessity)" – gave an insider's view of being on the receiving end of censorship operations. In line with *Polityka*'s general tendency to debunk myths and stereotypes prevalent in Polish thinking, he presented journalist-censor relations as essentially collaborative: "the editor is not, however, a typical negation of the censor, since in the round they are both implementing the same policy [...] A bit of the censor lurks in everyone with a sense of responsibility who expresses himself publicly."⁴² Passent expressed his disapproval of the Catholic press's insistence on exposing censorship, when he stated "... some have a different opinion and show off the wounds they have received from the censorship.

³⁹ In the case of confiscated articles, only the author's name appeared in press.

⁴⁰ Goban-Klas, *Orchestration*, p. 194.

⁴¹ '[Cel podstawowy tej pracy to] ukazanie porządkującej, konstruktywnej społecznie roli prawa o cenzurze, a więc roli służebnej wobec idei praworządności również w tej szczególnej sferze życia społecznego.' Bafia, *Prawo*, p. 217.

⁴² 'Redaktor nie jest jednak zwykłym zaprzeczeniem cenzora, gdyż w sumie obaj realizują tę samą politykę [...] Odrobina cenzora tkwi w każdym, kto wypowiada się publicznie z poczuciem odpowiedzialności.' *Polityka*, 13 September 1986, p. 16.

This has no great significance because in the final analysis what matters is what has been published."⁴³

Justyn Sobol, replying a week later in the article "Cenzura o sobie (The Censorship Speaks About Itself)", underlined the legal nature of censorship activity and the 'transparency' of its decisions. In a (for Polish communist officialdom) fairly standard disinformation exercise, he highlighted the existence of the governing body comprising writers, journalists and publishers, which supervised the operations of the GUKP, and with reference to article 2 of the 1981 law denied any charge that interventions were subject to the whims of censorship. He supported these assertions by quoting official figures: only 7% of press titles had been censored, which mostly involved 20 newspapers, whereas with books the percentage was even smaller (0.7% with no single book being confiscated in its entirety for years).⁴⁴ The Catholic press, in his opinion, 'preferred' confiscations. What was lacking from both Passent and Sobol's account was any reference to the general Polish context of recent years. The changes they detailed had been enforced by Solidarity, rather than initiated by the regime in good will. Likewise, the relatively few instances of censorship stemmed from editors' compromises with the GUKP, informed by their fear of angering the authorities (who could impose reductions in paper supplies for 'repeat offending') or the GUKP's own massaging of censorship criteria. Throughout 1984 and 1985, the cultural apparatus (Ministry of Culture, Central Committee Cultural Department, etc.) had vetted annual publishing plans with increasing vigilance in an attempt to exclude 'dissenters'. Publishers had then withdrawn from contracts with authors they deemed refractory, suspended production on certain works that were problematic from the standpoint of their theme or author, or refused even to consider publishing others they knew would create problems. At the same time, some writers preferred to publish their work in the expanding underground sector, where they were free from political interference. However, the most significant feature of the exchange between Sobol and Passent was that it took place at all. Without the changes Gorbachev was driving through information policy in the USSR (under the slogan of *glasnost'*) following the Chernobyl catastrophe, it would have been unimaginable.

⁴³ ... niektórzy są odmiennego zdania i eksponują bliżny po cenzurze. Nie ma to większego znaczenia, gdyż w ostatecznym rachunku liczy się to, co zostało ogłoszone.' *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Polityka*, 20 September 1986, p. 8.

The revelation of the presence of the censor in writers' autobiographies, fiction and literary criticism played a small, yet significant part in the process of 'acclimatizing' readers to censorship in the 1980s. The pro-regime writer, Roman Bratny, provided the most flamboyant example with self-serving accounts of his (usually successful) skirmishes with the GUKP in his second volume of memoirs, *Pamiętnik moich książek* (*A Memoir of My Books*, 1983). Decidedly more restrained were other writers' versions, such as Krzysztof Nowicki, the fourth part of whose *The Last Quarter* (*Ostatni kwartał – próba autobiografii*), published in the refined literary monthly *Twórczość* (*Creativity*), took up the question of the constraints operating within the whole system, in which the censorship office was merely one of the factors:

The system regulating authors which functioned in various periods and did not allow them to speak out openly, caused lasting traumas and serious disruption in the system of communication. It can be proven with ease that even authors themselves sometimes doubted the possibility of saying what they had to say. The censorship merely created incidental problems and was fairly obvious. Fundamental constraints occurred at other levels. Editors' consciences and authors themselves, who gradually became convinced that certain of their efforts would be of no avail, prevented many things from being said clearly and unequivocally.⁴⁵

In contrast to Bratny's more pragmatic resilience in dealing with censorship, Nowicki here implicates the whole system and suggests that it caused Polish culture lasting damage. His account therefore absolves the GUKP of sole responsibility, in which he foreshadows Passent's stance of co-responsibility, and avoids positioning himself simply as a victim of 'regulation'. However, his attention focuses upon the past, which may be seen as providing the current regime with the alibi that such practices no longer applied.

Perhaps the most provocative literary treatment of censorship can be found in Tadeusz Konwicki's quasi-memoir *Nowy Świat i okolice* (translated as *New World Avenue and Vicinity*), published by the major state publisher Czytelnik in 1986. Between 1978 and 1984 Konwicki, a leading contemporary writer, published four novels in the underground. His return to

⁴⁵ 'System kontroli autorów, jaki funkcjonował w różnych okresach i nie pozwalał wypowiadać się pełnym głosem, wywołał trwałe urazy i poważne zakłócenia w systemie komunikacji. Nie trudno dowieść, że nawet sami autorzy zważyli w możliwość powiedzenia tego, co mieli do powiedzenia. Cenzura stwarzała jedynie incydenty, była w miarę jawna. Zasadnicze zahamowania następowały na innych szczeblach. Do wielu dopowiedzeń nie dopuszczali sumienia redaktorów i sami autorzy, którzy z wolną przekonywali się o daremności pewnych usiłowań.' Nowicki, *Ostatni*, p. 105.

the official circulation therefore marked a political coup for the authorities, albeit one that brought him considerable concessions, as his new work bore out. Throughout the work Konwicki makes continual addresses to the censor, invariably his first reader. One passage, entitled "Apostrophe to the Censor", declares:

I repose such confidence in the censorship. Voluntarily do I slip into its yoke, for I look forward to some extraordinary effects from my asthmatic writing. At one time I did not fare badly under the censor's tender hand, some little successes were even scored... Censor, dear censor, help a poor, aging scribe!

But even the censor can't pour from an empty barrel ...⁴⁶

Konwicki's attitude here is far removed from Nowicki's seriousness. His direct address to – unmasking of – the censor emphasises his sense of freedom despite the constraints the latter can impose. Moreover, he mocks the notion that the writer is necessarily merely a victim of censorship, suggesting rather its 'beneficence' as Lev Loseff has put it. This levity belies the fact that Konwicki's path back to the official circulation was not easy. The underground journal *Kultura Niezależna* (*Independent Culture*) reported that his name was amongst those eliminated as 'oppositionist' from the publishing plan in 1984.⁴⁷ The censorship rubric – given in all Polish books – indicates that the novel's production extended at least over one year: it was sent to be type-set in May 1985 and its printing was sanctioned only in April 1986. Andrzej Werner states that Konwicki refused to make 'minor corrections', and that *Czytelnik* accepted his condition that the book be published as it was or not at all.⁴⁸ Indeed, the work was 'fast-tracked' through the production process – a privilege normally reserved for the most trusted or ideologically correct authors – and received a sizeable print run of 30,000 copies.

In the same article, Werner highlighted a growing phenomenon in the latter half of the 1980s, that of the 'double existence' of writers,

⁴⁶ "Tyle zaufania pokładam w cenzurze. Dobrowolnie włączę w jej jarzmo, bo spodziewam się jakichś nadzwyczajnych efektów w swoim astmatycznym pisanu. Kiedyś pod czułą ręką cenzora szło mi niezłe, miewało się nawet sukcesiki. Cenzorze, cenzorko, pomóżcie ubogiemu, starzejącemu się literatowi. Ale z pustego i censor nie naleje." Konwicki, *Nowy*, p. 111/*New World*, p. 102.

⁴⁷ Bober, "Ile", p. 92. Comparative figures were, in 1983, 16 titles by 11 oppositionist authors, and, in 1984, 43 titles by 28 authors. This may be set against the average annual figure of 1035 titles for adults published between 1981 and 1985. Source: Czarnik, "Instytucje", p. 133.

⁴⁸ Werner, "Dwojaczki", p. 199.

publishing simultaneously officially and unofficially.⁴⁹ This phenomenon was indicative both of the regime's ideological degradation and the pressure exerted by the second circulation. Hard-line figures in the cultural apparatus had briefly attempted to resist the erosion between oppositionist and official circulations by excluding those authors who had published in the underground. By 1987, however, the relations between the domains had moved onto different ground. Whilst certain censorship pressures remained (particularly regarding political matters such as Poland's relationship with the USSR), a state of competition obtained between the circulations: state institutions could offer larger print runs and royalties, underground publishers freedom from censorship intervention. The relaxation of censorship, which had resulted *inter alia* from underground pressure, therefore caused changes in the underground also. As Werner put it at the time, "what can be published will in principle be written for official publishers."⁵⁰ The ramifications of these developments will be dealt with in the next section.

The Continuing Problems of Literary Conspiracy

The late 1980s proved to be a highly ambiguous period for publishing as a whole. The appearance of oppositionist works in official circulation served the regime's fairly transparent desire to pose as liberal and also to blunt the appeal of the underground as a purveyor of forbidden fruit. In the latter respect, its strategy enjoyed increasing success, a situation which evoked Culture Minister Krawczuk's somewhat seigneurial challenge to underground writers in December 1986 to "write and show us what you're creating!" in the absence of any great restrictions placed by the authorities upon their

⁴⁹ Jerzy Andrzejewski's novel *Miazga (Pulp)* may be said to have initiated this phenomenon. Its first official edition (1981) followed the underground version published in 1979 by NOW-a. Werner cites the case of Igor Newerly: the émigré publisher Instytut Literacki (IL), NOW-a and high state officials expressed an interest in publishing his memoirs *Zostało z uczty bogów (The Remains of the Feast of the Gods)*. The passages concerning the October Revolution and Civil War, however, frightened off the state publishers (Czytelnik, at the GUKP's instructions, had suspended publication in 1984), and left the way clear to IL and NOW-a in 1986. Subsequently, Newerly received a state honour, appeared on the main news, and published his next novel *Wzgórza błękitnego snu (The Hills of Blue Dreams)*, 1986 with Czytelnik. Werner, "Dwojaczki", p. 200.

⁵⁰ "To, co "nadaje się do druku", będzie już w założeniu pisane dla wydawnictw oficjalnych." Werner, "Dwojaczki", p. 201.

activities.⁵¹ Even committed oppositionist writers concurred about the sterility of literary work emerging from the second circulation.⁵² At the same time, they were conscious that the greater freedom enjoyed by writers publishing officially stemmed in no small measure from the existence of an alternative network.

The decision to continue publishing underground during the 1980s reflected in some writers' cases an ethical stance. The satirist Jacek Fedorowicz, who had been writing since the mid-1950s, disputed the possibility of returning to the official circulation without causing damage to "one's own creative work and even personality."⁵³ He categorically denounced what he saw as the implicit capitulation to censorship in Aesopic writing: "it is precisely with its preference for allusion that the censorship corrupts both authors and audiences."⁵⁴ Fedorowicz's quandary was that publishing above ground might entail compromising his perception of truth as a creative writer. For critics and literary scholars, however, the dilemma seems to have been less acute: Włodzimierz Bolecki could happily distinguish the work he published officially (on uncontentious pre-Romantic writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century) from what he published underground (about the officially unacceptable Mackiewicz).⁵⁵

Certain younger writers, on the other hand, such as the poet Jan Polkowski, whose activism in Solidarity had put them beyond the pale, had no alternative but to publish underground or in emigration. This testified also to a generational gulf within the second circulation: those who made their literary debuts after the underground had become established were able to write without half an eye on the censorship. This outlook set them apart from previous generations, the old socialist realists (Andrzejewski and Konwicki) or the so-called 'New Wave' or 'Generation of 1968' (Barańczak), who had been instrumental in setting up the second circulation. As the New Wave poet Adam Zagajewski explained, until the late 1970s their experience was essentially one of co-habitation with censorship: "We were born, as it were,

⁵¹ "Proszę więc, piszcie, pokażcie co tworzycie!" Interview with *Polityka*, 20 December 1986, cited in *Puls*, 29, spring 1986, p. 114.

⁵² Janusz Anderman, the author of pessimistic prose works about the experience of Martial Law, remarked that no work had moved him in the past two years. *Wezwanie*, 13, January 1988, p. 89.

⁵³ Fedorowicz, *Krótko*, p. 4.

⁵⁴ "...właśnie przy pomocy preferowania aluzji cenzura degeneruje autorów, a także i odbiorców." Fedorowicz, *Krótko*, p. 8.

⁵⁵ A further consideration to be noted with academic writing is that scholars were generally allowed more leeway by the censorship since their work usually had a small target audience.

with censorship. When I was twenty, censorship was natural and it seemed it had to be like that."⁵⁶ The chief consequence of that situation, according to Zagajewski, was the ultimately undetectable slide into self-censorship. The key events of the period 1976–1981 – the creation of the second circulation, rise of Solidarity, and revelation of the wide-scale nature of censorship interference – therefore constituted a major education for the older generations. Fedorowicz's reluctance to return to state publishers can thus be understood as the result of the sea-change in outlook that writers had undergone during those years. It should also be seen as a consequence of the radical shift from the pragmatic policy of the journal *Zapis*, originally conceived as a temporary measure to force limited change, to the stance that a fully independent, underground culture with its own concerns could be achieved.

Fedorowicz stopped short of the isolationism that characterised the more intransigent end of the underground's political spectrum, which tended to view all works that appeared 'above ground' as politically and morally compromised and as serving the regime's interests. More restrained voices rejected this view as absurd, but questioned whether the second circulation was indeed independent, autonomous, and free. Until the later 1980s, for the more perspicacious underground critics, the second circulation continued to remain dependent – if only psychologically – upon the authorities and their political concerns.

What this meant in actuality can be seen by the 'blank spaces' that existed in the second circulation. Issues that have come to the fore after 1989 then received relatively little attention – homosexuality, women's rights, and to a lesser extent ethnicity (above all, Polish/Jewish relations). The authorities' opportunism in paying lip service to the first two issues tended to disqualify them from serious consideration by the underground, while a more realistic picture of Polish attitudes towards the Jews, including proper appraisals of Polish complicity in aspects of the Holocaust, has had to wait until the new millennium.⁵⁷ To an extent, these deficiencies reflected the hegemony of a different concept of liberty in the final years of communist

⁵⁶ 'Urodziliśmy się niejako z cenzurą. Gdy miałem lat dwadzieścia, to cenzura była czymś naturalnym. Wydawało się, że tak musi być.' Hobot, *Gra*, p. 334.

⁵⁷ The so-called 'Jewish number' of the London-based journal *Aneks* (41–42, 1986) was exceptional in this respect, and did include a highly critical contribution by Jan Tomasz Gross, author of *Sąsiedzi. Historia zagłady żydowskiego miasta (Neighbours. The Story of the Annihilation of a Jewish Town)*, Sejny: Pogranicze, 2000, an account of the atrocities in Jedwabne that provoked a storm of controversy in Poland.

rule – the collectivist ethos embodied in Solidarity, which essentially deferred consideration of individual liberty for the sake of the general cause.

The traditionalist and patriarchal nature of Solidarity's organisation similarly remained above criticism till recently.⁵⁸ The collectivist ethos sanctioned modes of behaviour that if practised by the state would have been (rightly) denounced as oppressive. The eminent historian of Polish thought, Andrzej Walicki, commented in an article published in the mid-eighties that it was "the opposition which has a monopoly on psychological pressure today, far worse than common physical coercion."⁵⁹ Solidarity activists could surpass the communist authorities in organising blacklists, boycotts and in practising coercion, particularly when compelling people to sign protest letters, precisely because they regarded themselves as possessing the 'moral right' to do so. The consequences of that assumption are still being felt in today's Poland.

Developments since 1989 have borne out Halina Filipowicz's assessment that "[w]hat emerged from the Quiet Revolution of 1989 in Poland was a highly traditional culture, rooted in religious fundamentalism, nationalist ideology and patriarchal practices."⁶⁰ The powerful presence of these factors ensures that, despite the absence of institutional censorship, major constraints and taboos continue to exist. In this respect, a 'free market of ideas' has yet to be achieved.

⁵⁸ For an overview of the issues, see: Penn, Shana, 'The Great Debate. When feminism hit the headlines, Poland hit the roof,' *Ms. News*, December 2000/January 2001, p. 15–19.

⁵⁹ 'Monopol na nacisk psychiczny, o wiele gorszy od zwykłego przymusu fizycznego, ma dziś przecież opozycja.' *Arka*, 16, 1986, p. 134.

⁶⁰ Filipowicz, "Taboo", p. 4.

Bibliography

- Bafia, Jerzy. *Prawo o cenzurze (The Censorship Law)*. Warsaw: Książka i Wiedza, 1983.
- Bates, John. "Making Approaches: Official Attitudes and Practice in People's Poland towards Polish Emigré Literature after 1956." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 38.2–4 (1999): 191–213.
- Bober, Leon. "Ile książek (How Many Books)?" *Kultura Niezależna*, 9 (1985): 87–93.
- Bocheński, Jacek. "Potencjał wolności (The Potential of Freedom)." *Kultura Niezależna (Independent Culture)* 50 (1989): 36–44.
- Bolecki, Włodzimierz [Jerzy Malewski]. „Prawda historyczna, której zmienić się nie da (A Historical Truth that Cannot be Changed)." *Arka (The Ark)*, 22 (1988): 54–66.
- Czapliński, Przemysław. "O realizmie antysocjalistycznym (On Anti-Socialist Realism)." *Teksty Drugie* 1 (1995): 31–48.
- Czarnik, Oskar Stanisław. "Instytucje wydawnicze w okresie przemian politycznych, ekonomicznych i kulturalnych (1975–1995) [Publishing Institutions in the Period of Political, Economic and Cultural Change (1975–1995)]." Ed. Alina Brodzka and Lidia Burska. *Sporne sprawy polskiej literatury współczesnej (Controversial Issues in Contemporary Polish Literature)*. Warsaw: IBL, 1998. 81–149.
- Fedorowicz, Jacek. *Krótką biografia człowieka cenzurowanego (The Short Biography of a Censored Man)*. Łódź: Tajne Wydawnictwo Oświatowe i Wydawnictwo Świadectwa, 1985.
- Filipowicz, Halina. "Taboo Topics in Polish and Polish/Jewish Cultural Studies." *The Journal of the International Institute*, U. of Michigan, 9.1 (2001): 4–5, 25.
- Frizke, Andrzej. *Opozycja polityczna w PRL 1945–1980 (Political Opposition in People's Poland, 1945–1980)*. London: Aneks, 1994.
- Gałański, Dariusz. "Silencing by law: The 1981 Polish 'performances and publications control act,'" 2002 (in press).
- Goban-Klas, Tomasz. *The Orchestration of the Media*. Boulder, Colorado & Oxford: Westview Press, 1994.
- Hobot, Joanna. *Gra z cenzurą w poezji Nowej Fali (1968–1976) (Playing with Censorship in the Poetry of the New Wave (1968–1976))*. Cracow: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2000.

- Kisielewski, Stefan. "Przeciw cenzurze — legalnie (garść wspomnień) (Against Censorship In a Legal Manner (A Handful of Memories))." *Bez cenzury (Without Censorship)*. 1983. Paris: Spotkania, 1987.
- Konwicki, Tadeusz. *Nowy Świat i okolice*. Warsaw: Czytelnik, 1986.
- . *New World Avenue and Vicinity*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1991.
- . *Pamiętam, że było gorąco (I Remember It was Hot)*, Cracow: Wydawnictwo Znak, 2001.
- Kozłowski, Krzysztof. "Mówić możliwie głośno (Speak as Loudly as Possible)." *Puls (Pulse)*, jesień (autumn) 1985: 151–61.
- Mikołajczyk, Magdalena. *Jak się pisało o historii... Problemy polityczne powojennej Polski w publikacjach drugiego obiegu (How History was Written About... Political Issues of Post-War Poland in the Publications of the Second Circulation)*. Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 1998.
- Misior, Paweł. *Ja, Tomasz Strzyżewski. O cenzurze i cenzorach (I, Tomasz Strzyżewski. On Censorship and Censors)*. Cracow: Léon Bonnet & Co, 1997.
- Nowicki, Krzysztof. *Ostatni kwartał – próba autobiografii. 4 (The Last Quarter. An Attempted Autobiography)*. *Twórczość (Creativity)* 10 (1984): 95–114.
- Radzikowska, Zofia. *Z historii walki o wolność słowa w Polsce. Cenzura w PRL w latach 1981–1987 (From the History of the Struggle for Freedom of Speech in Poland. Censorship in People's Poland, 1981–1987)*. Cracow: Towarzystwo Wydawców Prac Naukowych Universitas, 1990.
- Schöpfli, George (ed.). *Censorship and Political Communication in Eastern Europe. A Collection of Documents*. London: Frances Pinter (Publishers) in association with Index on Censorship, 1983.
- Strzyżewski, Tomasz. *Czarna księga cenzury PRL (The Black Book of Censorship in People's Poland)*. Vol. 1. London: Aneks, 1977.
- Szaruga, Leszek. "Untergrundpresse in Polen. Ein Beschreibungsversuch." *Samizdat. Alternative Kultur in Zentral- und Osteuropa. Die 60er bis 80er Jahre*. Ed. Wolfgang Eichwede. Bremen: Edition Temmen, 2000. 130–34.
- . "'Zapis'. Wstęp do opisu" ('Recorded Work. An Introductory Description'). *Piśmiennictwo – systemy kontroli – obiegi alternatywne (Literature – Regulatory Systems – Alternative Circulations)*, vol. 2. Ed. Janusz Kostecki and Alina Brodzka. Warsaw: Biblioteka Narodowa, 1992. 297–319.

- Świdarska, Hanna. "Independent Publishing in Poland: An Outline of its Development to 1986." *Solanus. International Journal for Russian and East European Bibliographic, Library & Publishing Studies*. New Series, 1 (1987): 54–75.
- Torańska, Teresa. *Oni (They)*. 1985. Warsaw: Agencja Omnipress, 1990.
- Werner, Andrzej. "Dwojaczki (Twins)". *Krytyka (Critique)*, 27 (1988): 199–202.
- Włodek, Zbigniew (ed.). *Tajne dokumenty Biura Politycznego KC PZPR (Secret Documents of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the PUWP)*. London: Puls, 1992.

This page intentionally left blank

**PERFORMING THE UNSPEAKABLE:
DEFEATING CENSORSHIP IN TWO STORIES BY
MARIO BENEDETTI**

Carmen Tisnado

This paper examines two short stories by Uruguayan writer Mario Benedetti (1920), written in years of extreme repression and dictatorship in Uruguay. In both stories, censorship and oppression are omnipresent. In both, some forms of discourse that appear to be entirely innocent (a love-song contest, a daily horoscope) are transformed, with resourceful imagination, into effective acts of communal insurgency or individual defiance. This paper shows how censorship makes characters have to resort to a kind of ingenuity of which they would be otherwise unaware for in both stories censorship creates an awareness of the double performativity of language. This paper, through an analysis of specific speech acts and of narrative silences, explores the stimulating yet—and above all—dismaying effects of censorship.

As long as language has existed, individuals have experienced, in one way or other, a need to tell stories. More importantly, the need to tell our own stories seems, at times, urgent. The array from which people can tell their own stories is, of course, widely open and vast. In the second half of the twentieth-century, however, all over the world, there was an emergence of testimonial stories in which survivors bear witness to their experiences of unimaginable abuse and torture. As Elie Wiesel's famous quote states, "if the Greeks invented tragedy, the Romans the epistle, and the Renaissance the sonnet, our generation invented a new literature, that of testimony."¹

In Latin America itself, the 1970s and 1980s generated a number of testimonials from survivors of detention camps in the Southern Cone as well as narratives from relatives of prisoners who were euphemistically called *desaparecidos* [disappeared]. Hundreds of personal accounts could be read in *Argentina Nunca Más* and *Uruguay Nunca Más*, apart from the many other declarations registered by different commissions on Human Rights. But a new literature also emerged in this period, with characteristics all its own. There are literary testimonials such as Alicia Partnoy's *The Little School*, Jacobo Timerman's *Prisoner without A Name, Cell without A Number*, Nora

¹ Wiesel, "The Holocaust," p. 9.

Strejilevich's *A Single Numberless Death*, as well as purely fictional works such as Luisa Valenzuela's *The Lizard's Tail* or *Bedside Manners*, Ariel Dorfman's *Death and the Maiden*, and many of the short stories by the Uruguayan Mario Benedetti (1920).

Uruguay lived through a military dictatorship from 1972 to 1985. The country, thus, was no stranger to what has been termed "the culture of fear" that ruled so many South American countries in the 1970s and 1980s.² Uruguay was, until the 1950s, a peaceful and apparently prosperous country known and often celebrated as "the Switzerland of America." The country's peace and prosperity were the product of a welfare state that had been established early in the century:

[u]ntil the late 1960s, the state played a key role in the economic and social life of Uruguay, distributing much of the country's income and fostering progressive and social policies [but] at the end of the 1950s, production and exports began to stagnate, an indication that the economic system had been doing little more than subsisting at a comparatively advantageous time in international trade. Nevertheless, the country did not change its economic policies or habits.³

As Juan Rial states, "by the late 1950s, Uruguay's prosperity—based on agricultural exports—came to an end. A protracted period of social and economic crisis ensued. Thereafter, the paternalistic state failed to fulfill its customary role as 'protector of the people.'"⁴ All this, not surprisingly, led to an increase in social discontent, which manifested in demonstrations and written thoughts of protest and criticism of the government. Consequently, in the 1960s the civil government imposed new draconian economic measures and restricted the freedom of people and workers to organize public protests or go on strikes. In June 1968 President Jorge Pacheco Areco declared the *Medidas Prontas de Seguridad*, known as MPS [Prompt Security Measures], which, "provided [his] government with a constitutional means of imposing economic policies and prohibiting opposition."⁵ Just days after the MPS were introduced, "the administration froze salaries and dissolved the salary boards that for thirty years had negotiated labor-management agreements."⁶

² For more on "the culture of fear," see Corradi, *Fear at the Edge*.

³ *Uruguay Nunca Más*, p. 4.

⁴ Rial, "Makers and Guardians of Fear," p. 91.

⁵ *Uruguay Nunca Más*, p.7.

⁶ *Uruguay Nunca Más*, p.6.

At the same time, the Tupamaros, an urban guerrilla group, led several armed attacks – some of them successful – against the authorities, who declared a state of emergency in 1968:

Between 1963 and 1972, the [Tupamaros] staged repeated violent actions [...] that were intended to dislodge the elected government and replace it with a revolutionary government. [...] The Tupamaros wanted to bring about social transformation that would get the country out of crisis and they were especially concerned about improving the lives of the poor."⁷

Regardless of these apparently honourable motives, "they carried out violent actions that caused loss of life and liberty to innocent people as well as to members of the forces of repression. [...] The rebels were attacking the fundamental rights of a civilized community."⁸ In the 1970s, after the military coup of 1973, the military government decided to inflict a "punishment" to those who, according to them, got involved in guerrilla activities – a punishment that entailed arrest, torture and death. The national emergency declared in 1968 lasted until the early 1980s. In 1970 there was yet another security measure which "allowed the executive, with prior approval of Congress, to carry out arrests and household searches without court warrants, to censor the press, to open mail and to wiretap communications."⁹

Censorship invaded all areas of public and private life. Since any group larger than four individuals could not meet without an official authorization, people had to ask for permission even to have a birthday party in somebody's house. Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano explains that "with the guerrilla threat as a pretext, state terrorism set its gears in motion. [...] Through the wholesale use of terror and uncertainty, the military set out to create a society of deaf-mutes."¹⁰

Fear became too imposing for people to speak up or to listen if anyone else would dare to criticise the government. Rial, in his study of Uruguayan society in the 1970s and 1980s, finds that the culture of fear that ensued had three basic components: silence, isolation and a sense of hopelessness. As the immediate effect of self-censorship, silence was the expression of a deep and general distrust. Isolation and extreme privacy were brought about by the heavy toll that silence imposed on everyday life. This,

⁷ Uruguay Nunca Más, p. 18.

⁸ Uruguay Nunca Más, p. 18.

⁹ Rial, "Makers and Guardians of Fear," p. 93.

¹⁰ Galeano, "The Dictatorship," p. 103-104.

in turn, made people feel they were trapped in time, without any possibility to act.¹¹ Rial explains that "there were measures designed to terrorize dissidents, to neutralize and destroy them. On the other [hand], the regime attempted to manipulate the fear of marginal sectors of the population and to draft them as guardians of the dissidents."¹² The culture of fear, thus, was spread all over the country.

Labour leaders, artists, singers, and writers suffered all kinds of hardship at the hands of the military regime, and among them, Mario Benedetti, who is regarded by Oscar Fernández, as well as by several other critics, as "one of the best contemporary Latin American *cuentistas* [short story writers]."¹³ As was the case with many other intellectuals, Benedetti's works were banned and he was forced to live in exile. His trajectory of exile is long and varied. He first went to Buenos Aires, but then the military dictatorship in Argentina expelled him from the country. He then went to Lima. After some time the Peruvian government gave him notice that he had to leave within twenty-four hours. He took off to Havana, but did not stay in Cuba for his whole period as an exile. He ended up in Spain, where he won many literary accolades and was – and still is – loved and celebrated by most readers. Both "El cambiazio" [The Swap]¹⁴ and "Los astros y vos" [The Stars and You], the two stories I will discuss here, came out in collections published in Spain and Mexico.

Benedetti has written novels, poetry, plays, essays, but he has definitely excelled in the short story. As he himself pointed out in the fifties, when no one could have foreseen the military takeover of the seventies, "[Uruguay is] a small nook of America which has neither oil, nor Indians, nor minerals. Nor volcanos, nor even an army dedicated to coups. We are a small country of short stories."¹⁵ In his short stories, Benedetti mainly portrays the inhabitants of the capital city, Montevideo. One of his early collections is entitled, precisely, *Montevideanos* (1959). Benedetti, through his short fiction, provides a vivid description of the idiosyncracies of these *montevideanos*, their predicaments, their fears, anxieties, hopes. He also shows how these traits are altered as the country changes. At first, in the

¹¹ See Rial, "Makers and Guardians of Fear," p. 100-101.

¹² Rial, "Makers and Guardians of Fear," p. 95.

¹³ Fernández, "Mario Benedetti: Four Stories," p. 290.

¹⁴ Anita Louise Williams (*Death and Other Surprises*) translates the title as "The Switch", but "The Swap" gives a better sense of the range and shades of meaning of the Spanish noun *cambiazio*.

¹⁵ As quoted by Fernández, "Mario Benedetti: Four Stories," p. 288.

1960s and early 1970s, Benedetti's *montevideanos* are "deadened urbanites whose inability to act leaves them befuddled and adrift, [...] customarily marked by inertia, vacillation, and a quiet anguish."¹⁶ Indeed, Benedetti's early *montevideanos* are so trapped by fear that they have lost their ability to choose. They are too self-involved in their particular circumstances, and their vision of the world is too narrow for them to break out of their trap. These *montevideanos*, however, change their attitude when their country starts experiencing the symptoms of the crisis. This change is shown in a few of the short stories in his collection *La muerte y otras sorpresas* [Death and Other Surprises] (1968), and is fully exposed in the stories of *Con y sin nostalgia* [With and without Nostalgia] (1977). In *Con y sin nostalgia*, the same kind of *montevideanos* find their way into political action as terrorism and violence compels them to come to terms with the inescapable fact that they must make a choice. Choice is probably the key word to understand the progression in Benedetti's characters. From inertia and apathy they move to desperation and despair. Yet the situation reaches a point in which they can no longer remain passive and must act to modify their circumstances.

"El cambiazio" appeared in *La muerte y otras sorpresas*, and "Los astros y vos" in *Con y sin nostalgia*. *La muerte y otras sorpresas* (1968) appears at a moment in which, according to Hugo Verani, "la crisis política y económica se agrava [...], entrando el país en una etapa de conmoción social sin precedentes"¹⁷ [the political and economic crisis worsens [...], and the country enters into a period of social commotion as it had never seen before].¹⁸ This social commotion took place under a democratically elected government which had let the military set in motion the mechanisms of state repression. *Con y sin nostalgia* was published in 1977 when Uruguay was living under an openly and brutally repressive military dictatorship:

en esos años de dictadura, fenómenos como la censura, la represión, el exilio y las diferentes formas de resistencia interna, marcaron de tal modo la vida creativa que buena parte de su producción se vio obligada a 'situarse' coyunturalmente en relación a 'esa' historia¹⁹

[in those years of dictatorship, creative life was so inscribed by censorship, repression, exile and the different forms of internal resistance, that a great part of its production had to 'be situated' at that conjuncture, in relation to 'that' history].

¹⁶ Lewis, "The Political Act," p. 28.

¹⁷ Verani, *De la vanguardia*, p. 39.

¹⁸ This and other English translations throughout the article are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

¹⁹ Ainsa, *Nuevas fronteras*, p. 17.

The titles of the short stories I study refer to aspects of life in a community. "Los astros y vos" is the name of an astrology column that everyone reads in the fictional Uruguayan town where the story takes place. "El cambiazio" is the name of a public contest that draws thousands of people to an open-air event. It seems relevant to point out one of the uses of the word *cambiazio* in Spanish. The phrase *dar el cambiazio* [give the swap] is defined by the *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* [Royal Academy of the Spanish Language] as *cambiar fraudulentamente una cosa por otra* – replace deceitfully one thing with another. And the question to pose here is, then: what role does deceit play, if any, in the plot of "El cambiazio"?

"El cambiazio" tells the story of the death of Colonel Corrales, a Chief of Police who, abusing his powers, not only imposes extreme censorship but arrests and tortures anyone he considers "subversive." During the years of dictatorship, the word *subversivo* [subversive] had more connotations than its actual meaning may suggest. The same as during the military regime in Argentina, in Uruguay, language was manipulated to the advantage of the government. In her study of the words used and abused by the Argentine regime, Marguerite Feitlowitz explains that "the 'Dirty War' junta, which ruled Argentina from 1976 to 1983, was intensely verbal and used language with diabolical skill to confuse, disorient, and terrorize."²⁰ The "subversive," in Argentina, was not considered a citizen. Furthermore, as one Chief of Police stated, "[the subversive] should not even be considered our brother [...] this conflict between us cannot be likened to that between Cain and Abel."²¹ The situation in Uruguay was not different from that in Argentina. Colonel Corrales, within the fictional world of "El cambiazio," regards a subversive under the same premises as the Argentine Chief of Police to whom Feitlowitz refers.

"El cambiazio" has nine tightly structured paragraphs: the first eight are clearly divided into two groups. The first group consists of the odd paragraphs, that is, paragraphs 1, 3, 5, and 7, which represent the unmediated voice of Corrales. Corrales's words are thus the absolute beginning of the text and the world it represents. And those words, significantly, are: "Mierda con ellos" (p. 82) [To hell with them – literally – Shit to them].²² Corrales's angry insult provides a wealth of meanings in just three words: first, a world

²⁰ Feitlowitz, *A Lexicon of Terror*, p. ix.

²¹ As quoted by Feitlowitz, *A Lexicon of Terror*, p. 24.

²² Page numbers for the Spanish text of "El cambiazio" refer to Benedetti, *La muerte y otras sorpresas*.

obviously divided into *us* and *them*; also, the dismissive judgment of *them* by *us*; also, the self-assurance of someone who could send *them*, not just metaphorically, to hell.

The even paragraphs – 2, 4, 6, 8 – present a third-person narrative about Lito Suárez, a singer and TV host, highly admired by the country's youth. The narrative voice has a sarcastic tone when describing Lito's public appearances in front of enthusiastic young crowds. It is as if the voice were reassuring us that Lito is actually foolish, too young, and, above all, totally inoffensive. Among Lito's fans is Julita, Corrales's teenage daughter, who seems to be unaware of her father's job as master of repression. Julita provides the initial link between the two lines (*us–them*) of the story. The ninth and last paragraph represents the climax of both the structural and the thematic progression of the story, connecting the two apparently separate lines that appear in alternate paragraphs.

Lito launches a public contest that will take place during four weeks, based on a love-song. He declares that the contest is "un juego que jugaremos al nivel de *masas*, al nivel de *pueblo*, al nivel de *juventud*" (p. 82; my emphases) [a game that we shall play at the level of *the masses*, at the level of *the people*, at the level of *the youth*]. No one seems to suspect that the game has any "political" intention or goal. And this is true not only for the characters within the story but also for the readers outside the text. It is also true that the Spanish words *masa* and *pueblo* ["the masses" and "the people"] are often charged with a strong political connotation. But it is only at the end of the story that these words, in retrospect, acquire, for both characters and readers, the meaning they connote.

Lito presents a four-line stanza that has an explicit romantic tone:

Para que nadie lo impida,
para que tu amor despierte,
para vos mi voz rendida,
para mí sólo quererte (p. 83).

[So that no one could prevent it,
so that your love may be awakened,
for you, my voice in surrender,
for me, to love you forever.]

Lito says that the goal, over four weeks, is to transform this poem into a new one by changing one line a week. Each new line must fit into the already given syntax and general tone (love poem) of the quatrain. Lito encourages his fans to submit their lines each week. He will sing the new version of the

stanza each week on his Sunday TV show. The fourth week the final quatrain will be announced in a public event. The world of Lito Suárez and his love songs seems to be innocent and trivial enough to Colonel Corrales, whose main concern is the imprisonment and interrogation of "suspects." He is thus more than willing to allow the public event in which the completion of the transformed new stanza would take place. The fictional "Uruguay" of Benedetti's story replicates the repressive regime that ravaged the real Uruguay between 1973 and 1985. Following the "rules," Lito requests official permission for the last day of the contest to take place publicly, and Corrales is more than glad to grant it. So far, two worlds seem to coexist, and one is apparently unaware of the other: Lito's only interest is his TV show and Corrales believes that the young people, by paying attention to this contest, are prevented from thinking: "La verdad es que la muchachada se entretiene, se pone juvenilmente histórica, pide autógrafos, besa fotografías, y mientras tanto no piensa. [...] Siempre es mejor que canten eso y no la Internacional." (p. 85) [The truth is that the youngsters amuse themselves. They become youthfully hysterical, ask for autographs, kiss photographs, and all the while, they do not think. [...] It is always better that they sing that and not the International]. Ironically, it is Corrales who is not allowed to "think" by the perverse structure of the swap, which does not reveal its true meaning until the moment in which Corrales is killed as the final line of the new quatrain is uttered. Even when the third line of the stanza has been changed, its tone continues to be the usual mixture of sweet and tacky of many popular love songs:

Para que se abra la herida,
 para que usemos la suerte,
 para nosotros la vida,
 para mí sólo quererte. (p. 88)

[So that the wound may be opened,
 so that we let fortune help us,
 for us, to live long together,
 for me, to love you forever.]

The fact that the verbs change from the first person singular to the first person plural seems of no importance at first glance. The message the "I" gives to her or his beloved becomes a "we" when they are both in conjunction. Nothing at this point would imply that the "we" actually refers to "the youth," "the people," "the masses" to whom Lito alludes when he first announces the contest.

When the final line of the transformed stanza is uttered, a second, entirely unexpected level of meaning comes as an explosion:

Para que se abra la herida,
para que usemos la suerte,
para nosotros la vida,
para Corrales la muerte. (p. 89)

[So that the wound may be opened,
so that we let fortune help us,
for us, a long life together,
for Corrales only, death.]

While chanting the last verse, the crowd breaks into Corrales's office, where, following the song's prediction, he is shot to death.

The process through which Corrales's death is planned now becomes clear. It is obvious that censorship, repression, and brutality are routinely practiced by the authorities. It is thus inconceivable that anyone would submit for the contest a verse calling for Corrales's death. This, however, does happen in the world created by Benedetti. Within the lack of verisimilitude of this event, what is left for us to assume is that Lito has the final stanza before he even introduces the contest. The final "political" quatrain is, in fact, the absolute beginning of the process, the "original" one. By transforming this initial quatrain, line by line, Lito creates *a posteriori* the supposedly "initial" love quatrain. As the contest unfolds, the four lines of the original stanza are presented as a progression, when they actually constitute a retrogression. At the start, Lito has a stanza that exhorts the crowd into rebellion. In order to achieve that end, he needs to de-construct it into a romantic love-song. The contest appears simply to propose to change one love-song into another. But in the explosive and surprise ending, the political message bursts in all its original intent and subversive force.

This story is the tale of a reversal. At first Corrales owns the strong voice, the one that controls; he sends others – *them* – *a la mierda*, to hell. But at the end the strong voice belongs to the others. They have seized, as fleetingly as it may be, the power to act and control, the very power that sends Corrales to death.

Lito deceives the authorities the same way the narrator and Benedetti deceive us, the readers. Lito, with his ingenuity, and through his voice and silence, defeats censorship. Silence may bespeak fear but it may also be the tool of cunning. Lito's plan, in fact, consists in hiding its end and means. Lito needs to toy with both words and silence in order to achieve his goal.

Silence and discourse are of extreme importance in "Los astros y vos" as well. The fictional action of this story also takes place in a little Uruguayan town called Rosales. The initial situation is presented as a series of peaceful and insignificant events. Two characters stand out: Oliva, the Chief of Police, and Arroyo, the writer responsible for the astrology column on the daily paper. They, along with other prominent men in town, frequently meet at a café to play dice. Oliva is so well integrated into the town's everyday life that he, for instance, never wears his police uniform.

The initial situation is disrupted by the changes that occur following a military coup, which – readers cannot fail to recognise – coincides with the 1973 coup in Uruguay. Oliva starts wearing his uniform and becomes authoritarian and repressive. This twist of behaviour marks how censorship and terror become institutionalized and how military or police uniforms turn into a symbol of abuse and torture. After a short time, Arroyo begins to write his column expressing "un pronóstico sombrío" (p. 11) [gloomy predictions (p. 47)] for the town.²³

Oliva controls all town events and abuses his power. Once he exercises so much psychological pressure on a pregnant woman that her husband, Aníbal, feels compelled to speak up. Aníbal is later arrested and his wife has a miscarriage. It is after Aníbal's arrest and the woman's miscarriage that Arroyo decides to issue messages every day and, as the narrator describes, "su campaña fue sistemática" (p. 15) [his campaign was systematic (p. 50)]. Arroyo deliberately provokes Oliva. He "reads" the stars and predicts Oliva's future to the public. All predictions subtly entail Oliva's death:

Pronto llegará la hora en que *alguien* pague. (my emphasis) (p. 15)
[It will soon be time for *someone* to pay for his actions.] (p. 50)

Negras perspectivas para quien hace alarde de la fuerza ante los débiles. (p. 15)
[A grim future awaits the strong man who oppresses the weak.] (p. 50)

El autoritario va a sucumbir y lo merece. (p. 15)
[The strong man deserves to lose out, and he will.] (p. 50)

Los astros anuncian inexorablemente el fin del aprendiz. Del aprendiz de déspota (p. 15)
[The stars say that the demise of the apprentice, the tyrant's apprentice, is close at hand.]
(p. 50)

²³ Page numbers for the Spanish text of "Los astros y vos" refer to Benedetti, *La muerte y otras sorpresas*. Page numbers for the English translation of the story refer to James Graham, tr., Benedetti, *Blood Pact*.

Arroyo's messages are shrouded in the veil of astrological predictions that threaten an unnamed figure. He and his readers have a silent complicity in which everyone understands who the implied person is. Arroyo cannot be censored since he is not criticising anyone in particular. He uses figures of speech that allow his message to appear in a newspaper. Any reader in town would recognise who "the tyrant's apprentice" is. Oliva himself knows that Arroyo, in his column, is referring to him but he cannot publicly confront Arroyo, because doing so would be to admit, also publicly, that he is, indeed, the "tyrant's apprentice" whose demise Arroyo – or rather, the stars – foretell.

Oliva thus knows he is being attacked by Arroyo, but Arroyo's voice is protected and, in a way, concealed within the designs of the stars. Oliva has no weapons to fight the stars but the stars themselves. His only recourse, therefore, is to make use of astrology in order to modify what has already been said. Oliva, then, tries to force Arroyo to publish a favourable horoscope about his future. This fits Arroyo's plan perfectly, and while he says to Oliva, "Los astros nunca mienten, comisario" (p. 16) ["The stars never lie, Commissioner" (p. 51)], he shoots him.

Arroyo's plan works to perfection. He exercises the performative power of language by killing Oliva. The same as Lito Suárez follows the conventions of a public TV contest, Arroyo follows the conventions required for a horoscope, which could be perceived by some as banal and harmless. Neither Arroyo nor Lito is under any surveillance, unlike some other public figures whose words are censored. Because Arroyo appears to be merely interpreting the stars, he is given, in effect, the freedom to write whatever he wants. Thus, Arroyo twists the concept of interpreting the stars and disguises his own voice. Therefore he does not predict the future; he creates it.

As in "El cambiazo," in "Los astros y vos" we can see that words are used to carry out a plan that would not work without those words that precede its outcome. The plan, however, would not work without the complicitous silence that surrounds its execution. In "Los astros y vos" Oliva is the implied referent of Arroyo's discourse; the fact that Arroyo writes a horoscope allows him to indirectly refer to Oliva. This process seems very simple, but it supposes a collective understanding of a semantic code. For instance, there is nothing in the word *alguien* [someone] by itself that might lead us to find out who is being alluded to. Only when the experience of the community serves the purpose of establishing the link between linguistic signs and outside reality can the code be deciphered and the message understood. In Arroyo's community, as well as in Lito and Corrales's, people share experiences. In both places the division now established is between *us*

and *them*, and what separates them both is the way of perceiving and talking about the world. Yet only one part of the division (either us or them, depending on the perspective from which they are seen) constitute the "masses" who decipher messages and take them into some sort of action.

"Los astros y vos" also plays with double meaning. What appears as the predictions of the stars turns out to be the plan to kill the tyrant. As in "El cambiazo," in this other story there is a need for a double encoding since censorship and repression are so strongly enforced that open opposition to the system would never be tolerated. In both stories the plan is secret but the means to perform it are public. In the contest of "El cambiazo" there is no reference to Corrales except for the last line of the stanza. The double meaning consists precisely of presenting two apparently separate referents. In the column of "Los astros y vos" Oliva is the veiled target. Yet, no one realises that the horoscope serves the purpose to provoke Oliva so that he will fall victim to a destiny preordained by Arroyo. Arroyo creates the future in a backward way, the same as Lito does: shooting Oliva is what gives validity to the predictions.

Arroyo and Lito Suárez take advantage of the silence to which they and other potential protesters are condemned by the regime. They pretend to silence their voices of protest, but they simply disguise them with a second meaning. When the second meaning is revealed Arroyo's and Lito's plans are carried out to their end.

"El cambiazo" and "Los astros y vos" can only occur in a fictional Uruguay. In the real Uruguay, Lito and the crowd would have been massacred, and Arroyo would have been jailed, or he would have been killed after he had shot Oliva. Most probably, also, if the stories had appeared in Uruguay, Benedetti would have been "punished" in a severe way. Since they appeared when he was in exile, published by editorial houses abroad, we have to assume that they reached readers from different Spanish-speaking countries and backgrounds. Although his books were banned in his own country, Uruguayans managed to get Benedetti's texts, so he was read both in Uruguay and abroad. The reception of his texts was obviously different in each case. Yet unlike the actual country it seeks to evoke, Benedetti's fictional Uruguay is, for every reader, a relentless and lucid meditation on the horrors of systematic repression and censorship. It also invites readers to ponder the possibilities of individual courage, creative imagination and human solidarity that, in some paradoxical ways, such repression and censorship seem to bring about. Benedetti's stories point the reader to a beguiling paradox – that it is precisely repression and censorship that move

people to this enormous courage and creativity. For, as the Russian poet Joseph Brodsky says: "[...] the machinery of constraint, of censorship, of suppression turns out to be – this is a paradox – useful to literature. [...] If there is censorship, and in Russia, God knows, there is!—then one must avoid it; that is, censorship is unwittingly an impetus to metaphorical language."²⁴

Uruguayan critic Mabel Moraña indicates that, as a counter-effect of censorship, texts became overvalued in Uruguay. In other words, any text that would not appear to be ideologically aligned with the official discourse was considered suspicious and dangerous. Thus, Moraña explains: "Esto produce un proceso de sobrevaloración de lo escrito. [...] El texto es perseguido y secuestrado, requisado y destruido, exactamente igual que los individuos."²⁵ [this creates a process by which whatever is written is valued in excess [...] The text is persecuted and kidnapped, inspected and destroyed, all in the same ways individuals are]. Moraña, obviously, refers to the complex ways in which repressive regimes try both to suppress and effectively use the power of language. By suppressing texts they may believe they are diminishing that power. Yet things are indeed more complicated than that. Moraña goes on to state: "la censura produce la hipertrofia de la fuerza ilocucionaria del texto, impulsando un proceso de vaciamiento y resemantización del lenguaje, y la necesidad de adopción de una serie de estrategias discursivas que inciden en la temática y la composición literaria."²⁶ [censorship generates a large increase of the illocutionary force of the text, promoting a process of emptying and redefining language, and a need to adopt a variety of discursive strategies that emphasize on the themes and on the literary composition].

We can see this effect of censorship in "El cambio" and in "Los astros y vos." In both stories, Mario Benedetti presents language – with its components of speech and silence – as a weapon to fight oppression. In both cases language has a double performative force. Both stories are a tribute to creativity and ingenuity when there is nothing left with which to fight. In other words, Benedetti offers the possibility of hope. It is as if he were telling his fellow Uruguayans and so many other readers living under oppression that silence is not only and not necessarily passive, that there are ways to defeat censorship. Such ways, though, could lead to success only through life shared in a community and through a common – communal – understanding of the different layers of the linguistic and semantic code. This understanding

²⁴ As quoted by Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p.12.

²⁵ Moraña, *Memorias de la generación fantasma*, p. 134.

²⁶ Moraña, *Memorias de la generación fantasma*, p. 134.

does not promote or vindicate assassination as a solution to political oppression. For instance, Uruguayans knew, even if it was in their collective unconscious, that politically motivated violence would not change their situation. They, however, then and now, may understand that there is hope, and that they themselves are responsible for creating it through their own actions. Benedetti, thus, enables his readers to see themselves as possible agents of social and political change.

"El cambiazio" and "Los astros y vos" present different degrees of Aesopian utterances. Benedetti, willingly or not, has succeeded in constructing stories that fit Lev Loseff's description of what happens in an Aesopian text: "the Author's one chance is to construct the text in such a way that the objectionable material will reach the Reader but be perceived by the Censor as an aesthetic imperfection, irrelevant material, empty filler, or noise. This quasi noise is the Aesopian utterance."²⁷

Clearly, the concept of an Aesopian utterance is more directly seen in "El cambiazio," where neither Corrales nor other officials realise the subversive goal covered under the guise of a song-contest. Oliva, in "Los astros y vos," does know he is the referent in Arroyo's column, but he is somewhat trapped by the fact that the reference to him is framed within the inoffensive and even laughable boundaries of an astrology column. For, what serious grounds does Oliva have to accuse Arroyo? Surely, he does not need any because he could have Arroyo arrested simply by his own decree. This, however, would imply public consent that it is he, Oliva, the one referred to as "the tyrant's apprentice," and this would be humiliating to him as a figure of authority. Yet Oliva, in a rather oblique way, understands that the readers of the Rosales paper know what Arroyo is doing. Oliva as a censor at first may perceive Arroyo's column as "irrelevant material or an empty filler," but later he will, as censors do, have learned to decipher Arroyo's "Aesopian code" and become aware of Arroyo's tactic.

In both "El cambiazio" and "Los astros y vos," the moment of realization comes along with a cathartic action for characters as well as for readers. Characters are relieved in that the tyrant is dead, and readers experience the explosion of the surprise ending reaching a sudden understanding of the two levels of meaning in the stories. Through this understanding the reader does not only celebrate Benedetti's ingenuity but also arrives, even if only theoretically, to a hopeful and inspiring stage from which things that seem at first impossible turn out plausible. Most

²⁷ Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. 45.

Uruguayans were, obviously, not looking for stratagems to kill police officers or other official authorities. Most Uruguayans, however, wanted the dictatorship to end, which implied the metaphorical death of such authorities. And this is precisely what Benedetti offered them: the metaphorical killing of the tyrants. In this way, the cathartic effect of the stories is fully achieved.

It is especially in the cathartic effect of the surprise endings designed by Benedetti that "El cambiazio" and "Los astros y vos" are configured as Aesopian texts:

the structure of the Aesopian text [...] unfolds in its proper perspective: 1) the surface level of articulated context; 2) the level of veiled allegorical content (a level which is as a rule trifling); 3) the deep content of a socio-psychological cast, catharsis. Again and again in a society where ideological censorship prevails the reader will animatedly follow this dangerous game in which intellect bests authority; again and again the reader will participate, albeit passively, in the game, not analyzing or responding emotionally to the text so much as *celebrating* it as he would a mythical ritual.²⁸

Following a ritual is precisely what Benedetti makes his characters do. No one in Rosales, with the exception of Oliva, comments on the words Arroyo writes but everyone silently understands them for sure. In "El cambiazio" contestants and the general public go by Lito's rules, and thus follow a ritual, not necessarily comprehending – or unconsciously doing so – what the "ritual" is really about.

Interestingly, there is an unequivocal parallelism between what Benedetti's two short stories propose and what happened with the *murgas* and with *canto popular*, two rituals of a sort, during the dictatorship years in Uruguay. The *murgas* belong to the Carnival season. For a whole month, a group of humorists and parodists circulate holding public performances for which they write their own lyrics, basing them primarily on current issues and events. As Leo Masliah points out, "in part because of content, but above all because of the large size of the audiences addicted to this popular art form, the *murgas* were a prime target for the censors."²⁹

Censors demanded to read all scripts, and forced some lyricists to change at random words that they considered subversive. During performances, police agents in disguise checked each word against their official script. Any group who did not follow procedures was severely punished. Certain words were attributed a specific – insurgent – connotation, and were banned from the *murga* performances. For instance, Masliah tells

²⁸ Loseff, *On the Beneficence of Censorship*, p. 222-223.

²⁹ Masliah, "Popular Music," p. 112.

of a group who had a sketch about the period of Prohibition in the United States. Regardless of the specific North-American context in which they were used, words such as *clandestino* [clandestine], *pasado* [past], or *pueblo*, translated as both "people" and "town," were banned. Masliah expresses eloquently the irony involved in the relation between the *murga* lyricists and their censors:

the Carnival lyricists might just as well have been students in a literary workshop taught by the police, who year after year reassigned them the difficult exercise of changing four or five words in each stanza of a text without changing the meter (because the music had already been rehearsed by the time they ruled on its feasibility or lack thereof) while at the same time attempting to preserve some meaning or – in cases involving a rare display of skill – the meaning originally intended.³⁰

Murga songs, needless to say, were written and performed long before there was military dictatorship in Uruguay. Within the fictional realm of the stories, Lito Suárez has also held public performances, and Arroyo has also written his astrology column before their authoritarian regimes ever appear and exercise their power. When dictatorship asserts its power, *murga* lyricists, Lito, and Arroyo are bound by the need to adapt to new circumstances and to adopt strategies and techniques that would allow them to continue their public activities while getting their concealed messages across. For these characters, acting in public, of course, implies abiding by the rules but, at the same time, mocking and dismissing them. Like the real *murgas* during the dictatorship years in Uruguay, the song contest and the astrology column in the two stories are creative and organized forms of resisting and even defeating censorship.

As stated above, *canto popular* [popular song] can also be reckoned as a ritual that, differently from *murgas*, emerged during dictatorship. *Canto popular* became a new genre—composed and performed by singers and musicians—that drew multitudes. Besides its deep roots in folk tradition, *canto popular* created a semantic space in which disguised political messages could be successfully conveyed to the audience. Thus, as Moraña explains, "el mensaje que se comunica, tematizado de diferentes maneras, opera a partir de una complicidad tácita con el conjunto receptor, capaz de leer los blancos del discurso poético-musical o completarlo con intervenciones espontáneas."³¹ [the message, thematically presented in diverse ways, is

³⁰ Masliah, "Popular Music," p. 112.

³¹ Moraña, *Memorias de la generación fantasma*, p. 102.

communicated thanks to and through a tacit complicity with the audience, who are able to read the blanks of the poetic and musical discourse and even expand on that discourse with spontaneous participation]. According to Moraña audiences were trained to perform these interpretive strategies because they lived in a system of censored listening and reading, and they were used to the interaction and complicity that abide by and yet bypass the restrictions imposed by censorship.

The themes of Benedetti's short stories seem to be based on this principle of tacit complicity. Evidently, either in the gigantic former Soviet Union, or in a small country such as Uruguay, if censorship is imposed, it enforces some definite forms of silence and of discourse that do not exist outside the universe created by repression – a silence that eloquently points at all that discourse is not allowed to say, and, in turn, a discourse that is metaphorical, displaced, indirect. In both of his short stories, Benedetti creates characters that resist and defeat censorship through the concealment and disclosure of specific-coded-messages that the general public, to an extent, is able to understand.

Mario Benedetti, the writer, acts as he makes his characters act: within the process of adjusting to a new situation of censorship and repression. He finds almost infinite ways to convey the "dangerous" meanings he wishes to convey by means of his literary craft, which he practices with method and discipline and with inexhaustible talent and creativity. "El cambiado" and "Los astros y vos" – and almost all of Benedetti's works – represent language as the most powerful and versatile tool, capable of becoming the most important weapon available to everybody for good or ill. Censors, and even torturers, use language to instill fear, control people's minds, and, in the case of torture, to inflict psychological and emotional pain and thus annihilate the prisoners' humanity. Artists, intellectuals, as well as a multitude of individuals have the ability to use language to circumvent rules, to oppose repression, and to obliquely utter a powerful "No" to censorship. Mario Benedetti shows that we can be victims of language, but we can also become its masters.

Bibliography

- Aínsa, Fernando. *Nuevas fronteras de la narrativa uruguaya (1960–1993)*. Montevideo: Trilce, 1993.
- Benedetti, Mario. "El cambiazo." *La muerte y otras sorpresas*. México: Siglo Veintiuno, vigésima edición, 1986: 82–89.
- . "Los astros y vos." *Con y sin nostalgia*. México: Siglo Veintiuno, decimotercera edición, 1990: 9–16.
- . "The Stars and You." *Blood Pact and Other Stories*. Ed. Claribel Alegría / Darwin Flakoll. Willimantic, CT: Curbstone Press, 1997.
- Corradi, Juan / Patricia Weiss Fagen / Manuel Antonio Garretón, (eds.) *Fear at the Edge. State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.
- Feitlowitz, Marguerite. *A Lexicon of Terror. Argentina and the Legacies of Torture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Fernández, Oscar. "Mario Benedetti: Four Stories, Four Styles." *Studies in Short Fiction*. 3 (1974): 283–290.
- Galeano, Eduardo. "The Dictatorship and Its Aftermath. The Hidden Wounds." *Repression, Exile, and Democracy: Uruguayan Culture*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993. 103–107.
- Lewis, Bart. "The Political Act in Mario Benedetti's *Con y Sin Nostalgia*." *Latin American Literary Review* 9 (1980): 28–35.
- Loseff, Lev. *On the Beneficence of Censorship. Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner in Kommission, 1984.
- Masliah, Leo. "Popular Music: Censorship and Repression." *Repression, Exile, and Democracy: Uruguayan Culture*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993. 108–119.
- Moraña, Mabel. *Memorias de la generación fantasma*. Montevideo: Monte Sexto, 1988.
- Real Academia Española. *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. I. Vigésima edición. Madrid: 1984.
- Rial, Juan. "Makers and Guardians of Fear: Controlled Terror in Uruguay." *Fear at the Edge. State Terror and Resistance in Latin America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992. 90–103.
- Servicio Paz y Justicia Uruguay. *Uruguay Nunca Más. Human Rights Violations 1972–1985*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

Verani, Hugo, J. *De la vanguardia a la posmodernidad: narrativa uruguaya. (1920–1995)*. Montevideo: Trilce, 1996.

Wiesel, Elie. "The Holocaust as Literary Imagination." *Dimensions of the Holocaust*, annotated by Elliot Lefkovitz. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1997.

Williams, Anita Louise. *Death and Other Surprises by Mario Benedetti*. Dissertation Thesis (M.A.) Kutztown State College: 1982.

This page intentionally left blank

AESOPIAN STRATEGIES OF TEXTUAL RESISTANCE IN THE STRUGGLE TO OVERCOME THE CENSORSHIP OF POPULAR MUSIC IN APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

Michael Drewett

The censorship of popular music during the apartheid era in South Africa severely affected the way musicians expressed themselves lyrically. Musicians who overtly sang about taboo topics or who used controversial language often experienced the censorship of their music, especially at the level of airplay. Yet despite structural constraints, musicians sought ways of overcoming censorship practices. This chapter focuses specifically on cryptic forms of textual resistance including the use of symbolism, camouflaged lyrics, satire and crossover performance. Musicians were faced with the challenge of bypassing censors yet nevertheless conveying their message to an audience. In many instances the attempts were too broad or obscure to communicate a clear meaning. Conversely, in other instances the messages were not sufficiently subtle, resulting in censorship. The most successful cases negotiated censorial practices while getting an apparent message across to a wide audience. The many innovative practices outlined in this paper demonstrate that even in the context of constraint, resistance is possible. Despite censorship, South African musicians were able to express themselves through approaching their music in innovative ways.

Introduction

Apartheid forms a crucial aspect of the history of South African popular music because of the acute political tension it brought about and the ability of music to act as an emotive and innovative means of protest. Politically, pressures severely restricted the movement and creativity of musicians. These included a myriad of restrictive laws such as the Internal Security Act and consecutive States of Emergency imposed during the mid-to-late 1980s, allowing the police extensive control over South African citizens. Being stopped at roadblocks, having concerts monitored and houses searched became part of the norm for many politicized musicians. In addition, musicians were confronted by overt and direct government censorship carried out by the Directorate of Publications and the state-owned (and controlled) South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). Despite

attempts to prevent them from being heard, South African musicians devised many strategies of resistance to censorship. While these strategies were diverse, the focus of this paper is restricted to Aesopian textual responses to censorship in apartheid South Africa during the decade immediately preceding the collapse of this system of racial inequality.

While it is accepted that the drawing of a direct correlation between music and political change is very problematic, it is argued here that successful Aesopian strategies at the very least brought about an awareness of the shortcomings of the apartheid system and the need for a different (post-apartheid) society. In this sense resistance music was simply one part of a burgeoning mass of opposition to apartheid. It cannot be said to have directly brought about the downfall of apartheid, but the voices and music of the minority of musicians who resisted apartheid certainly provided an emotional soundtrack to the struggle taking place in broader society. Musical recordings and performances were able to solidify opposition to apartheid by holding up a mirror, reflecting the aims and visions of those opposed to the system.¹

Mechanisms of censorship

The Publications Act of 1974 was the official means by which publications, including recorded music, could be censored. According to the Act, the South African public, police and customs officials could submit material to the Directorate of Publications for appraisal. The government could also use other legislation, such as the Internal Security Act of 1982 to ban music, but it rarely pursued this option, preferring the less controversial and quicker route of the Directorate. The Directorate could only ever ban music that was submitted to it by another body. It did not automatically vet all music released in South Africa. This was not the case with the SABC however.

The SABC pursued a far more rigorous approach to censorship, scrutinizing each and every song submitted for airplay. The effect of the SABC's approach to censorship was severe, given its domination of the South African airwaves.² If a song was not play-listed on one or more of the

¹ Eyerman and Jamison, *Music and Social Movements*, p.169.

² The SABC owned all radio stations apart from two independent stations operating out of two of the phony apartheid homelands. These were Capital Radio based in Transkei, established in 1979

SABC stations, it was unlikely to be commercially successful, given that very few people would be likely to hear it. The effect of Directorate of Publications policy together with the SABC's stringent censorship policies permeated the entire music industry. Record companies often put pressure on musicians to censor their music and periodically cut controversial tracks from albums in order to avoid the likely outcome of commercial failure if censorship ensued. South Africa's two pressing plants were known to refuse to press controversial songs in fear of government reprisals.³ There was no direct relationship between the SABC and the Directorate of Publications. However, the SABC obviously did not play music banned by the Directorate and routinely forwarded their lists of 'restricted' songs to the Directorate. The Directorate simply read through the lists as a matter of interest, but did not act upon any of the restrictions. As already outlined, they were only able to act upon official submissions.

Songs as text in an age of censorship

The primary focus of acts of censorship, whether by the Directorate of Publications or the SABC, was the lyrics of songs. At times the music was taken into consideration as accompaniment or backing to lyrics. This was the case with Roger Lucey's 'You only need say nothing' where the Directorate of Publications argued that "the words are accompanied with the beat of an African rhythm to enhance the impact of the words".⁴ It was felt that the impact was to incite people towards insurgency. However, no music was banned simply because of the music itself.⁵ Both the Directorate and the SABC censored music for political, sexual and religious reasons, while the SABC also intervened for other aspects such as promoting brand names and use of bad language. All of these categories focused on lyrics and titles of songs. The only exception being the SABC's decision to ban all music by particular musicians, as with Stevie Wonder when for a period in 1985 all his music was banned on SABC after he dedicated his Oscar award to Nelson Mandela. When instrumentals were banned it was because of the title, as in

and Radio 702 based in Bophutatswana, established in 1980. Both had fairly limited regional audiences.

³ Sony, "Strange business", p. 114.

⁴ Directorate of Publications, 1982.

⁵ As revealed in the authors' interviews with Director of Publications, Braam Coetzee, 14 July 1998 and SABC record librarian, Cecile Pracher, 12 September 2000.

the SABC's banning of Sabenza's 'Song for Winnie'.⁶ Given the censors' emphasis on the lyrics of songs, this paper considers the way in which musicians approached song/lyric-writing and the subsequent recording of songs/lyrics.

Aesopian responses to censorship

The following discussion centres on South African musicians' attempts to negotiate the terrain of popular music contest in South Africa, looking at the way in which many musicians manipulated, censored, camouflaged, hid and obscured their lyrics as a means of bypassing or evading the censors. When faced with severe censorship, many musicians opted for forms of self-censorship rather than not say anything at all or having their music banned so that very few ever got to hear it. This is not to say that all self-censorship was a conscious choice, but the cases referred to in this paper involved the musician consciously attempting to bypass the censor. These attempts to outmaneuver the censors through subtle forms of self-censorship are regarded here as a creative attempt to open spaces of resistance. For the songwriter this resulted in a contest with the censor which, as J.M Coetzee⁷ describes, at the least leads to a diversion from the occupation of writing and which, at worst, might even fascinate and pervert the imagination. The censor-figure is involuntarily incorporated into the interior, psychic life of the writer, "experienced as a parasite, a pathological invader of the body-self, repudiated with visceral intensity but never wholly expelled". And so the songwriter approached the writing process with this internalised figure of the censor: who put pressure on the writer (in terms of the boundaries set by the dominant discourse) to act responsibly and police him/herself. Musician Richard Ellis of the Usuals, summed up this experience aptly when he described how, after their music had been banned by the SABC's record committee: "There was all this paranoia about a group's lyrical contents. I think it had a hand in destroying a lot of that type of creativity, because suddenly you are self-censoring. You are writing and you see something happening, and you think 'jeez I want to write about this'. It's self-censorship. Then you start thinking 'I'm not going to get radio play.'"⁸

⁶ Winnie Mandela, wife of the then imprisoned Nelson Mandela.

⁷ Coetzee, *Giving Offense*, p.10.

⁸ Interview with author, March 1999.

Another musician who suffered in this way was Afrikaans singer-songwriter Anton Goosen. His first song was banned by the SABC in the late 70s, affecting him throughout his career during the apartheid system. He described how: "it became a game for me. Not to see how far I could go without getting banned, but to almost obscurely, symbolically – on lateral levels – use words that I knew they wouldn't understand. Sometimes I was quite surprised that they didn't understand. And maybe in a way intellectually I survived on that level by doing that".⁹ Yet the symbolism was very remote. Afrikaans protest singer Ralf Rabie bears this out:

I thought Afrikaans music at the time was pretty dead and very bourgeois. They were trying to keep the middle class nicely asleep and in a coma [...] the Afrikaans music scene at the time was so comatose. If you ask me where the protest is in Anton Goosen's music, I am afraid I won't be able to tell you. I couldn't see it at the time. I still can't.¹⁰

Notwithstanding Rabie's criticism of Goosen, the idea of "playing games" with the censor is not unimportant. While this practise hints at the sort of "perversion of the imagination" to which Coetzee alluded, it also points to potential creative spaces which can be opened by pushing back boundaries. Certainly, specific forms of domination give rise to corresponding forms of resistance. In particular there has been a long tradition of popular song writing using Aesopian strategies of masking lyrics and corresponding audience participation. Indeed, millions of popular music fans and other critical listeners have spent hours analysing and decoding song lyrics: searching for hidden or abstract meanings.¹¹ The game of outwitting the censor thus fitted neatly into certain traditions of song writing, but with the added burden of the ever-present imaginative figure of the censor waiting to intercept the message and prevent it from being disseminated in the first place. Under apartheid censorship the game was thus heightened: camouflaged lyrics needed to bypass the imagined censor but still be decipherable to the end listener.

⁹ Interview with author, September 1998.

¹⁰ Interview with author, September 1998.

¹¹ One only needs listen to or read a fundamentalist Christian account of the 'Evils of rock music' or similar topic to witness a fascinating exploration of the hidden messages of rock songs, particularly to do with songs that – despite their seeming innocence – are interpreted as being about Satanism, drug-taking, sex and other contemporary evils.

Camouflaged lyrics, symbolism and cryptic messages

The approach to this varied between musicians. In the least tactful approach musicians would record a song as they wanted to, but then change potentially offensive words on the lyric sheet. Knowing how the SABC operated, with its preoccupation with lyric sheets, certainly made this a potential route to bypassing the censors. Keith Berelowitz of Carte Blanche recalled how: "There were certain words you couldn't use in those days. You couldn't use the word black or white or policeman. And you had to submit your words to the SABC I remember, and I used to change them."¹²

Indeed Carte Blanche submitted counterfeit lyric sheets for the song 'Killer in the crowd' when they sent the song to the SABC. They bizarrely changed the line "I'm just a policeman, a martyr in blue" to "I'm just a please man, a tomato in blue". Another clear example of changing words on the lyric sheet in this way was David Kramer's 'Tjoepstil'. The recorded song includes the line "but when the shit starts to fly" but the lyric sheet substituted this with "but when things turn sour".

Shifty Records released a compilation album of rebel rhythms called 'A naartjie in our sosatie' (Afrikaans for a tangerine in our kebab), sounding like 'Anarchy in our society' without using an obviously subversive title which would surely have been banned. The title worked exceptionally well in diverting the suspicions of the censors, given that naartjies and sosaties are both an inherent part of white Afrikaner culture: naartjies are often associated with rugby matches, the national Afrikaner sport, while sosaties are an essential component of a good South African braaivleis (barbecue). At face value the title of the album therefore seems to conjure well-intended and jovial images of important aspects of Afrikaans pastimes. Indeed, when the South African police submitted the album to the Directorate of Publications it wasn't banned, and no mention at all was made of the album title in the explanation of the Directorate's decision.¹³

Many musicians tried to sneak controversial ideas onto recordings and/or radio using cryptic references to the South African situation. One group who used this approach was the Soul Brothers. Band member, Moses Ngwenya explained that:

¹² Interview with author, 1998.

¹³ Directorate of Publications, 1985.

We had some tracks with lyrics which talked about the situation at that time, you know like people were suffering, and our fathers are in jail, the children are crying, they don't have food and they don't have a place to sleep. But we knew at that time they were censoring records, so you wouldn't just put it as straight as it is. There's a way that you can maybe change one or two words, but the meaning, it means the same thing.... we were very aware of [censorship]. That's why we had to change some of the lyrics. Even if they mean something else, but we changed them to sound like it doesn't mean it, but when an African person listens to it, he will know exactly what we're trying to say.¹⁴

A group who regularly encrypted their lyrics was Juluka. For example, on their first album, 'Universal men', Juluka included a Zulu song (with Zulu lyrics) about two fighting bulls.¹⁵ The one bull is large with strong horns while the other is small with tiny horns. But when they fight the little one wins because of superior fighting knowledge. The battle against apartheid was thus encrypted through the use of a Zulu proverb.¹⁶ In an act of self-censorship the group similarly encrypted a line of the song 'Sky people'. The album was recorded a few months before Zimbabwe won independence. Group member, Johnny Clegg, recalls how "I wanted to use the lines 'The drums of Zimbabwe speak/They roll across the great divide' but everyone was convinced that would lead to the album being banned so we changed it to 'The drums of Zambezi'¹⁷ speak."¹⁸

Warrick Sony of the Kalahari Surfers made use of studio dubbing to subvert statements made by politicians. In the tradition of musicians such as the Residents, Sony cut up speeches of politicians, changed the meaning of what they were saying and put the subverted speeches to musical backing. For example in 'Reasonable men' a government minister's statement is cut up and mixed into the song in such a way that he appears to say "It is the duty of the government to ensure that a normal community life can no longer be tolerated". This sophisticated technique very effectively put words into the mouths of apartheid politicians, who for far too long had controlled who said what on South African radio and television, interpreting people as best suited them, often putting words into the mouths of the opposition. Sampling of this form enables the musician-as-audience to government speeches to become a

¹⁴ Interview with author, September 1998.

¹⁵ 'Inkunzi ayihlabi ngokumisa'.

¹⁶ Marre and Charlton, *Beats of the heart*, p. 39.

¹⁷ The Zambezi River forms one of Zimbabwe's Northern borders, signifying successful struggles for independence north of South Africa.

¹⁸ Pithouse, "A national treasure turns 21", p. 40.

producer, using studio technology to create something new and subversive. Although the Surfers were not played on South African radio, the group's music expressed a refusal to allow the government's statements to go unchecked, to speak unopposed, and to frame the world according to its perspective only.

An example of symbolism as a means of bypassing censorship is found in Steve Kekana's song 'The Bushman' who taught himself to shoot with a bow and arrow:

He lives under a tree
 Hides himself and sleeps
 His mind is tuned to be aware of danger
 He never makes mistakes
 Survival is his way
 At nights he plays a song on a wooden kalimba
 Wo ho the bushman
 He fights like a man should do
 He strives like a man should do...

These sentiments complied with apartheid notions of blacks as primitives and the song was played on SABC. However, Kekana explained that: "In my mind I didn't really think of a real Bushman, I was thinking of the guerrillas."¹⁹ Kekana's lyrics were therefore open to radical interpretation. But as can be seen, the symbolism had to be very vague in order to receive airplay on SABC, given the SABC's paranoia about anything controversial being played on air. Richard Ellis, stung by unsuccessful acts of self-censorship argued: "You might as well have written whatever you want to write anyway because you weren't going to get radio play anyway."²⁰ Yet Ellis' pessimism was not always founded. Some musicians successfully wrote progressive songs in a symbolic manner. For example, Bright Blue by-passed the SABC's strict controls with their song 'Weeping' which contained symbolic lyrics about a man living in fear within a heavily repressive society:

I knew a man who lived in fear
 It was huge, it was angry, it was drawing near
 Behind his house, a secret place
 Was the shadow of the demon he could never face

¹⁹ Interview with author, September 1998.

²⁰ Interview with author, March 1999.

He built a wall of steel and flame
And men with guns, to keep it tame
Then, standing back, he made it plain
That the nightmare would never ever rise again
But the fear and the fire and the guns remain

The lyrics were sung against the backdrop of a haunting version of 'Nkosi Sikeleli', the ANC national anthem that was banned on the SABC. Nevertheless, the song became a major hit on SABC's Radio 5 music station. The disguised tune, if detected, heightened the symbolism of the lyrics, guiding the audience into a correct reading.

The use of satire/irony

An offshoot of the camouflaged or symbolic song is the satirical or ironic song. This is an auspicious means of bypassing censorship, and clever medium of protest, given that the essence of the song is not immediately apparent. However, the difficulty of the satirical format is that it is so easily misunderstood, as was often the case in South Africa. The greatest proponent of the satirical tradition in South Africa was David Kramer. His lyrics were repeatedly misunderstood, taken at face value by most of the people who heard his music.

Kramer began as a folk singer creating a persona based on aspects of South African culture (in terms of dress, hairstyle and his Western Cape accent). Kramer tried to keep a finely tuned balance between the funny side of his characters (poking fun at them) and regarding them seriously, pointing to the sadness of their lives. Often the point of sadness would be the point of humour too.

Given that most of the characters about whom Kramer sang were white Afrikaners, the liberal audiences enjoyed his songs, as they poked fun at traditional white Afrikaner life. However, Kramer's strongest following came from within the traditionally conservative white Afrikaans community who accepted his lyrics at face value. They found him funny, patriotic and extremely likeable, bought his music and attended his concerts in droves. This presented a problem for Kramer who felt the pressure of this mass audience. Kramer wanted to please them (certainly not to antagonise them) and so his music and shows became less hard-hitting:

I got to a point where I felt quite trapped by my popularity, and by the expectations of what people thought I was going to do and the potential for writing, moving more and more into the ra-ra-ra type of South African song. And I suppose at that point I was becoming quite disillusioned with people misinterpreting what I really was trying to do, and that there wasn't really a lot of emphasis on issues of language and cultural politics and so on, and also I got involved with the Volkswagen commercials and I suppose people started seeing me much more as just a comedian. You know, a funny little guy. And I became more and more one-dimensional. And what I was saying there was that I felt people weren't really listening. And I suppose the edge that I had in the early years – which was very powerful for me – I'd lost that. And was now very much accepted by everybody. So, sort of by the mid-80s a sense of disillusion had set in [...]. It was the time of the State of Emergency and the country was really in a bad, bad way – and suddenly I looked at myself and I didn't like what I saw. This happy-go-lucky guy making everybody feel good, and I decided to try and get back to where I had started. And that's what led me back to doing 'Baboon Dogs'.²¹

'Baboon dogs' was a far more serious album than any that preceded it, in which Kramer tackled political issues more directly. For example, in 'Dry wine' he contemplated the daily atrocities of apartheid with lines such as "I look at newspaper headlines with a mouth full of dry wine." And in 'Going away' he dealt with white South Africans leaving South Africa as a way out of the surrounding political turmoil: "Are you thinking of staying, or are you going away?" The album was far less popular, as his strong (conservative) Afrikaans support base avoided the album, disillusioned with their folk hero. This seems to symbolise the difficulty of the satirical song, in using humour as a form of protest. Either the humour is completely lost on people who therefore like or dislike it, whatever their political persuasion (just as there were conservative Afrikaners who liked Kramer's music, there were liberals and others further to the left who didn't like his music because they felt that he was conservative), or the humour itself seems an inappropriate form of protest. In that moment of laughter it is difficult to separate out the different issues involved. Furthermore, satiric irony – which entails speaking in the language of the subject and seeming to identify with that subject²² forces the singer into the paradox of being and not being the subject of the song. In Kramer's case the boundary between who he was and the subject of his irony became blurred, which is why he looked at himself and didn't like what he saw. This paradox finally led Kramer to seriously reconsider his use of satire.

²¹ Interview with author, July 1998.

²² Coetzee, *Giving Offense*, p. 221.

The multiplicity of voices present in any satirical protest song makes it a difficult song format to interpret, with layers of interpretation required. Often this results in the equivalent of a cult audience comprising those who truly know how to read the irony within the songs. As much as these people reassure the singer in what s/he is doing, there is nevertheless the uncanny presence of a majority of listeners who misunderstand the singer's intentions. Notwithstanding this, many effective satirical songs have been written about the South African situation, making poignant comments on class, race, ethnicity, sex, tradition, language, culture and other central aspects of South African life. For example Kramer's song 'Hekke van Paradise' (Gates of Paradise) in which he describes a segregated apartheid town as being:

Like a clean white shirt
With gold cuff links
It looks quite clean
But the armpits stink

The South African censor, not always the quickest to pick up on satire, often let this slip through. Unfortunately, as indicated, in most instances onto an unwitting and impervious audience.

Subverting mainstream songs

The Kalahari Surfers made good use of existing songs to voice their protest through providing subtle renditions in order to change the political context of the song. These new versions were not just covers, although the tunes and words were not changed. An excellent example was their version of 'These boots were made for walking' re-titled 'Song for Magnus' (the apartheid regime's Minister of Defence, Magnus Malan). Sinister, menacing vocals completely transformed the meaning of the line "They're gonna walk all over you". The Surfers similarly covered 'I see a bad moon rising' (as the 'Voice of rage and ruin'). Warrick Sony, who was strongly influenced by Robert Wyatt's ability to inject new emotion and sentiment into cover versions, did covers of songs which he wished had been written for the South African context in the first instance.

This approach is similar – although to different (also protest) ends – to the hip hop practice of digitally sampling samples of old songs and

redeploying them in the present. The central challenge of hip hop though is to call into question "Western notions of cultural production as property through its evocation, quotation, and outright theft of socially shared musical memories."²³ It is the borrowing from socially shared memories which made the Kalahari Surfers covers so effective: the snarling vocals causing the listener to focus on the lyrics, not to take them for granted, to suddenly realise that they said something about the South African situation. The use of covers in this way was not common in a country that thrived off cover versions of western rock/pop songs. Very few bands used reinterpreted covers as a means of conveying protest, although on the folk circuit straightforward imitative covers of overseas protest songs was common.

Crossover/non-racial performances

In a society in which inter-racial mixing was discouraged, where it was deemed correct to keep a safe distance from people of different race and ethnic groups, it was always likely that musicians would make use of inter-racial performances to challenge the status quo. Until the mid-1980s members of different race groups had to live in separate areas, were not allowed to marry each other, and in many instances were not allowed to share the same public amenities such as park benches, beaches, cinemas and theatres. During the 1970s bands like Afro-rock styled Hawk rocked the boat by becoming multiracial, although the black members bizarrely played behind curtains during live performances. Increasingly, politicised bands refused to play in front of whites-only audiences. The most successful group to create a challenge to the racial separateness of apartheid was Juluka, who became popular in 1976 with the single 'Woza Friday'. With the release of their album 'Universal Men' in 1979 they became more popular, for the first time capturing the interest and support of white youth in South Africa. The group members – black and white alike – wore animal skins, beads and bangles, and the front musicians (particularly Johnny Clegg and Sipho Mchunu) engaged in Zulu dance and stick fighting to heavy drum beats, singing in Zulu and English, offering a strong image of what Clegg refers to as the secret of Zulu masculinity. As Clegg explained:

²³ Lipsitz, *Dangerous crossroads*, p. 37.

What we started to do is to try and expand and find a way to explore what it is for me as a white person to be an African. I explored that quite intensively in a lot of my lyrics. And the issue of being a white African and finding a place for European culture in a base of African music was an important aspect of what I was doing. On the other hand I also wanted to be a platform whereby traditional music could be appreciated from another angle. And it's a very funny thing because when you saw a multiracial band which was singing all those various languages: the white audience particularly was far more open to traditional music, whereas you played that music two hours later they would be closed off to it – it's just that we created a context in our live performances, we created a platform, we heightened their awareness, especially the white audiences. And black audiences although they never understood some of the more cryptic lyrics I wrote in English, they felt that part of their musical culture was being supplemented by somebody who was actually serious about how he was expressing himself. So we had so many different ways of mixing, and so many different ways of experimenting.²⁴

For blacks this made him very popular, but the threat of Clegg's association with 'the other' was too much for many apartheid supporters, leading to bannings from radio and being banned by the Pietersburg town council, afraid of the effect of Clegg's otherness on the 'civilised' local audiences. Juluka created an enormous impression on white audiences 'protected' from the ways of other races and cultures, taught that these were in fact inferior to their own race and culture. Johnny Clegg created an especially strong fascination for audiences, as a white who has crossed over to 'the other'.²⁵ In terms of a white audience, Frith argues that this figure is one of both white fear and white desire. For two reasons: firstly, "as the shocking, exotic, primitive *other* of bourgeois respectability", and secondly, "as 'nature' as opposed to 'culture,' a means of access to the pre-social, to 'innocence' (defined against the civilized, the sophisticated, the rational, the controlled)."²⁶ Within the context of apartheid this point is especially significant. White youth in particular were drawn to the image presented by Juluka, precisely because the image on show contrasted with the bourgeois and racist respectability of their parents' generation. Lipsitz argues that in

²⁴ Interview with author, April 1998.

²⁵ It must not be forgotten however, that it was Clegg's power and privilege as a white middle class male that provided him with the luxury to imagine himself as 'the other'. As Lipsitz – speaking of white minstrel performances in the U.S.A – (1994:54) notes: "The enormous rewards available to whites pretending to be Black were never available to Black performers denied control over their own performances and always forbidden to think of themselves as 'white'". Nevertheless it should be noted that Clegg's explorations – at the time – were at considerable risk of police harassment and were not simply for performance purposes.

²⁶ Frith, "The cultural study of popular music", p. 180–181.

such circumstances white audiences are able to "identify with transgression while at the same time distancing themselves from it by connecting the violation of cultural norms with the ostensibly 'natural' and biologically-driven urges of a despised (racial and ethnic) group".²⁷ In providing audiences with a glimpse, an insight into black culture, Clegg tapped into a forbidden curiosity which allowed audiences to safely consider an alternative at a distance. However, the analytic categories of 'other' 'cultural' and 'natural' should not be stretched too far, should not give the impression that Juluka's performances were cultural peep shows. Nhlanhla Ngcobo pointed to the wide acceptance and popularity amongst black South Africans as Juluka's successful intervention at a socio-cultural level in dissolving racial stereotypes and prejudice. In Juluka's music and performance: "The common error of equating 'traditional' with 'primitive' and 'Western' with 'civilised' is challenged and replaced by attitudes of compatibility and equality."²⁸

Juluka's openness in collaboratively exploring a black culture in the South African context, where for a long time it was illegal for people of different races to even share a park bench, communicated a vision of a different South Africa to the audience. And as indicated by Ngcobo, this does not only relate to whites in the audience, but to blacks too. Music was thus used to prepare Juluka audiences (through the image of inter-racial collaboration and freedom of association) for a post-apartheid future. The imagery of Juluka acted as a means of publicly challenging apartheid notions of racial and ethnic separateness. The very justification and legitimacy of representations of apartheid inequality were threatened by Juluka's demonstration of an alternative way, that not only challenged apartheid's values, but which, in every instance, reflected a freedom more alluring and liberating than the claustrophobia of racial separateness. Other groups also put forward a strong message through being non-racial bands. Mango Groove very successfully crossed-over African and western styles of music. Crossover initiatives were clear examples of Lipsitz's notion of 'strategic anti-essentialism' because they defied apartheid norms of separate ethnic music styles. Indeed, Ingrid Byerly discusses a variety of collaborative musical initiatives which served the purpose of breaking down many barriers between different groups of people in South Africa, even between Afrikaans folk styles and western rock and so on. She argued that:

²⁷ Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads*, p. 54.

²⁸ Ngcobo, "Glimpses into South Africa", p. 6.

Through complex configurations of lyrics, melodies, harmonies instrumentations, rhythms, styles and forms people were able to express not only social fragmentations but also social unions. Furthermore, the increasing use of code-switching, not merely linguistic but also musical juxtapositions echoed social tension and conflict resolution in song. While the use of folk themes or traditional instrumentations signified desires for ethnic preservation or renewal, the frequent merging of intercultural musical components increasingly suggested both the desire for non-racial nationalism, as well as critical presentations of irony and humor.²⁹

The importance of crossover, multicultural and non-racial music performance was thus in challenging these barriers which apartheid tried to enforce through apartheid legislation, including censorship policies. Those musicians who pursued these styles and formations used music as a crossroad for the expression of their own ideals, to contest existing injustices and to challenge the audience to see things differently, to reposition themselves according to a post-apartheid South Africa.

The power of Aesopian tactics

It has been shown that when censorship leads musicians to turn to Aesopian strategies, a variety of results are possible. These range from ineffectual vague double meanings to more poignant symbolism, conveying a powerful statement whilst nevertheless bypassing the censors. Censorship can be seen to be productive if it gives rise to forms of resistance which develop out of censorship practices. 'Productive' here would be seen in a beneficial sense. Certainly, Lev Loseff has put forward the seemingly paradoxical argument that censorship has long been a part of the creative process in Russian literature.³⁰ This is largely due to the pressure which censorship puts on the author to develop an Aesopian manner of writing. The Aesopian approach develops the work's aesthetic value and heightens the involvement of the reader in the psychological scheme. He quotes poet Joseph Brodsky as saying that censorship is useful to literature because it "is unwittingly an impetus to metaphorical language".³¹ Herzen concludes that: "Censorship is highly conducive to progress in the mastery of style and in the ability to restrain one's words [...] In allegorical discourse there is perceptible

²⁹ Byerly, *The music indaba*, p. 116.

³⁰ Loseff, *On the beneficence of censorship*, p. 11.

³¹ Loseff, *On the beneficence of censorship*, p. 12.

excitement and struggle: this discourse is more impassioned than any straight exposition."³²

For Herzen, an utterance which is checked has greater meaning concentrated in it and it has a sharper edge because implication increases the power of language. This effect is potentially enhanced when the utterance is made musically. Roland Barthes argues that perhaps the value of music is its metaphoric power, its ability to symbolize things unknowable by ordinary cognitive or logical means.³³

While the power referred to here develops out of the aesthetic value of the writing/music, it is nevertheless a form of power which develops out of resistance to censorship. It is because of censorship that the writer uses Aesopian muses to put across a dissenting message, to overcome censorship. The core element of contest is clearly revealed. An ongoing contest over structures of censorship in which both censors and censored attempt to outmaneuver the other, but also attempt to reposition themselves, in the hope that they might find a niche in which power can be exercised.

Conclusion

During the apartheid era South African musicians were confronted with severe censorship in various forms. In response different musicians devised various innovative textual strategies for overcoming or at least bypassing censorship. In some instances they did so overtly, but most often they attempted a more subtle approach, as has been shown, disguising their message through adjusting the lyrics, in performance, and working with resistance melodies in getting messages across to the audience. In most instances, the more direct the message, the less likely it was to be heard by a large audience, yet conversely, the more disguised the message, the less likely the audience was to read it as subversive or resistant. The most innovative of musicians were obviously those who stumbled across or strategised methods that somehow managed to be both overt and in some way subtle. Juluka were successful in demonstrating resistance through their actions (on stage and in music videos), through subtle lyrical innovations (particularly combining English and African languages in their songs), and

³² Loseff, *On the beneficence of censorship*, p. 11.

³³ Barthes, *The responsibility of forms*, p. 285.

releasing albums which did not rely on heavily overt political lyrics. Even when they did record more overtly political songs, as on their album 'Work for all' in 1983, the singles which the band chose to release were the safe options of 'December African rain' and 'Work for all' which expressed positive sentiments about South Africa and were consequently played on SABC radio and television. Audiences who bought the album as a result of broadcast coverage were then exposed to more political songs such as 'Mdantsane', which, if it had been released as a single, might well have brought the album to the attention of the censors. For other musicians, disguising words or messages meant that they at least experienced personal satisfaction at having expressed what they wanted to, yet knowing that the message was not going to be noticed by a wide audience. Even so, it signified a refusal to keep totally silent.

However, the case of Juluka shows that musicians were often most successful when they did not work only with songs as text to make known their opposition to the government and its censorship policies. There were many other ways of resisting the state's attempts to silence musicians. Unlike song lyrics trapped on vinyl or cassette, broader strategies, such as live performances and playing at political rallies, were often more difficult to monitor and control. Nevertheless, musicians first and foremost work with the material that they have written, and in confronting the structures of censorship through creative song writing, some were able to open important spaces for resisting apartheid policy and censorship. They were each in their own way able to criticise the injustices and policies of the apartheid state, placing the need for political change on the musical agenda of apartheid South Africa.

Bibliography

- Barthes, Roland. *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays on Music, Art and Representation*. California: Berkeley Press, 1991.
- Byerly, Ingrid. *The Music Indaba: Music as Mirror, Mediator and Prophet in the South African Transition from Apartheid to Democracy*. Doctoral thesis Duke University, 1996.
- Coetzee, John. *Giving Offense: Essays on Censorship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Directorate of Publications. Official correspondence to Roger Lucey, Cape Town: 22 September 1982.
- Directorate of Publications. Directorate of Publications Committee decision on *A Naartjie in our Sosatie*, Cape Town: 31 October 1885.
- Eyerman, Ron and Jamison, Andrew. *Music and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Frith, Simon. "The Cultural Study of Popular Music". *Cultural Studies*. Ed. L. Grossberg et. al. New York: Routledge, 1992. 174–182.
- Lipsitz, George. *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism and Poetics of Place*. London: Verso, 1994.
- Loseff, Lev. *On the Beneficence of Censorship: Aesopian Language in Modern Russian Literature*. Munich: Sagner, 1984.
- Marre, Jeremy and Charlton, Hannah. *Beats of the Heart: Popular Music of the World*. London: Pluto Press, 1985.
- Ngcobo, Nhlanhla. "Glimpses into South Africa – a Perspective Through Juluka Music". *Reality* 14.1 (1982): 4–6.
- Pithouse, Richard. "A National Treasure Turns 21". *Mail and Guardian* October 20 to 26 (2000): 40–41.
- Sony, Warrick. "Strange Business: The Independent Music Culture in South Africa". *Staffrider* 9.4 (1991): 113–119.

Discography

- Bright Blue. 1987. 'Weeping' off 'The Rising Tide' album. E.M.I.
- Carte Blanche. 1986. 'Killer in the Crowd'. Seven inch single. Priority Records.
- Juluka. 1982. 'Woza Friday' off the 'Ubuhle Bemvelo' album. E.M.I.

- Juluka. 1979. 'Inkunzi Ayihlabi Ngokumisa' off the 'Universal Men' album. CBS.
- Juluka. 1979. 'Sky people' off the 'Universal Men' album, CBS.
- Juluka. 1983. 'December African Rain' off the 'Work For All' album, E.M.I.
- Juluka. 1983. 'Work For All' off the 'Work For All' album, E.M.I.
- Juluka. 1983. 'Mdantsane' off the 'Work For All' album. E.M.I.
- Kalahari Surfers. 1985. 'Reasonable Men' off the Living in the Heart of the Beast' album. Recommended Records.
- Kalahari Surfers. 1985. 'Song for Magnus' off the 'Living in the Heart of the Beast' album. Recommended Records.
- Kalahari Surfers. 1985. 'The voice of rage and ruin' off the 'Living in the Heart of the Beast' album. Recommended Records.
- Kekana, Steve. 1982. 'The Bushman' off the 'No Going Back' album. E.M.I.
- Kramer, David. 1981. 'Tjoepstil' off the 'Bakgat' album. Mountain Records.
- Kramer, David. 1982. 'Hekke van Paradise' off the 'Delicious Monster' album. C.C.P.
- Kramer, David. 1986. 'Dry wine' off the 'Baboondogs' album. E.M.I.
- Kramer, David. 1986. 'Going away' off the 'Baboondogs' album. E.M.I.
- Lucey, Roger. 1979. 'You Only Need Say Nothing' off 'The Road Is Much Longer' album. Third Ear Music.
- Sabenza. 1987. 'Song For Winnie' off the 'Sabenza' album. Mountain Records.
- Various. 1985. 'A naartjie in our sosatie'. Shifty Records.

Interviews

- Berelowitz, Keith. Interview with author in Johannesburg, July 1998.
- Coetzee, Braam. Interview with author in Hermanus, July 1998.
- Ellis, John. Interview with author in Durban, March 1999.
- Goosen, Anton. Interview with author in Johannesburg, September 1998.
- Kekana, Steve. Interview with author in Pietersberg, September 1998.
- Kramer, David. Interview with author in Cape Town, July 1998.
- Ngwenya, Moses. Interview with author in Johannesburg, September 1998.
- Pracher, Cecile. Interview with author in Johannesburg, September 2000.
- Rabie, Ralf. Interview with author in Johannesburg, September 1998.
- Sony, Warrick. Interview with author in Cape Town, July 1998.

This page intentionally left blank

REPRESENTING THE CENSORED TEACHER

Anne Ruggles Gere

Defining censorship in terms of regulation, constraint, and exclusion, this article examines the silencing effects of censorship by focusing on the figure of the female teacher. Against the background of the regulations, constraints, and exclusions imposed upon women teachers during the 19th century in the United States, it considers the case of Mary Latourneau, a teacher jailed for having an affair and bearing children by her male student, to suggest how the silence of constraint can work in positive as well as negative ways. The breaking of silence led to Latourneau's arrest and incarceration, but, more important, the Latourneau event demonstrates shows how breaking silence for erotic and personal discourses can undermine whole classes of people. In this case, teachers, and women teachers in particular, lost opportunities to direct public attention to their working conditions and professional needs.

In this paper I begin by positing that gender inflects the phenomenon of censorship in several ways. First, I will consider definitions or forms of censorship, then the question of the aesthetics of censorship, and finally the issue of the relationship between censorship and institutions. I will look at the definitions, aesthetics, and institutional dimensions of gendered censorship by focusing on the figure of the female teacher. From there I will go on to question some of our assumptions about censorship.

Woven throughout much of the discourse on censorship is an equation with silence. The playhouse is closed down, the music is not played, the manuscript is not published, the book is not read — this view of censorship opposes silence to speech. Silence is the thing to be overcome. The playhouse should be opened, the music played, the manuscript published, the book read. The silence of censorship ought to give way to articulation, to freedom of expression, to a breaking of silence. A quick scan of scholarship in a variety of fields demonstrates this connection between silence and censorship. Art critics link silence and censorship in thinking about cultural regulation; historians look at the silencing of women as a 16th century form of censorship; literary critics consider how silence and

ensorship function for novelists; and anthropologists describe silence as a form of cultural censorship.¹

When we add gender to censorship, the equation with silence becomes even stronger. Instances of silenced women extend across time and disciplines. Sophocles wrote "Silence gives the proper grace to women," and much of history shows an adherence to that precept.² The paucity of female voices in literature before the 18th century and the continuing dominance of men in literary publishing speaks to the ways regulation of women's literacy practices have contributed to their silence. In Colonial America, for example, women were rarely taught to write, because reading instruction preceded and frequently precluded writing instruction. Writing masters focused their attentions on young men.³ Virginia Woolf addresses the censored silence of women writers by evoking Shakespeare's sister, who "had the quickest fancy, a gift like her brother's, for the tune of words" but who was prevented, by the constraints of her gender, from leaving us any words.⁴ The equation between silence and censorship of women is also visible in everyday life. Males are given more opportunities to talk in class than females, women are more frequently interrupted by men, and women use tag questions — an indication of hesitance tending toward silence—much more frequently than men.⁵ And on a personal note, I went to college in the shadow of The Silent Woman restaurant whose logo and outdoor advertisement featured a headless woman.

These and many other examples I could cite show how censorship becomes linked to silence, especially where women are concerned. Censorship, as I define it here, takes three forms: regulation, constraint and exclusion. Regulation refers to gender-based rules and social conventions; constraint refers to the less visible but nonetheless forceful limitations imposed in gender-specific ways by particular institutions and contexts; and exclusion refers to a gender-based and unequal distribution of opportunity. All three types of censorship are closely allied with silence, and one clear illustration of this appears in representations of the female teacher. Narratives of female teachers in nineteenth century America are filled with accounts of the silencing effects of regulation, constraint, and exclusion. Rules for

¹ Post, *Censorship and Silencing*; Matheson, "Breaking the Silence;" San Diego Bakhtin Circle, *Bakhtin and the Nation*; Sheriff, "Exposing Silence."

² Sophocles, *Ajax I*, 293.

³ Monaghan, "Literacy Instruction and Gender."

⁴ Woolf, *A Room of One's Own*, p. 49.

⁵ Lakoff, *Language and Woman's Place*.

teachers were frequently published by the community and included items such as these from an 1872 list:

Each teacher will bring a bucket of water and a scuttle of coal for the day's session; After ten hours in school, the teachers may spend the remaining time reading the Bible or other good books; Men teachers may take one evening each week for courting purposes, or two evenings a week if they go to church regularly; and Women teachers who marry or engage in unseemly conduct will be dismissed.⁶

Another, somewhat later, list included items such as "You will not marry during the term of your contract. You are not to keep company with men. You must be home between the hours of 8 pm and 6 am unless attending a school function."⁷ The differing expectations articulated in these rules demonstrate how constructions of gender shaped the rules that regulated the lives of women teachers. While it was assumed that men would be courting and perhaps going to church, it was apparently assumed that women would be attending church. It did not even need to be mentioned as a requirement. For women, courting was not assumed; it was expressly forbidden, and the equation between marriage and unseemly conduct suggests that women teachers, unlike their male counterparts, were regulated into complete abstinence from any behaviors that reflected their sexuality.

Although the behavior of all teachers was subject to regulation, gender shaped the terms of this censorship. The desires of women teachers were to be subjugated to the needs and desires of others, something expected of middle class women at least since the 1830s. As Carroll Smith-Rosenberg has shown, between 1780 and 1830 the 'meaning' of virtue shifted from military service and land-holding to more private and moral understandings that included "the sexual propriety of middle class women."⁸ Women were expected to preserve the integrity of domestic spaces by upholding a high moral standard, and social regulations that frequently confined them to domestic spaces served to insure that they met this responsibility. The concept of virtue being produced by female domesticity took shape in the 1830s and echoed through the 19th century, contributing to the shape of common schools. Catherine Beecher, who began a program of educational reform in the 1830s, argued that the moral degeneration of the nation could

⁶ Tennis, *The School That Was*, p. 4.

⁷ Aps, *One-Room Country Schools*, p. 29.

⁸ Rosenberg, "Domesticating 'Virtue,'" p. 165.

be reversed by educating women to become teachers. They would, she argued, provide "moral and religious education [which] must be the foundation of national education."⁹ By extending women's moral sphere to the school, Beecher helped to open teaching as a career for women. As a result, women were expected to produce virtue in the home *and* in the classroom through regulating themselves as well as others.

The silencing of constraint, especially economic constraint, also appears regularly in representations of women teachers of the 19th century. They were, first of all, represented as needing less money than their male colleagues. To school boards setting salaries, they were young single women enjoying a brief interlude before marriage provided them a new source of support. Never mind that many women teachers were widows supporting children, daughters supporting infirm parents, or aunts supporting nieces and nephews. In the U.S. women and men were paid different salaries for doing the same work because women had been welcomed into the teaching field as a source of inexpensive labor for a burgeoning public school system. In Britain teachers faced and resisted the same constraints. Teacher Amy Grant wrote:

The salary issue was the worst. The men got more than the women...The conflicts were right through the NUT. The NUWT (National Union of Women Teachers) were all strongly for equal salaries. But the NUT—there were such a lot of men in the union. It was a very difficult business. I got fed up with unions altogether. In the end I stopped going.¹⁰

The material circumstances of their lives imposed the silencing censorship of economic constraint, a constraint to which they could only rarely object and even more rarely overcome.

Because they were not perceived as heads of households, women teachers were frequently expected to "board around" with families in the community, receiving part of their compensation in the form of food and shelter. Woman teachers thus remained under the scrutiny of individual householders as well as their school supervisors. In addition to insuring that women teachers attended church, community members with whom they lived while "boarding around" served as chaperones and enforcers of virtue. Such constraints in the lives of women teachers endured into the 20th century.

⁹ Beecher, *An Essay upon Education*, p. 18.

¹⁰ Gardner, "Constructing the Classroom Teacher," p. 199.

Herbert Hoover proclaimed in 1928, the teacher was "peculiarly a public character under the most searching of watchful and critical eyes."¹¹

Personal accounts of 19th century women teachers show a strong tendency to internalization — self-censorship if you will — of constraints imposed on them by the community. In describing the beginning of her teaching career — a career begun in 1882 when she was 14 years old, Lucia Downing worried chiefly about her appearance.

I really did not look very old, and my chief anxiety was to acquire the appearance that for many years now I have made every effort to avoid! My shirts were fearfully short, and though careful in seating myself, there was a glimpse of my stockings that no modest young woman, especially a teacher should permit. However, Mother sewed a watch-pocket in my little dresses and gave me her watch, a lovely little Swiss, with wide-open face, and there was a gorgeous long chain. You can't think how much dignity was added thereby!¹²

Downing's concern with the modesty and dignity befitting a teacher suggest that she had already, even at age 14, internalized community expectations about how women teachers should appear. She knew that her stockinged legs should remain out of sight, and her hair should be tied in a 'pug' on the top of her head. Lucia, like most women teachers of her era, represents herself as fashioning her body and her garments to fit these expectations.

A common image of the nineteenth century woman teacher featured her soothing a disobedient child. According to the stereotype represented by this image, the woman's gentle moral suasion would wield a powerful influence on the unruly youngster. This sentimentalized image of the female teacher who brings students under control through exerting enormous self-control, often at the cost of silencing herself, is one that appears again and again in nineteenth century literature. The figure of Marmee in Louisa Mae Alcott's *Little Women* exemplifies this image when she explains to her daughter, "I am angry nearly every day of my life, Jo, but I have learned not to show it; and I still hope to learn not to feel it, though it may take me another forty years to do so."¹³ Diaries show that women teachers internalized this image. They saw the silence of self censorship as the best

¹¹ Marsh, *The Teacher Outside the School*, p. x.

¹² Downing, "Teaching in the Little Red Schoolhouse," p. 31.

¹³ Alcott, *Little Women*, p. 92.

route toward controlling their students. One teacher wrote: "I seek to know and govern myself that I may better teach and know others."¹⁴

Male supervisors frequently appropriated this image to represent the women teachers under their gaze, praising highly those who stroked and soothed students into obedience rather than speaking sharply. Both men and women teachers were expected to keep order in their classes, but men could thrash those who misbehaved, while women, constrained by physical size as well as social forces that positioned them as the "gentle sex," could not. The destructive effects of representing women teachers as managing others by silencing themselves show through in pain-filled diary accounts where women teachers confront the double bind impossibility of their situation. Here is one example:

I do not seem at times to have any command over my pupils. If they are disposed to be quiet and orderly all goes well, but on the contrary if inclined to make a great deal of noise and trouble I am obliged to endure it feeling incapable of preventing it...O! my book I wish you could tell me just how to govern my school aright I am completely discouraged with myself do not believe I know how to train and guide the young.¹⁵

Impossibly high standards for professional and personal life made women teachers engage in a continuing and self-defeating cycle of self examination and self criticism. Letters and journals from women teachers of the 19th century resound with self doubt. Amelia Lines wrote this in her diary for 1855:

I have chosen the occupation of a teacher and do not feel willing to resign this office for any other, but sometimes I feel almost persuaded that it is my duty to do so thinking I am unfit for a teacher. Do not feel the responsibility which rests upon me as I ought. Do not feel that anxiety to instill right principles in the hearts of my pupils which a teacher ought to feel.¹⁶

For Amelia, as for most female teachers, teaching was more than a job, it was a calling that required both exemplifying and instilling "right principles." As Julia Tevis, who taught for 60 years beginning in the 1820s, wrote about her own career as well as that of other women, "That teacher, who feels no conviction of the importance of the cause, and no solicitude about the issue,

¹⁴ Lines, *To Raise Myself A Little*, p. 125.

¹⁵ Lines, *To Raise Myself A Little*, p. 28.

¹⁶ Lines, *To Raise Myself A Little*, p. 21.

should give up the office."¹⁷ The difficulty, as Tevis, and most of her peers experienced it, was that actual youngsters put teacher ideals on trial, testing their ability to love the unlovable and discipline the undisciplined. Even as they recognized the impossibility of meeting the gender-based expectations that the position of teacher imposed upon them, women teachers continue to seek after this elusive standard.

Carolyn Steedman has written very effectively about this impossible position of the woman teacher, describing her as "the eccentric, convinced, hard-working saint and martyr, for her labour comes cheap and lack of promotion is really what she expects."¹⁸ In Steedman's terms she is the 'mother made conscious,' the upholder of domestic virtue who extends her efforts into the classroom at tremendous cost to herself. The aesthetics of the sentimentalized representation of the woman teacher who soothes disobedient students into good behavior clearly contributed to the distress many women felt at facing what seemed an impossible task of simultaneously disciplining both themselves and their students.

In addition to the censorship of constraint and regulation, women teachers faced the censorship of exclusion. The sentimentalized images of the soothing and silent woman teacher were instrumental in portraying her as incapable of directing the work of other adults, thereby disqualifying her for administrative positions. In addition, or perhaps as a consequence, higher education was divided along gendered lines, with normal schools training female teachers while universities educated male administrators who would become the supervisors of women teachers. As David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot put it, "From the beginning of the graded urban school, the feminization of teaching had been closely linked with the bureaucratization of education. Male managers controlled their subordinates in part through the greater status and power accorded men in the larger society."¹⁹ While a few women did make it into the administrative ranks, this was relatively rare. As recently as 1971 only 15% of principals and ½ of one percent of superintendents in U.S. Schools were women.²⁰ For most women teachers the censorship of exclusion prevailed, and they were subject to the gaze of male administrators who controlled their working conditions and the terms of their employment.

¹⁷ Tevis, *Sixty Years in a School-Room*, p. 164.

¹⁸ Steedman, *The Tidy House*, p. 7.

¹⁹ Tyack/Hansot, *Managers of Virtue*, p. 181.

²⁰ Sexton, *Women in Education*, p. 58.

The censorship of exclusion also operated to drive certain women from the classroom. As the teacher rules recounted earlier show, women teachers were forbidden to marry, and if they chose to defy this stricture and marry anyway, they were fired. Some women married in secret and tried to hide their new status, but that strategy had limited effect. In the early 1940s, my own mother was dismissed from her teaching position when it became apparent that I would soon arrive.

I recount these representations of the censored female teacher in order to complicate them. Certainly one can claim that the censoring silences of regulation, constraint and exclusion come freighted with negative valances; it is impossible to argue the benefits of limiting social expectations, unequal compensation for the same work or inaccessibility of leadership positions. I do, however, want to argue that we need to move beyond seeing censorship only in terms of silences or prohibitions because it may blind us to the ways power functions. Censorship can enable as well as constrain, and representations of the female teacher illustrate this liberating dimension also. While it is true that the regulation of teachers' lives was not gender neutral in the 19th century, it is also true that teaching provided one of the very few alternatives for women who did not marry and/or did not want to live on the charity of a father or brother. The very fact that "women teachers who marry or engage in unseemly conduct" appears on a list of rules serves to represent the idea that women worked outside the home in a respectable profession. Indeed the prohibition against "unseemly conduct" is calculated to maintain the respectability of the figure of the female teacher. Women who wanted to could become teachers without risking social sanctions. The practice of "boarding around" among families in the community likewise insured the respectability of women teachers. The figure of the woman teacher thus remained, as the figure of the woman factory worker did not, one that met with social approval, particularly among the middle class.

Women teachers certainly suffered the economic constraints of being paid less than their male peers, but they *were* paid, and for many women this opportunity to generate income of their own represented liberation from confining household duties. It also made it possible for women to support themselves or members of their families. In the 1820s, for example, two sisters offered to educate their father's creditors to help pay off his debts. As was typical for the time, they added other students to the group, and the account concludes: "They soon had a large and flourishing school, which enabled them not only to help pay their father's debts, but supported

them and their parents in great comfort, and secured to them finally quite a little estate."²¹

The censoring silence of self-regulation led many women teachers to depression and despair, but it also enabled and inspired a number of them to become creative on their own behalf. Among other things, they developed private perspectives and practices that could not be subjected to the searching light of public scrutiny. The figure of the soothing teacher could be held in the gaze of the male supervisor, but that scrutiny did not extend to her inner life. She was free, like most humans, to think her own thoughts, something teaching actually nurtured. Indeed the classroom was — and is — a private place where women could create what some have called a secret garden, and within that garden they could develop relationships with students. Julia Tevis who began teaching in 1808 describes Frances, a favorite student whom she met early in her career:

So natural and without disguise was her character, and so winning the simplicity of her manners, due to her child-like innocence and sweet feminine timidity, that she soon became the sunshine of daily existence, helping to dispel the clouds that sometimes gathered around my heart....She was my constant and efficient aid in carrying out every arrangement; yet she was gentle, confiding, and one of the most obedient of my pupils.²²

The erotics of this relationship work for both teacher and student. Tevis is granted a narcissistic control over her young charge, and Frances, the student is given an idealized version of herself by her teacher. In its benign forms, the passion and desire of learning and teaching give students new narratives about themselves, and teachers enjoy opportunities to exhibit the authority of their own subjectivities.

The silences of exclusion made it much easier for men than women to become school administrators, but it also led women to move in new directions. One of the liberating effects of limiting the opportunities for women teachers was that it pushed them to travel farther afield in search of greater options. At a time when it was difficult for women to travel alone, numbers of women journeyed west to teach in frontier towns. Distant from the regulated East, they enjoyed a broader range of experiences. Hannah Breece, a teacher who went to Alaska was able to "travel far by dogsled,

²¹ Biklen, *School Work*, p. 53.

²² Tevis, *Sixty Years in a School-Room*, p. 164.

riverboats and foot trails to remote locations, into some of which no woman of European descent had previously found her way."²³ Like her peers who took teaching positions in the "west" of Wisconsin or Illinois a few decades earlier, Hannah could count on protection from the respect accorded teachers. In addition, women teachers in the West were able to move into administrative positions. Especially in the West, women became superintendents and created networks of support with one another²⁴

In citing these examples, I am not arguing that the censoring silences of regulation, constraint, and exclusion are desirable nor that they enhanced the lives of most nineteenth century women teachers. I am trying to show that in some instances these silences created spaces where women teachers could expand the horizons of their lives. These forms of censorship appeared concurrently with and perhaps even stimulated women moving into new areas of experience. Such examples suggest the political potential of the silences of censorship. Away from the scrutiny of public exposure, protected by the cloak of silences, it is possible to participate in practices not available in other circumstances. The silences of censorship are more complex than we may at first think. They can enable as well as constrain.

A more compelling representation of the value of censorship's silences appears in the case of a contemporary American woman teacher. Mary Latourneau has become widely known for having two children with a teen-ager, Vili Fualaau, her former student. Although she has been in prison since 1997, she has remained very much in the public eye. Every turn in her legal case generates a shower of media attention, and her image appears on tabloids and television. She has been interviewed on Oprah, appeared on the cover of *People Magazine* and been the subject of articles in *Time*, *Paris Match*, and *George*. At least two books about her have been published, *If Loving You Is Wrong*, was published in 1999 and *The Mary Kay Latourneau Affair* in 2001.²⁵ A television movie, *The Mary Kay Latourneau Story: All-American Girl*, was aired in January of 2000, and the media attention continues. Even though Mary Latourneau has not been in a classroom since February of 1997, she is nearly always described as a teacher or, less frequently, "a former teacher." A review of the recent television movie was titled, "When A Teacher Strays from the Lesson Plan."

²³ Jacobs, *A Schoolteacher in Old Alaska*, p. 3.

²⁴ Weiler, *Country School Women*.

²⁵ Olsen, *If Loving You Is Wrong*; Robinson, *The Mary Kay Latourneau Affair*.

This appellation of teacher resonates with representations of the gendered figure of the woman teacher from the 19th century. This is not just any woman who had an illicit affair with a male considerably younger than herself. This is a *woman teacher*. Mary Latourneau is not the only woman teacher to have had affair with a male student. We could point to a number of other cases. It is, however, fairly rare as compared with the number of men teachers who have affairs with female students, and few teachers, male or female, have been subjected to the level of punishment Mary Latourneau has experienced for having an illicit relationship with a student. I certainly do not want to minimize the devastating consequences of Latourneau's actions for her young lover, the two children she has produced, and other members of her family, along with the teaching profession more generally, but it seems that she has paid an unusually high price for her behavior. Gender seems to play a role in the strength of the outrage directed toward her. The gendered image still carries with it remnants of 19th century expectations that women teachers should silence or self-censor their own sexuality. Latourneau has been the object of public wrath precisely because she failed to adhere to social expectations about disciplining herself and her students.

The Latourneau case could be read, then, as an instance of resisting the censoring silences imposed upon 19th century teachers. Mary Latourneau insists on expressing her own sexuality. She does not allow regulation, constraint and exclusion to direct her life; she speaks openly about desire and intimacy, and she has produced, in the form of two babies — who bear the racial markings of her Samoan student — visible proof of her sexual activity. This case might be described as revolutionary, an insurrection on behalf of forbidden love. Indeed, the cover for the book *If Loving You Is Wrong* bears this introduction: "The schoolteacher, the student, and the story that stunned the world," making the terms of this forbidden love immediately clear. Articulation of experience is being offered. Operating from the paradigm of silence as negative and speech as positive, we should be delighted. Silence has been broken.

Yet, I would argue, it is precisely that broken silence which regulates and constrains Mary Latourneau. In literal terms, it was publicity that led her to the jailhouse door and excluded her from the world of free people. Had her husband not made her love letters to Villi available to school authorities, Mary Latourneau would not have achieved the fame that puts her on the cover of *People Magazine*. She would probably still be teaching her sixth grade class, a position for which she received excellent reviews and

where she had no record of misconduct. Latourneau's fame contributed to the alacrity with which a police officer acted when he found Latourneau and Villi in a car at 2:00 am when she had completed her initial six month sentence and was out on parole. Without the glare of public exposure and articulation, Latourneau would not be in prison today. Speech, not silence, has constrained and excluded her. Again, I hasten to say that I don't necessarily think Latourneau should be free or in the classroom. I am simply pointing to the ways that silence would have served her better.

Larger political implications emerge from this situation. The position of women teachers has changed somewhat since the 19th century, but many of the factors that operated then continue to play a role. Perhaps most important, the profession of teaching remains a feminized field. There are many more women than men in elementary and secondary school classrooms, and the gendered model of female teachers operating under the scrutinizing gaze of male supervisors prevails. The majority of principals and superintendents are men, and the working conditions of classroom teachers — with loudspeakers that interrupt without warning, mandated curriculum materials, and panoptic architecture — prohibit development of the autonomy essential to what gets designated as a profession. In the American context, at least, the difference between the material circumstances of university and school instructors is marked. Although they do the same work, the conditions under which they labor differ significantly.

The breaking of silence in the Latourneau case not only constrains Latourneau herself, it also has implications for teachers more generally. Because Latourneau has been so consistently identified as a teacher in all the media coverage, the public accounts of her actions become attached to teachers as a class. The highly personalized discourses surrounding Latourneau, language like "Villi is the love of my life" or "There was a respect, an insight, a spirit, an understanding between us that grew over time" — language like this distorts the erotics of instruction (an erotics that Julia Tevis portrays well in describing her relationship with Frances — "one of the most obedient of my pupils") and displaces it into the public sphere.

The privileging of Latourneau's private sexual life in public discourse crowds out the larger social, political and economic forces that limit the lives of teachers. If discourse focuses on how Latourneau managed to sleep with Villi when her parole forbade her to have any contact with him, it becomes much more difficult to direct public attention to the social forces that lead many women to introduce themselves as 'just a teacher'. It makes

recognition of how high-stakes testing undercuts teacher professionalism much harder to achieve. It reduces the impact of questions about teacher salaries. In other words, the emphasis on private personal discourses limits the possibilities for having any effect on the social, political, and economic forces that constrain the lives of most teachers.

As I hope the Latourneau example shows, articulation, the breaking of silence does not always result in greater freedom. It can have precisely the opposite effect both for an individual like Latourneau and for the class of people — like teachers — whom she represents. Joshua Gamson makes this point in his examination of TV talk shows that describe themselves as democratic because they "let just folks stand up and say what-for."²⁶ As Gamson shows, TV talk shows "democratize through exploitation," they are both "manipulative spectacle and democratic forum."²⁷ The private and personal accounts individuals share on talk shows often serve to limit rather than liberate them, even though their apparent freedom of expression appears democratic. Similarly, the silences of censorship can be productive as well as constraining. Annette Kuhn, in her study of British film censorship in the early 20th century, argues that understanding power — as in the power of censorship — only in terms of prohibition limits our understanding of "how and with what effects" power works. I would add, based on my examination of the figure of the censored teacher, that seeing censorship in terms of silence positions the object, in this case the gendered figure of the female teacher, in static and inflexible terms. It allows no space for individual action, no recognition that power does not operate in a single direction but as a field of forces that does not reside in any particular individual or institution. I hope, then, that we can expand definitions of censorship to include the capacity for productivity as well as prohibition; that we can acknowledge how the censorship of persons, like the censoring of literature, has dimensions that inspire as well as inhibit; and that the censorship practiced by institutions is met by assertions of individual agency.

²⁶ Gamson, *Freaks Talk Back*, p. 14.

²⁷ Gamson, *Freaks Talk Back*, p. 19.

Bibliography

- Alcott, Louisa Mae. *Little Women*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1886.
- Apps, Jerry. *One-Room Country Schools: History and Recollections from Wisconsin*. Amherst, Wisconsin: Palmer Publications, 1996.
- Beecher, Catherine. *An Essay on the Education of Female Teachers*. New York: Van Nostrand & Dwight, 1835.
- Biklen, Sari Knopp. *School Work: Gender and the Cultural Construction of Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1995.
- Downing, Lucia G. "Teaching in the Little Red Schoolhouse." *Woman's True Profession: Voices from the History of Teaching*. Ed. Nancy Hoffman. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press, 1982.
- Gamson, Joshua. *Freaks Talk Back: Tabloid Talk Shows and Sexual Nonconformity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Gardner, Philip. "Constructing the Classroom Teacher, 1903–1945." *Silences and Images: The Social History of the Classroom*. Eds. Ian Grosvenor, Martin Lawn, and Kate Rousmaniere. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Jacobs, Jane. Ed. *A Schoolteacher in Old Alaska: The Story of Hannah Breece*. New York: Vintage, 1997.
- Lakoff, Robin. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper, 1975.
- Lines, Amelia Akehurst. *To Raise Myself a Little: The Diaries and Letters of Jennie, A Georgia Teacher 1851–1886*. Ed. Thomas Dyer. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1982.
- Matheson, Peter. "Breaking the Silence: Women, Censorship and the Reformation." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996): 97–109.
- Monaghan, E. Jennifer. "Literacy Instruction and Gender in Colonial New England." *Reading in America: Literature and Social History*. Ed. Cathy N. Davidson. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Olsen, Gregg. *If Loving You Is Wrong*. New York: St Martin's, 1999.
- Post, Robert C. (ed.). *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998.
- Robinson, James. *The Mary Latourneau Affair*. New York: Leathers Publishing, 2001.
- Rosenberg, Carroll Smith. "Domesticating 'Virtue': Coquettes and Revolutionaries in Young America." *Literature and the Body: Essays on*

- Populations and Persons*. Ed. Elaine Scarry. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1988.
- San Diego Bakhtin Circle. *Bakhtin and the Nation*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2000.
- Sexton, Patricia Cayo. *Women in Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1976.
- Sheriff, Robin E. "Exposing Silence as Cultural Censorship: A Brazilian Case." *American Anthropologist* 102 (2000): 114–132.
- Sophocles *Ajax*. Trans. David Grene. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Steedman, Carolyn. *The Tidy House: Little Girls Writing*. London: Virago, 1982.
- Tevis, Julia Ann. *Sixty Years in a School-Room: An Autobiography*. Cincinnati: Western Methodist Book Concern, 1878.
- Tyack, David / Elizabeth Hansot. *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820–1980*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Weiler, Kathleen. *Country School Women: Teaching in Rural California 1850–1950*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. New York: Harcourt, 1957.

This page intentionally left blank

TOWARDS A REDEFINITION OF CENSORSHIP

Helen Freshwater

Any redefinition necessitates an assessment of existing provision. This article analyses contemporary models of censorship and outlines the theoretical antecedents informing the 'new censorship' debate before moving onto a further reorientation of the term. Theorists including Richard Burt, Sue Curry Jansen and Michael Holquist come under consideration in an investigation which highlights the prevalence of theories which maintain that censorship is an omnipresent, structural necessity. The article assesses the influence of Michel Foucault, asking whether the critical preoccupation with constitutive forms of censorship has led to a failure to acknowledge the potential subversion and dysfunction of censorious forces. Whilst defending a strongly inclusive application of the term, 'Towards a Redefinition of Censorship' proposes that we place greater value upon responsiveness to the experience of the censored author or artist. Without such consideration, we risk perpetuating procedures of exclusion.

Any analysis of censorship will eventually come up against the difficult question of what the term 'censorship' actually signifies. This article engages with contemporary debates over the definition of censorship, and discusses the implications of an increasingly wide application of the term. I interrogate the suppositions of the 'new censorship' debate, arguing that attempts to define the slippery concept of censorship often fail to acknowledge the experience of those who consider themselves censored.

I propose an inclusive definition that responds to the diverse experiences of censorship, and which reflects the socio-historical specificity of instances of control, conditioning or silencing. This definition acknowledges that censorship is a process, realised through the relationships between censorious agents, rather than a series of actions carried out by a discrete or isolated authority. In order to reflect the ethical complexity of speaking for the silenced, this definition of censorship is directed by the inclusive logic of 'both/and', rather than preserving the censorious modality of 'either/or'.

Questioning Convention

Many recent analyses of censorship contrast contemporary definitions of censorship with traditional models. Within the last fifteen years, the contention that conventional approaches to censorship have concentrated on institutional acts of prohibition to the detriment of a more sophisticated or subtle understanding of censorship has become commonplace.

Critics such as Richard Burt, Judith Butler, Annette Kuhn and Michael Holquist have noted that this conventional conception of censorship focuses upon the external silencing of a resistant subject's speech or expression, which is understood to be 'free', or hitherto uncensored. Within this model, censorious intervention is generally assumed to take place *after* the act of expression. Curiously, none of these critics provide close readings of (or indeed any references to) examples of the application of this model, raising the suspicion that it is difficult to locate a definition of censorship which is quite as naive as they imply. However, what is of concern here is the question of redefinition, and below I summarise the alternative models they propose in opposition to this faceless orthodoxy.

Annette Kuhn frames her study of early twentieth century film censorship (produced in 1988) with a rejection of convention. She states that models which concentrate upon institutional prohibition serve to inhibit appreciation of the complexity of censorship, noting that they tend to reify the censored object, placing it in a position of inert passivity in which it is subordinated to institutional practices. Kuhn alleges that within this framework, censored films "can be seen only in terms of their absences, of what has been actively denied expression in them."¹ Her redefinition aims to problematise the notion that censorship is always a matter of repression, arguing that we should take greater account of its productivity. She also remarks that it occurs through the interaction of different censorious forces, concluding that it is "a process, not an object."

Censorship is not reducible to a circumscribed and predefined set of institutions and institutional activities, but is produced within an array of constantly shifting discourses, practices and apparatuses. It cannot, therefore, be regarded as either fixed or monolithic.

¹ Kuhn, *Cinema, Censorship and Sexuality*, p.4.

[It ...] is an ongoing process embodying complex and often contradictory relations of power.²

This emphasis upon a multiplicity of different discourses and practices is reiterated in Sue Curry Jansen's work *Censorship: The Knot that Binds Knowledge and Power*, which was published in 1991. She puts forward her alternative definition of censorship:

My definition of the term encompasses all socially structured proscriptions or prescriptions which inhibit or prohibit dissemination of ideas, information, images, and other messages through a society's channels of communication whether these obstructions are secured by political, economic, religious, or other systems of authority. It includes both overt and covert proscriptions and prescriptions.³

Jansen draws attention to the power of *constitutive* (as compared to regulative) censorship, citing the significance of the taboos and mores of the community, and the underlying construction of psychic and social forces. She proposes that we analyse the *implicit* structures of censorship rather than the more obvious operations of communicational and cultural control, which criticism has tended to focus upon in the past.

Constitutive censorship is also foregrounded in Michael Holquist's introduction to a special 1994 edition of the *PMLA*, "Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship". Holquist asserts that we should know better than to accept the conventional 'either/or' hypothesis: the popular perception that censorship either exists, or it does not. He notes that censorship may be inescapable, and that the removal of overtly repressive institutions, or the introduction of legislation which promises to deliver 'free speech', are merely palliatives. He states that censorship is:

Still treated through a crude axiology, as an absolute choice between prohibition and freedom. This position denies the reality of interdiction and masks the necessity of choosing between the myriad specific conditions that embody censorship's fatedness. To be for or against censorship as such is to assume a freedom no one has. Censorship *is*. One can only discriminate among its more and less repressive effects.⁴

According to Holquist, the most valuable tool available to those who wish to control cultural activity may be the tendency to characterise censorship as an

² Kuhn, *Cinema, Censorship and Sexuality*, p.127.

³ Jansen, *Censorship: The Knot That Binds*, p.221.

⁴ Holquist, "Corrupt Originals", p.16.

act of repressive intervention. This conviction leads to the assumption that censorship cannot go unnoticed, thus masking its more obscure operations. His depressing vision defines censorship as omnipresent and inevitable.

Other critics have also explored this concept. Some ten years after Kuhn's publication, Richard Burt's reading of the operations of theatrical censorship in early modern England restates her rejection of long-established definitions. He avers that his "deconstructive" definition of censorship replaces earlier academic emphases upon the fifteenth century English court's repressive activities with an illumination of procedures of dispersal and displacement. He claims that his "more complex and nuanced model" demonstrates that censorship was present among "a variety of regulatory agents and practices; it was productive as well as prohibitive; it involved cultural legitimation as well as delegitimation. Censorship was more than one thing, occurred at more than one place and at more than one time." Burt observes that this approach connects "those terms that the more traditional model wishes to oppose: *repression* and *diversity*; *production* and *consumption*; *censoring* and *uncensoring*; and *public* and *private*."⁵

I list these treatments of censorship in order to draw attention to the way in which the moment of redefinition has been repeatedly rehearsed in recent years. These approaches cannot be described as illegitimate, but they are problematic. Kuhn, Holquist and Burt foreground the productivity of censorship by comparing the naivety of popular, or conventional, perceptions of censorship with the theoretical complexity of their own approach. My contribution to this ongoing process of redefinition rejects this tendency to denounce an unsophisticated, or popular, apprehension of censorship. Moreover, I believe that it is important to examine the theoretical foundations underlying this contemporary shift in thinking about censorship. It is to these foundations I now turn.

Constitutive Censorship

Whether Kuhn, Holquist, Jansen and Burt acknowledge it or not, it is clear that contemporary definitions of censorship which foreground its diverse, dispersed and productive character are informed by the work of Michel

⁵ Burt, "(Un)Censoring in Detail", p.17–18.

Foucault.⁶ His influence should not be underestimated. After all, it was Foucault who encouraged us to "escape from the limited field of juridical sovereignty and State institutions, and instead base our analysis of power on the study of techniques and tactics of domination."⁷ Any recent scholarship which highlights censorship's constitutive nature – or draws out the complex interrelationship of censor and censored – owes a considerable debt to his examinations of wide-ranging networks of disciplinary power and discursive practices.

The ontology of censorship and its relation to power is a recurring theme in Foucault's work. In the series *The History of Sexuality*, first published in 1976, he uncouples the link between censorship and constraint, suggesting that we have misunderstood the relationship between sexuality and repression. He contends that histories which characterise the nineteenth century as an era of prudery, modesty, and sexual repressiveness fail to grasp censorship's paradoxical power. He argues that sex became the object of obsessive amounts of attention during this period. This excessive interest produced areas of knowledge around this focus of cultural anxiety, rather than its excision from the discursive agenda. This results in a reconfiguration of censorship as a productive force, which constitutes the discourse surrounding sexuality, just as it defines its boundaries.⁸

Censorship's potential power as a constitutive force is also explored in Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. In this text, Foucault describes the disciplinary function of enlightenment institutions such as Jeremy Bentham's Panopticon. The architectural principles of this edifice provide a blue-print for the rise of self-censorship. The Panoptic society, which reflects the design of this prison building, is one in which internal codes of control displace external methods of punishment and surveillance. Foucault discusses the operation of these codes, noting that they exist to measure, supervise and correct the "abnormal". He observes that "all the authorities exercising individual control function according to a double mode; that of binary division and branding (mad/sane; dangerous/harmless; normal/abnormal) [...] to which every individual is subjected."⁹ Within the

⁶ Curiously, Jansen goes out of her way to disassociate her work from Foucault, despite the suggestive reference of her title. See Jansen, *Censorship: The Knot that Binds*, p.219.

⁷ Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, p.102.

⁸ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, p.15–35.

⁹ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, p.199.

Panopticon, the subject learns to apply this system of branding to his own behaviour.

The Foucauldian definition of censorship as a productive force may seem counter-intuitive. Indeed, using a model of censorship which implies that processes of exclusion and differentiation are fundamental to our construction of knowledge, and even our identities, necessarily complicates any effort to define censorship. It not only undermines the cherished liberal ideal of free speech, but simultaneously presents us with a theory that is difficult, if not impossible, to evidence. If censorship is constitutive, operating at the most basic level of discourse and comprehension, how are we to assess it? Rejecting the 'either/or' binarism of 'freedom/repression', or refuting the notion that censorship is always external to the subject, clearly requires analysis of the most foundational levels of communication and consciousness.

Pierre Bourdieu's work, *Language and Symbolic Power* (first published in French in 1982) contains just such an analysis. His enquiry into the constitutive role of language proposes that censorship may be an unavoidable structural necessity. In the essay, "Censorship and the Imposition of Form" (in which he examines the relationship between linguistic content and form) he comments: "The censorship exercised by the structure of the field determines the form [...] and, necessarily, the content, which is inseparable from its appropriate expression and therefore literally unthinkable outside of the known forms and recognised norms."¹⁰ Bourdieu indicates that this constitutive level of censorship is profoundly compelling. He asserts that the more effective the process of regulation and repression is, the less apparent it becomes, as it begins to appear as the natural 'way of the world'. The need for explicit prohibitions, imposed and sanctioned by an institutionalised authority, diminishes as the mechanisms of internalisation take hold. He reasons that:

Censorship is never quite as perfect or as invisible as when each agent has nothing to say apart from what he is objectively authorised to say [...] he is [...] censored once and for all, through the forms of perception and expression that he has internalised and which impose their form on all his expressions.¹¹

¹⁰ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p.139.

¹¹ Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, p.138.

Thus, censorship's success is indicated by its apparent abolition. Some things become impossible to say or, if said, are impossible to take seriously.

Other theorists have capitalised upon the 'linguistic turn' in sociological thought. Stanley Fish's monograph, *There's No Such Thing as Free Speech*, explores the idea that all texts are generated by a process of exclusion and selection, as he seeks to refute the 'freedom' in 'free speech'. Fish proposes that every statement's coherence lies firmly within the "interpretative community" that receives it. He suggests that free speech "has never been general and has always been understood against the background of an originary exclusion that gives it meaning."¹² There is a certain indisputable logic about this argument. For a sentence to become comprehensible, it must be produced by an operation that realises certain possibilities, and rules out others. Thus, both Fish and Bourdieu observe that censorship is a structural necessity; an economy of choice governed by principles of selection and regulation; internalised through language, and consequently present in every utterance.

The idea of censorship as structural necessity is also fundamental to the teachings of psychoanalysis. The powerful operation of an internalised form of censorship is firmly inscribed in the work of Freud, and latterly, Lacan. Freud intimates that a process of censorious exclusion and differentiation is bound up with our most basic instincts, as it is generated during our early socialisation. At this early stage, the function of judgement is based upon the oldest oral impulses. We function by introjecting everything perceived as 'good', while ejecting everything perceived as 'bad'. Freud claims that we are governed by the logic of statements such as "'I should like to eat this', or 'I should like to spit it out' [...] that is to say: 'It shall be inside me' or 'it shall be outside me'."¹³

This insight was given a greater measure of complexity as Freud developed his concept of depth psychology. His speculative framework, describing the opaque structure of our consciousness, rests upon a system of repression rather than exclusion. His theories propose the internal division of the psyche, in which the shadowy and mysterious area of the subconscious functions as an internal censorship mechanism, suppressing problematic and distressing areas of thought, memory, and experience. Freud maintained that

¹² Fish, *There's No Such Thing As Free Speech*, p.104.

¹³ Freud, quoted in *The Freud Reader*, p.668.

repression was essential for the formation of subjectivity, proposing that the operations of repression and the beginnings of self-awareness are simultaneous.¹⁴ It is important to note that this is *repression*, rather than exclusion (in contrast to his earlier analysis). Derrida notes that the Freudian psyche "neither repels, nor flees, nor excludes an exterior force; it contains an interior representation, laying out within itself a space of repression."¹⁵

Both Freud's groundbreaking project and Lacan's reworking of psychoanalytic theory ponder the dependence of the psyche upon the material it attempts to repress or exclude. Their work encourages acknowledgement of the constitutive role of exclusion and demarcation, implying that censorship is not primarily experienced as external pressure, but is generated from within. Furthermore, the way in which psychoanalytic concepts are caught up in the traditions of semiotic thought is made explicit in Lacan's reassessment of Freudian theory. His writings indicate that our subjectivity is created by language's sign system: our identity is formed through language and linguistic structure, as it comes to reflect a symbolic order which is dependent upon margins, limits, borders and boundaries. Just as the denotation of any given term rests upon that which it excludes, identity is also constructed through relation to an exterior or outside. Our entry into language, which Lacan describes as the transition from the 'Imaginary' to the 'Symbolic' phase, constitutes the entry into a cultural order that forms the infant's identity.

Contemplating Foucauldian discourse theory alongside psychoanalytic interpretations of internalised censorship is a disquieting experience. Whilst they represent very different intellectual traditions, both theoretical approaches seem to undermine any faith in the possibility of free expression. Both psychoanalytic and Foucauldian subjects seem to be complicit, caught within an ineluctable web of power. Oppositional discourse is therefore contained within, and indeed produced by, the very terms it seeks to challenge. Foucault indicates that the normative cultural sphere is heavily reliant upon a realm of obscenity that it seeks to exclude from its own operation, while psychoanalysis emphasises the formative presence of processes of repression at the most foundational levels of our consciousness. Both approaches appear to lead to the fatalistic conclusion that censorship is

¹⁴ Freud, quoted in *The Freud Reader*, p.569.

¹⁵ Freud, quoted in Derrida, *Writing and Difference*, p.196.

indeed omnipresent. Awareness of constitutive forms of censorship only seems to reinforce our belief in their inescapability.

Instances of Incompletion

While emphasis upon the constitutive, productive power of censorship may seem to be imbued with a certain theoretical rigor, it does not reflect the experience of censorship as the unwelcome imposition of external constraint. The essentialising language of psychoanalysis may often seem to empty censorship of its socio-historical specificity, just as the Foucauldian focus upon the complicitous subject does not always appear to do justice to a history of ideological conflict and confrontation. This is not to deny the power of constitutive censorship or the pressure exerted by societal norms. However, it is important to remember that these norms are not fixed, but are instead subject to constant change. There may be no such thing as an uncensored text, but this fact does not rule out the possibility that further external constraints can be imposed upon it, or that the text may find ways of challenging such censorious interventions.

Indeed, it seems that constitutive censorship itself may contain a measure of such subversion. Michael Levine addresses the question of authorial self-censorship in his monograph, *Writing Through Repression*, foregrounding the way in which an awareness of censorship simultaneously inhibits and provokes the writer. He infers that work which anticipates or negotiates censorship begins to take on a style which addresses these limitations, commenting that censorship can be figured both "as a debilitating impediment and [...] as an impetus to stylistic innovation."¹⁶ Levine notes that the use of the unspoken as a stylistic device by authors is illuminated by Freud's characterisation of the repressed as a continually developing set of processes.

Freud describes the series of distortions repressed items undergo before they can resurface in the conscious mind, transformed by condensation, displacement and symbolism. According to Levine, these psychoanalytic processes are reflected in the stylistic innovations and strategies of dissimulation employed by writers under the threat of silencing.

¹⁶ Levine, *Writing Through Repression*, p.2.

Besides, repression is not a single event, but a series of acts that demand a constant expenditure of force. Perhaps the anxieties betrayed in censorship are so pervasively present because they have to be continually imagined. Whether we accept this notion or not, it is apparent that repression requires reiteration and therefore must be open to a level of renegotiation. Consequently, the censorious process of repression only functions as a dysfunctional and self-subversive operation.

Similar dysfunction and self-subversion can be found in regulative forms of censorship. Judith Butler identifies a parallel to the repetition inherent in the psychoanalytic process of repression in the performative contradiction enacted by overt censorship. She indicates that censorship contains within itself a repetition of censored material, noting that the official censor finds him or herself in a classic 'Catch 22' situation. She suggests that censors are compelled to re-stage the very utterances they seek to banish from public life: "The regulation that states what it does not want stated thwarts its own desire, conducting a performative contradiction."¹⁷ Nonetheless, this indisputable, if unpredictable, side-effect of censorship can only be the product of public statements. This form of performative contradiction will only be realised by censorship which attracts attention in the public realm.

So, it seems that both constitutive and regulative forms of censorship are vulnerable to a measure of destabilisation. These instances of censorious incompleteness become most apparent upon consideration of the reception of censored material. If overt censorship heightens awareness of excluded material, it may also generate sophisticated and complicit audiences who are aware of the dual structure of the censored text. For these spectators, comprehension of the simultaneous existence of manifest and latent levels of meaning opens the censored text to an entirely new mode of reception: they become accustomed to listening for the hidden significances which lurk between the lines.

The potential for any text to produce an unstoppable proliferation of interpretation poses problems for all systems of censorship. Michael Holquist suggests that censors are haunted by a "monologic terror of indeterminacy";

¹⁷ Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech*, p.130. Holquist reads this dependency as a positive sign of censorship's permeability: "That censorship necessarily includes the other it seeks to exclude is taken as a hopeful sign that any set of prohibitions, no matter how stringent, has loopholes." "Corrupt Originals", p.15.

that they are motivated by a desire to fix meaning, expunge ambiguity, and to fill the vacuum into which interpretation rushes. Holquist uncovers the fundamental instability at the foundations of the censorial edifice, proposing that, in attempting to cement interpretation,

Censors intend to construct rather than prohibit. What they wish to make is a certain kind of text, one that can be read in only one way: its grammatical (or logical) form will be seamlessly coterminous with all its rhetorical (or semiotic) implications.¹⁸

However, this desire for absolute textual fixity is destined to remain unsatisfied. Consideration of censorship's Latin base, *consere*, which means "to estimate, rate, assess, to be of opinion" reveals the difficult issues of interpretation and moral relativity which any good censor seeks to elide.¹⁹

Reading Between the Lines

These insights are reflected in the proliferation of critical theories which place particular emphasis upon moments of textual contradiction, denial and unwitting self-subversion. Marxists such as Althusser have recommended "symptomatic reading" of capital and its cultural representatives, while Derrida advocates a similar approach in *Of Grammatology*. He advises that deconstructive reading

must always aim at a certain relationship, unperceived by the writer, between what he commands and what he does not command of the patterns of language that he uses. This relationship is [...] a signifying structure that critical reading should *produce* [that is, a] production [which] attempts to make the not-seen accessible to sight.²⁰

Pierre Macherey's *A Theory of Literary Production* also demands a critical awareness of the volubility of silence and moments of displacement. He proposes that these instances of contradiction and silence can be interrogated by shifting attention to the ideological intertext where the "unspoken" speaks. He observes:

¹⁸ Holquist, "Corrupt Originals", p.22.

¹⁹ Cited by Tribe, *Questions of Censorship*, p.36.

²⁰ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, p.158,163.

The book [...] circles about the absence of that which it cannot say, haunted by the absence of certain repressed words which make their return. [...] It bears in its material substance the imprint of a determinate absence which is also the principle of its identity.²¹

Ultimately, the potential of speech to contain many levels of meaning, both spoken and unspoken, points to the very essence of censorship's failure.

The expressive potential of the unspoken has proved to be a valuable area of enquiry for queer theory. It is invoked by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick in *The Epistemology of the Closet*, in which she examines the literary heritage of homosexuality, and demonstrates the importance of 'closeting' to gay culture. Whilst anatomising the connection between linguistic performativity and same-sex desire, she draws upon Foucauldian theory, which bears witness to the articulation of silent speech acts:

There is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say; we must try to determine the different ways of not saying such things. [...] There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourses.²²

For those who oppose censorship, this is the positive side of Foucault's formulation of power's productivity.

Foucault's assertion that censorious power circulates amongst different agents, rather than residing in a single institution or central authority, initially appears to reassure. Resistance is not only possible, but it is built into this model of power. Foucault's well-known essay, "A Preface to Transgression" expands this idea to disturbing effect. He demands that we contemplate the possibility that we may be complicit in the maintenance of censorious institutions, even as we tell ourselves that we are resistant to them. Uncompromising contemplation of our part in perpetuating regulative forms of censorious control is an uncomfortable exercise. It seems that the terms 'censorship' or, alternatively 'free speech', may actually serve to obscure the complex interaction of different agencies at work in this cultural sphere.

"A Preface to Transgression" provides an eloquent theoretical elucidation of this curious situation. Foucault comments upon the way in

²¹ Macherey, *A Theory of Literary Production*, p.80.

²² Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, p.27.

which shocking, controversial, or challenging art work is necessarily dependent upon the existence of a set of pre-existing conventions. His essay does not only explore the interdependence of the censor and the censored, but also effectively severs transgression's traditional association with liberation or progression. Foucault observes that transgression does not eliminate the frontiers it crosses, nor does it represent a release from censorious constraints. He comments: "transgression contains nothing negative, but affirms limited being."²³

Disavowal and Disassociation

Evidence that authors and artists may occasionally exploit the condemnation of the authorities (or indeed even trade upon it) presents a healthy challenge to the moralising discourse which often surrounds discussion of censorship. Unsurprisingly, the academic inspection of instances of censorship is generally produced by those who deplore social coercion, exclusion and oppression. Consequently, these analyses are predisposed towards critique and condemnation, rather than defence or justification. Generally (if somewhat reductively) speaking, the political affiliations of this liberal community have perpetuated an approach which applies the ideological mantra: 'censorship bad, free speech good'.

Some critics have observed that it has become all but impossible to discuss censorship in anything other than pejorative terms. Frederick Schauer comments that today, "to praise an act of censorship is to verge on committing a linguistic mistake",²⁴ while Jean-Jacques Pauvert eloquently outlines the generalised condemnation of censorship in the west:

Censorship is one of those convenient words which are widely used today because they allow people to seem, with a minimum of effort, decent and right-thinking, the same as everyone else these days. The Left, the Right and the Centre all agree that one should be *anti-censorship, anti-war, anti-racism, pro-human rights* or freedom of expression.²⁵

²³ Foucault, "A Preface to Transgression", p.28.

²⁴ Schauer, "The Ontology of Censorship", p.147.

²⁵ Pauvert concludes that "these are impressive convictions, which don't last five minutes when they are put to the test." See Pauvert, *Nouveaux (Et Moins Nouveaux) Visages de la Censure*, p.7. (Translation in Harrison, *Circles of Censorship*, p.1.)

This tendency, outlined by Schauer and Pauvert, has even been described as an "anti-censorial prejudice".²⁶

If evidence of this prejudice is needed, it can be easily found in the widespread rejection of the title of censor. Institutions that currently perform an overtly censorious role in the west are careful to describe themselves as licencing authorities or classificatory bodies. The label of 'censor' is applied, it is never claimed: which inevitably frustrates any attempt to define censorship. Sue Curry Jansen describes this mendacity as the "Good Lie". She observes that this process of dissociation and disavowal first appeared during the enlightenment, when overt methods of social control and coercion began to be replaced by constitutive forms. She proposes that the "Good Lie" is still in circulation, working to hide the operations of the censor.

This anti-censorial bias is accompanied by a concomitant celebration of free speech, or the 'constitutional liberty' enshrined in North American discourse. The domination of this polarised rhetoric (the either/or binarism of freedom/repression identified by Michael Holquist) not only blinds the critic to the omnipresence of a certain level of constitutive censorship, it also belies the possibility that the censored may be complicit in the censorious system, and serves to conceal the qualities of the material which finds itself subject to censorious constraint.

Nicholas Harrison provides an eloquent critique of the discourse of counter-censorship in his work *Circles of Censorship*, which analyses the history of literary censorship in France. He traces unquestioning valorisations of free speech back to the psychoanalytic commitment to uncovering repressed material in the psyche of the analysand. Harrison comments:

Psychoanalysis [...] aims to uncover that which has been censored, and the idea that that which is censored is more important, more *fundamental*, than the social conventions which marginalise, distort, and hide it, is both a starting hypothesis and a conclusion of this process.²⁷

Harrison infers that the psychoanalytic procedures of "*tout dire*" are supposed to overturn mundane truths and expose their superficiality. This logic intimates that saying what the censor has declared unsayable has an intrinsic value: a quality which is inherently beneficial and liberatory. But Harrison problematises the notion that there is any such value in "*tout dire*".

²⁶ Murray, *Drama Trauma*, p.219.

²⁷ Harrison, *Circles of Censorship*, p.210.

He suggests that we should remember that censorship has no fundamental relation to truth: censored material does not possess an essential or transcendent value, nor does it share a universal quality. He maintains that we should cease presenting cultural confrontations over censorship as a matter of ongoing conflict between the forces of oppression and the forces of liberation, as he uses a reading of the politics of pornography to disassociate censored material from subversion. Unquestioning support for the censored is soon undermined, exposing the contingency of our judgements and the mutability of the standards we use to measure such representations.

If presuppositions about the value of the object of censorship require such destabilisation, then traditional assumptions about the political affiliation of the censor also demand interrogation. Richard Burt observes that, until recently, it has been accepted that:

Censorship clearly divides right and left: the right is for it, the left is against it; the right acts as an agent of censorship, the left is its victim; the right is for 'safe' or ornamental art without sexual content, the left accepts confrontational public art with graphic sexual images; the right is for artistic decency, the left is for artistic diversity.²⁸

In fact, the 'new censorship' debates reveal that it is no longer possible to conflate political affiliation with a stance on censorship. Today, calls for the restraint of representation or silencing of expression are just as likely to come from the left as the right, as race activists support the regulation of hate speech and feminists attempt to ban pornography.²⁹ On the other hand, heralds of free speech have begun to sound from the right of the political spectrum.³⁰

It is plain that it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between progressive anti-censorship and reactionary pro-censorship lobbies.

²⁸ Burt, *The Administration of Aesthetics*, p.xii.

²⁹ See hooks, *Outlaw Culture*, (1994). For a discussion of the debate on pornography, see Robertson / Wilson, *Pornography and Feminism*; Dworkin, *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*; and Dworkin, *In Harm's Way: The Pornography Civil Rights Hearings*.

³⁰ The revisionist historian David Irving preaches in *The Search for Truth in History*: "Freedom of speech is like one of those ancient, medieval rights, like a right of way, like a right of passage across a farmer's field... These ancient rights, like freedom of speech, need to be asserted... I will walk this path of freedom of speech because, if we do not walk it, then ugly forces come to the fore and dictate and ordain and restrict, and we then see emerge the kind of society that liberal politicians all claim we were trying to prevent in the World Wars, which saw the sacrifice

Burt asserts that "those on the left and the right occupy the same discursive terrain: both sides adopt the same rhetoric; both sides say they are against censorship and for diversity; each side accuses the other of trying to exercise censorship."³¹ It seems that the new hegemony is governed by this rhetoric of diversity. Controversially, Burt hypothesises that this newly dominant discourse of diversity maybe just as oppressive as traditional regulative practices. He postulates that it reinscribes a censorious logic, operating according to a procedure of exclusion.

Everywhere? Or Nowhere?

We seem to have reached the farthest possible point in the definition of censorship. Some critics would say that all choices are ideological, therefore censorship is omnipresent. Or that all speech is censorious, even when it preaches diversity and tolerance. Or that any political stance can be associated with censorship, and consequently any expression of identity is to be mistrusted as exclusory. Consequently, any critic seeking to redefine censorship has to address some difficult questions. Has censorship been redefined out of existence? Does the critical adoption of the model of dispersal and displacement 'flatten out' the differences between 'hard' and 'soft' forms of control? Might the critical concentration on the constant struggle between competing ideological discourses, removal of subsidy or sponsorship, or the censureship of criticism itself, serve to draw attention away from 'strong' repressive measures?³² Is it advisable to push the definition of censorship any further?³³

The wide application of the term can certainly appear to overwhelm or trivialise its significance. In some parts of the world censorship can be equated, all too literally, with death. Incarceration, death and disappearance possess an unarguable finality: silencing's most absolute incarnation. The existence of *fatwas* against authors such as Salman Rushdie and the murder

of so many millions of lives of innocent people." Quoted in Jackson, *The Case for David Irving*, p.vi.

³¹ Burt, *The Administration of Aesthetics*, p.xv.

³² See Post, *Censorship and Silencing*, p.4.

³³ See Langton, "Subordination, Silence, and Pornography's Authority", p.261–284.

of Ken Saro-Wiwa in 1996 prove the accuracy of George Bernard Shaw's dictum: "assassination is the extreme form of censorship."³⁴

While the term censorship is still used to describe the human rights abuses brought to our attention by organisations such as Amnesty International and catalogued by *Index on Censorship*, it may seem inappropriate to promote a wider application of the term. By interpreting censorship as a constitutive, productive power, there is certainly a danger that we negate any attempt to use the term for political mobilisation. If censorship is everywhere, unavoidable and ineluctable, then it is hard to believe that it is possible to intervene to counter it.

Towards a Redefinition

Despite these concerns, it is possible to make a strong argument for the heterogeneity of censorship. It is evident that expression can be controlled and conditioned in many different ways. Today, censorship can still appear in its most traditional guise, such as the intervention of a representative of a repressive institution, directly linked to the state: but it also materialises in the actions and decisions taken by those who administrate charitable foundations and local government, or corporate sponsors and sources of public subsidy. An inclusive model of censorship, which acknowledges these diverse manifestations, is required by the individuals who are subject to such acts of critical exclusion, authoritarian intervention and institutional interference. My research demonstrates that those who are on the receiving end of censorship are well aware that it can take on many different guises.³⁵ The language which such artists and authors use as they discuss the destruction, distortion, or limited dissemination of their work makes it clear that they believe that they have experienced egregious and excessive intervention. To suggest that they did not encounter censorship because their experience does not correspond to a predefined category would represent an untenable reinscription of the original act of exclusion.

³⁴ Quoted in Holquist, "Corrupt Originals", p.15.

³⁵ This research is on theatrical censorship, contained in my thesis, "Shadow Play: The Censorship of the Stage in Twentieth Century Britain". Published articles include "Suppressed Desire" and "Anti-theatrical prejudice and the persistence of performance".

This is a model of diversity, dispersal and displacement, but it is not created through contrast with popular or naive usage of the term. Instead, it responds to its common application. Richard Burt's argument would benefit from acknowledgement that his definition of a 'deconstructive', post-modern definition of censorship reflects quotidian experience, rather than providing a revolutionary rectification of popular misconceptions.

Although this inclusive model of censorship seeks to recognise variety, it does not conflate extreme violations of human rights with the refusal of grant money, or the criticism of a reviewer. Censorious events should be analysed with critical emphasis upon their socio-historical specificity: such an approach foregrounds the *differences* between different types of censorship and the decisions taken by numerous censorious agencies, as well as their interaction. Conclusions about censorship should surely be provisional, rather than fixed; plural, rather than singular; time and site-specific, rather than universal. Of course, responsiveness to charges of censorship should not obstruct investigation into the possible presence of complicitous relationships between censored individuals and censorious institutions. As Judith Butler proposes, it seems more appropriate to view censorship as a continuum, upon which it is possible to place the brutal extremes of incarceration or murder at one end, and the shadowy operations of constitutive exclusion at the other. Their connection is thus established, without negating their differences.³⁶

The ethical responsibilities of examining work that has been silenced demand a model of censorship which is inclusive, rather than exclusive. Refusal to acknowledge certain forms of constraint and curtailment because they do not fit into a convenient category effectively reiterates the original act of exclusion. Consequently, I propose that we move towards a redefinition that is based upon a responsiveness to the experience of those who are subject to censorship.

³⁶ Butler, "Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor", p.249.

Bibliography

- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Ed. John B. Thompson. Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Oxford: Polity P, 1991.
- Burt, Richard (ed.). *The Administration of Aesthetics: Censorship, Political Criticism and the Public Sphere*. (Cultural Politics 7). Minneapolis, London: U of Minnesota P, 1994.
- . "(Un)Censoring in Detail: The Fetish of Censorship in the Early Modern Past and the Postmodern Present." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 17–42.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. London, New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . "Ruled Out: Vocabularies of the Censor." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 247–259.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- . *Of Grammatology*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Corr. ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1997.
- Dworkin, Andrea. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. London: The Women's Press, 1981.
- . / Catherine A. MacKinnon (eds.). *In Harm's Way: The Pornography Civil Rights Hearings*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard UP, 1998.
- Fish, Stanley. *There's No Such Thing As Free Speech*. Oxford: OUP, 1994.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Ed. and trans. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- . "A Preface to Transgression." *Bataille: A Critical Reader*. Eds. Fred Botting and Scott Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. 24–40.
- . *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Penguin, 1977.
- . *The History of Sexuality*. Vol. 1. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Freshwater, Helen. "Suppressed Desire: Dramatic Inscriptions of Lesbianism in 1930s Britain." *New Theatre Quarterly* 68 (2001): 310–318.

- . "Shadow Play: The Censorship of the Stage in Twentieth Century Britain." Thesis. U of Edinburgh, 2002.
- . "Anti-theatrical prejudice and the persistence of performance: the Lord Chamberlain's plays and correspondence archive." *Performance Research* 7.4 (2002): 50–58.
- Harrison, Nicholas. *Circles of Censorship: Censorship and its Metaphors in French History, Literature and Theory*. Oxford: OUP, 1995.
- Holquist, Michael. "Corrupt Originals: The Paradox of Censorship." *PMLA* 109.1 (1994): 14–25.
- Gay, Peter (ed.). *The Freud Reader*. London: Vintage, 1995.
- hooks, bell. *Outlaw Culture*. London, New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Kuhn, Annette. *Cinema, Censorship and Sexuality, 1909-1925*. London, New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Jackson, Nigel. *The Case for David Irving*. Cranbrook, Australia: Veritas Publishing Company Pty, 1994.
- Jansen, Sue Curry. *Censorship: The Knot That Binds Power and Knowledge*. New York, Oxford: OUP, 1991.
- Langton, Rae. "Subordination, Silence, and Pornography's Authority." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 261–284.
- Levine, Michael. *Writing Through Repression*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Macherey, Pierre. *A Theory of Literary Production*. Trans. Geoffrey Wall. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Murray, Timothy. *Drama Trauma: Specters of Race and Sexuality in Performance, Video and Art*. London, New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Pauvert, Jean-Jacques. *Nouveaux (Et Moins Nouveaux) Visages de la Censure*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1994.
- Post, Robert C. (ed.). *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998.
- Robertson, Gail / Elizabeth Wilson (eds.). *Pornography and Feminism: The Case against Censorship*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1991.
- Schauer, Frederick. "The Ontology of Censorship." *Censorship and Silencing: Practices of Cultural Regulation*. Ed. Robert C. Post. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1998. 147–168.

Tribe, David. *Questions of Censorship*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abusch, Alexander, 101
Aínsa, Fernando, 173
Andrzejewski, Jerzy, 146, 151,
161, 162
Bach, Johann Sebastian, 87, 89
Bafia, Jerzy, 154, 157
Barańczak, Stanisław, 146, 162
Bartels, Adolf, 72
Barthes, Roland, 204
Bartók, Béla, 82
Batt, Kurt, 23
Baudelaire, Charles, 16, 17
Becher, Johannes R., 64, 101, 105
Becker, Jurek, 22
Beecher, Catherine, 211, 212
Benedetti, Mario, 169, 170, 171,
172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178,
180, 181, 182, 183, 185
Bentzien, Hans, 112
Berelowitz, Keith, 194
Berg, Alban, 64, 69, 70, 82, 91
Beyer, Frank, 111, 112, 116, 117,
120, 128, 132, 133
Biermann, Armin, 4, 9
Biermann, Wolf, 20
Biklen, Sari Knopp, 217
Blacher, Boris, 81, 82
Blei, Franz, 65
Bljum, Arlen, 143
Bocheński, Jacek, 146
Bolecki Włodzimierz (*aka*
Malewski, Jerzy), 151, 152,
162
Boulez, Pierre, 88
Bourdieu, Pierre, 2, 8, 9, 11, 36,
230, 231
Brecht, Bertolt, 68, 74, 94
Bresgen, Cesar, 81
Brod, Max, 25
Brodsky, Joseph, 203
Bulgakov, Mikhail, 21
Burkhard, Willy, 94
Burt, Richard, 1, 2, 3, 34, 35, 36,
225, 226, 228, 239, 240, 242
Busch, Ernst, 101
Busch, Fritz, 67, 75
Butler, Judith, 5, 6, 226, 234, 242
Butting, Max, 64, 89, 93, 95, 97,
99, 105
Byerly, Ingrid, 202, 203
Chambers, E. K., 34, 38, 39, 40
Charlton, Hannah, 195
Clare, Janet, 34
Clegg, Cyndia Susan, 54
Clegg, Johnny, 195, 200, 201,
202
Coetzee, Braam, 191
Coetzee, J.M., 192, 193, 198
Collinson, Patrick, 47, 48, 49, 50,
51
Crashaw, William, 33, 35, 46, 47,
50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56
Daniels, Samuel, 38
de Bruyn, Günter, 22
Dekker, Thomas, 43
Dessau, Paul, 89, 94
During, Hans-Georg, 107
Dutton, Richard, 34, 35, 37, 38,
39, 40, 41
Einem, Gottfried von, 81, 82
Eisler, Hanns, 64, 89, 91, 95, 101
Eisner, Kurt, 89
Ellis, Richard, 192, 196
Emmerich, Wolfgang, 21, 24
Erdmann, Eduard, 64
Eyerman, Ron, 190
Fedorowicz, Jacek, 162, 163
Feitlowitz, Marguerite, 174
Fik, Marta, 142
Forest, Jean Kurt, 95
Fortner, Wolfgang, 80

- Foucault, Michel, 6, 7, 225, 229, 232, 236, 237
- Freud, Sigmund, 25, 231, 232, 233
- Frick, Wilhelm, 73, 78
- Frith, Simon, 201
- Gair, Reavley, 35, 37, 42, 43, 55, 56
- Galeano, Eduardo, 171
- Gamson, Joshua, 221
- Gardner, Philip, 212
- Genzmer, Harald, 80
- Gibbons, Brian, 48, 49
- Gierek, Edward, 144, 145
- Goebbels, Joseph, 77, 79, 97, 106
- Gomułka, Władysław, 144
- Goosen, Anton, 193
- Grant, Amy, 212
- Grunsky, Karl, 65
- Günther, Egon, 111, 117, 133
- Gurr, Andrew, 35, 37, 38, 39, 49, 54, 55
- Handel, George Friderich, 87
- Harich, Wolfgang, 23
- Harrison, Nicholas, 238
- Hartig, Rudolf, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103, 105, 108
- Hein, Christoph, 22
- Heinemann, Margot, 50, 51
- Henkel, Kurt, 101
- Herminghouse, Patricia A., 24
- Herzen, 204
- Heuss, Alfred, 69, 73
- Heymann, Stefan, 101
- Heywood, Thomas, 38, 39, 45
- Hindemith, Paul, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 73, 79, 80, 94
- Hinkel, Hans, 75
- Hitler, Adolf, 81, 88, 89
- Höllner, Karl, 80
- Holquist, Michael, 1, 5, 225, 226, 227, 228, 234, 235, 238
- Holzhauser, Helmut, 89, 92, 97, 104
- Honecker, Erich, 111, 116, 122, 130, 131, 132, 134
- Jahrow, Franz, 129, 130, 132
- James I, 48
- Jamison, Andrew, 190
- Janka, Walter, 23
- Jansen, Sue Curry, 225, 227, 228, 229, 238
- Jaruzelski, Wojciech, 146, 157
- Jean Paul, 22
- John, Eckhard, 65, 79
- Jonson, Ben, 38, 45, 46, 50, 54, 55
- Kafka, Franz, 25
- Kaiser, Georg, 75
- Kálman, Emmerich, 83
- Kanzog, Klaus, 18
- Kaplan, M. Lindsay, 36, 37, 40
- Kater, Michael, 105, 106
- Kehm, Albert, 67, 68
- Kekana, Steve, 196
- Kenton, Stan, 97
- Kirkham, Edward, 35, 55
- Kleiber, Erich, 80, 82
- Klein, Gerhard, 111, 112, 122, 126, 127, 128, 131, 132, 133
- Klemperer, Otto, 71, 75
- Klenau, Paul von, 82
- Knepler, Georg, 89, 94, 95
- Kohlhaase, Wolfgang, 111, 112, 117, 122, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133
- Kokoschka, Oskar, 67
- Konwicki, Tadeusz, 152, 159, 160, 162
- Kozłowski, Kazimierz, 156, 157
- Kramer, David, 194, 197, 198, 199
- Krenek, Ernst, 71, 73, 74
- Lake, Peter, 39, 48, 50, 54
- Lakoff, Robin, 210
- Leifs, Jón, 82
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilych, 98
- Levine, Michael, 233
- Lewis, Bart, 173
- Liebermann, Rolf, 92, 94

- Lipsitz, George, 200, 201, 202
 Loseff, Lev, 5, 21, 181, 182, 183, 203, 204
 Lucey, Roger, 191
 Lyly, John, 39, 41, 43, 49, 51
 Mackiewicz, Józef, 151, 162
 Maetzig, Kurt, 111, 118, 120
 Malan, Magnus, 199
 Mandela, Nelson, 191, 192
 Mandela, Winnie, 192
 Marcus, Leah, 50
 Marre, Jeremy, 195
 Marx, Karl, 95, 98
 Masliah, Leo, 183, 184
 Mchunu, Siphon, 200
 McLure, Millar, 44, 45
 Meyer, Ernst Hermann, 98, 101
 Middleton, Thomas, 35, 43, 48, 50
 Miłosz, Czesław, 141, 148
 Milton, John, 22
 Misiór, Paweł, 145
 Moraña, Mabel, 181, 184, 185
 Mückenberger, Jochen, 112, 118, 121, 126
 Mullaney, Steven, 41, 42
 Nagel, Willibald, 65, 66
 Nashe, Thomas, 39, 43, 48, 49
 Ngcobo, Nhlanhla, 202
 Ngwenya, Moses, 194
 Notowicz, Nathan, 89, 94
 Orff, Carl, 81
 Orwell, George, 22
 Passent, Daniel, 157, 158, 159
 Patterson, Annabel, 34
 Peele, George, 43, 48, 49
 Pfitzner, Hans, 66, 67
 Pischner, Hans, 89, 99, 101, 105
 Pithouse, Richard, 195
 Post, Robert C., 1, 6, 10
 Pracher, Cecile, 191
 Raabe, Peter, 78
 Rabie, Ralf, 193
 Rebling, Eberhard, 89, 97
 Reger, Max, 93
 Reutter, Hermann, 80
 Rial, Juan, 170, 171, 172
 Roll, Paul, 102
 Rosenberg, Alfred, 63, 72, 78, 79, 81, 82
 Rosenfeld, Sophia, 1, 5, 6
 Ryan, Marie-Laure, 15
 Schauer, Frederick, 10
 Schirach, Carl von, 72
 Schlemmer, Oskar, 65
 Schoenberg, Arnold, 69, 71, 73, 78, 82, 83, 88, 91, 92, 94, 105
 Schöpflin, George, 156
 Schroeder, Hermann, 80
 Schulhoff, Erwin, 64
 Schütz, Heinrich, 87
 Seyppel, Joachim, 23
 Shakespeare, William, 33, 34, 37, 45, 48, 50, 53
 Silberman, Marc, 24
 Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll, 211
 Solzhenitsyn, Alexander, 20
 Sony, Warrick, 191, 195, 199
 Spengler, Oswald, 67
 Stahnke, Günter, 111, 120
 Stalin, Josif, 88
 Steedman, Carolyn, 215
 Stewart, Rex, 101
 Stramm, August, 67
 Straus, Oscar, 83
 Strauss, Richard, 64
 Stravinsky, Igor, 68, 71, 73, 80, 81, 94
 Strzyżewski, Tomasz, 147
 Stuckenschmidt, Hans-Heinz, 80
 Szaruga, Leszek, 146, 147, 150
 Szczepański, Jan Józef, 149
 Telemann, Georg, 87
 Tiessen, Heinz, 64
 Tilney, Edmund, 33, 35, 37, 40, 55
 Torańska, Teresa, 154
 Tyack, David, 215
 Ulbrich, Franz, 69
 Uszkoreit, Hans-Georg, 94, 95, 102, 105
 Verani, Hugo, 173

- Vogel, Frank, 111, 120, 124
Wagner, Richard, 63, 65, 66, 72
Wagner-Régeny, Rudolph, 95
Walicki, Andrzej, 164
Walter, Bruno, 75
Walther, Joachim, 19, 20, 143
Webern, Anton, 71, 82, 88, 91
Weiler, Kathleen, 218
Weill, Kurt, 64, 71, 73, 74, 75,
78, 83
Werner, Andrzej, 160, 161
White, Thomas, 52, 54
Wischnewski, Klaus, 112, 119,
133
Witt, Günter, 112, 119
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 1, 15
Wolpe, Stefan, 64
Wolzogen, Hans von, 72
Wonder, Stevie, 191
Woolf, Virginia, 210
Wyatt, Robert, 199
Zhdanov, Andrei, 98
Ziegler, Hans Severus, 73, 78
Zillig, Winfried, 82