

Kamila Budrowska  
(Uniwersytet w Białymstoku)

### **The censored past. GUKPPiW and a picture of Polish history in the 1948-1958 literature \***

This article is based on a query carried out in the Archives of New Records [Archiwum Akt Nowych, dalej: AAN] in Warsaw, where the main literate legacy of the Central Audit Office for Press Publications and Performances [Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk, dalej: GUKPPiW] is gathered. The accepted time frames reflect the state of archive materials. From the remaining 4982 folders all the ones containing the earliest materials were read (about 45 000 letters). Materials prior to 1948 appear only residually, while I would like to put a regular query beyond 1958 as a postulate for further research<sup>1</sup>.

One of the most interesting research topics seems to be building by GUKPPiW a specially formulated image of the Polish past. Historical subjects have always been censored meticulously and native history is one of the most important points on the censorship list. The reason seems obvious - *historical is political* - however, I would like to differentiate this obviousness.

Censoring historical topics can be discussed taking into account various research material: 1. fiction submitted for printing for the first time, 2. republished literary classics, 3. Polish or foreign fiction, 4. historical literature (scientific), 5. memories, diaries, resumes, etc... If you decide on the examination of either category, this issue can be arranged: according to the described historical events, according to the author of the work, according to the time of the work (tightening and mitigating the censorship with "interperiod" attributable to the Stalinist period), according to the degree of its censorship (without reservations, cut, detained for a short time, detained for a long time, never

---

\* Praca naukowa finansowana w ramach programu Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego pod nazwą Narodowy Program Rozwoju Humanistyki w latach 2012-2017.

<sup>1</sup> Zob. K. Budrowska, *Literatura i pisarze wobec cenzury PRL. 1948-1958*, Białystok 2009.

officially published in PRL /People's Republic of Poland/). It is clear that the issue is extremely rich; hence there is the need to simplify and the demand for further studies. The article includes only Polish fiction, both - the new texts and the republished classics, submitted for printing in the years 1948 - 1958. Categorization, which I would like to apply to the analyzed material, is looking at the works according to the subject matter - the described historical events. Here immediately appears the division into ancient and contemporary history, with special emphasis on the issues of World War II. I would like to emphasize that I am not interested only in historical novels, but in all the texts of Polish fiction which present historical events from the point of view of GUKPPIW. In this context also descriptions of the just ended war can be regarded as historical. The most important fact for my discussion point is the formulation of a certain vision of the past, the image - as it turns out - relatively coherent and homogeneous.

\*\*\*

In the oldest preserved in GUKPPIW material - a stenographic record from the first domestic briefing held in May 1945 a female official reports from Białystok:

I did not let put a play "Tamten" /that one/ on the stage. This play is old, dating from 1902 and discusses the conditions of life of Poles in Russia, Siberia, shackles, etc... As a censor I am of the opinion that although I condemn the tsarist oppression and so does the Soviet Government, but at this point to put up moments against the Russian people. We want to have friendly relations and it is not in the interest of democracy to remind festering wounds [...].<sup>2</sup>

Already the first months of operation of the office of censorship (they were still the Provincial and Municipal Press Audit Offices at that time) show how painstakingly the quite basic directive was executed - they looked at and selected the content related to the Soviet Union and Russia very carefully.

Zofia Radzikowska writes: "Censorship behaved as though in Poland the Russian Code of Principal and Correctional Penalties - 1847 was still in force, whose rules prohibited any speech deemed likely to endanger the authority of government, including the wide recognition of the prohibition of any criticism"<sup>3</sup>. In the case of Zapolska's play it seems particularly absurd. I am showing, however, another important principle applied in controlling the content of history: the analysis of these events through the prism of the current political situation, without the proper context. Aleksander Pawlicki, mentioning the unwritten law, according to which GUKPPIW worked, called such action respecting the "principle of topicality"<sup>4</sup>.

To present the frequency of the use of the "principle of topicality" you can look at one of many remaining reviews of the novel *Bolesław Chrobry* by Antoni Gołubiew. In 1949, the 3-rd volume of the cycle comes for an assessment from "Czytelnik". The opinions of the censors are very critical; in one of them we can read:

<sup>2</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 421,teczka 197/1, k. 30. In the article I decided on the following rules of citing sources: modification of the spelling and punctuation is accompanied by preservation of the original syntax.

<sup>3</sup> Z. Radzikowska, *Z historii walki o wolność słowa w Polsce (Cenzura w latach 1981-1987)*, Kraków 1990, s. 31.

<sup>4</sup> A. Pawlicki, *Kompletna szarość. Cenzura w latach 1965-1972. Instytucja i ludzie*, Warszawa 2001, s. 52 i nast.

The answer to the question whether the book brings something new in terms of ideological upbringing must be negative. The book is neither a combat anti-German, nor touching at a certain angle any social problems, even the religious problem is highlighted in the margin. It is, in fact, a novel - "fiction" written with talent<sup>5</sup>.

Another officer is even surprised that the publication of the work was undertaken by a printing house whose mission was *socialization of literature*<sup>6</sup>. Again, the censors read the text through the prism of current events, bypassing, or even misunderstanding author's historiosophic plan. It is worth paying attention to the characteristic allegations: the book is not a combat anti-German, does not address social problems, and is the fiction written with talent (sic). The German problem is particularly complicated due to the need to maintain political correctness to the comrades of the newly created GDR<sup>7</sup>. But even in the early 1949 the desired (and unrealized by Gołubiew) model describing the history of the Piast appears to be clear, combat anti-German attitude.

The books by Soviet and Russian authors, as well as current Polish authors have the lengthiest reviews (even a dozen or so typed pages!).

If the subject touches the *rotten relations of before-September Poland* the censor is also more effusive, especially considering the existence or not of a negative assessment of II Rzeczpospolita /the Second Republic/. And so we come to the next principle, which is guiding the employees of GUKPPiW in controlling the content of history - the existence of "legitimate and illegitimate" events and periods.

In the novel *Dwadzieścia lat życia /Twenty Years of Life/* by Zbigniew Uniłowski censors want to delete not assessed negatively hero's recollection of Pilsudski's Kiev expedition and the "miracle on the Vistula". However, the issue of interference in the text previously published (1937 and 1946) requires a higher level decision - the proposal is sent to the director<sup>8</sup>.

From the archival materials is not clear what the further fate of any deletions was. However, in 1955 we have the expanded edition of the novel, enriched with two texts published in the press even before the death of the writer - *Na dole /At the bottom/* and *Dalsze dzieje Kamila Kuranta /Further fate of Kamil Kurant/*<sup>9</sup>. It changed fundamentally the proportions of the text and "freed" the odium from the war in 1920, encasing the events of the war with subsequent fate of the participant.

The full dependence on the Soviet Union caused that any publicized texts were selected for the absence in them or not of any anti-Russian elements. Hence, you can notice the very selective treatment of Polish history, literary classics and modified pantheon of heroes. Describing in the literary work "unorthodox" periods and events in the history of Poland required their severest criticism by the narrator or the hero. If this was lacking, the texts were transformed or their publication was withheld. In a very particular situation "were" literary classics of the nineteenth century, yet pragmatically anti-Russian (like *Tamten /That One/* by Gabriela Zapolska) and anti-German. The issue, interesting and im-

<sup>5</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 145, teczka 31/23.

<sup>6</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 145, teczka 31/26.

<sup>7</sup> J.M. Bates, *Cenzura wobec problemu niemieckiego w Polsce (1948-1955)*, [w:] *Presja i ekspresja. Zjazd szczeciński i socrealizm*, red. D. Dąbrowska, P. Michałowski, Szczecin 2002, s. 79-92.

<sup>8</sup> AAN, GUKPPW, 386, teczka 31/126..

<sup>9</sup> *Współcześni polscy pisarze i badacze literatury*, red. J. Czachowska, A. Szałagan, Warszawa, 1994-2007, t. 8, s. 422.

portant to reflect on the culture of the 40s and 50s of the twentieth century, requires deeper study, the article only signals it.

„Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza” specialized in the publication of works on the rural subjects and works written by the authors of peasant origin. Next to the propaganda pamphlets, among which we may mention the bizarre *Z dziejów walki chłopskiej w starożytności /The History of Peasant Struggle in Antiquity/* (1952), also numerous novels by Józef Ignacy Kraszewski are printed. Censors most carefully read introductions to editions, which are to eliminate the imperfections of the main text, thanks to the interpreting commentary. The practice of adding such introductions, which GUKPPIW often postulated, the already cited Aleksander Pawlicki defines as the use of “principle of the last word”<sup>10</sup>. Such introductions should be - as the reviews preach - as wide as possible. Kraszewski’s novels are full of defects, but *little compact construction of the novel* - it is about *Banita /The Outlaw/ - is compensated by widely regarded historical - moral background (useful for school children)*<sup>11</sup>, so it is worth “working” over them.

Another method of adapting classics to the requirements of GUKPPIW turns out to be annotating the text with specific footnotes; the censors do not hesitate to change the author’s footnotes, which can be confirmed by the example of the 2-nd volume of *Dzieła /The Works/* by Juliusz Słowacki, where the poet’s anti-Russian postscript was removed (1950)<sup>12</sup>. When it comes to Kraszewski they certainly changed the footnote on Chmielnicki in the novel *Król Piast /King Piast/*<sup>13</sup>.

Every now and then some objections to the subsequent volumes of *Dzieła /The Works/* by Henryk Sienkiewicz, published in the years 1948-1955, come back to the office. They are published, but with the reluctant attitudes, to recall only two significant opinions: “Beautiful, but very harmful and false books by Sienkiewicz; footnotes to “Potop” /The Deluge/ striking with objectivity”. And even more reservations than historical novels by Sienkiewicz raise his *Kroniki i artykuły polityczne /Chronicles and Political Articles/*, in which: “the writer blurs the facts, disguises the case of oppression of the oppressed classes, speaks foaming at the mouth, imputes “banditry” to the revolutionary movement and talks nonsense”. Also, the contemporary novel *Wiry /The Swirls/* is directly challenged<sup>14</sup>

However, a large number of works is republished by these authors (sometimes only some titles) who gained the opinion of progressive ones. Such a title was earned by the author of *Miłosierdzie gminy /Mercy of Municipality/* - Maria Konopnicka: “[...] It is correct precisely today, when so much is written and heard about pseudo-democracy of the west, the publication of the story of commonly known Maria Konopnicka, so much current in the present era, although written in the year 1898”<sup>15</sup>. Other works of the writer, however, have not received such favorable ratings. In 1951, for example, *Jak to ze lnem było /How Was it with Linen/* was challenged, arguing that the King was presented in a harmful way.

Social issues have already appeared several times in the aforementioned reviews, to remind only Antoni Gołubiew’s novel *Bolesław Chrobry*, in relation to which the censors

<sup>10</sup> A. Pawlicki, dz.cyt.

<sup>11</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 154,teczka 31/134.

<sup>12</sup> More of the topic: K. Budrowska, dz.cyt., s. 281.

<sup>13</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 388,teczka 31/136 i 31/137.

<sup>14</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 386,teczka 31/122.

<sup>15</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 146,teczka 31/41.

formulated the objection that *it does not address social problems*. Works on historical themes, even the very distant chronologically, were supposed to be, in fact /it was another directive of GUKPPIW/ involved in the construction of a new social order. And so, in the opinion on the drama of Roman Brandstaetter *Król i aktor /The King and the Actor/* you can read that although the drama refers to the time of Stanisław August Poniatowski, it “[...] shows a line of socialist realism”<sup>16</sup>. Such a note causes obtaining consent and printing (1952) the text of the writer who was reluctantly perceived by the authorities, in connection with the religious theme of many works.

In 1952 T. Wojdalska, having no objections to other parts, sharply objected to the improper image of the peasant society in part II of *Chłopi /The Peasants/* by Reymont, which does not interfere with publishing the novel without changes in the following year. The review draws attention to the poverty of vocabulary and argumentation as well as to the clear dependence on the language of propaganda<sup>17</sup>. On the basis of such an essay its author would not pass the school test today.

Another recommendation clearly used in assessing historical subjects is tracking down religious themes. Religion was on a kind of censorship “black list”, which, with a great number of literary works touching the threads of religious and spiritual life of Poles, put censors in quite a trouble.

Reading the biographical essay *Chopin* by Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz (the borderland of fiction and nonfiction), for example, in 1949, the officer of GUKPPIW compliments the author’s good Polish language, but also comments on the account of the last sacrament of the dying composer. “Maybe it was like that, because a man in agony does not know what they are doing with him”. Next, he writes about Chopin’s atheism and free-thinking. However, in the second review its author - censor Szymbalska - is no longer happy about the book and is worried about the lack of Russian works in bibliography and the lack of emphasis on Chopin’s revolutionary spirit<sup>18</sup>. It is evident in the opinions of the controllers that there is the need for socially desired accents in the Polish history, as well as socially, not religiously involved heroes.

Christian elements cause grumbling of the reader of historical short stories *Bursztyny /Amber/* by Zofia Kossak. The collection goes for review on the March 12, 1958. The consent to printing comes the very next day. Censor Godlewska writes:

This is a collection of stories which give a total cross-section through the history of Poland, from pagan times to the wandering of the great exile in Paris. The individual stories are devoted to either landmark moments in our history (e.g. Baptism of Poland, Prussian homage, Targowica - confederation), or individuals who have played in the history a crucial role (eg. Casimir the Great, Rej, Kościuszko). In this historical perspective the author is always on the side of progressive, democratic elements. According to its essence, however, the author glorifies the role of the Church e.g., in the story “W uścisku dziejów” /In the Grip of History/ (p. 13 on baptism of Poland) or in “Proroczyna boży” /God’s Prophet/ (p. 22 about Skarga)<sup>19</sup>.

In 1958 it was no longer possible on such grounds to stop printing stories of just restored homeland of the writer and *Bursztyny /Amber/* are printed without any changes.

<sup>16</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 386, teczka 31/122.

<sup>17</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 386, teczka 31/123.

<sup>18</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 1/152, teczka 31/120.

<sup>19</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 1/596, teczka 68/2, k. 10-11.

Building a new pantheon often leads to bizarre treatments. In a repeated review of *Spotkania z Salomeą /Meetings with Salomea/* (it is another text from the periphery of fiction) by Mieczysław Jastrun there is a section in which the censor "defends" Słowacki against Jastrun, in connection with rather unfair approach and showing the poet as a shaky and weak person "[...] but only Słowacki knew for sure that the Polish proletariat will change and gain freedom"<sup>20</sup>.

\*\*\*

A particular care and caution of the censorship officers is put, as mentioned before, to controlling literature associated with the Second World War. This is connected on the one hand, with a sense of the historical importance of the events and the number of messages, on the other hand - with many controversial aspects of the Polish collective experience of 1939-1945. Hence, a number of reluctant reviews, transformation tips, postponing texts or their total elimination, or preventing the circulation, were giving in total the distortion of recent history<sup>21</sup>. Controversial issues are, above all, "Soviet", but also - as shown by the query - "German", "Jewish" and naturalism of presentation. I have discussed this extensively elsewhere, that the total suspension of the printing hung over the authors of the works, in which these uncomfortable issues - Extinction, invasion of the Red Army on the Polish eastern lands, Katyń, labor camps, activities of AK /Home Army/, the Warsaw Uprising, the attitude of Soviet soldiers to Polish population - were accompanied by poetics, which was reluctantly seen by GUKPPIW<sup>22</sup>. At this point I would like to present some interesting examples of censorship of texts about the war, to see whether there are here the same directives as in the evaluation of works depicting the events before 1939.

Bypassing proper historical context and referring to the current political situation instead, can be presented on an example of censors' relation to the German issue. December 24, 1949 is the date of review of *Niemcy /The Germans/* by Leon Kruczkowski. The feedback is positive, but not enthusiastic. They point out a number of drawbacks in the drama: it does not consider issues at the level of the class, the progressive forces in West Germany are poorly presented. However, the permission is granted to print a significant amount of 25,500 copies, with the conclusion: "The value of the drama lies in the publication of a number of political issues of wartime and postwar Germany and to demonstrate the incorrectness of the "apolitical" attitude"<sup>23</sup>. Thus, it turns out that the most important issue is not the description or responsibility for the committed crimes, but the existence of the *progressive forces*. We understand that they later co-created the GDR.

In the audit opinion on the novel *Kleszcze /Ticks/* by Wilhelm Szewczyk (published in 1951 and awarded a literary award of Gliwice<sup>24</sup> in the same year) as an important asset the censor recognizes the fact that the book, despite showing the Nazi invasion, is devoid of anti-German accents. In another review of the same novel we encounter, in turn, a distinctive social complaint: *The author does not take a clear class position in any issue. In the novel, the proletariat cannot be seen, but you can see the intelligence, the lower middle class and the working*

<sup>20</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, I/386,teczka 31/122.

<sup>21</sup> S. Siekierski, *Drugi obieg jako efekt istnienia cenzury*, [w:] Autor, tekst, cenzura. Prace na Kongres Slawistów w Krakowie, red. J. Pelc, M. Prejs, Warszawa 1998, s. 25-38.

<sup>22</sup> K. Budrowska, *Literatura i pisarze*, dz.cyt., s. 63-64.

<sup>23</sup> AAN, GUKPPIW, 146,teczka 31/41.

<sup>24</sup> *Współcześni polscy pisarze*, dz.cyt., t. 8, s. 172.

aristocracy (sic) shown with a distinct sentiment<sup>25</sup>. Thus, also the works about World War II were not supposed to be deprived of proper social accents.

In the descriptive report of the fourth quarter of 1950 we read, in turn, that one of the books proposed by the publishing house Książka i Wiedza which did not get the permission to be printed was a short story from the war collection *Ucieczka z Jasnej Polany/Escape from Yasnaya Polyana/* by Adolf Rudnicki<sup>26</sup>. The action is motivated by the *false setting of the German problem*. From the analysis of other materials it seems clear that it was the title story which had been withdrawn and which "returns" to the collection only during the "thaw" in the 1955 edition.

Numerous archive documents certify the fact of dividing the content relating to the years 1939 - 1945 according to the "legitimacy" of presentation. And here we have historical events and opinions misrepresented, elided, or specifically interpreted. From Maria Dąbrowska's occupation short story, to take an example of the outstanding writer - *W piękny letni poranek/On a Beautiful Summer Morning/* - the censor cuts the sentences which suggest inflicting the suffering on the Polish nation by the Soviet Union. They intervene in the thoughts of the hero caused by the view of a prisoner who escaped from a Soviet labor camp, feeding himself in the shop with bread: *What a shame ... What a pity they made us suffer so much... And right now, right now ... What a mistake ... What a pity!*<sup>27</sup> The story was to be printed in *Odrodzenie/Rebirth/* on April 27, 1948. It was printed as late as 1956 in the first volume of *Pisma wybrane/Selected Writings/* published by Czytelnik, thus bypassing several collections of short stories of the author issued in the years 1948-1956. In the edition changes proposed by the censors are registered.

In the same period (June 15, 1948) they checked Wojciech Żukrowski's short story *Swoi* reported for publication in the journal "Płomień" /Flame/. The text was removed entirely because of the forbidden subject; it spoke about the AK guerrillas, who rescued three Slovaks from captivity<sup>28</sup>. Interestingly, the work was not found in the bibliography of the author. Probably it was never published, so here you can put an editorial request for publication of the text preserved in the AAN version.

A part of closely hunted and cut military topics "is released" in the short period of the thaw, which in GUKPPiW lasted from the beginning of 1955 until the autumn of 1957. Then they published a part of the so-called "półkowników" /shelf-occupiers/, i.e. the works detained in its entirety. The studies suggest that these were mainly the works showing the war, to name the most important ones: *Opadły liście z drzew/The Leaves Fell from the Trees/* by Tadeusz Różewicz, *Buty/The Shoes/* and *Polska jesień/Polish Autumn/* by Jan Józef Szczepański, *Szpital Przemienienia/Hospital of the Transfiguration/* by Stanisław Lem (one-volume version). Here the issue is merely indicated; elsewhere I deal with it extensively<sup>29</sup>. During the period of easing of censorship they allowed to reveal the content related to AK-underground army, the helplessness of the civilian population, or the cruelty of the Germans, but most of all they agreed to the emergence of the tone of pessimism, or the immediacy of performance.

In 1957 *Kolumbowie, rocznik dwudziesty* by Roman Bratny - a very symptomatic novel, from the point of view of these considerations - received the permission to be printed.

<sup>25</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 386, teczka 31/122.

<sup>26</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 77, teczka 4/2a.

<sup>27</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 29, teczka 1/62, k. 9.

<sup>28</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 29, teczka 1/63, k. 6-9.

<sup>29</sup> K. Budrowska, op. cit., s. 53 i nast.

In the materials I came across a two-page positive opinion, calling for a series of interventions, of which the ones with anti-Soviet connotations were executed (Katyń, lack of patriotism in the Soviet simple man, the fate of AK forces in the areas occupied by the Red Army). The censor states that:

Pessimism of the book may not be an argument against its publishing. There is no doubt that the Home Army officer, editor of "Pokolenie" /Generation/, Roman Bratny put on the pages the passion to show the process of creation of the so-called "AK complex" and if this process has some distortions, this unmasking passion is to be blamed. The book is certainly the best and formally most mature work of Bratny. Its historical errors cannot be the allegations, since they serve the overall concept of the book. This is to be the bill with the past - with showing heroism, patriotism and injustice. If the bill is annoying - it is one tiny part of the price we pay today for the mistakes of the past. (...) However, the publication of the passages which, unfortunately, evoke the very anti-Soviet impression seems to be impossible<sup>30</sup>.

An important but disclosed historic moment turns out to be also the Warsaw Uprising, although it is described as a *historical error*. As in the past, and it will increase already in the early 1958, they negate any signals regarding the disgraceful actions of the Red Army and the persecution of Polish soldiers of other than communist pedigree.

To support my statements with the query examples, I would like to concentrate only on two cases, but again on the very eminent writers. Their creativity, constantly oscillating around the theme of World War II, induced the reluctant flurry among the "official factors". I am thinking of already mentioned Jan Józef Szczepański and Włodzimierz Odojewski. In 1958, they deleted in its entirety Jan Józef Szczepański's short story *Manekin /The Mannequin/* from No. 3 of "Twórczość". Its "settling of accounts" topic decided on the withdrawal of the text. It concerned the early-postwar investigations carried out on AK soldiers<sup>31</sup>. Interestingly, only fifteen years later the short story was published (Kraków, Wydawnictwo Literackie, 1973) in the collection *Opowiadania dawne i dawniejsze /Old and Older Stories/* emphasizing with the symbolic, as it seems, title its participation in GUKP-PiW<sup>32</sup>.

In the materials of Wydawnictwo Poznańskie - 1958 - there are traces of censoring of the collection of short stories *Codzienna ściana płaczu /Daily Wailing Wall/* by Odojewski. They propose to delete in its entirety two texts: *Nim drugi raz wstanie świt /Before the Second Dawn/* (vague title) and *Droga /The Road/*, these short stories were included entirely in the file<sup>33</sup>. As we know from literature, finally the publishing did not take place and the collection was stopped in its entirety by the censors<sup>34</sup>. The discovered documents indicate which short stories were considered the most unprintable, and so indirectly we can understand which issues were seen as particularly threatening (Kresy /Borderlands/ and "Soviet issues"). *Nim raz drugi wstanie świt* was published in the collection *Zmierzch świata /Twilight of the World/* in 1962. *Drogi* was never published in PRL /People's Republic of Poland/.

I suggested earlier that one of the important objectives of the work of censors read-

<sup>30</sup> AAN, GUKP PiW, 426,teczka 34/3, k. 371.

<sup>31</sup> AAN, GUKP PiW, 546,teczka 41/32.

<sup>32</sup> *Współcześni polscy pisarze*, dz.cyt., t. 8, s. 137.

<sup>33</sup> AAN, 427,teczka 34/6 i 34/7.

<sup>34</sup> *Współcześni polscy pisarze*, dz.cyt., t. 6, s. 124-126.



ing historical texts was the elimination of religious content. Both - declared religiosity of the author (recall Brandstaetter) and the tendency expressed in the work could cause harm to the book. In the collection "Wydawnictwa różne "K - P" 1948"<sup>35</sup>, we find a handwritten card with a negative opinion of a two-volume novel *Najeźdźcy /The Invaders/* by Jan Dobraczynski. The decision to withhold the 2-nd edition (1-st took place in 1946-1947), dedicated to the times of occupation, was affected by both the substantive content and the ideological attitude of Dobraczyński. In addition, the case was complicated by the fact that the print notification was made by a private publishing house, with which GUKPPiW /it is another interesting issue/ led a regular war.

It was no longer withheld, but profound changes were made to eliminate the Christian accents in the second edition of the camp prose *Dymy nad Birkenau /Smoke over Birkenau/* by Seweryna Szmaglewska. Between the edition of 1945 and 1948 there were as many as 8 transformations of the text, all about the religious overtones.

\*\*\*

Finally, I would like to collect the conclusions presented in the article. A certain picture of Polish history, which appears in connection with the activities of GUKPPiW and other official factors, changes over time. Even in the brief but turbulent period of 1948 - 1958 the picture of Polish history was extensively modified at least twice: in 1949, they tightened the freedom to present content, and when at the end of 1955 some of the topics were "laid off" from prohibitions for a while.

Formulation of a particular vision of the past seems to be particularly urgent, from the point of view of the office of censorship, in relation to World War II. Making this experience historical creates the distance necessary to build the vision displacing the memory and current social experience<sup>36</sup>. The descriptions of the years 1939 - 1945 contain particularly many "legitimate" and "illegitimate" moments. Despite of multiple controversial occupation topics it was impossible to stop printing all publications, which GUKPPiW simply had to accept. Hence, the fate of the works addressing the topic of World War II was so intricate.

Trying to recreate the guidelines, according to which they censored literature thematically related to Polish history, I skipped the most outstanding artistic texts covering the experience of war - *Medaliony /Medallions/* by Zofia Nałkowska, labor camp stories by Tadeusz Borowski, or Tadeusz Różewicz's poetry. In these cases, however, and I studied them elsewhere, all recommendations collided and modified under the influence of excellence of the text. You could see them more clearly when the censor was more courageous with the text, recognizing it (rightly or wrongly) as mediocre.

One can also mention another issue related to the historical topics - choosing "historical costume" as one of the methods to escape from censorship. Both - Leszek Szaruga<sup>37</sup> and Ryszard Nycz<sup>38</sup> write about it. In such cases one usually chooses the alien history, and if it is the Polish history - it's very old. I only indicate the issue here.

---

<sup>35</sup> AAN, GUKPPiW, 182, k. 277-278.

<sup>36</sup> Zob. Z. Wóycicka, *Przerwana żałoba. Polskie spory wokół pamięci nazistowskich obozów koncentracyjnych i zagłady. 1944-1950*, Warszawa 2009.

<sup>37</sup> Na ten temat: L. Szaruga, *Wobec totalitaryzmu. Kostium kościelny w prozie polskiej. Wobec cenzury*, Szczecin 1994.

<sup>38</sup> R. Nycz, *Literatura polska w cieniu cenzury (Wykład)*, [w:] „Teksty Drugie”, 1998, nr 3, s. 5-25.

Резюме

Камила Будровска

**Цензурированное прошлое. Польский Главлит и картина истории Польши в литературе 1948-1958 гг.**

В статье рассматривается вопрос о цензурирования образа польской истории в беллетристике в 1948-1958 годы. Польское Главное Управление по делам Печати резко контролирует - как видно из архивных исследований, проведенных автором - спорные с точки зрения коммунистических властей, исторические факты и их изображение, созданные в литературных произведениях того класса, что «Потоп» Сенкевича, или «Хлопи» Реймонта. Сильной регламентации подвергаются информации о второй мировой войне а особенно о нападении Советского Союза на Польшу в 1939 г., структур подпольного государства и его партизанских отрядов, истребления евреев, все это является причиной серьезных перемен в работах писателей затрагивающих эти вопросы: Одоевского, Лема или Ружевича.

Streszczenie

Kamila Budrowska

**Ocenzurowana przeszłość. GUKPPiW i obraz historii Polski w literaturze w latach 1948-1958**

W artykule podjęto kwestię cenzurowania obrazu historii Polski w literaturze pięknej w latach 1948 – 1958. GUKPPiW ostro kontroluje – jak wynika z badań archiwalnych prowadzonych przez autorkę – kontrowersyjne, z punktu widzenia komunistycznych władz, fakty historyczne i ich obraz stworzony w dziełach literackich tej miary, co *Potop* Sienkiewicza, czy *Chłopi* Reymonta. Najściślej reglamentowana jest jednak wiedza na temat II wojny światowej, tu zwłaszcza problem agresji radzieckiej na Polskę w 1939 r., struktur państwa podziemnego i jego oddziałów zbrojnych (AK), zagłady Żydów. Stąd poważne zmiany w utworach pisarzy podejmujących te kwestie: Odojewskiego, Lema, czy Różewicza.

