

# acta

# 5-8/88

**Havel: Cards on the Table  
Symposium Prague-Vienna  
Havel: Neglected Generation  
Vaculík: August's November**

**Rupnik-Jungmann-Šimečka:  
Intellectuals and Power  
Portraits of the Defiant  
Tatarka's „Jottings“**

**Eva Kantůrková's „Jan Hus“  
„Central Europe“ Journal  
Jiří Theiner: In Memoriam**

**Samizdat Periodicals in  
Czechoslovakia, 1977-88  
„Historical Studies“  
Solidarity with I. Polanský**



**Quarterly of the Documentation  
Centre for the Promotion of Independent  
Czechoslovak Literature**

**ACTA, Vol. 2, No. 5-8, Winter 1988**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Václav Havel: Cards on the table	1
<b>CZECHOSLOVAKIA 1988</b>	
Czechoslovakia in the European context, 1918-1988 (Symposium „Czechoslovakia '88“)	4
Jacques Rupnik: Intellectuals and power in Czechoslovakia	11
Václav Havel: A neglected generation	21
Ludvík Vaculík: August's November	24
<b>ARTICLES ON CZECHOSLOVAK LITERATURE</b>	
Milan Jungmann: Sketeches for portraits of the defiant	26
Milan Šimečka: Tatarka's „jottings“	36
<b>CRITIQUE, BOOKS AND JOURNALS</b>	
„Jan Hus“ by Eva Kantůrková (M. Rejchrt)	41
The journal „Střední Evropa“	44
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK SAMIZDAT</b>	
„Historical studies“ 1978-1988	51
Samizdat periodicals 1977-1988	64
Jiří Theiner: In memoriam	83
Solidarity with Ivan Polanský	86
Grant in memory of Bedřich Fučík	90
Vladimír Solovjov Prize awarded	91
News about the Czech edition of Patočka's Works	92
ČSDS publications 1986-88	93

ACTA. Quarterly of the Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature. The chief editor of ACTA is Jan Vladislav in Collaboration with Jiří Gruša and Vilém Prečan; John Keane is responsible for editing the English version.

Address: Dokumentationszentrum  
Schwarzenberg 6  
D-8533 Scheinfeld  
Telephone: 09162/7761

Acta are published in Czech and English versions. This English version of ACTA, No. 5-8, has 96 pages, and went to press in December 1988.

**DOCUMENTATION CENTRE FOR THE  
PROMOTION OF INDEPENDENT  
CZECHOSLOVAK LITERATURE (ČSDS)**

Founding members: Jiří Gruša (Vice-chairman), František Janouch, Josef Jelínek (Secretary), Ivan Medek, Jiří Pelikán, Vilém Prečan, Karel Jan Schwarzenberg, Pavel Tigrid, Jan Vladislav (Chairman) et al.

Academic Council: Professor H. Gordon Skilling, Toronto (President), Professor Włodimierz Brus (Oxford University), Professor Robert Byrnes (Indiana University, Bloomington), Professor Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz (University of British Columbia, Vancouver), Dr Eva Hartmann (Collegium Carolinum, Munich), Professor John Keane (The Polytechnic of Central London), Professor Erazim Kohák (Boston University), Professor Jacques Rupnik (Foundation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, Paris), Roger Scruton (University of London), Professor Anton Staudinger (Vienna University), Professor Josef Škvorecký (University of Toronto)

Honorary members: Václav Havel, Miroslav Kusý, Hana Ponická, Dominik Tatarka, Milan Uhde, Ludvík Vaculík

- © Dokumentationszentrum zur Förderung der unabhängigen tschechoslowakischen Literatur e. V., 1988
- © Translation copyright by A. G. Brain, except for the article by Jacques Rupnik which was written in English, and the article *a neglected generation* by V. Havel which was translated by Paul Wilson.

Texts from ACTA may be reprinted after prior agreement and on condition that the source is given.

Price: DM 40. Subscribers receive in addition a copy of the publication „About Theatre“ and of the pamphlet „Democracy for All“.

ISBN: 3-89014-039-4

Production: Druck + Papier Meyer, GmbH  
8533 Scheinfeld, West Germany

The Central and East European Publishing Project, Oxford, contributed substantially to the publication of this present volume of ACTA.

## CARDS ON THE TABLE

For Czechoslovakia, 1988 was not just a year of several notable round anniversaries. It was also a year of great political importance for our country – as we have come to expect of years ending in an eight. Admittedly there has been no dramatic turn of events, either for the better or the worse, but something did happen, nevertheless: the cards were put on the table, so to speak.

At long last, people started to assert openly that they no longer intend to put up apathetically with the imposed status quo and that they have the capacity to do something more for freedom than just sympathising tacitly with Charter 77 when listening to foreign broadcasts at home, swapping samizdat literature secretly with their workmates, or occasionally applauding some less inhibited theatrical production within the darkness of the auditorium. This was proved by the many thousands of citizens who had the courage to take part in independent demonstrations. But there are other signs as well: everywhere people are talking far more openly than before, even within highly official structures. More and more “licensed” artists, academics and journalists are beginning to call a spade a spade regardless of possible consequences. It looks as if the barrier which has been laboriously constructed between society and those citizens ready to speak their minds is beginning to crumble and fall away. People would seem to have

had their fill of the government’s inability to solve the problems which it has heaped upon itself, and they are growing tired of their own cautiousness.

But the regime has put its cards on the table too. Not only has it restructured itself in such a way that absolutely nothing is now left to chance – whereby it has destroyed any remaining illusion that society might have – it has even gone so far as to demonstrate quite unambiguously – either through the use of water-cannon, further arrests, bans of every kind, or hopelessly half-hearted reforms – that what really lies behind all its talk of “restructuring” and “democratisation” is the preservation of the existing totalitarian structures at all costs. “There will be no dialogue”, declared Mr Štěpán breezily from the platform on Wenceslas Square and he went on to show what he meant in eloquent fashion the following day when he took personal charge of the (happily erratic) water-cannon. There is only one possible interpretation of his words: abandon all hopes you may have of any real shift or change of direction.

The cards are on the table. How the game will proceed from here on is anyone’s guess. While it is true that the water-cannon are not particularly functional, it is equally true that civic awareness will not suddenly start to function trouble-free after twenty years of neglect. So the game is not going to be an easy one – for any of the players.

---

What is most important is that the “game” has started at all: or more precisely, that it has entered a new phase – one in which it is impossible to pretend that there is nothing to play for.

And as happens at such moments of truth, something has surfaced, as it always does when a totalitarian system of a Communist type gets itself into a crisis (or alternatively, when it tries to reform itself). Its corner-stone and formal self-justification: the notorious dogma of the leading role of the Communist Party – a dogma that is incompatible with the democratic functioning of any constitution – has been called into question. In other words, the idea of PLURALISM has emerged, the idea that no ideology, doctrine or political force should a priori and for all time (i.e. through constitutional legislation) dominate all others, but that everyone has an equal right to seek political power.

There is nothing new about this, of course. As a result of the political ferment that we are witnessing almost everywhere in the Soviet bloc, the idea of pluralism is emerging all around us. The way the Communist leadership reacts to it varies from country to country. Gorbachov speaks of “socialist pluralism” by which he most likely means a plurality of views both within the Communist Party as the leading force, and outside it. When Rakowski talks about political pluralism, he probably has in mind giving opposition forces a few seats in the government and parliament as a safety-valve for social discontent and a way of diverting attention away from his worst nightmare: trade-union pluralism. So far, it is the Hungarian Party leader Imre Poszgay who has gone furthest in this direction, particularly in his unam-

biguous declaration that there would be no place at all in the new Hungarian constitution for a clause stipulating the leading role of the Party.

In Czechoslovakia, this idea was proclaimed openly in October in the manifesto of the recently-created MOVEMENT FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES (HOS), significantly entitled DEMOCRACY FOR ALL. It is no coincidence that it happened this year in particular: if the time has come for putting cards on the table, then this card – the last, but in its way the most important of all – had to be played too.

The value of the DEMOCRACY FOR ALL manifesto does not reside in the originality of its thinking. Most of what it says has long been taken more or less for granted by all sensible people here (which does not mean to say that certain details of the manifesto might not prove controversial).

Its value lies in the fact that it sets out all these different self-evident truths IN A SINGLE DOCUMENT, and does so PUBLICLY, AS A BASIS FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY, and not as someone’s private viewpoint.

What HOS will develop into only time will tell. Maybe it will quickly become an integral feature of our country’s life, albeit one not particularly beloved of the regime (rather like Charter 77). Perhaps it will remain for the time being merely the seed of something that will bear fruit in the dim and distant future. It is equally possible that the entire “matter” will be stamped on hard (although criminal investigation has so far been initiated solely into “the matter”, and no one has yet been charged or arrested in connection with it). But whatever happens, one thing is already clear: the logic behind the constitutional enshrining of the leading role of one particular party has been openly called into question and these misgivings

---

have been voiced and disseminated along with other fundamental concerns. This is of enormous significance. What has been done in this way can no longer be undone. This public declaration of the emperor's nakedness will go on sounding in the ears of all onlookers for so long as he remains without clothes, or at least until such a time as fear will have stopped up the last receptive ears (which is by now a most unlikely alternative).

Of course, many other hopeful things happened in 1988 apart from that manifesto. But even if nothing else had happened it would have been a great deal. Whatever turn the game takes now, one thing is certain: it will be impossible to ignore this new card. Besides there is no telling whether this particular card could ever have been played without the others.

The fact that 1988 saw an end to the taboo about the leading role of the Party (among other things) as well as a call for the rehabilitation of politics may well be important in the long term. However, there is an issue that seems to me even more important for us in the here and now. I refer to a "leading role" of rather a different kind, namely, what is to gain the upper hand in the immediate future: the awakening spirit of free-

dom, common sense and civic awareness, or the water-cannon?

It could well be the water-cannon, of course. But its domination will certainly not last for ever. Soaking people to the skin and scaring them is one thing, eliminating civil discontent is another. Water-cannon are more likely to intensify the latter, rather than eliminate it. Above all, there is no way now they will avert the logical consequences of the present political and economic events.

So we should enter the new year without any illusions, but also with the assurance that the prison warder who talked to me in my cell on 28th October was not wrong when he said: You've got truth on your side!

Prague, 1st December 1988; written for *Lidové noviny*.

This essay by Václav Havel not only serves as the editorial but also helps explain the production delays in the second annual series of Acta.

*The Editors*

---

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA 1988

### CZECHOSLOVAKIA IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT, 1918-1988

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM CZECHOSLOVAKIA '88

By a strange coincidence, a number of fateful events in the recent history of the Czechs and Slovaks occurred in years ending in an eight. Consequently, this year we shall be commemorating several key anniversaries at the same time. And because of our country's specific geo-political circumstances – amongst other reasons – the events in question had repercussions well beyond the national borders and indeed had a major impact on the history of the entire European continent. On each occasion, the course of European history was fundamentally changed, for better or worse. They were events that usually gave rise to a historical dilemma, and generally left some permanent mark on the continent's history. On more than one occasion, an event that seemed to be of purely Czechoslovak importance either presaged various wider European developments or threw light on certain European aspirations or disasters.

The creation of an independent Czechoslovak state in 1918 and the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy totally transformed the European political map and were the key to subsequent developments in Europe and a prelude to

the coming dangers. The Munich diktat of 1938 and the policy of appeasement of violence that it came to symbolise were the main factors that encouraged and paved the way for Hitler's expansion and World War II. The coup d'Etat of February 1948 was conceivably the final and crucial step towards the lasting division of Europe and the continued escalation of the Cold War. The Prague Spring of 1968 was the culmination of a period, dating back to the late fifties, during which attempts were made in various countries of the bloc to reform the Soviet-style system. The Soviet intervention brought that era to a tragic end. At the same time it was a test of how far the Brezhnev regime could go in consolidating Soviet superpower hegemony. And now, in 1988, there is a sense in which Czechoslovakia is once again a historical testing ground. The contrast between political inertia and the need for change, highlighted by the current developments in the USSR, is most obvious here in Czechoslovakia. It could well be that it will fall to our country to test the seriousness, depth and credibility of the new policies being pursued by the Soviet bloc.

We have come to realise that our country's internal situation, in terms of human dignity, democracy, social harmony and tolerance, is intimately bound up with the overall European context and has always been in some way indicative of the prospects of peace on the continent. There were some Czechoslovak politicians in the past who showed an awareness of these linkages and

of their own special responsibility. Hence a number of major initiatives motivated by the ideal of a friendly and peaceful European community of sovereign democratic states originated in our country. And it is still a valid ideal in the eyes of Charter 77 and other independently-minded groups and individuals in Czechoslovakia. There are many of us who believe that it is actually more topical now than ever before and we are doing what we can to promote it, though our scope for action is limited. Incidentally, this helps explain Charter 77's constant insistence that human rights, a democratic order and mutual tolerance are the only rational basis for genuine and lasting peace.

Clearly these are wide-ranging and complex issues, with many intellectual, spiritual and cultural ramifications, which demand analysis and conceptual debate. In view of this, we have decided to mark this year's anniversaries with an informal, independent symposium on the topic: Czechoslovakia in the European context 1918–1988.

Prague, 25th May 1988

On behalf of the Symposium Steering Committee :

Václav Havel, Miloš Hájek, Radim Palouš, Emanuel Mandler, Rudolf Battěk, Ladislav Lis, Libuše Šilhánová

#### LIST OF PAPERS

prepared for the international symposium CZECHOSLOVAKIA 88, organised in parallel in Prague and Vienna, 11th-13th November and

13th-14th November respectively, and declared to be permanent until such a time as it can be brought to a regular conclusion by the chairman of the steering committee, Václav Havel.

- BENDA, Václav (Prague):  
Programme for a decade of spiritual renewal
- BRUS, Włodimierz (Oxford):  
The East European countries from the "Brezhnev doctrine" to the new Gorbachev course
- BŘACH, Radko (Prague):  
Eduard Beneš as Foreign Minister
- CÍSAŘ, Čestmír (Prague):  
Czechoslovakia in the European context 1988
- CÍSAŘOVSKÁ, Blanka (Prague):  
Russia and the creation of Czechoslovakia
- CÍSAŘOVSKÝ, Josef (Prague):  
A few comments on our present cultural crisis
- DIENSTBIER, Jiří (Prague):  
The need for a foreign policy
- DOMAŇSKÝ, Josef (Brno):  
Notes on historical contingency and the contribution of the Czech question to the 20th century
- GARTON ASH, Timothy (Oxford):  
Reform or revolution?  
\*\*\*The Prague advertisement
- HÁJEK, Jiří (Prague):  
Human rights and civil liberties in the context of the "Prague Spring" 1968
- HÁJEK, Miloš (Prague):  
The workers' internationals and the foundation of the Czechoslovak republic
- HEJDÁNEK, Ladislav (Prague):  
A message of the past and a promise of things to come

- 
- HŮBL, Milan (Prague):  
Some “unexplored ground” surrounding Munich  
1938
- JANÁT, Bohumír (Prague):  
The spiritual roots of our recent history
- JELÍNEK, Yeshayahu (Israel):  
The Czechs, the Slovaks and the Jews: 70 years of  
coexistence and confrontation
- JIČÍNSKÝ, Zdeněk (Prague):  
The ideology of the CPCz and the democratic tradi-  
tion
- JUNGMANN, Milan (Prague):  
The sectarian concept of Czech culture
- JUNIUS, S. V. (Prague):  
The Czech Sokol movement and the creation of the  
Czechoslovak Republic
- KADLECOVÁ, Erika (Prague):  
Religious freedom and this year’s anniversaries
- KALVODA, Josef (USA):  
The Prague Spring 1968
- KANTŮRKOVÁ, Eva (Prague):  
The Czech ethos in Václav Černý’s “Memoirs”
- KAUTMAN, František (Prague):  
The tragic element in Czech nationalism: Viktor Dyk
- KOHÁK, Erazim (USA):  
Being philosophical about 28th October
- KOHOUT, Jaroslav (Prague):  
Masaryk’s Czechoslovakia 70 years on: ideal and re-  
ality
- KOHOUT, Luboš (Prague):  
The state of historical research and perception  
about 1968 in Czechoslovakia – and related prob-  
lems
- KOVÁŘ, Adam (Prague):  
Some positive and negative features of our economy
- KŘEN, Jan (Prague):  
The rehabilitation of 28th October: the way it’s been  
and the way it ought to be
- KUSÝ, Miroslav (Bratislava):  
The Slovaks and Czechoslovak statehood
- LIPPELT, Helmut (Bonn):  
Stellungnahme zum Vorschlag einer “European As-  
sembly for Peace and Democracy” /Position paper to  
the proposal for a “European Assembly for Peace  
and Democracy”/
- MENCL, Vojtěch (Prague):  
The Czech experience – how to survive without atro-  
phying
- MEZNÍK, Jaroslav (Brno):  
Responsibility for history, responsibility before his-  
tory
- OPAT, Jaroslav (Prague):  
Grin and bear it?
- PALOUŠ, Radim (Prague):  
Czechoslovakia and the change of an era
- PELIKÁN, Jiří (Rome):  
Problems in the transition from totalitarianism to  
democracy
- PREČAN, Vilém (Scheinfeld):  
A note on the relations between Czechs and Slovaks
- RUPNIK, Jacques (Paris):  
Intellectuals and power in Czechoslovakia
- ŠABATA, Jaroslav (Brno):  
Czechoslovakia in the perspective of a democratic  
and united Europe
- ŠAMALÍK, František (Prague):  
The historical origins of Czech humanitarian democ-  
racy
- ŠIMEČKA, Milan (Bratislava):  
Czechoslovakia 1988 – our prospects to the end of  
the century



---

TIGRID, Pavel (Paris):  
Freedom as an act

VRABEC, Václav (Prague):  
Democracy and socialism: the tradition of human rights struggle in the Czech labour movement

ZUKAL, Rudolf (Prague):  
Czechoslovak emigration through the eyes of an economist

ZVĚŘINA, Josef (Prague):  
Some views on religious life in the Czech lands, 1918-1988

\*\*\* Timothy Garton Ash sent the symposium in Prague a paper entitled *Reform or revolution?* and in December 1988 published in *The New York Review of Books* (Vol. XXXV, No.20, pp.36-39) an article entitled *The Prague advertisement*, which he described as a contribution to the permanent symposium Czechoslovakia 88.

Charter 77 Document No 56/88

Prague, 16th November 1988

#### MINDLESS HARASSMENT OF "CZECHOSLOVAKIA 88" SYMPOSIUM

Early last summer, a group of independent historians together with other people with an interest in modern history decided to organise a symposium around the four main watersheds in Czechoslovakia's history (1918, 1938, 1948 and 1968), with particular reference to the violation and defence of human and civil rights. They were motivated by the belief that every cultured nation has

both the right and the duty to reflect freely on its past and assess its present situation, as well as to draw conclusions therefrom for its further development. The responsibility for preparing this specialised gathering was assumed by representatives of independent initiatives who set up a steering committee and issued a document on 6th September last announcing their intention to hold a symposium entitled "Czechoslovakia 88" and subtitled "Czechoslovakia in the European context", from 11th to 13th November 1988. Invitations to the symposium were extended to experts from home and abroad, as well as to a number of official institutions.

The steering committee saw no need to ask the Czechoslovak authorities for permission to hold the symposium since it was intended as a meeting of invited persons, not a public gathering. None the less, members of the steering committee approached the Prague City Council and the Presidium of the Czechoslovak government in person to inform the representatives of those bodies of the symposium's objectives. On both occasions, the steering committee members received a positive response, and were even assured at the offices of the City Council that such initiatives were useful and worthy of support. Nothing was said in the course of those meetings to suggest that there was any likelihood that the symposium would be banned. Several members of the steering committee merely received warnings from officers of the State Security Police that the symposium was allegedly "contrary to the interests of the working people". As late as 9th November, it appeared that the symposium would go ahead without interference. Most of the foreign partici-

---

pants received entry visas, although some of them were cautioned. Only a handful of the foreign guests were refused visas.

However, on the morning of 10th November, the Czechoslovak State Security Police launched a massive operation against confirmed and potential participants in the symposium. From the early hours of that day, historians, Charter 77 signatories and members of other citizens' initiatives were taken away for questioning. About forty of them were detained, and the majority of them subjected to lengthy interrogations. More than twenty potential participants (including 75-year-old Dr Jiří Hájek) were held in remand cells, particularly at Ruzyně Prison. The majority were held in cells for over 48 hours. They even included citizens who had not intended to take part the symposium, and had not been involved in its preparation. It was not until 10th November that the local council for the Prague 1 district issued an unlawful and absurd order banning the event, and of the organisers was formally notified of it in prison.

On Friday 11th November, when the three-day symposium was due to open, the rendezvous points on Republic Square and in its vicinity were cordoned off by uniformed police, and other potential participants were arrested and taken away for questioning.

The foreign participants assembled on 11th November at 8:30 a.m. in the Hotel Paříž. They included the executive director of the International Helsinki Federation, Gerald Nagler and the former Dutch Foreign Minister Max van der Stoel, together with representatives of national Helsinki committees, historians, journalists and

other distinguished personalities. At this point, the chairman of the symposium's steering committee, Václav Havel, made an unexpected appearance and announced to the foreign guests that the symposium participants were being arrested and that he too might be arrested at any moment. Without further ado he formally opened the "Czechoslovakia 88" symposium. Then, before the gaze of everyone present, he was immediately led away by State Security officers and driven off to interrogation and prison. The foreign participants then wrote a sharp protest to the General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Miloš Jakeš, and made representations to the State Security. They subsequently laid flowers on the grave of Professor Jan Patočka, one of the founders of Charter 77.

In spite of large-scale police repression, the discussions continued in private apartments and in the cells at Ruzyně Prison. A parallel event along the same lines had been arranged in Vienna on 13th and 14th November for those foreign participants who were unable to attend the Prague symposium. The Vienna participants were apprised of the thirty and more papers written for the Prague symposium. The participants in the Prague and Vienna symposia agreed that the *Czechoslovakia 88* symposium should remain open until such a time as Václav Havel would be able to bring it to a regular close in Prague. Papers already submitted to the symposium would be published in collected form, while all further contributions would be presented as "intended for the 'Czechoslovakia 88' standing symposium".

The sabotage of the symposium and the widespread police harassment of independently-

---

minded Czechoslovak citizens received unusually wide coverage in the foreign media. The Czechoslovak government has received protests about the intimidation from several other European governments, and the matter has also been raised at the Vienna follow-up meeting of the Helsinki Conference, where it was described as an act that grossly violated the principles both of the Conference and of the follow-up talks. The overall outcome of the harassment, therefore, is as follows: 1. Far greater publicity for the symposium than it would have received had it taken place; 2. an enormous disgrace for the Czechoslovak authorities, who have demonstrated to representatives of civilised countries that they are among the most conservative in Europe (particularly in comparison with Hungary, the Soviet Union and Poland, where several meetings of a similar kind have been held undisturbed in the recent period); 3. far from being ruined, the symposium was the more effective for what happened, and it will stay in existence – many experts and other interested parties who have learnt about it having expressed their desire to submit their own papers.

As representatives of independent initiatives we adamantly protest against this police interference and pose the question: who stood to gain from this preposterous police action, and ordered it – apparently at the last moment? We demand that the appropriate authorities – and chiefly governmental bodies – should condemn and thoroughly investigate the operation. Such an investigation must take into account the enormous cost involved in this senseless and unlawful action and it should lead to sanctions, including occupational ones, against those responsible. At the same time,

we would caution Czechoslovakia's political leaders that the longer they postpone a dialogue with the representatives of independent citizens' initiatives, the more the restlessness in our society will grow. For the fact is that increasing numbers of people are beginning to regard the work of the citizens' initiatives as a reflection of their own thinking and true aspirations. This was also the clear lesson of the recent demonstrations. What is required is an objective and tolerant attitude to these initiatives. The opening of a dialogue must not be postponed any longer. Otherwise it might be too late and the manifestations of general discontent will become uncontrollable.

On many previous occasions, Charter 77 and other citizens' initiatives have addressed their lawful demands, critical letters and analyses to the Czechoslovak political authorities. Apart from rare exceptions, they have never received any response from official bodies. We once more request the opening of a rational dialogue between the authorities and our representatives and a halt to absurd and unlawful repression.

Stanislav Devátý, Miloš Hájek, Bohumír Janát – Charter 77 spokesmen

Jana Petrová – The Independent Peace Association

Petr Bartoš, Pavel Jungmann, Bedřich Koutný – Friends of the USA Association

Any additions or corrections to our information about samizdat publications will be most warmly welcomed, and will be published.

---

DECLARATION  
of the foreign participants of the  
Prague meeting

We, the foreign participants at the Prague seminar "Czechoslovakia '88" strongly protest against the arbitrary actions of the police and security services to prevent the seminar taking place. Before he was arrested, when meeting us, Václav Havel declared the seminar opened. We consider the continuation of this seminar about the significance of the anniversaries of 1918, 1938, 1948 and 1968 for Czechoslovakia and the whole of Europe be entirely legitimate. The disruption of the meeting is a blatant violation of the Helsinki Final Act. We therefore are filing our protest with the government of the ČSSR and informing all the CSCE delegations at the Vienna Review Conference.

Prague, 11th November 1918

DECLARATION  
adopted by the participants of the  
Vienna meeting

We, the participants of the Vienna meeting organised in parallel with the Prague symposium "Czechoslovakia '88"

EXPRESS our support to those who in Czechoslovakia attempt to carry out a free and open discussion of their country's past and present;

PROTEST against the violent police action against a peaceful historical seminar which was to be held in the Czechoslovak capital and in connection with which dozens of Czech and Slovak citizens were arrested, some of them still being held in jail;

ACCUSE the Czechoslovak authorities of flagrant violations of the Helsinki Final Act and other international agreements duly signed by the Prague government;

STATE that at a time when in some other Soviet bloc countries human and civil rights are enlarged, in Czechoslovakia, on the contrary, repression and police terror reign, resembling some of the worst periods of blind persecution;

REQUEST that the Czechoslovak authorities immediately release all those who wanted to attend the Prague symposium and were arrested, as well as the other political prisoners, and apologise publicly for the unheard-of police action in Prague;

ASK the Austrian representatives at the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe to submit on our behalf this protest to the Czechoslovak delegation to the Vienna Follow-up Conference.

Vienna, 13th November 1988

---

Jacques Rupnik

## INTELLECTUALS AND THE POWER IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

This paper was sent to the symposium  
organisers in Prague and delivered in abridged  
form at the meeting in Vienna  
on 13th November 1988

*“Le monde ne sera sauvé, s’il peut l’être, que par des  
insoumis. Sans eux c’en serait fait de notre civilisa-  
tion, de notre culture, de ce que nous aimions et qui  
donnait à notre existence sur cette terre une justifi-  
cation secrète. Ils sont, ces insoumis, »le sel de la  
terre« et les responsables de Dieu.”*

*André Gide, Journal, 1939*

*“It didn’t require great character at all our refusal,  
disagreement and resistance we had a shred of nec-  
essary courage but fundamentally it was a matter of  
taste.”*

*Zbigniew Herbert*

Perhaps nowhere else in post-war East-Central Europe has the dilemma of the intellectuals – torn between power and society – been more sharply focused than in Czechoslovakia. In 1948, the fair majority of the Czech (and to some extent the Slovak) intellectuals supported the Communist take-over; they identified with the new party-state and its ideology, which in turn rewarded them with the illusion of power and the realities of privilege. In 1988, the situation is quite the opposite: in the

face of a relentless “normalisation” process, the intellectuals defy political authority and assume the role of the “conscience of nation”. The missing link between these two contrasting situations is, of course, 1968: the triumph and the demise of the Czech intellectual; “enlightening” the ruler (the Party) in the Spring, expressing the resistance of a society in the long Winter which has not yet ended.

The odyssey of the Czech intellectuals thus appears as a perfect illustration of the European intellectual’s love affair with Marxism and Communism. It is the story of the “God that failed”, and the protagonists insist that it can only be properly understood in its historical context: the gradual erosion of messianic ideals by the praxis of social engineering, the story of change within intellectual and political generations (A. J. Liehm).

There is indeed a story to be told, but the 1968 version is too neat to be true; as always, it depends on who is telling the story. The last two decades brought a climate to introspection and critical re-examination of the role of the intellectuals. By revealing that there are different “stories”, it challenged the hitherto prevailing linear interpretation of post-war Czech intellectual history and restored pluralism and differentiation within the intelligentsia.

### I. The “Betrayal of the Clerks”

Czechoslovakia was the country where the Communists obtained the largest popular backing in Europe after the war: nearly 40 per cent in the relatively free elections of 1946.<sup>1</sup> They also en-

---

joyed the broadest intellectual support. On the eve of the February 1948 take-over, the Communists published a brochure entitled *My Attitude Towards the Communist Party* (Můj vztah ke KSČ). The list of well-known writers and artists who gave their support reads like a *Who's Who* of Czechoslovak intellectual elite of the time.<sup>2</sup> In the preface, the Minister of Information (and senior Soviet intelligence officer), Václav Kopecký, explained this support by arguing that the Communist Party had taken over the role of the bourgeoisie as the only force capable of uniting the interest of a class with that of the whole nation.

Whether or not the impressive list of intellectuals who lent their names to the Party's campaign actually believed such rationalisations, it could be argued that the Czechoslovak Communists' success seemed to follow a Gramscian model: winning a "cultural hegemony" in society even before they actually held the complete monopoly on political power. The triumph and staying power of Czech Stalinism (and conversely, the weakness of resistance to it) can be accounted for not just by the terror that came after 1948, but above all by the fact that the Communists conquered more than state power – they took over the system of values, the symbolic structure of the meaning that individuals and society give to their actions. The emergence of the "organic intellectual", confusing truth with political expediency, was not, in Czechoslovakia, the result of terror but of "conviction". "The pressure of the state machine is nothing compared with the pressure of a convincing argument," wrote Czesław Miłosz. In *The Captive Mind*, he gave us memorable portraits of Polish intellectual seduced by the "new faith" that came in from the East: former Catholic nationa-

lists (Andrzejewski) and survivors of the death camps; pre-war fellow travellers and post-war converts, sometimes returning from exile (Galczynski, Slonimski). A mixture of fascination and a feeling of impotence, opportunism and the need to belong to an irresistible and irreversible force of History.

"Why did I become a Communist?" asks the main character in Milan Kundera's novel *The Joke*, and explains that it was the excitement of belonging to a movement which was at the "steering wheel of history". "At the time we could really decide the fate of the people" – they were not just "dizzy with power" but intoxicated at the prospect of mastering history as well.<sup>3</sup> Marx, after all, declared that the task of the intellectuals was no longer to interpret the world but to change it. Thus understanding "utopia in power" refers to the ancient divide between *vita activa* and *vita contemplativa*.

But there is also, Miłosz suggested, an element of deceit, what he called "the art of the ketman", of outward conformism transposed from the Islamic to the Communist world. To the point when it became unclear who was deceiving whom: to what extent was "the power" aware (and how much did it mind) being deceived by the writer? Or might not the conformist writer in the end be deceiving only himself?

In his short story *Edward and God*, Kundera makes a similar point that the ultimate intention of the Communists is to defeat "truth" rather than simply to vanquish politically: "If I obstinately told a man the truth to his face, it would mean that I am taking him seriously. And to take something so unimportant seriously means to become less than serious oneself. I, you see, *must* lie, if I don't

---

want to take madmen seriously and become one of them myself.”

Beyond the paradoxes of fascination and deceit, a deeper explanation for the appeal of communism at the end of the war was the collapse of the old world and its values. Jan Patočka observed that Masarykian liberal rationalism was not enough in the age of Hitler and Stalin. There was widespread contempt in Central Europe for liberal values and politics, which accounts at least in part for the weak resistance to Communism. As John Dos Passos put it: to be liberal or a social democrat at the end of the war was like drinking small beer.

A few specifically Czech traits may, however, facilitate comparisons. To trace the origins of the *intellectual engagé* in Czechoslovakia, one has to recall that, since the decimation of the Czech nobility in the 17th century, it was the intellectuals (writers, scholars, etc.) who took over as the elite of the nation. In the 19th century, before a bourgeoisie had developed, the intellectuals took a leading part in the “national revival”, with its emphasis on language and history. Culture became a substitute for politics. Whereas in Poland and Hungary, intellectual and political elites were aristocratic, the Czech intellectuals were of plebeian origin. This also accounts for the differences in style of intellectual and political discourse: in contrast to the spirit of defiance and independence of the elites in the two neighbouring countries, the Czech intellectuals were “realists”, proud of their close identification with the people.

The power of the written word was somewhat overvalued while political power was often despised or underestimated. The *Dichter* and *Denker* were naturally held in high esteem. The newly

created state in 1918 was a “Republic of the Professors”. Masaryk was the President- philosopher and Beneš, his successor, was an academic, too. (Even in the 1960’s, an opinion poll showed that university professors were still considered to top the social status scale. This, I presume, would no longer be the case today.) Every week, President Masaryk would attend a literary salon held by the Čapek brothers. Could one imagine a contemporary statesman doing the same?

Culture in Bohemia was, however, always more “progressive” than politics.<sup>4</sup> When, in the 19th century, Czech political representation was still conservative, the intellectuals were liberal. When liberal politicians took over, the intellectuals were democrats. After the First World War, as Czechoslovak political leadership became democratic, the intellectuals were moved to the radical Left.

This, of course, is an over-simplification, but it can be said that the inter-war relationship between Czech intellectuals and politics resembled (and was much influenced by) the French pattern. To be an intellectual was almost synonymous with being on the left. Indeed, the Czechoslovak and French Communist Parties were, after the advent of Nazism in Germany, the two largest CP’s in democratic Europe. And it is because they operated in a democratic environment that they were able to attract a substantial section of this intellectuals and at the same time build an extremely resilient Stalinist protection shield to insulate themselves from the contagion of democratic environment. Gottwald was the Czech Maurice Thorez and even the split between Communists and surrealists had its Czech equivalents: Vítězslav Nezval was the Czech Aragon while Karel Teige,

---

the theoretician of the artistic avant-garde, sided with Breton. Such controversies within the intellectual left were considered a normal part of intellectual life.<sup>5</sup> It was only after the war that they became deadly serious. Harassed by the regime, Teige died prematurely of a heart attack in 1950. Závěš Kalandra, a talented Marxist philosopher and historian, was sentenced to death in the very first of the show trials of the Stalinists era. In Paris, André Breton wrote an open letter to the poet Paul Eluard (who knew Kalandra well), to intercede on behalf of the Czech writer. Eluard replied with a memorable excuse: "I am too busy defending the innocent who claim their innocence to deal with guilty people who admit their guilt." If Communists had seized power in France after the war, it is a fair guess that their reign of terror would have been as murderous as it has been in Czechoslovakia. In 1945, Czechoslovak intellectuals did not have the impression of severing their traditional ties with the West in endorsing the "new faith" from the East. After all, leading intellectuals in Paris were undergoing a similar conversion (without, of course, having to suffer the consequences).

Liberals, like Karel Čapek, the country's leading writer of the inter-war generation, did try to argue against the radical drift of the intelligentsia, but with limited success. In 1924, he published a piece entitled: *Why am I not a Communist?* It argued against Communism's "pessimism and dismal hatred pumped artificially" into the working class. There is no proletarian culture, he declared. "Whatever cultural values we have left reside in the middle class, or so-called intellectual class. The proletariat can claim its share of this tradition and work within it, but if Communism just rushes

on ahead and rejects everything it calls bourgeois culture, then goodbye, nothing will be left."

The liberal generation of the First Republic (Masaryk, Šalda, Čapek etc.) disappeared on the eve of or during the war. But it was Munich, the betrayal by the West, which played a decisive part in the shift eastwards (and to the left) of the new post-war generation. The collapse of Masaryk's Republic meant also the collapse of the values associated with it. The Communist Party seemed best equipped to capture the aspirations to radical change, as Pavel Kohout recalled in a 1964 article:

"For my generation the arrival of Russian tanks was a real miracle... The perspective of a socialist revolution seemed to be the only starting point... Our enemies wanted to restore capitalism. Most of all, I liked being the poet of the revolution. It was an era of great faith that around the corner was the time when the best ideals of humanity would be realised. I am not ashamed of that faith, whatever I called it, Stalin or anything else. The poet – unlike the judges – has the right to believe."

But Kohout, the believer, also wrote poetry celebrating the judges passing death sentences on those reluctant to march cheerfully towards the radiant future. His *Diary of a Counter-Revolutionary* is an honest account but not an explanation of what happened. For that, one has to go back to what is known as František Halas' *Testament* (actually written by his friend Jindřich Chaloupecký), the first work to analyse the mechanisms of the cultural *Gleichschaltung*. This short essay (which deserves to be rediscovered) remains the first serious attempt by a leading Czech intellectual to account for what Julien Benda called the "betrayal of the clerks". Going back to Plato and



---

Marx (but without neglecting the more mundane mechanisms of control and manipulation) he traced the origins of the intellectuals' support for "utopia in power".

Professor Václav Černý (with Jan Patočka possibly the most important, yet a marginal intellectual figure of the post-war period), gives an even less generous interpretation. In his *Memoirs* (1984), he paints a devastating picture of the Communist generation "class of 1948": zealots and opportunists, careerists quick to lead the purge and grab the vacant job while the going was good. This, he concludes, was a spineless and, on the whole, intellectually mediocre generation (the abundant quotations he gives make painful if often amusing reading). True, there is bitterness, often unfairness in his uncompromising account; but only a scholar of his stature and of his generation (born in 1905, like Sartre, whose existentialism was his philosophical inspiration, and Aron, with whom he shared the privilege of being for four decades the lonely *spectateur engagé* proved-right-in-the-end) could write so freely about the demise of Czech intellectuals.

## II. 1958-1968: Reason and Conscience

The XXth Congress brought the period of "gardening in a cemetery" (Šalda) to an end and opened the period of soul-searching. Between 1956 and 1968, Czech and Slovak intellectuals denounced the crimes of the Stalinist era in the name of the socialist values and ideals. After 1968, it was the other way round: they renounced socialist ideas in the name of the crimes committed after '48 and again after '68. (This dialectic of "crimes and ideals" is by no means unique to the Stalinist

period. French intellectuals initially denounced slavery in the name of Enlightenment. Many of their 20th-century successors denounced Western values in the name of the crimes or injustices attributed to colonialism.)

The intellectual foundations of Czech "revisionism" (1956-1968) were remarkably similar to those of Poland and Hungary; a critique of Stalinism in the name of the "Young Marx" and the "Old Engels", an increasingly elastic concept of socialist ideology. Above all it marked the assertion of the primacy of ethics over politics, of the Kantian categorical imperative over the Marxian laws of history and the principle that the end justifies the means. The best illustration of both aspects can be found in the writings of Karel Kosík, *The Dialectic of the Concrete* (1963), and his 1968 essay on "Reason and Conscience". Kosík's influence was, in this respect, comparable to that of Kolakowski in Poland and Lukács in Hungary.

Czech revisionism had its hour of glory in 1968, though it had already experienced an abortive launch in 1956. At the Writers' Congress in April 1956, the poets Jaroslav Seifert and František Hrubín spoke in terms remarkably similar to those of *Po Prostu* in Warsaw or of the Petöfi Circle in Budapest. "Let us hope," said Seifert, "that we can now be the conscience of the nation. Because, believe me, I think that we have failed in that task. During all these years we have neither been the conscience of the nation, nor even our own conscience."

The main difference with the situation in Poland and Hungary, however, was the isolation of the intellectuals from society. The Hungarian Revolution could easily be used by the apparatus to put the lid tightly back on. This accounts for

---

another feature of Czech “revisionism”: Because it was politically frustrated it was sublimated into cultural life which contributed to give it, in the 1960’s, an exceptional richness and intensity. And because political de-stalinisation was delayed, it eventually came with a vengeance. The Writers’ Congress of June 1967 was the culmination of the intellectuals’ conflict with the political leadership which foreshadowed the Prague Spring. It was primarily the work of the 1948 generation – recovering from its Stalinist hangover – compensating (sometimes overcompensating) for its past failures.

A “revolution within the revolution”, 1968 marked the apotheosis of political influence of the intellectuals acting as a bridge between the Party and the people, “enlightening” the ruler while expressing the democratic aspirations of society. No less importantly, they were trying to redefine their own role as intellectuals, which had been compromised by the experience of the 1950’s. Hence the demonstratively heretical tone and substance of much of the 1968 soul-searching.

The tanks of August crushed the hopes of “socialism with a human face” and the intellectuals’ attempt to salvage the ideals of their youth by correcting the abuses of Stalinism. Yet, paradoxically, many experienced the defeat as a liberation, a reconciliation with their nation. In his *Diary of a Counter-Revolutionary*, Pavel Kohout wrote: “For the first time, after twenty years, I have the sensation of belonging to the nation.” Milan Kundera wrote that the tragic days of August were “the most beautiful week in our lives”. The novelist and former Charter 77 spokesperson Eva Kantůrková recently described it as the “expulsion from paradise”, the prime virtue of which

was that “the one time critical loyalist finally found themselves in the same position as the rest of the nation”.

Defeat was given as evidence of the *grandeur* of the Czechoslovak experiment. In a famous article published at the end of 1968, Kundera argued that “the significance of the Czechoslovak autumn is perhaps greater than that of the Czechoslovak Spring”. In a similar vein, Eduard Goldstücker, the Chairman of the Writers’ Union, wrote an article entitled “The Power of the Weak”.

One way of understanding this eulogizing of weakness and the virtues of defeat at a time (end of 1968) when the roll-back of reformism was already under way (with the participation of the Dubček leadership), is to see that for the Communist intellectuals, August 1968 was a tragic yet purifying, liberating experience. It proved *in contrario* that their intentions had been honourable since an invasion was needed to crash them. In the words of one samizdat author (Sládeček-Pithart) “it relieved the Communist intellectuals of the feeling of responsibility” for the regime’s past misdeeds. Nor were they to share the responsibility for the return to the ice age of neo-Stalinism. Under “normalisation” they shared (at last!) the fate of their nation.

This, of course, sheds a different light on the role of the Communist intellectuals in 1968: Was it for them, above all, an attempt to settle old scores with “the power” and their own past? Škvořecký’s novel *Mirákl* provides devastating (and very funny) portraits along these lines. Was the purpose of 1968 merely to correct 1948? As Sládeček put it: “Was improved socialism to belong to all, or were all, once again, to belong to socialism?” These are merely some of the questions

---

raised in samizdat literature over the last decade and they are obviously loaded ones. Their purpose is not “objectivity” or fairness to the individuals involved, but a challenge to the interpretation of post-war Czechoslovak intellectual history as given by the Communist intellectuals themselves: from the innocence of youthful revolutionary idealism to the original sin of Stalinist terror, from the “purification” of 1968 to the purgatory of “normalisation”. The Communist intellectuals had a tendency to use the collective “we”, claiming always to speak for all intellectuals, often for the Party, sometimes for the nation. In fact they were mostly speaking for themselves, the (admittedly important) Communist generation, the class of 1948.

This collective “we” has been challenged since 1968. When Karel Kosík published his famous essay “Our Present Crisis”, another philosopher, Ivan Sviták, replied with a piece: “Your Present Crisis”. Kundera’s meditations on the “Czech Fate” were answered in February 1969 by Václav Havel. For Havel the return of free speech and basic civil rights can hardly be presented as an earth-shattering novelty, as a return to the centre of world history, since for most people outside the Communist *milieu* this was merely the return to “normalcy”, to something that had already existed in Czechoslovakia and that was still enjoyed in most civilised countries. In the end, the reform-minded Communist intellectuals presented as their greatest achievement what the rest of the society saw as the undoing of the nonsense to which they had contributed some twenty years earlier.

In a 1986 interview Havel described his relationship with the “revisionist” intellectuals in 1968

as follows: “They represented something like a cultural establishment. For us younger non-communists there were many things in their endeavour that were close to us; they were naturally a preferable alternative to the sclerotic bureaucracy of Novotný and its prominent dogmatists; nevertheless they too had, from our point of view, their »limits« (today, of course, they have mostly overcome them). We found in their activity a number of problematic elements: from illusionism, paying tribute to old ideological schemes, a constant obsession with tactics, a lack of thoroughness and even infantilism to unabashed identification with their »establishment« status which they considered as a matter of fact: The idea that someone else could speak on certain issues was for them inconceivable. They had a tendency to extend their personal experience to all. They always spoke of themselves as a generation rather than its communist component.”

The “normalisation”, by giving control over official cultural life to a handful of discredited third rate hacks, also swept aside the reform-communist “establishment”. The independent counter-culture of the 1970’created a new “equality” of access to publishing. It also modified the hitherto prevailing terms of the debate.

Two themes are worth mentioning for the purpose of our analysis. 1. For the non-Communist intellectuals, 1968 was the first occasion to have their voice heard. For them 1968 was more than a belated effort from above to correct the “deformations” of socialism; it was above all a key moment in the revival of civil society and of truly free intellectual life (a point made in 1988 interviews with the author by V. Havel, J. Gruša, V. Bělohradský, and J. Němec). 2. The “cultural Biafra”.

The tragedy of Czech culture did not start in 1968, but in 1948. The origins of independent cultural life and samizdat have to be traced to the Stalinist period. It suffices to read Jiří Kolář's diary, now published under the title *Eyewitness* ("Today, the greatest perversion, eccentricity, absurdity, is to tell the truth and see the face of the world as it is", 1. 1. 1949), the writings of V. Effenberger and the surrealists, or Jindřich Chaloupecký's *On the margins of art* (1988) to understand that parallel culture developed (admittedly on a small scale) the very day communist intellectuals seized power over the realm of culture. Jan Vladislav, one of the founder of literary samizdat some forty years ago, puts as it follows:

"In reality, the history of Czech – and in certain cases of Slovak – spiritual resistance goes back to the Communist take-over of February 1948. At that period, a considerable number of intellectuals, university teachers, students and artists were excluded from public activity as a result of harsh administrative measures. Many of them, including two score of the country's writers were even arrested and jailed in the fifties, while a still greater number were deprived of any opportunity of working in their chosen disciplines. Numerous authors were expelled from the official Writers' Union and lost all chance of being published. Czechoslovak intellectuals virtually split into two camps at that time: on the one hand, there were those who accepted the cultural policies of the new regime – either from conviction or out of opportunism, and on the other, there were those who, in one way or another, realised the danger then facing the spiritual identity of every individual and of the national society as a whole, and sought to confront it by going on working accord-

ing to the dictates of their own conscience, though deprived of any prospect of public expression." (Kolář, Hrabal, Patočka, Černý, etc.)

### III. 1968-1988: Intellectuals and anti-politics

After 1968, the intellectuals who had been so active during the Prague Spring also became the prime target of the repression that followed. For Czech intellectuals (the situation was markedly different in Slovakia), the post-'68 period could be described as a shift from power to society, from politics to "anti-politics". By breaking with political power, the intellectual rediscovered his/or her role as a moral counter-power. In a recent essay Jan Vladislav put it as follows:

"Even if they do not strive directly for power in the community, in a sense they have it regardless. It is power of a particular kind, however. In general it operates outside the established power structures, which is probably one of the main reasons why the powerful consider this kind of power so dangerous even though its resources consist exclusively of words and ideas."

This new role of the intellectual entailed two aspects: 1. the politics of counter-culture; 2. the ethics of spiritual resistance.

1. Over the last twenty years the Czech intellectuals have resumed their traditional role inherited from the 19th century. In the face of a massive onslaught on society by a totalitarian power, the sphere of culture became the ultimate rampart against "normalisation"/sovietisation. On the one hand, the underground of parallel culture was, for the intellectual, an emancipation from political and ideological constraints of the

---

past; from censorship and self-censorship. On the other hand, it restored the role of culture as a substitute for politics. Hence another danger: Should independent culture “serve” society the same way it served the Party and its ideology in the past?

In “totalitarian conditions”, says Havel, this can be a double-edged weapon: it gives to any intellectual activity a dimension it does not have in open societies – an “added radioactivity” – otherwise people would not be put in jail for their writings. But it also has its trappings any writer should be aware of: those of a literature with a “message”.

2. Ethical anti-politics. The emergence of the Charter 77 human rights movement has created a new situation for the Czech intellectuals: after the emancipation from power came the defiance of power. Václav Černý saw in the Charter “a milestone in the culture development of the nation, a moment in the history of Czech spirit, restoring the moral backbone, reviving the feeling for law, justice, human dignity, and the will for truth. It was a warning and a reminder to power-holders, all of them everywhere...”.

It was undoubtedly Jan Patočka, the philosopher, who became the *spiritus movens* in the shift from politics to the ethics of resistance. In his famous piece of January 1977 entitled *What Charter 77 Is and What It Is Not*, he stated: “No society, no matter how good its technological foundations, can function without a moral foundation, without conviction that has nothing to do with opportunism, circumstances and expected advantage. Morality, however, does not just exist to allow society to function, but simply to allow human beings to be human. Man does not define morality according to the caprice of his needs, wishes, tendencies

and cravings; it is morality that defines man ... (it) is aimed exclusively at cleansing and reinforcing the awareness that a higher authority does exist...”

The regime’s hysterical campaign against the Charter merely reinforced this notion that the challenge was primarily a moral rather than a political one. This accounted for the strength and the appeal of the intellectuals’ ethics of resistance, but also for some of its limitations. As Petr Pithart observed, in the face of a power obsessed merely with self-preservation, the intellectual obtains almost automatically a monopoly on “truth”. The danger would be to confine the intellectual to a virtuous ghetto existence.

The Catholic philosopher Václav Benda was the first to suggest the extension of ethical resistance to the creation of parallel structures; from the assertion of the responsibility of each individual for the fate of society as a whole to the creation of a “parallel Polis”. The thinking was rather similar to Michnik’s “new evolutionism”, but the self-organisation of civil society did not materialise in Czechoslovakia (except in the cultural sphere). The passivity of an atomised society, the absence of independent institutions such as the Polish church, the intellectuals’ preoccupation with a threatened European cultural identity (rather than with the mobilising powers of nationalism) all mark important differences between the Czechs and Polish intellectuals’ attempts to establish ties with society in the late 1970’ and early 1980’s. The Czech intellectual did not manage to reach out to society as did his Polish counterpart. By the same token he avoided also having to “compete” for moral authority with the Church or with Solidarity. In Prague, he preserved his “monopoly” on moral indignation.

---

This led him sometimes to rationalise his socially marginal yet spiritually central role. In the tacit “social contract” between Communist power and a consumer-oriented society, the intellectual is the only one for whom the terms of the contract remain fundamentally unacceptable (Liehm, 1973). One can find in Havel’s writings a critique of the nature of power (influenced by Patočka and Bělohradský: “the impersonal rule of the megamachines which escape human control”) and a parallel critique of a society succumbing, taking part in the “totalitarian lie”.

Respected, even admired by society for his courage to “live in truth” (which it does not have), feared by the powers-that-be for relentlessly exposing their illegitimacy, the Czech intellectual’s cultural and ethical substitutes for politics place him in a difficult yet in many ways gratifying position: he alone holds the symbolic power of the written word and on moral defiance.

Virtuous, yet isolated, he sometimes wishes to be relieved from the burden of the nation’s conscience and be “just a writer”. Havel’s play *Largo Desolato* is a moving depiction of the intellectual over-burdened with demands by society, tired of his role as the “professional supplier of hope”. Yet he cannot escape that role because it is, after all, his destiny as an intellectual. Since the death of Jan Patočka following nearly a whole day’s police interrogation, Václav Havel has become the pivotal figure of the Czech intellec-

tuals’ spiritual resistance, and is best qualified to speak about “the tragedy of fate stemming from responsibility; about the futility of all human endeavours to break out of the role that responsibility has imposed; about responsibility as destiny”.

#### NOTES

1 Two main pre-war political parties, the Czech Agrarian Party and the Slovak People’s Party, were banned.

2 An important distinction should be made between the literary elite and the academic community. The former, for a variety of reasons (ranging from a “bourgeois background” guilt complex to a dubious wartime record) gave their support to the Party. The scholarly community (including the students) was more reserved and therefore subjected to a drastic purge after 1948. Among the great scholars it suffices to mention the contrast between Professors Václav Černý and Jan Patočka, who resisted, and Professors Bohuslav Havránek and Jan Mukařovský, who gave in.

3 Kundera’s most interesting exploration of the subject is to be found in his novel *Life is elsewhere*.

4 See V. Kořán, *Promarněná příležitost*, in *Svědectví* (Těmoignage), 1983, No. 70-71.

5 For instance: André Gide’s *Retour d’USSR* was immediately translated into Czech (by Bohumil Mathesius who later translated Cholókhov!) provoking a sharp rebuff (*Anti-Gide*) by S. K. Neumann (formerly an anarchist poet who had never been in the USSR!).

## A NEGLECTED GENERATION

This is the full text of Havel's address to the Literary Section of the Conference "Czechoslovakia 1918-1988: Seven Decades from Independence", held by the University of Toronto, October 28-30, 1918

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like to take this opportunity to send you all my warmest greetings. Like many of my fellow citizens, I'm delighted that Czechoslovakia has not been forgotten in the world, and that even in far-off Toronto, you are commemorating some of its important anniversaries. And I'm especially glad that you're not merely commemorating it with a celebration, or on the contrary, with a memorial service of some kind, but with actual work, that is, by holding a meeting of experts capable of making a qualified assessment of what the events recalled by these anniversaries actually mean. It is no mere coincidence, but rather a proof of kindred feeling, that we here in Czechoslovakia intend to mark these anniversaries in a similar way, that is, with a symposium. I firmly believe that some of you, at least, will attend, and will be able to report to us on the proceedings in Toronto.

I would like to contribute to the discussions of your literary section with some brief, and therefore only general, remarks.

It's a well known fact that for many years, Czechoslovak literature has been artificially divided, not only into literature officially published at home and samizdat literature, but also into domestic literature and exile literature.

My remarks concern the drastic splitting of Czechoslovak literature within the country, which took place twenty years ago. Twenty years is not a negligible period of time. One indication of this is that the dividing line no longer lies between those who were banned from publishing their work after 1968 and 1969 and those who, in whatever way, managed to avoid that fate. In other words, it is no longer the case that we have Ludvík Vaculík on the one hand and Ivan Skála on the other – to name a symbolic representative of each of the two camps. For one thing, literature has never been, and certainly is not today, an activity indulged in only by people over fifty. In the past twenty years, several literary generations have inevitably grown up. They are generations of authors too young to have been involved in any way in the events of 1968 and as a result, they were not automatically either favoured or rejected by the state. These younger authors – unlike we older ones – began their writing careers in the divided situation of today, and because they were unburdened by past reputations, they had essentially more space to manoeuvre than we did. That is, they could make up their minds where they belonged at the very outset.

And this, in fact, is what they did, and in so doing, divided themselves accordingly too.

Some of them immediately and quite consciously lowered their own standards and expectations simply to make themselves acceptable to

---

the powers that be. Such writers are, I think, the least interesting.

A second group is more interesting: those who used their advantage of their unsullied reputations not to establish an easy career for themselves, but for something else within the field of permitted or tolerated literature: they tried to go as far as they could, even at the risk of getting burned, and in this way, they managed to extend the limits of the possible. Occasionally they were banned, occasionally they were allowed to publish. Sometimes the state supported them, at other times it rejected them, but they were never entirely banished from cultural life and placed on the index of official enemies of the state that so many of their older colleagues had found themselves on. Their work is important and, as a matter of fact, it isn't all that different from what many older and today banned authors were doing ten or twenty years before.

But this is not the group I want to mention today; they are well known and enjoy the – greater or lesser – favour of both the public and even of the more circumspect representatives of power.

The group I really want to draw your attention to is the third, which, in many ways is not only the most important, but also the most often overlooked or ignored. I'm referring to those writers who have quite consciously and freely decided to operate in this area of independent culture and *samizdat*, rather than take part in the struggles on the battlefield of official literature. At the very beginning of their literary careers, they have joined forces with those who are already "branded", since publishing in *samizdat* usually

leads to one being immediately included on the black list.

Why did they do it? Simply because their opinions, the nature of their talents, their attitudes, interests and work, and of course their moral consistency, all very naturally led them to the decision. They were not driven out of the official sphere, they simply refused to enter it in the first place. Their notions of what should be written about, and how it should be said, simply did not fit into the official framework. These young authors – and there are more than just a few of them – are, if I may put it this way, outcasts by choice. The world of *samizdat* is not a provisional solution for them, nor a substitute for something more genuine, but an entirely natural space in which they can authentically realize themselves.

These writers are often forgotten, and if they are not, then they tend to be gratuitously lumped together as eternal beginners, as outsiders among outsiders. And this happens despite the fact that they may well represent our best hope for the future of literature, a hope that is the focus of all our hopes, because in a few years, they may be the only ones in whom a genuinely free spirit survives.

Of course as far as officialdom is concerned, these people do not exist. If we leave aside the occasional interest of the police, they don't even enjoy the abusive attention that we do. Moreover, they are seldom taken very seriously even on the other, freer end of our intellectual and spiritual continuum: for the past twenty years, our independent literature here at home has for most people – including most exiles and foreigners in general – been represented by the same set of



---

names (Vaculík, Klíma, Pecka, Havel and so on), that is, names of those who already managed to build themselves a reputation when the printing presses were still available to them. It sounds paradoxical, but it sometimes seems that only those who have, at one time, published here in Czechoslovakia, are considered worthy of the notoriety of being unpublished authors today; as though the degree of respect one gains through samizdat were determined by the degree to which a person was, once upon a time, not dependent on it. It may even seem that the only person who may become a symbol of resistance to censorship are those whose work was once passed by the censor. Meanwhile the rest, who thanks to their age and their uncompromising nature have never published anything officially at all, remain slightly suspect as writers.

I can well imagine what some of my eminent colleagues will object to in my conclusions: "But where are their works?" they will say. "After all, they do not write as well as we do." Such an objection, however, is not really an objection at all, but rather a confirmation of what I have been saying, since it is based on the doubtful assumption that only we, the older and formerly published writers, are competent to decide what is good. But the fact is that we cannot decide this. Literature has its own life. It is essentially pluralistic; no one has the exclusive key to literature's ultimate evaluation, much less to any centralized control of it. Some will like one thing, others something else, and no one can compel anyone else to like something he does not, nor can anyone turn his likes and dislikes into an instrument of power. I said this once to my publishing colleagues in the Union

of Writers when they objected to the officially published magazine *Tvář*, and I say it again today – albeit in a very different situation – to my unpublished friends at home, when they pay little or no attention to their own never-published younger colleagues. And if my imaginary critic were to object that he is restricting no one, I would object in turn that although his attitude hinders no one directly – since he doesn't have the tools at his disposal anyway – indirectly (and more involuntarily than consciously) it sometimes is a hindrance. When we, who are independent but well-known authors, behave as though those younger, unpublished writers did not exist, it has an inevitable consequence, one that, from a certain point of view, serves the interests of those in power. It means that exile publishing houses and magazines do not get to know about them, not to mention foreign publishing houses; the critics don't know about them, and they are not even taken seriously by those who might provide them with some technical or other assistance. At the same time, these "unknown, unpublished writers" are often unknown as well because once, in the early stages of their writing careers, some of us who were better known served as models to them on their way to independence. Does this not mean that we bear a special responsibility to them? We can't very well claim that the place of the true poet today is not in the bookshops but in the pillory – and at the same time consider a younger colleague who took us at our word and submitted to the pillory as slightly suspect because he was never in the bookshops!

Perhaps the younger writers I am talking about will not care for my support and in any case,

---

they will make their way without my help. But I'm not saying all this merely for their benefit. I am saying it for all of us, for literature as a whole, and that means for myself as well. For none of what we create will continue to be good if it silently accepts the possibility that it may squeeze someone else's creation – however indirectly and undeliberately – out of contention. The better positioned – thanks to the interplay of circumstances – any of us is, the more attentive we should be – in our own

interests – to those who are worse off. The sad literary end of those who ignore this injunction can be clearly observed in today's officially published literature. And that, certainly, is not how we want to end up.

Thank you for your attention.

(Translated from the Czech by Paul Wilson)

---

Ludvík Vaculík

### AUGUST'S NOVEMBER

A fellow decides to hold a birthday party for himself. He invites relations and friends and, as usually happens, several of his admirers turn up uninvited. And then, will you believe, all sorts of bacteria, bacilli and bugs that have been assaulting and threatening him since the day he was born suddenly burst into the room. The germs elbow their way among the guests and take the floor. A double inflammation of the ear-drum tells of sleepless nights at the boy bedside in company with his mother. The mumps relate how, when a schoolboy, our hero gamely caught up on his lessons after their attack on him. Infectious jaundice hands round photos showing how pitiful he looked after his encounter with it, but how he managed to recover two years' later. The tubercle

bacillus reads a paper about how it affected his early poetry, and a National Theatre actor reads an extract as illustration... Flabbergasted, you draw breath to ask a question and the 'flu virus knocks you sideways. Our protagonist protests vigorously against this hijacking of his party, when he is gripped by a coronary which leads him away for some bed rest.

And that, dear reader, is exactly how we, the admirers, friends and family of the Czechoslovak Republic celebrated its seventieth birthday. Ever since, I have been looking for the most apt way to convey our amazement at the sheer brazenness of its notorious and long standing adversaries who, when it was born, regarded it as no more than a temporary affliction, and then went on to use it as a battlefield in their fight for power, before finally, over the past forty years treating it as their feudal fief. Now all of a sudden here they are, edging their way in among the democrats, elbowing aside those who have always held the First Republic in esteem: those who felt the same way about it last year, just as they did twenty or even fifty years ago. Wherever did these cheeky tykes

---

ever hear about Masaryk and Štefánik, seeing that the school history-books they imposed make no mention of either of them? Now they strut around like the heirs and executors of republican democracy à la Masaryk.

To err is human. Fools can too. The trouble is that when fools realise their mistakes it means further – unforeseeable – disaster. For they haven't the sense or strength of character to mend their ways. Even quite clever people can make mistakes – as I did, for instance, when – fool that I am – I encouraged you to come with me to the government's celebration of Independence Day. But I had in mind ten thousand of you. I didn't pull it off. Only two of us turned up. Well, at least the next day our own "Young Czechs" were true to their word. They've stopped relying on us any more and are beginning to assemble their thousands one by one.

When someone starts to acknowledge a past which up until then they have been trying to erase, one may rightly expect some sort of explanation – failing an apology. After all, there are still people around who went to prison for speaking of Masaryk or Beneš, or showing loyalty to their legacy. The explanation – which is not forthcoming – is quite simple: good old *Perestroika* again – but in its Czech version, i.e. repaint the facade and leave the structure intact. To organise a celebration of National Independence Day on the 27th and then, on the 28th – the actual anniversary – to have the streets cleared by truncheon-wielding cops: such actions are two faces of the same government policy and encapsulate their thinking. The truth is that they had no intention of recognising something that cannot be suppressed. No, they wanted

to take it over. Having commandeered the workers' cause, the cause of the philosophers and the cause of the social utopians and poets, they now want to appropriate the nation's cause, after having done their best to ignore it up to now. First they degraded May Day. Then they defiled harmless Mothers' Day. Christmas was eviscerated. This year it's the turn of our national Independence Day to receive the treatment: if you're good you'll get – but only on 27th October; on the 28th we'll get black-and-blue pudding – and they'll use our own flesh for it. So long as they held to the view that national states should not exist, they did all they could to consign them to oblivion. Now that they have come to realise that national states will go on existing regardless, they are desperately trying to find a pedigree for the one they have been dragging around for years.

And I have to tell you that such behaviour doesn't appeal to me, not even as an erstwhile member of the Communist Party. I maintain that for communists Masaryk should continue to be an agent of imperialism, Beneš a traitor to the nation, and pre-war Czechoslovakia a tool of capitalist plots against the Soviet Union. But this lot are ready to betray the Slovak Soviet Republic of 1919 for a mess of pottage, and stab the December 1920 General Strike in the back, as well as abandon their youthful dreams of dissolving nations and creating a people of motley race. In my book they are opportunists and I'm glad I'm not one of them.

I was late for the government demonstration on 27th October. I arrived back in Prague at midday but when I heard who they had arrested and whose places had been searched, I first had to do

---

a spot of tidying up at home. I got to Wenceslas Square when the spotlights were switched off and the loudspeakers had fallen silent. Defeated without a battle, I made my way down the square, with heavy heart and limbs. I turned off Příkopy into Rytířská Street and there stood Jaroslav Putík looking at a window-display of winter coats. "Nothing happened, then?" says he. "The others didn't turn up," says I.

There followed a filthy November. Fog, smog and bad tidings. The "Czechoslovakia 88" symposium broken up. Dubček in Bologna. Interrogations. In Rudé právo, the Slovak minister of culture, Válek, talked about the trauma created by the occupation of 1968 and even seemed in a way to be vindicating Charter 77 and samizdat. The cheeky blighter! Let him mind his own (twenty-

year-old) business. When I read an article in the paper about how the Soviet Procurator General had exonerated the members of the "workers' opposition" executed fifty years ago, I felt like taking a protest note round to their embassy. But where were the words to express all my disgust, repugnance and total mistrust?

Imagine a fellow coming to see you one Monday morning and insisting that it's Wednesday. You argue with him. Bad luck, he's one of them and has you arrested. Not to worry, he turns out to be one of the reforming variety, and he has you released on the Friday – with the rehabilitating assurance: "You're right, it's Monday".

(November 1988)

---

## ARTICLES

Milan Jungmann

### SKETCHES FOR PORTRAITS OF THE DEFIANT

(Notes on contemporary Czech literature)

For almost twenty years now, Czech literature has been suffering the painful effects of the regime's interference in its natural evolution since 1968, some twenty years after the first such intrusion which followed the February 1948 take-over. As

a result, literary output has split into three main currents: books published by the official publishing houses; typescript "*inédit*" editions (known as *samizdat*); and finally, books published by emigré publishing-houses abroad. It is obvious to anyone with even a passing acquaintance with cultural history that such a situation has an extremely deleterious effect on the external factors vital to the healthy development of literature – contact with readers, independent criticism, scope for creating literary circles, public debate, and so on. But above all, it impairs those delicate, almost intan-

---

gible, intrinsic factors which are so hard to gauge, not to mention the complex infrastructure of intellectual relationships that evolves gradually and unpredictably over the course of time, incorporating the mutual influence of all possible viewpoints, trends, traditions, programmes, personalities, and the like.

However, Czech culture's state of spiritual decline not only affects official literature: the sort that serves to a greater or lesser degree the regime's propaganda purposes, and is subject to both state and private (self) censorship – whereby individuality is lost, leaving a grey, uninteresting residue. For even though samizdat literature or books published by emigré publishing houses are not directly limited by such external or internal censorship, they too are marked by the national tragedy, whether they like it or not. Their authors inevitably react to the situation of a divided society made up of a large ghetto of privileged, apparently unrestricted citizens and a small ghetto of persecuted and silenced intellectuals.

The fact that the literature in question includes very few works whose subject-matter does not reflect the status quo is also evidence of that influence. Only rarely does a book appear which manages to escape from the tyranny of the present and get to the heart of human problems, in order to pose those existential questions that are not necessarily bound up with the current state of society. There is a positive side to this, however. Samizdat literature as a whole constitutes an appeal to those human values which can be described as morality or ethics. It is an appeal for people to resist the temptations of materialistic consumerism and reject moral ambivalence in fa-

vor of personal responsibility for the present and the future. It is a call for them to act according to their consciences.

In the following review of fiction produced over the past twenty years within each of the three above-mentioned categories, I have deliberately disregarded authors living abroad or those whose work has become known (to the interested reader, at least) through translations. I refer not only to Milan Kundera, Josef Škvorecký or Arnošt Lustig but also to such writers as Václav Havel or the Nobel prize-winner Jaroslav Seifert.

My chief concern is with books written in Czech whose artistic merit is intrinsically relevant to the development of Czech literature. This means books which have played a significant role in maintaining the continuity of Czech literature over the period.

\* \* \*

In the course of so-called “normalisation”, some two hundred Czech writers and journalists were silenced, including a whole number of outstanding literary personalities. This led to an artificially induced decline of standards in official publishing and the adoption of “soft” criteria. As a result even below-average writers started to be published, and literary mediocrity came to the fore. There were only two figures of any outstanding artistic merit left in the Czech Writers' Union: Ladislav Fuks and Vladimír Páral. During the first two years of “normalisation”, both of them managed to publish novels which were still consistent with their artistic tenets and their personal philosophies. Thereafter, however, they were obliged to find ways of satisfying socialist realism's demand

---

for an optimistic portrayal of reality. It had a profound and immediate effect. Their artistic standard slumped and their creative output entered a phase of permanent crisis. It now looks as if Fuks has come to realise in the last few years that talent can only produce quality if artists have the freedom to follow their inclinations and do not have to betray their own views.

LADISLAV FUKS (born 1923) first acquired a major literary reputation in 1963 with his novel *Mr. Theodore Mundstock* which was translated into several world languages (appearing in West Germany, USA, France, England, and elsewhere). Apart from the originality of the author's style, the book's success derived largely from his extremely individual portrayal of someone threatened by anti-semitic Nazi tyranny. One can somehow sense the spirit of Franz Kafka abroad in Fuks' work. Indeed, the tragic predicament of twentieth century Europeans beset by evil, violence and dehumanised machinery, is also reflected in all his other books. The setting for *Myši Natálie Mooshabrové* (Natalie Mooshabrová's Mice), published in 1970, is, as in most of Fuks' books, historically and geographically vague and its atmosphere weirdly bizarre. It is a mixture of horror, black-comedy and fairy-tale. The apparent primitiveness of expression (the repetition of phrases, characteristics, situations, etc.) as well as the naivety of descriptions and the narrator's ingenuousness are in fact refined artistic devices whose purpose is only revealed at the end of the novel. The phantasms surrounding the unfortunate Mrs. Mooshabrová – the mother of ungrateful children – have come into being because power in the land has been usurped by a man who has cunningly man-

aged to silence public opinion. Moreover, by manipulating information, he has also enforced a superficial order, though human relations are rigid, distorted and formalised as a result.

During the seventies, the author published a number of books in which he tried to satisfy the demand for works with positive story lines. Not until his ambitious 722-page novel *Věvodkyně a kuchařka* (The Duchess and the housekeeper) – published in 1983 – did the Fuks of old re-emerge. It is set in Vienna before World War I and as in his earliest works its complex and episodic structure lends it an intriguingly dream-like quality which leaves the reader in suspense about the denouement – will it be the end of an age, or even the end of human civilisation? The curious, masterfully-depicted details of Austrian imperial society are no more than a backcloth concealing the novel's true message – that modern humanity has lost the basis of its security. It is a parable about a self-threatening civilisation imperilled by its own creations and by its assertion of certain values to the detriment of others, etc. It is a world in which human beings are surrounded by substitutes, alienated from their proper nature and from everything that ought to constitute their substance.

VLADIMÍR PÁRAL (born 1932) published his last authentically personal novel *Milenci a vrazi* (Lovers and murderers) in 1969. (It was completed on 13th August 1968 – i.e. a week before the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia). It is sub-titled *Magazine of Gratification pre-2000 A.D.*, (sub-titles are always an integral part of Páral's fiction). Like Fuks, Páral also acknowledges a debt to Kafka, not least of all with his motto about leopards

---

invading a cathedral, though chiefly in his belief in the absurdity of history. In terms of style, however, it could not be less Kafkaesque. Having started his career as a technician, he has a first-hand knowledge of the run-of-the-mill industrial worker and technician, the narrow-mindedness of the "herd", human mediocrity, etc. As in his earliest books, this provides the starting point for a story told in a very simple and matter-of-fact way. He relates the fate of his characters with ironic detachment and even cynical indifference, describing the banal strivings of people whose horizons do not extend beyond material gain and sensual pleasure, capable only of sexual fulfilment, not love, who want nothing but an easy life and actually reject anything of spiritual worth. The novel tells the story of a number of factory directors and depicts with sarcasm the rat-race of those in power that eventually destroys all that is human in them. The history of human society is portrayed solely as a never-ending alternation at the summit of power which can never lead to any "progress" or improvement, only constant repetition of the same old striving to seize selfish advantage and gain the power to dominate others. The novel was condemned by official critics as a squib against the Marxist concept of history and it has never been re-edited. Since then, its author has deliberately conformed to the demand for optimistic plots and has published texts which are artistically inferior, although they continue to enjoy considerable success among the reading public.

The most popular of the published authors, however, is BOHUMIL HRABAL (born 1914) who performed a public *autocritique* at the beginning of the seventies, since when he has been permitted

to publish at least some of his fiction officially. Unlike Fuks and Páral, Hrabal has not "throttled his song", as Mayakovsky put it. He does not censor his texts, which are written more or less in the form of a "train of consciousness". Instead he submits them to the official censor. The upshot is that his works generally exist in two versions: an uncensored version that circulates in samizdat form and the suitably censored one that appears in his published books. His novel *Obsluhoval jsem anglického krále* (I waited on the King of England), completed in 1971, circulates among the reading public both as typescript and in a photocopied edition published by the Jazz Section shortly before it was banned. In this short novel, narrated by a waiter (the latest in Hrabal's long line of inveterate raconteurs), the reader is taken behind the scenes in the world of pre-war hotels and restaurants to learn diverse stories of their rich patrons, before the war, during the Nazi occupation and after 1948, when the hotels were nationalised and their owners (including the narrator) found themselves interned in labour camps. In keeping with the author's personal philosophy, the narrator relates his fate light-heartedly and observes the world with humorous detachment and the grin of one who has "seen it all". No catastrophe catches him unawares and he is always able to see "the best side" of every situation. Hrabal's vivid prose, which is saturated with popular speech and slang, and not even averse to so-called "naturalism", elevates the story to the level of poetic improvisation.

Hrabal's style of "oral fiction" was unacceptable to the publishers of the fifties. And when his first short-story collections were eventually pub-

---

lished, a number of critics and readers were angered both by his consistent anti-ideological stance and his portrayal of characters on the fringes of society – outcasts or poor devils who had got the worst end of the stick, lost souls, gypsies, pub loafers, and the like, all of whom had one thing in common: an ability to live spontaneously and the gift of the gab. It came as quite a surprise when, in 1986, so utterly “unideological” an author as Hrabal published his novel *Proluky* (Vacant sites) in samizdat, following its rejection by the official publishing houses. Quite a fuss was caused by the fact that its subject-matter took the political risk of dealing openly with the more relaxed atmosphere of the sixties and the actual day of the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia. It even took in the subsequent harassment of writers unpopular with the regime. The story is told by the author’s wife and her seeming naivety enables Hrabal to portray all kinds of events without censoring himself in any way. This device, however, cannot conceal from experienced readers that the book is essentially a personal testimony which provides valuable human, artistic and psychological insight into the author himself. The novel is the third in a trilogy whose first two parts were entitled *Svatby v domě* (Weddings in the House) and *Vita nuova*.

OTA PAVEL (1930-1973) had quite an unusual writing career. His first success was the publication of several collections of sports stories, but his exceptional, highly individual talent did not truly come to the fore until the two slim volumes of short stories *Smrt krásných srnců* (The handsome roe-bucks are dead), published in 1971 shortly before his untimely death, and *Jak jsem potkal ryby*

(My encounters with fish), published posthumously in 1974. The main characters of these stories are members of a Jewish family and chiefly the wonderfully crackpot father (who is a bit of a braggart), the anxious mother, and the son who plays the role of narrator. The tales are set either in the immediate pre-war period or in war-time when the family lives in constant fear of extermination by Nazi decree. The underlying reality in all the stories is Nature, which the narrator regards as a power enabling human beings to live spontaneously and as a source of solace for them at moments of danger through its quasi-magical purgative powers. By the time Pavel wrote them, he was already suffering from severe mental illness and these stories and this return to his childhood and the warmth of the family circle, as well as to the elemental forces of nature, meant for him a quest for some sort of life support. However, the childhood experiences are not comforting idylls: the narrator evokes above all those singular scenes and events behind which lurks the threat of finality and death, and this inner tension was crucial to his perception of people, the world and human values. Pavel’s tragi-comic portrayal of his characters is vaguely reminiscent of Hrabal’s style, but Pavel’s reminiscences, which are swathed in melancholy, and told with exceptional depth of feeling and human warmth, testify to a unique narrative talent.

Among those authors who had to reconcile themselves with the prospect of not being published after 1968, the most original would seem to be LUDVÍK VACULÍK (born 1926). As well as being a founder of the first Czech samizdat book series *Edice etlice* (Padlock Books), he has also pro-



---

moted the writing of the topical articles known in Czech as *fejtony* ("feuilletons"). His novel *Morčata* (The Guinea-pigs) was written in 1970, too late to be published in his home country, although it has since been translated into many world languages. The author's supreme literary achievement to date, however, is his novel *Český snář* (The Czech dreambook), published in samizdat in 1980 with the sub-title "Life and dreams of the Year 1979". Written in diary form, it deals with the period following the regime's harassment of those who signed Charter 77, the civil rights initiative which gave birth to what was virtually a closed community of people, within which new kinds of human and social relationships came into being as in every ghetto. It was a story not just of constant arguments about tactics, but also personal rivalries, sympathies and antipathies. Even love started to assume new characteristics and was obliged to seek new outlets inside the ghetto walls. In the *Dreambook*, Vaculík assumes an original role as commentator of his friends' and enemies' actions, as well as of events at home and abroad. His ironic and, above all, self-deprecating portraits are frank in the extreme, and their candour even raised the hackles of some of those depicted. At a time of merciless conflict with the regime, the author proclaims his need "to live from the good things of life", and not just take a negative stance. While acknowledging, in the form of a Rousseau-esque confession, his "immaturity" and human inadequacy, he admits to be still searching for himself, frequently dumbstruck by his own spontaneous actions, deriving from his wilful, rebellious nature. Social contradictions, police persecution, threats, vilification, and so on, form one of the diary's

thematic strands. In addition, however, the journal is also full of private vexations, disappointments in love and his unsuccessful attempts to overcome his private suffering. The book's singular language, based on one very particular Northern Moravian dialect, places serious obstacles in the way of achieving a translation of the work that would do justice to all its outstanding artistic merits (the German translation is, in fact, incomplete).

In his novel *Vyhnanství* (Exile), completed in 1973, writer and journalist MOJMÍR KLÁNSKÝ (1921-1983) reached the peak of his literary achievement. His previous fiction had been nothing very much out of the ordinary, but here he managed to bring his talent as a reporter successfully to bear on a topical theme. The story's protagonist is one of the "kulaks" who were expelled from their villages at the time of enforced collectivisation during the nineteen fifties. Sensing his life to be nearing its close, he yearns to be buried in the soil of his forebears and therefore makes efforts to return to his birthplace. By chance, he gets the opportunity to move into a nearby forester's cottage due for demolition. He lives here in total isolation, renounced by his siblings (now officials in the agricultural co-operative), and also ostracised by his town-dwelling children who do not visit him for fear that contact with their suspect father might damage their careers. Though weak and infirm, the old farmer is incapable of idleness. It is in his ancestral blood to work. Work is a basic need for him, almost an animal instinct. In time, his cellar, hay loft and barn are crammed with unheard-of stocks of no use to anyone. The author

---

lets the naked facts speak for themselves and confines himself to factual description, but it is precisely this accent on the practical aspects which lends the story metaphorical significance.

Experience of imprisonment in socialist labour camps gave KAREL PECKA (born 1928) enough material for several novels. Artistically his most accomplished work, and the one with the most autobiographical elements, is a sort of chronicle of eleven years of being shunted from one camp to another during the nineteen-fifties, entitled *Motázky nezvěstnému* (Messages from prison to one who disappeared), published in samizdat in 1980. It is no mere portrayal of horror and suffering, however, nor simply an account of how hell becomes a daily fact of life. Instead it is an account of a young man's passage to true manhood and the development of his character under the pressure of those cruel surroundings. He subsequently bears his almost superhuman burden as a test of moral resistance, firm in the belief that his personal resilience and incorruptibility not merely preserve his own honour and character, but are also a way of salvaging that fundamental humanity which is crucial to the national existence. It is the modern counterpart of Dostoyevsky's *Notes from the House of the Dead* – created, however, not out of literary ambition, but from an uncontrollable urge to bear witness to the forms assumed by evil in the modern world, and show how a cause that seems at first to embody the lofty idea of justice can become destructive as soon as fanaticism sets in. Pecka neither seeks to moralise, nor even to condemn his tormentors. Instead he pities them as people bereft of everything that

makes human life human. Naked fact and specific detail are the means used by the author to achieve an effect equivalent to tragic catharsis.

After her two latest attempts at full-length novels (*Černá hvězda* (Black star), 1974 and *Pán věže* (Lord of the tower), 1979) were received with certain reservations, EVA KANTŮRKOVÁ (born 1930) abandoned her endeavours to create complex historical and philosophical structures and decided to draw instead on her bitter experience of a year on remand (on trumped-up charges of anti-state activity) in order to write some fifteen stories, all of them portraits of women in the narrow confines of a world of unfreedom. The stories in the collection *Mé přítelkyně v domě smutku* (My companions in the bleak house), published in 1984, appear at first sight to be documentary accounts of how different human types react to life in prison. In reality, though, they are sensitive psychological portraits of people from the fringes of society, not only people with adventure in their blood, but also deceitful and niggardly types. The stories of all these different women – naive, cynical, good-hearted and mean alike – are a reflection of the moral state of our society and the problem of its underworld, which the regime deliberately conceals. The author achieves a well-balanced narrative tone which ranges from warm understanding for apparently amoral actions to a much cooler treatment of those scheming individuals who readily become stool-pigeons of the prison authorities. The author's own experience remains discreetly in the background of the stories she relates.

---

The philosophical and political crisis of Czech intellectuals of the 1970s is, in essence, the subject of the samizdat novel *Svedený a opuštěný* (Seduced and abandoned) published in 1981 by JAN TREFULKA (born 1929). The story's main character is an emotionally unstable individual, who, after being forced by the authorities to abandon his theological studies, embarks on a happy marriage and starts a family. However, he is always finding himself in conflict situations on account of his passivity and eccentricity, but above all because of his inability to conform to prevailing materialist attitudes. He dismisses his own shortcomings as divinely ordained. It is only after a sordid sexual affair to which he more or less deliberately consents (regarding it as a diabolic temptation), that he is forced to come to terms with being abandoned not only by people but also by God. He realises that there is nothing or no one on earth capable of releasing human beings from their duty to answer for themselves, to bear their own crosses and find the moral centre within their own consciences. The book's central theme is a clue to the author's own quest – one which he has publicly acknowledged in successive articles – for an integral ethical basis for people who have had to renounce all higher authority, whether divine or ideological.

The turbulence of post-thirties Czech history has already inspired many novels, whose plots are determined chiefly by the outward events. JAROSLAV PUTÍK (born 1923) is not alone among Czech writers in seeking to distance himself from that sort of writing. With admirable artistic courage he has managed to avoid it not by abandoning the

historical framework, but by adopting a patently ironic stance to past events and satirizing their commonly accepted significance. The hero of his lengthy novel *Muž s břitvou* (Man with a razor), completed in 1984, is the comic figure of a bald and lanky barber in a provincial town. By refusing to see himself as comic he has the power to observe the events and people around him with the detachment of the popular philosopher, the eccentric whose actions are somehow always out of the ordinary. Unconsciously, he frequently sets others an example of courage and is a paragon of the civic virtues which he himself refuses to take seriously. His life story is told by a nephew who obtains his uncle's notebooks after his death. He also questions his uncle's friends in his efforts to fathom the meaning of the barber's curious and often bizarre actions. Each of the hero's deeds, whether superficially courageous or embarrassingly comic, is viewed by the stoic France-esque narrator from several possible angles. This device enables the writer to portray people in historical events without any trace of pathos. Although they are looked at sceptically and with an indulgent smile, the writer also displays understanding for their foibles as being just another facet of their humanity. Grandeur and pettiness, importance and insignificance, gravity and comicality are indivisible categories – phenomena which illustrate the mystery of human life.

The aforementioned genre in which people are subordinated to history was chosen by IVAN KLÍMA (born 1931) for his voluminous novel *Stojt, stojt šibenička* (There stands a gallows), published in samizdat in 1978 and afterwards translated into

---

German. In it, the author seeks, more through portrayal of external events – and specifically through separate historical chapters intended to show the nation’s uninterrupted battle for survival – to trace his generation’s journey from their post-war enthusiasm for the socialist programme to their profound disillusionment with its implementation. This first text was virtually rejected by the author who went on to realise his intention in a much more concise form in the novel *Soudce z milosti* (Judge on trial) completed in 1986 on the same theme and with identical subject-matter. In the new version, judge Adam Kindl’s fate is now determined above all by the growing contradictions not only in his family and love life but also in his professional career on account of the ideological and existential pressures of the post-1968 regime. It is an eventful novel with frequent flashbacks to the protagonist’s past life – as a Jewish child in Terezín concentration camp, and his later difficulties in the post-war period in coming to terms with complex political developments. By relating the stories of his characters in intimate detail, the author is able to convey the reality of Czech society at a time when the spectre of universal fear was beginning to stalk the land and deform people’s characters, their civic sense and their personal relationships.

Unlike the samizdat or “inédit” texts with which I have just been dealing, *Semester života* (A term of life) by JANA ČERVENKOVÁ (born 1939) was published officially in 1981. However, it had been kept on ice for ten long years because of its disillusioned and sharply critical stance, whereby it stands out from current run-of-the-mill fiction.

This story of a young woman leaving university to take up a teaching post in a small provincial town is used as a means of analysing the everyday life of Czech society which has lost all ethical values as well as any meaningful striving for transcendental goals. This young intellectual with her “naive” ideals (i.e. notions of living a full spiritual life) comes into conflict with materialistic interests, governed by envy, selfishness and the narrow-mindedness of her provincial surroundings. As a result, she not only becomes disillusioned but, in accordance with the logic of the story, also ends up in a life crisis. What superficially seems to be tranquil mediocrity defends itself tooth and nail against the invasion of another, more demanding human ethic and wreaks cruel vengeance for the threat to its comfortable parochial existence. The reader is encouraged, not through the writer’s comment but solely through epic devices, to consider with what success (or lack of it) a “socialist” society has managed to put its proclaimed ethical ideals into practice, and to realise the terrifying forms which materialistic attitudes have assumed within it.

One of the most appealing features of the books of EDA KRISEOVÁ (born 1940) is her evocative and strongly emotive style, and her good eye for detail. For this reason, the author is most at ease when writing shorter fiction, such as short stories or novelettes. Although she deliberately chooses to write love stories, these manage to encapsulate our times and our country, including the political pressures, moral crises, alienation and absence of freedom. The various forms of man/woman relationship provide the common theme for her most

---

recent short-story collection *Sedm lásek* (Seven loves), finished in 1985. Each of these sensitively constructed fables has a female narrator bewitched by the mystery of the human psyche and distressed at the way it is squandered. Her richly worded, precise and sensuously graphic descriptions enable the author to get present-day people who are marked by the pressures of civilisation and the absence of any sort of order in their lifestyle. The lives of Eda Kriseová's heroines – and this equally applies to the collections *Klíčň kůstka netopýra* (Vampyre's collar-bone) of 1979 and *Ryby, raky* (Fish, cray-fish) of 1985 – are all fatally afflicted by the realisation that they have to hold their ground in a world which is governed by impersonal forces external to them. As a result, they are incapable of leading the sort of life that would allow them to answer the compelling demands of their deep sensitivity. Any danger of sentimentality – a feature quite common in fiction of this kind – is avoided by the author's profound concern to strike a balance between spiritual and emotional experience, even in those stories with autobiographical overtones.

The fiction of JIŘÍ GRUŠA (born 1939) differs fundamentally from the usual narrative genres. His very first prose works, published in the wake of his poetry collections, raised the hackles of the State's ideological guardians. The publication of his novelette *Mimner* actually led to his prosecution in Czechoslovakia on grounds of alleged pornography, though charges were dropped in 1970. His novel *Dotazník aneb Modlitba za jedno město a přátele* (The employment form, or, Prayer for a town and a friend), written in 1975, provoked

a similar reaction: the author was held on remand for two months on the charge of writing a text undermining the socialist system. The partisans of ideological rectitude saw in Gruša's interpretation of reality a desecration of socialism's untouchable fundamental tenets. In reality it is a satire on the pseudo-seriousness and pseudo-importance attached to the conventional methods and formalities used to evaluate people in terms of dogmatic ideas: methods even used to pry into the most intimate areas of their lives. Gruša's fiction has more of the cruel jeremiad to it than the epic. The book splinters into fragmentary episodes and digressions which gradually take it over. The periphery becomes the foreground, and the digressions usurp the Leitmotiv. Then all of a sudden, we are back with the main story line about a man who, on being given the usual politically-loaded form to fill in when starting a new job, is provoked into evaluating his life in terms according to his own personal criteria. All the things that appear important to official eyes seem irrelevant to him, and apparently trivial events are seen to be crucial to his future. This diffamatory treatment of the regime's method of evaluating citizens proved shocking to those who share the ideological prejudices of those in power, but at the same time, the book's untraditional form even proves an obstacle to readers accustomed to conventional narrative prose.

Gruša adopted a similar approach in his novel *Doktor Kokeš – Mistr Panny* (Doctor Kokeš – Master of the Virgin) published in samizdat in 1984. In it, the past and the present form an indissoluble whole, in a sense: things that the pro-

---

recent short-story collection *Sedm lásek* (Seven loves), finished in 1985. Each of these sensitively constructed fables has a female narrator bewitched by the mystery of the human psyche and distressed at the way it is squandered. Her richly worded, precise and sensuously graphic descriptions enable the author to get present-day people who are marked by the pressures of civilisation and the absence of any sort of order in their lifestyle. The lives of Eda Kriseová's heroines – and this equally applies to the collections *Klíčnt kůstka netopýra* (Vampyre's collar-bone) of 1979 and *Ryby, raky* (Fish, cray-fish) of 1985 – are all fatally afflicted by the realisation that they have to hold their ground in a world which is governed by impersonal forces external to them. As a result, they are incapable of leading the sort of life that would allow them to answer the compelling demands of their deep sensitivity. Any danger of sentimentality – a feature quite common in fiction of this kind – is avoided by the author's profound concern to strike a balance between spiritual and emotional experience, even in those stories with autobiographical overtones.

The fiction of JIŘÍ GRUŠA (born 1939) differs fundamentally from the usual narrative genres. His very first prose works, published in the wake of his poetry collections, raised the hackles of the State's ideological guardians. The publication of his novelette *Mimner* actually led to his prosecution in Czechoslovakia on grounds of alleged pornography, though charges were dropped in 1970. His novel *Dotazník aneb Modlitba za jedno město a přítele* (The employment form, or, Prayer for a town and a friend), written in 1975, provoked

a similar reaction: the author was held on remand for two months on the charge of writing a text undermining the socialist system. The partisans of ideological rectitude saw in Gruša's interpretation of reality a desecration of socialism's untouchable fundamental tenets. In reality it is a satire on the pseudo-seriousness and pseudo-importance attached to the conventional methods and formalities used to evaluate people in terms of dogmatic ideas: methods even used to pry into the most intimate areas of their lives. Gruša's fiction has more of the cruel jeremiad to it than the epic. The book splinters into fragmentary episodes and digressions which gradually take it over. The periphery becomes the foreground, and the digressions usurp the Leitmotiv. Then all of a sudden, we are back with the main story line about a man who, on being given the usual politically-loaded form to fill in when starting a new job, is provoked into evaluating his life in terms according to his own personal criteria. All the things that appear important to official eyes seem irrelevant to him, and apparently trivial events are seen to be crucial to his future. This diffamatory treatment of the regime's method of evaluating citizens proved shocking to those who share the ideological prejudices of those in power, but at the same time, the book's untraditional form even proves an obstacle to readers accustomed to conventional narrative prose.

Gruša adopted a similar approach in his novel *Doktor Kokeš – Mistr Panny* (Doctor Kokeš – Master of the Virgin) published in samizdat in 1984. In it, the past and the present form an indissoluble whole, in a sense: things that the pro-

---

tagonist once experienced live on within him. The entire structure of the story is interwoven with systematic satire and comedy. Gruša takes the enormous risk of undermining the traditional epic supports and seeking a new style of narration, as well as new, firm values. Some critics consider his striving for new forms to be inspired by the French “*roman nouveau*”.

\*\*\*

Some brief comments by way of conclusion. Present “inedit” output is already being referred to as “ageing literature”. This designation is intended to draw attention to the fact that for the last two decades the independent literary scene has remained virtually unchanged and no new, younger faces have appeared, apart from rare exceptions (mainly poets). One exception in the field of fiction is ZUZANA BRABCOVÁ (born 1960), who attracted attention with her second novel *Daleko od stromu* (Far from the tree), published in samizdat in 1984, which displays a maturity of language and richness of style. The story, which is told in the first person by the novel’s heroine, illustrates the underlying inner contradictions of a generation who, as adolescents, found themselves confronted with barriers created in one way or another by their parents. As a result, they gropingly search for something firm to cling on to, having fallen like apples “far from the tree” – in other words, away from home and their parents’ attitudes. None the less they realise that a merely negative stance is no way to find a reliable alternative.

Although the generation gap does not cause official literature such serious problems, there are

also obvious signs of stagnation among its new authors, who lack both the courage and the opportunity to experiment, let alone take their predecessors to task. The great bulk of young writing reflects the stifling atmosphere in society resulting from the long years of political opportunism and mindless propaganda. The most there has been by way of resistance to this situation is the occasional tendency for young writers to abandon all intellectual concepts and just record their sensations. The very title of one recent verse collection: *Chůdy po předcích* (Inherited stilts) indicates how ludicrous the younger generation finds the bombast of their predecessors. They have no wish to inherit their “stilts”. They want to walk with their feet on the ground in a world of real, ideologically unrefined people.

Written two years ago, in December 1986, for the “Central and East European Publishing Project” (CEEPP) in Oxford. It is published here with the kind permission of the author and the CEEPP.

Milan Šimečka

### TATARKA’S “JOTTINGS”

To describe a literary work as “jottings” might lead the uninformed to judge from the title that the text is second-rate. Sensitive readers would realise after only the first few pages of Tatarka’s latest work, however, that they were in the presence of

top-class literature, the fruit of a deep experience of life and of personal suffering. "Jottings" is actually a poetic understatement, one which, in fact, reflects the author's own literary integrity.

Years ago, whenever I visited Tatarka, he would point to an old trunk full of jumbled manuscripts and say: "There you are, those are my jottings". There was no way he could call that clutter in the trunk "books" or "manuscripts", because at the time he did not believe they could ever become real books. And he was right. Had it not been for the exile publishing houses, they would never have turned into books. That is why he called them "jottings". The word also conveys the deep heartache of a writer who for years has written in solitude and isolation, without any hope that his manuscripts will ever emerge in printed form, properly bound and – most importantly – read. Tatarka used to call everything jottings (*ptšačky*), including those texts that were subsequently published in Czech under the title *Sám proti noci* (Alone against the night). That book was translated into Czech by Mr and Mrs Binar – and I ought to take this opportunity to say how beautifully that Moravian couple rendered Tatarka's Slovak: it was such a magical translation that as I read it I would continually find myself forgetting that I was reading a Czech text and in a mysterious way I would hear Tatarka's actual intonation in Slovak coming through their translation. That, I hope, clears up any doubts about *ptšačky*.

I used to read those "jottings" from the trunk at a time when the author had not yet the desire, or the strength even, to think of them as potential books. It was the exiled Ján Mlynárik who prepared the book for publication, thereby rendering

an enormous service to the author and Slovak literature alike. I vividly recall, however, that when I was reading those original manuscripts that time, with their pages covered in revisions and reworkings, I never doubted for an instant that I was in the presence of great literature.

In spite of being isolated by the authorities, Tatarka has already received the highest literary recognition. A jury composed of Czech writers of indisputable calibre chose Tatarka to be the first recipient of the Seifert prize. Tatarka has frequently been assailed with warm expressions of friendship at informal gatherings of banned writers. He is held in high esteem by the younger generation of Bratislava intellectuals who express enormous admiration for him. Time will tell what a profound influence he has had on them as a result of his art and his civic courage. The local lads come and dig his garden and paint his room, and at Yuletide, everybody comes – kids and all – to wish him a Happy Christmas. And there is also the occasional visitor from abroad. It is conceivable that some members of the literary establishment actually envy him such unofficial esteem. His *Demon of Consent* was recently published in France. How often do you find a Slovak writer being translated into a world language? Tatarka deserves to be translated more and more, of course. But we know how things are. Why ever should the mad world be interested in the delicate weavings of his imagination, or in his striking recollections of the beauty and dignity of old village life? Why should it care about his musings on the significance of ceremony, hospitality, sociability, or on the – now extinct – sacramental attitude towards domestic animals, let alone his well con-



---

cealed interpretations of Lévi-Strauss. After all isn't he a self-styled "Carpathian shepherd" who has rooted himself in the bygone cultures of Central Europe? And since his descriptions of the forms of love between men and women are veiled in mystique and couched in neologisms, they make great demands on the reader and are therefore – unlike soft porn – uncommercial. As a result, Tatarka remains chiefly a source of joy for Slovak readers and those Czechs who are not too lazy to read Slovak – and in Tatarka's case there are happily plenty of the latter.

What is disgraceful, though, is that Tatarka has been totally ignored by official Slovak literary history and criticism for nearly twenty years. It's as if he never existed. It is disgraceful because there are too few exponents of Slovak literature whose importance transcends the national framework for Tatarka to be excluded from its achievements. Slovak literature will live to rue this neglect.

There is, of course, a sense in which Tatarka himself is to blame for his own disinheritance. Not, however, because he led a demonstration in 1968 or joined the Charter community. There are other Slovak writers who have similar blots on their past. No, the fact is that Tatarka is just too different. Like few other Slovak writers, he is utterly immersed in Slovak culture and tradition and has almost a primeval attitude to the world. However, Tatarka has managed to retain his roots while achieving European stature. This he has done by making a virtue of his roots instead of an obstacle. He has never fallen prey to parochialism, or remained happily confined within his small nation. His horizons are wider and he has always treated everyone on equal terms. He has regarded his

Slovak identity as an asset, within a wider cultural context, not only in literature, but also in terms of the national life. Notwithstanding, I have never detected, in all the years I have known him, the slightest hint of any kind of defensive nationalism in his character. Even now it is a mystery to me how they could have charged him with bourgeois in the fifties. Tatarka talks about nationality with the candour of someone at home with the different world cultures. He will say things like: "You know, that Polish chap, Wojtyla...", or "Hey, that Jewish woman has the most beautiful Hasidic eyes...", or "Listen, that Czech fellow, Prince Wenceslas (referring to Václav Havel)..." When Tatarka speaks about people's nationalities you feel he is relishing the world's diversity. Such a sense of belonging is rarely found in present-day Europe and it marks Tatarka out from the crowd. This, I believe, explains the loneliness that troubles him. Moreover, such loneliness is nothing new in his case, but dates back to the beginning of the fifties. Although Tatarka is of archetypally Slovak origin, coming from a traditionally catholic village community on the borders of Slovakia and Poland, his experience as a student in Prague and Paris meant that he was "thrust into the world" – in the old existential sense – far more than any other Slovak writer of his generation. And it is quite likely that his assessment of that experience was also far more radical than anyone else's. His isolation as a writer is not solely of political origin. His is a solitariness of a different order: the kind we know from the lives of other distinguished writers. However, in the case of a writer in Slovakia whose genius lies in his mastery of human relationships, his plight is all the more bitter.

---

Tatarka is exacting company. He is incapable of small-talk and in every conversation gets straight down to brass tacks. He couldn't care less about new recipes, and he doesn't even have any interest in politics as it is understood in everyday chitchat. He is the last person you'd find in a writers' club and has never been suited to the role of national writer. And all attempts to impose that role on him have proved disastrous – for Tatarka, at least.

They are currently pressing him to agree to a re-edition of *Farská republika* (Parochial republic), Tatarka's only prose work in which he reflected the prevailing taste for "typical heroes in typical settings". Tatarka is rejecting their overtures and pressing for the publication of works from the peak of his artistic career. But that, as we know, is out of the question for the time being. And maybe here again it is not so much because of Tatarka's political defiance as because of the singularity of his style and subject-matter. Tatarka has always been an odd-man-out in Slovak literature, which still remains very close to the tradition of realistic narrative. In fact he has spent his whole life telling his own story, and in a fashion that does not give the reader time to draw breath. He tells it with provocative frankness and overwhelming sincerity. Whether speaking or writing, Tatarka's sole concern is for his own ontology and the ontology of his fellow human-beings – as well as for the fascinating phenomenon of male-female polarity, of course. You know the sort of thing: "There was a time when men and women were linked through work. The man would reap while the woman garnered... At noon they would sit and drink fresh water. Sometimes they would

even make love... Nowadays they come home from work to their flat on a housing estate, and they are strangers to each other..." etc. etc. Tatarka is capable of developing this theme ad infinitum, in conversation and in his books. One might compare how this theme is treated by Tatarka and by famous American writers like Mailer and Updike. We would discover that in Tatarka's writing, women are never treated as a modern partner in sexual lust, but as a sacrament, to use a word offensive to feminists – an object of inner searchings, sexual ceremonial, beauty and solemnity.

Tatarka lives the way he does, in his house below Slavín, because he has refrained from joining the various literary currents which have come into being in the Slovak literary world over the past fifty years. Tatarka's books contain none of the long and tedious passages typical of that school of Slovak literature held in the highest esteem: so-called "lyricised prose". Nor does he display any of the hastiness and indifference to variety of expression which one generally finds in the works of the younger generation. Tatarka makes no apologies for writing in Slovak. He treats it as a mature modern language and his manuscripts are full of deliberately chosen expressions, which editors remove from his texts as non-Slovak. None the less his is a young, boisterous and heady language, one that grips the attention.

Tatarka lives in isolation because he has never stopped thinking things out and has not been prepared to renounce or modify any of his ideas. And inevitably he himself was to find his intellectual rigour a painful process which could even boomerang on him. This was the case of his

---

religious belief which he abandoned and returned to later in a new form. Once he had identified the *Demon of Consent* and given it a name, however, he was never to submit to it thereafter. I recall how liberating was my first encounter with that designation over thirty years ago. I was reading *The Demon* in the tram. I got off, sat down on a bench and proceeded to read the book right to the end. I then walked home with my head in a whirl. It very much recalled Arbes' old horror tale, *Newton's Brain*. For me it hit the nail on the head: how they opened up people's skulls, took out their brains and stuck back someone else's instead. But it was written with such an astounding urgency and was so fantastically saturated with local colour, that it made both enjoyable and touching reading. It convinced me even more that it is daft to hanker after someone else's brain as it must destroy you in the end.

*The Demon* ought to have been translated into other languages back in those days. Unfortunately Tatarka was a victim of the world's indifference towards the literature of small nations. It was a time when the tame writings of the Soviet thaw were being hailed in the world as a literary sensation. All that Tatarka earned was local hostility. I was twenty six years old at the time and too shy to go and tell him how I, as an avid reader of world literature, had been intensely gripped by a work that was the product of our experience and of Slovak consciousness. I did not tell him it until fifteen years later. The recently published French translation of *The Demon* just cannot convey the thrill which the book engendered at that particular moment of history. It might well happen,

though, that *The Demon* will once more play its original role in some totally different country where someone comes up with the idea of swapping people's brains. But that is just a footnote to all the fine things that Václav Havel says about it in his introduction.

It is unlikely that this disgrace, which is now part of the national memory, will ever be forgotten. Faces will continue to redden every time anyone recalls how Tatarka was the victim of cruel indifference for twenty years and how his most recent works have been suppressed. Admittedly such things are commonplace in this part of the world. But the losses of the poor are always that much more tragic than the losses of the rich. I only wish that the whole sorry situation would come to an end, and that someone else, apart from ourselves, would declare in no uncertain terms what Tatarka was, is, and will be in Slovak literature.

This article was published originally in *Obsah* (samizdat, Prague), February 1988, and revised by the author for *Acta*.

We wish to thank all those in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere who communicated to us, either by phone or in writing, various corrections and additions to our bibliography: *Edice Petlice 1973-87*. We shall be publishing these along with information about Petlice's 1988 titles in a future issue of *Acta*.

---

## CRITIQUE, BOOK & JOURNALS

Eva Kantůrková. *Jan Hus. Příspěvek k národní identitě*  
A contribution to the notion of Czech national identity/  
Samizdat, 385 pp. Prague 1988. The book is dedicated to  
“my dear friend, François Brélaze”, the President of the Hus  
Foundation in Switzerland.

Our leading protestant historian, A. Molnár admits that modern historiography has an outstanding debt to Hus. But if Czech readers want to learn something about Jan Hus, stimulated perhaps by the news that the Roman Catholic church is considering a possible review of Hus's trial, where can they turn to? Molnár's ten-page essay on Hus's concept of truth in the collection *Na rozhraní věků /At the turn of the age/,* Prague, 1985, is no more than a “hint”. Šmahel's *Hranice pravdy /Truth at stake/,* Prague, 1969, while a successful example of “literature of fact”, actually covers only the last months of Hus's life. And the reader will have a hard time obtaining a picture of Hus from Bartoš's *Čechy v době Husově /Bohemia at the time of Hus/,* Prague, 1947, a book crammed with factual detail and events, much of which has only the most tenuous connection with Hus the man. We need to go right back to 1919 (Václav Novotný) or 1915 (Jan Sedlák and Václav Flajšhans) if we want an extensive monograph.

But now at long last, in 1988, we are rewarded with a record of Hus's entire life story and “the distinct phenomenon of Hus” can once more manifest itself, if not to all, then at least to those with access to Eva Kantůrková's samizdat publi-

cation *Jan Hus*. When in her epilogue the author tells us her ambition was to “recount what is perhaps the greatest life-story in Czech history”, it is possible that she herself does not do justice to her achievement. A book that contains a graphic outline of Pálec's and Hus's concepts of the church and a thorough exposition of the subtle differences between transubstantiation and remanence can hardly be described as merely “recounting a story”. With its almost 400 pages, Kantůrková's work is no more nor less than a meticulous historical study.

A book of this type naturally cries out for an index and explanatory notes, which it unhappily lacks. The presence of a proper index confirming the meticulous and unrelenting work with source material and basic Hussian literature, which it obviously entailed, would help Eva Kantůrková's *Jan Hus* to become a basic reference text about Hussism for future generations as well.

In “recounting” Hus's life-story, Kantůrková deliberately limits herself to those “verified” elements “from that distant past which have been preserved down to our own days”. Kantůrková makes fitting use of her skills as a fiction writer to bring out all the drama of the events of the period, while avoiding any temptation to use these same skills to fill the gaps in the extant records. The controversy regarded by the author as the “crux of Hus's dramatic story” started with Wycliffe's forty-five articles which the Dominican Jan Hubner assembled as a sort of sum total of heresies.

---

However, while it is true that “the characters within it would be defiled, friendships would come to grief, some would betray, others would pay with their lives”, what makes Hus’s story dramatic, in contrast to the lives of such full-blooded figures as Cossa, the pirate-Pope, Zbyněk Zajíc, the warrior-archbishop, or the sadistic weakling Wencelas IV, is the clash of ideas, theological opinions and philosophical persuasions, not to mention loyalty to these ideas or betrayal of them. In other words, Hus’s story has none of the thrill of a historical novel that can be read in a single sitting. The fact, for instance, that readers must work their way through a fifteen-page analysis of Hus’s ecclesiology and its comparison with Pálec’s reveals that the author was more concerned with seeking the roots of the Hussian dispute than with achieving a smooth story-line.

In the course of the book, Eva Kantůrková frequently allows Hus, as well as his contemporaries and Hussian scholars, to speak for themselves, while she herself remains well in the background. However her contribution as a writer is not restricted solely to collating scattered elements, setting out the story in thirteen chapters plus an introduction and epilogue and framing it all in a polished language which is stimulatingly modern while being well-suited to the chosen genre, it is also evident in the way she hits the nail on the head with such apposite comments as “mediocre individuals are unlikely to reach the top at periods of abrupt change, they tend to rule when the times are at a low ebb” or judgements such as: “there is nothing inherently repugnant about people changing their opinions, although there undoubtedly is when it happens not as the result

of new experience but out of fear”. On those occasions when the author voices her own opinion of Hus, she does so not from any particular denominational standpoint. She has no reason at all to defend Hus as a loyal Catholic misunderstood by the church establishment or as an authentic protestant and underrated pioneer of the Reformation. Rather she underlines the distance in time that separates us from him and makes it impossible to enlist Hus to the benefit of any particular party in today’s world: “Gothic Hus’ is one of the last outstanding representatives of that auspicious era in Europe’s spiritual past when the world was not yet separated from God, and man was integrated within it as in a womb from which, by death, if he so deserved, he could be born into heavenly glory. We, who are left to suffer the consequences of that separation, can only long for Hus’s integrity. It is one of the spiritual paradises that modern man has lost.” In other words, Kantůrková realises that one must also be careful about drawing any analogy between Hus’s experience and that of present-day dissidents, even if such a parallel does emerge between the lines: “The awkward thing about vital decisions which initially involve only fairly minor risks is that once one has said ‘a’, one has to go on and say ‘b’, and it is impossible to know at the outset how far one will have to continue into the alphabet...”

Of crucial importance in the book is a comparison between the destinies of Hus and Pálec. The latter, Hus’s erstwhile friend and former radical Wycliffite, went on to accuse Hus of Wycliffism and demand his condemnation. Kantůrková goes to great lengths to explain Pálec’s position while also providing a careful exposition of his views.

---

Just as in her eyes Hus is not “the one who did not know fear” (as Hana Hegerová used to sing), so Pálec for her is no ordinary traitor or vile knave. When she quotes Pálec’s anti-Wycliffian invective (e.g. “His writings are those hidden waters which many have now found so sweet that they are ready to lay down their lives for them, as could be seen at the recent execution. And that is an important sign of heresy, because none of our people would risk their lives for their faith...”) she warns her readers against hasty moral condemnation. In Pálec’s eyes, she explains, “if readiness to die for one’s belief is heretical, the opposite of heresy is obedience... Pálec’s position did not necessarily express the cowardice of a man fighting to save his life. Opting for the discipline of obedience is a fundamental decision”.

Thus Pálec takes the fundamental decision to obey the ecclesiastical institution, while Hus decides to owe allegiance to suprainstitutional authority: Hus “eluded the jurisdiction of institutions in favour of sanctity and devotion to Christ”.

Eva Kantůrková sub-titles her work “a contribution to the notion of Czech national identity”. Clearly the national identity is not something that was defined once and for all time by Jan Hus, but something that is constructed through the choices we make, the decisions we take, and the way we answer the call of truth. The key to deciphering the concept of “national identity” can be found in a paragraph of the book where Kantůrková once again counterposes Hus and Pálec: “Even though each of them decided in favour of something else, it is evident to the Czechs of today what were the

roots of those decisions. Furthermore they can directly relate to those experiences. As a lesson for us here and now, Pálec’s story is just as relevant as that of Jan Hus. Those two men embodied the two choices facing human beings, and the question we should be asking ourselves about Hus is not whether he should have gone willingly to the stake but whether we who are their historical descendants wish to emulate – or have it in us to emulate – Pálec or Hus.”

One can only hope that such a fundamentally important work will attract the attention of historians, and that they will assess it according to their own particular criteria. It is possible that they would indicate those parts of the book where the author remains faithful to certain notions on which doubt has been cast in the recent period (was Hus really Queen Sophia’s confessor?). There is one thing, though, that not even the most meticulous Hussian scholar could question, namely, that Eva Kantůrková has written a book for which Czech readers have waited decades.

Miloš Rejchrt

The International Committee for the Support of Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia has awarded Eva Kantůrková the Jan Palach Prize for 1988. This prize was established in 1979 to commemorate the anniversary of the immolation of the young Czech student in January 1969.

---

## THE JOURNAL "STŘEDNÍ EVROPA"

In keeping with our endeavour to build up comprehensive and systematically annotated bibliographical surveys of Czechoslovak samizdat publications and periodicals, we are publishing a detailed review of the journal *Střední Evropa* /Central Europe/ which started life in 1984 and already has ten issues to its credit. The review, which is taken from issue 4 of the seventh annual series of *Kritický sborník* /Critical review/ (Prague 1987), gave rise to a polemic which was printed in the first issue of *Kritický sborník* of 1988. That particular exchange of views was a good illustration of the breadth of opinion within independent circles and provided insight into the actual circumstances in which the editors of independent periodicals in Czechoslovakia work. We therefore thought it useful to publish it also.

We conclude this contribution with a review of *Střední Evropa* No.10, the most recent issue to date. This further article, which is by the same critic as before and published in the second issue of *Kritický sborník* this year (1988), helps demonstrate that polemic need not prove an obstacle to subsequent co-operation in support of a common cause.

*The editors*

STŘEDNÍ EVROPA /Central Europe/. No. 8 (Prague, July 1987, 166 pp.), No. 9 (Prague, November 1987, 192 pp.).

There are journals that come into the world "fully-fledged". For others the process of gestation is

long and arduous. An example of the first type is the review *O divadle* /About the theatre/, whose editors left no one in any doubt that they intended to work to the highest standards of professionalism current in normal circumstances. *Střední Evropa* is typical of the second category. The most that one could determine for sure from reading its first issue (Autumn 1984) was that it was the work of a single editor, done off his own bat and at his own risk. It was quite exciting in a way to see if it would survive and manage to forge a place for itself among Prague's samizdat periodicals. Well, *Střední Evropa* has indeed stood the test and has nine issues to its credit over the past three years – a rate of output that many other journals might well envy it. It appears at irregular intervals, each issue numbering about 150 A4 pages. The copies are bound in soft covers. As far as its subject-range is concerned, the very ambiguousness of the title and the sweeping terms of initial declaration of intent have given the editor ample scope to improvise. From the first issue, the journal has been gradually sharpening its focus of interest and this process has not yet culminated by any means. Nevertheless, now that the number of its issues is reaching double figures, *Střední Evropa* already represents a sufficiently identifiable platform of views for us to attempt a preliminary summary of its main features.

Anyone who was expecting a specialised discussion forum about "the Central European phenomenon" was probably disappointed. It was not until its sixth issue that *Střední Evropa* started to deal with problems of Central Europe per se. And even since then, discussion of such topics has not formed the main content of each issue, which is

---

made up chiefly of translated articles (contributions by local authors having been few and far between). *Střední Evropa* has always tended to give pride of place to the question of our national history, particularly that of the recent past, with special emphasis on aspects traditionally neglected or treated in an over-simplified or tendentious manner. It is certainly no coincidence that *Střední Evropa* came into being at the time when Charter 77's "Right to History" document was arousing passionate debate – and indeed the journal's views are close to those of that document's authors. In fact the abundance of contributions on such "national" themes, which are only indirectly related to the review's subject-matter as indicated by its title, has gradually led the editors to divide up what were initially random blocks of material. Thus in No. 6 there appeared a separate section under the heading REHABILITATION OF JAN HUS? in which *Střední Evropa* made an important contribution to the discussion already commenced in the catholic samizdat journals. Issue No. 7 saw the introduction of a special heading THE CZECH ARISTOCRACY – and we should recall in this connection that since its third issue, *Střední Evropa* has been serialising a translation of the monograph *The House of Habsburg – the history of a European dynasty* by Austrian historian A.Wandruszka (13 chapters published to date).

Articles on culture, literature and art constitute the journal's third main thematic strand. Most noteworthy of these have been J.Hradec's two-part study in Nos.3 and 4 on the significance of Josef Florian, and the special section of the seventh issue devoted to the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Jaroslav Durych. This particu-

lar subject area has virtually no connection with the topic of Central Europe. However, what is most disconcerting in *Střední Evropa* are those sections of the journal – whose headings vary from issue to issue – which are made up of shorter pieces such as reviews, commentaries, etc. Here one would expect the editor to make every effort to give readers an over-view of everything being written on the subject in various parts of the world. None the less, Central European issues are scarcely reflected in these pages and the contributions seem to be selected rather at random. Admittedly the editor has managed to give the journal a very particular stamp by a tendency to include in this section articles likely to raise hackles (such as L.Jehlička's polemical pieces, and the philosophical "reviews" signed "rzk-").

As far as its opinions and ideas are concerned, *Střední Evropa* is not of any one particular "hue". Nevertheless, there is a conspicuous number of articles from catholic circles (speaking in a cultural, rather than a confessional sense, of course). It should be pointed out that some of the views expressed echo pre-war right-wing thinking. This is particularly true of a lengthy article (to be continued) which appeared in Nos. 8 and 9 under the signature "Andreas", in which the author makes a radical critique of everything that might be described as the "Thomas Guarrigue Masaryk phenomenon" (or syndrome) in Czech history.

In its past two issues, the journal has continued the process of internal structuration with the introduction of two new sections. The first of these, headed by the Hebrew word ZEKHER (meaning recollection or memory) deals with Jewish aspects of the Central European issue, the



second, entitled DOCUMENTS has so far included, *inter alia*, a lengthy report about the fight of nature conservationists in Bratislava to save the historic St Andrew Cemetery. Among more recent features are essays devoted to regional artists, such as one about the painter and sculptor V.Vaculka from Uherské Hradiště (1914-1977), in No.8, and another about the young Moravian sculptor O.Oliva in No.9. It could well be that this is another area of interest which the journal is planning to follow more closely, but in the meantime, the editor "justifies" the inclusion of both contributions on the grounds that no independent art journal yet exists.

Also worthy of mention is another separate section devoted to CONTEMPORARY POLISH POLITICAL THOUGHT (Kolakowski, Michnik and Brzezinski) in No. 8, the continuation of the discussion about Hus in a specialised historical essay in No. 9 (signed "Speratus"), and the publication, also in No. 9, of the first part of Julius Vrána's *Notes for a history of Central Europe*. But while in terms of content and composition, *Střední Evropa* is sharpening its profile from issue to issue, in terms of editing the situation is one of stagnation. Even in the past two issues there have still been an unacceptable number not only of spelling mistakes but also of grammatical and stylistic lapses. One gets the impression that the editor has done no more than select and assemble texts and has deliberately avoided "interfering" with them. As a result, a good number of interesting pieces have suffered unnecessarily owing to insufficient editing.

-db-

*Kritický sborník*, 1987, Vol.7, No.4, pp.111-113. Editorially shortened.

## LETTERS

I

Dear "-db-",

I have many objections to your essay about the journal *Střední Evropa*. Maybe some of them would be more properly addressed to the editors of *Kritický sborník*, but I don't intend to try apportioning responsibility.

First of all, I fail to understand why your views on the editorial line and evolution of the journal in question were published in the BOOK NEWS section – which up to now, as far as I can tell, has been devoted to notes about samizdat publications. Secondly, if your article was intended to be objective reporting then I can only say that *Kritický sborník* is biased against *Střední Evropa*.

But let us examine what you actually wrote about it. It is clearly outrageous to state that certain themes "are only indirectly related to the review's subject-matter as proclaimed by its title". Do you really believe that Czech history is only "indirectly or by implication" related to Central European issues? What, then, in your view, is more directly related to the Central European issue than the history of the countries, nations and states making up this part of the world? If people are to find some way of living together in harmony, they need to know about each others' own history and traditions, clear up their misunderstandings and make every effort to redress mutual injustices. Or do you think she should set about dreaming up grand schemes, which would immediately start to collapse, being built on the sands of mere theory? In my view, the work both of Jaroslav Durych and

---

particularly of Josef Florian represent extremely important attempts at reviving catholic thought during the latter period of Austrian rule and at the time of the First Republic. Some might regard them as marginal figures. I personally hold to the view that without them things would look very different here today.

You find it “disconcerting” that the editors of *Střední Evropa* fail to provide “an overview of everything written about the topic” around the world, etc. Well, I must say it you who disconcert me. You air certain misgivings about the fact that “it chiefly comprises translated articles” and then over the page the reader is told that *Střední Evropa* does not provide information about EVERYTHING being written about the topic in different parts of the world. What do the journal’s poor editors have to do to please you? People from Czechoslovakia attending international conferences and symposia on the topic of Central Europe are few and far between. What can one do, therefore, apart from translating the papers given there or summarising the collected papers when they are subsequently published?

“It should be pointed out that some of the views expressed echo pre-war right-wing thinking.” Do you really think so? On the contrary, my dear “-db-”, on the contrary! Conditions here are not yet such as would allow one in all decency to stick such a denunciatory label on a person, nor will they be for a long time to come. If my friend Václav Benda writes that he considers himself to be an anti-communist, then that’s his business and he is fully aware of the risk he runs. But if I were to say the same thing about him, even if I thought he would agree, then I would be placing him at risk

of attracting even greater secret police interest. And the same applies to aspersions about those who, for various reasons, do not sign their articles with their full name, whether individuals or groups.

If you truly discovered from reading *Střední Evropa* that *Notes for a history of Central Europe*, published in No. 9, was written by JULIUS Vrána, then you should think about opening a travelling oracle. I took the trouble of asking the editors themselves, something which you could have one as well. The article was signed J.Vrána; you took a liberty in writing “Julius”. The same goes for your assertion that “one could determine for sure” that “it was the work of a single editor” – on the basis of the first issue of *Střední Evropa*! But whatever made you put in your sub-title that it was about issues 8 and 9 of the journal, when in fact you hardly mention them?

And as for “the unacceptable number of mistakes” you mention: you know, I could lend you a recopied *Kritický sborník* produced outside Prague, and I can assure you that you would be amazed how little of your professionally executed work remained. What is an “acceptable” number of mistakes? After all, even such outstanding style as your own is no guarantee of reliable information...

Petruška Šustrová

II

Dear Petruška Šustrová,

I must admit I read your letter with growing amazement! From my short piece about *Střední Evropa* you conclude that I am biased. If it’s true,

---

then it's news to me! The fact is that I have followed approvingly the progress of that journal since its very first issue. I am pleased that such a periodical has come into existence, and above all that it is holding its own (in itself no mean achievement). But my personal feelings are neither here nor there, are they? The important thing, naturally, is what I actually wrote. However, even after re-reading my article several times I still fail to see how it constitutes misrepresentation of *Střední Evropa* or inaccurate reporting as you claim. My criticisms were precisely two in number, and both of them can be easily substantiated. I readily admit that it is rather a tall order to provide – in the space of a few lines – an overall picture of a periodical which already has nine issues to its credit. Moreover my article makes no claims to “objectivity”: my ambitions fall far short of that. What matters is whether I was basically accurate in what I wrote. It is possible that I was guilty of certain imprecisions and that I neglected some important features, but anyway I was writing a magazine article, not a bibliographical entry. But you go right ahead and accuse me of malice, and that I find annoying.

You know, the whole business of “objectivity” is a very tricky one. Ask yourself whether you, who in such an enviable matter-of-course way demand “objectivity” of me, satisfy that requirement yourself. I think you would find it harder to accuse me of malice if your objections were not largely derived from subjective emotions, i.e. irritation. There is no arguing against irritation. Even so, I'll try and show that your objections are not quite as apt as you no doubt think.

How should I have gone about writing a brief appraisal of *Střední Evropa's* evolution, then? Surely you'll agree with me that the following three elements were essential: 1) a description of the journal's principal subject-matter; 2) an appraisal of its political or philosophical line, and 3) an assessment of the standard of its writing.

CONCERNING POINT 1): The title *Střední Evropa* implies a SPECIFIC POLICY, which was also obvious from the initial statement of intent. The fact that the title is so indefinite or ambiguous naturally gives the editor a fairly free hand. Nonetheless, the reader is entitled to ask to what degree the journal's content lives up to its declared aim. And here, I believe, it is obvious that only now is the journal beginning to achieve this goal – albeit slowly, and with certain ups and downs. There is nothing wrong in that, of course, and what I said was intended not as criticism, but comment.

Concerning the specific question of Czech history: of course it forms part of the whole issue of Central Europe, along with Czech literature and Czech art. The contrary does not follow however, and not every article on Czech history (or literature, etc.) is necessarily related to the question of Central Europe. The same historical or literary subject can be treated in many different ways, and its connection with the Central European question will vary accordingly. It can be directly or indirectly connected with it, OR BY IMPLICATION in some way. Do you still consider this approach to be “outrageous”? Just imagine, for the sake of argument, that the journal was called *Europe* and set itself the task of examining the phenomenon of “Europeanness”. Could one really maintain that any study of Czech history would

---

automatically form part of research into the phenomenon of Europe, merely because the territory of Bohemia lies in Europe?

That applies as much to Hussism, as it does to Durych or Florian. Of course one could deal with those outstanding figures in a “Central European” perspective. However, when *Střední Evropa* published Patočka’s foreword to *The divine rainbow* and Hradec’s study about Florian, I felt that it had failed to do so.

Do you find my criticism of the lack of consistency in the sections devoted to reviews, commentaries, etc., “outrageous” too? Of course a couple of good reviews have been published, but what is absolutely lacking is information (even in the form of brief notes) about “Central European” literature published abroad. Do you really consider it an effrontery for me to have drawn public attention to this shortcoming? Foreign sources are admittedly not readily accessible, but they are not totally inaccessible. My own enquiries have led me to conclude that the editorial team was in a position to overcome this deficiency if they had wanted to do.

CONCERNING POINT 2): You completely floored me when you called my reference to “right-wing” tendencies a “denunciatory label”. I wasn’t expecting that, I must say. The impression I have been getting over the past few years is that the term “right-wing” (if we are to go back to using that traditional designation) is at last ceasing to be a dirty word and being used at it ought to be in normal circumstances, i.e. to describe one particular legitimate political standpoint. One can see this happening throughout independent journalism: there are journals with left-wing leanings (e.g.

*Ze zásuvky a z bloku*) and those which take a more or less right-wing line (which – in my view, but not just mine – also include *Střední Evropa*). What at this point is a reviewer to do, in your opinion? Every independent journal attracts the attention of the secret police, by the very fact of being published, and I believe one would have a hard job deciding what annoys the powers that be more: right-wing views or independent left-wing opinion. To be sure, “anti-communism” is another case entirely, but your analogy is extremely far-fetched, to put it mildly.

CONCERNING POINT 3): I admit that the second of my criticisms, regarding continued shortcomings in the editing of texts, was worded rather strongly, but I assure you that I weighed my words carefully. Surely you can’t believe, dear Mrs Šustrová, that I would have the impudence to voice such a criticism on the basis of an *n*th transcript of *Střední Evropa* – let alone one produced outside Prague? I make it a principle always to use one of the first “batch” of copies – those that serve as models for subsequent transcripts – for my reviews. I am fully aware of the sort of howlers typists can commit when transcribing texts over and over again, and also that such texts are not copy edited. But surely this fact does not exempt editors from the duty to strive for professional standards, at the very least in the initial output over which they have control. “What is an acceptable number of mistakes?”, you ask, rather naively. It is extremely relative i.e. one can only judge it in comparison with other publishing operations. Were *Střední Evropa* Prague’s first ever samizdat periodical and had it no rivals in the field, my criticism would naturally have been excessive.

I really am not the sort of nit-picker who makes a point of searching for "printing errors" and then flinging them in editors' faces. On the other hand, I see no reason why, in samizdat's present state of development, we should put up with a lower standard in independent periodicals than in the official press. Besides we should also have an eye to the future: if we don't get used to working professionally in samizdat how will we cope when conditions change and we'll be faced with the public at large?

Finally, I must appease your curiosity about how I discovered that J.Vrána's first name is Julius. I do assure you that I neither dreamt it up nor was it revealed to me by occult forces. I discovered it in some French journal – I think it was either *Esprit* or *Commentaire* (though I can't exclude the possibility that they were mistaken). I didn't think it unreasonable for me to make practical use of this knowledge. It was partly a sort of test: if he really was Julius he would keep quiet about it; if he was Jaroslav, say, he would issue a disclaimer. Is that sufficient explanation for you? Mind you, I am curious to know why you make so much of it...

Yours faithfully,  
Daniel Bohdan

*Kritický sborník*, 1988, Vol.8, No.1, pp.98-103. Editorially shortened.

\*\*\*

*STŘEDNÍ EVROPA* /Central Europe/. No. 10 (Prague, February 1988, 193 pp. A4).

The introductory section opens with the second part of J(ulius) Vrána's *Notes for a history of*

*Central Europe*. This article, which is presumably to be continued, should be welcomed as the first major contribution by a local author to come to grips with the issues implicit in the journal's title. The next three contributions continue the discussion of the article by "Andreas": "Czech wanderings" (the first two parts of which appeared in issues 8 and 9). In terms of length, and above all approach, one of the replies: "Czech dreams", signed "Moravius", goes well beyond the scope of the discussion so far.

The following section, under the title of YUGOSLAV PATHS is the first part of a personal account of Tito's concentration camps by a former political prisoner, and a review of a book by British journalist Norah Beloff *Tito's dubious legacy*. In the light of the present situation, this new venture by the editors is a promising start to a demythologisation of Yugoslav communism.

The section entitled ZEKHER, which started in No.8 and deals with the Jewish phenomenon in Central and Eastern Europe is especially well represented in the present issue. It comprises the first part of the diary of a Zionist statesman of Czech origin, Leo Herrmann, recounting his visit to Prague in Autumn 1945 (translated from the German edition of historian Peter Heumos), an article by Ruth R. Wisse "Polish Jewish luminaries", and finally, a speech by Professor Ada Stego about the plans for a catholic monastery at Auschwitz.

The RESPONSES section contains a review by exiled Russian historian Mikhail Geller of Solzhenitsyn's *The Red Wheel* (two volumes of which have already been published: *August 1914* and *November 1916*, describing key moments in Rus-

---

sian history on the eve of the Revolution), and a profile of the Moravian artist Jan Jemelka by K.Novotný.

The DOCUMENTS section reproduces the petition by Czechoslovak catholics popularly known as the "Thirty-One Points", which calls for a new and just settlement of relations between Church and State.

This issue's APPENDIX comprises the final instalment of Adam Wandruszka's monograph *The House of Habsburg* (chaps. 14 and 15), due to be published in the *Střední Evropa* book series.

-db-

*Kritický sborník*, 1988, Vol.8, No.2, pp.IX.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### "HISTORICKÉ STUDIE" 1978-1988

One of the earliest samizdat periodicals, *Historické studie* /Historical studies/ marked its tenth year of publication in January 1988. It is the only journal devoted to independent Czechoslovak historiography. *Historické studie* is published biannually and fully deserves the description of a historical review offering original studies and articles by authors resident in Czechoslovakia and Czechoslovak historians living abroad. In addition it has regular sections such as discussions, book reviews, source material, translations, bibliographies, etc.

From the very first issues it was clear that this was a publishing initiative with long-term ambitions. Even so the group of independent historians which was responsible for the journal's publication gave their efforts the ostensible appearance of occasional or commemorative miscellanies. Indeed most of the first ten annual series actually included the word *sborník* (review) in their titles or sub-titles.

The title of the journal varied from issue to issue, and there was scarcely no duplication. The title *Historické studie. Sborník* /Historical studies. Review/, which was given to the first issue of January 1978, did not reappear until No. 17 of August 1984. The journal was published anonymously, without any indication of who edited or published it, although most of the contributors appeared under their actual names. Nor were the issues numbered serially. It was not until the issue of October 1985 that a typed figure 19 appeared on the title-page, from which it was apparent, even to the uninitiated, that this was the nineteenth issue of *Historické studie* in the series.

However, it is only since issue 22 of January 1988 that *Historické studie* has acquired a standard design, title and formal arrangement, and the number of the issue is clearly marked on the title page. The editors have emerged from anonymity and they are listed in the journal as Jaroslav Mez-

---

ník, Milan Otáhal and Jan Křen as part of an editorial group. In their introduction to issue 22 the editors acknowledge responsibility for the whole series. There are two other indications of this continuity. Firstly, there is the inclusion of the words "11th annual series" /11. ročník/ in the masthead, and secondly, the fact that a bibliography was published in No. 22 listing all the previous issues, including those subsequently numbered, along with an index of the contributions that had appeared in the journal up to and including the issue of January 1987 (No. 20). This bibliography also serves as an inventory of the journal's output.

By Autumn 1988 a total of 24 volumes of *Historické studie* had been published, numbered from 1 to 23 (the 11th annual series consisting of Nos. 22 and 23). There was also an unnumbered issue: the volume entitled *The history of German-Czech relations* which came out in 1980, and was subsequently listed by the publishers between issues 4 and 5. Issues 1 to 21 were reproduced as carbon copies; Nos. 22 and 23 were distributed in photocopy (xerox) form.

The *Historické studie* publishing group also has to its credit a book series entitled *Knižnice Historických studií* /The Library of Historical studies/ in which six titles appeared.

Please note that the Documentation Centre has a complete set of *Historické studie*. Orders for copies of the entire set or of individual issues (as well as of individual articles, in exceptional cases) may be placed up to end of March 1989.

\*\*\*

The following bibliographical synopsis is intended to provide comprehensive information

about the *Historické studie* series to date, and about its individual issues. (The preparation of a more detailed bibliography, including an index of authors and subject-matter, remains a task for the future, and the same applies to an analysis of the series to assess its overall contribution to Czechoslovak historiography, and the quality of the individual contributions, etc.)

The line immediately below the serial number of the publication contains all the information available from the title page of the individual issue, followed by the number of pages. The periodical's format has always been A4 and is therefore not specified. The initials s.l. (sine loco) indicate that the place of publication is not shown on the title-page. The names of individual sections of the journal are given as in the original.

All information given in square brackets is the work of the editor of this bibliographical synopsis; explanatory information about the content of individual contributions is also placed in square brackets. Numbers after the titles of the individual contributions indicate the page number within that particular issue. The abbreviation "Ed." is used to indicate the editors of journals and source material.

Entries concerning the books reviewed have been slightly simplified, compared to the data given in *Historické studie*. In most cases the original titles of the review articles are omitted so that only the name of the author and the title of the book are recorded. The names, initials or mark of book reviewers are given in round brackets after the book's title.

Vilém Prečan

1

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE. Sborník /Historical studies. Review/. Prague, January 1978, 246 pp.

[Studies:]

Bedřich Loewenstein, *Tři studie o občanské společnosti* /Three studies on civil society/, 1-77

Ján Mlynárik, *Slovenská sociáldemokratická strana v čase vzniku ČSR* /The Slovak Social Democratic Party in the early days of the Czechoslovak Republic/, 78-142

František Červinka, *Útěk do historie. Z kapitol o české kultuře za okupace* /Escape into history: from chapters on Czech culture during the Occupation/, 143-169

Jiří Doležal, *Nacisté a české školství* /Czech education under the Nazis/, 170-196

Miloš Hájek, *Vznik Italské komunistické strany ve světle historiografie* /The creation of the Italian Communist Party in the light of historiography/, 197-246

Reviews:

J.W.Brügel, *Tschechen und Deutsche 1938-1946* (Jan Křen), 222-232

B.Lazitch – M.Drachkovitch, *Lenin and the Comintern* (Hana Mejdrová), 233-240

F.Liversi, *Amadeo Bordiga* (Miloš Hájek), 241-246

2

[HISTORICKÉ STUDIE. Sborník] /Historical Studies. Review/. S.l., June 1978. 168 pp. (unnumbered)

Studies:

Bedřich Loewenstein, *Pugačov a Leviatan. Civilizace mezi zvůlň jednotlivce a státu* /Pugachov and Leviathan: civilisation between the tyranny of the individual and the state/, 1-37

Michal Reiman, *Říjnová revoluce v kontextu ruských a sovětských dějin. Historická úvaha* /The October Revolution in the context of Russian and Soviet history: a historical essay/, 38-70

Miloš Hájek, *Vztahy mezi Italskou komunistickou stranou a Kominternou ve dvacátých letech* /Relations between the Italian Communist Party and the Comintern in the nineteen-twenties/, 71-99

Criticism and news:

V.Kural, *Poznámky na okraj paměti generála F. Moravce* /Marginal notes on General Moravec's memoirs/, 101-134

B.Loewenstein, *Marxismus, fašismus, studená válka* /Marxism, fascism and the Cold War/ [an exhaustive survey of E.Nolte's publications on the topic], 135-145

S.F.Cohen, *Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution* (H. Mejdrová), 146-161

R.Luža, *History of the International Socialist Youth Movement* (Jiří Hájek), 162-168

3

SBORNÍK HISTORICKÝCH STUDIÍ /Review of historical studies/. S.l., Spring 1979. 234 pp. (unnumbered) Studies:

Karel Kinský, *K charakteristice ruské politiky v Bulharsku v letech 1876-1887* /Aspects of Russian policies in Bulgaria, 1876-1887/, 4-137

Jan Křen, *Palackého představy střední Evropy (1848-1849)* /Palacký's notions about Central Europe, 1848-49/, 138-173



Milan Otáhal, *Počátky české politiky (do roku 1848)* /The beginnings of Czech politics to 1848/, 174-219

Criticism and notes:

M.Hájek, *Portrét Palmira Togliattiho* /A portrait of Palmiro Togliatti/, 221-229

M.Otáhal, *Poznámky k problematice odboje v letech 1939-1945* /Notes on the question of resistance in the 1939-45 period/, 230-234

4

STUDIE Z ČESKOSLOVENSKÝCH DĚJIN. Sborník /Studies in Czechoslovak history. Review/. Prague, Autumn 1979, 169 pp.

Studies:

Jiří Doležal, *Vztah nacistů k české kultuře* /The Nazis' attitude to Czech culture/, 3-45

Ján Mlynárik, *Milan Rastislav Štefánik a československá státnost* /M.R.Štefánik and Czechoslovak statehood/, 46-63

Hana Mejdrová, *Československo 1926: solidarita s anglickými horníky* /Czechoslovakia 1926: solidarity with the English miners/, 64-113

Criticism and news:

M.Hájek – H.Mejdrová, *Vznik Třetí internacionály* /The creation of the Third International/ (K. Zubatý), 117-136

V.Černý, *Pláč koruny české* /The lamentation of the Crown of Bohemia/ (J.Doležal), 137-152

J.Kočí, *České národní obrození* /The Czech national revival/ (J.Karel), 153-158

M.Otáhal, *O 60. výročí vzniku Československé republiky* /The 60th anniversary of the Czechoslovak Republic/ [Re a samizdat opinion poll], 159-164

J.K., *Zpráva o mezinárodním sympoziu o ekonomice střední Evropy v meziválečném období* /News of an international symposium on the Central European economies in the inter-war period/, 165-169

[Unnumbered volume]

K DĚJINÁM ČESKO-NĚMECKÝCH VZTAHŮ. Sborník /On the history of Czech-German relations. Review/. Prague, 1980, 210 pp.

Introduction

Bohemus, *Slovo o odsunu Němců z Československa* /Thoughts on the expulsion of Germans from Czechoslovakia/, 3-27

Václav Kural, *Několik glos...* /A few notes.../, 28-34

Jan Křen, *Češi a Němci: kritické poznámky* /The Czechs and the Germans: critical notes/, 35-56

Václav Kural, *Češi a Němci v československém a německém státě (1918-1945): pokus o nástin "logiky" vývoje* /The Czechs and the Germans in the Czechoslovak and German state 1918-1945: a tentative outline of the "logical" development/, 57-100

Václav Vrabec, *Ke genezi myšlenky transferu Němců v domácí odboji* /The genesis of the idea of German expulsion in the home resistance/, 101-126

Jaroslav Opat, *K Bohemovu "Slovu o odsunu"* /Response to Bohemus' thoughts on the expulsions/, 127-152

Miloš Hájek, *Poznámky k diskusi o česko-německém vztahu (1918-1945)* /Notes concerning the debate on Czech-German relations 1918-1945/, 153-156

Luboš Kohout, *Dějinné souvislosti odsunu a jeho důsledky* /The historical ramifications of the expulsions and their consequences/, 157-164

Milan Hübl, *Spor o dvojí pojetí národa* /The controversy about two concepts of the nation/, 165-173

- Milan Hübl, *Nad dosavadním průběhem diskuse o odsunu čs. Němců /The state of play in the debate on the transfer of Czechoslovak Germans/, 174-189*
- Jaroslav Mezník, *Pokus o vlast? Pojmy a historická fakta v pojetí Petra Pitharta /A tentative homeland? Terms and historical facts in Petr Pithart's interpretation/, 190-200*
- Komárková – Mezník – Šimsa – Vydráň, *Pokus o vlast: Bolzano, Rádl, Patočka a my v roce 1979 /A tentative homeland: Bolzano, Rádl, Patočka and ourselves in 1979/, 201-210*

5

STUDIE HISTORICKÉ. Sborník /Historical studies. Review/. S.I., June 1980, 188 pp.

Articles:

- Jaroslav Opat, *Zdeněk Kalista. Úvaha k osmdesátinám českého historika /Essay to mark the 80th birthday of Czech historian Zdeněk Kalista/, 2-16.*
- Jiří Doležal, *Úvahy o pražském povstání /Thoughts on the Prague uprising [of May 1945]/, 17-67*
- Jaroslav Mezník, *Finance moravského markraběte Jošta (1375-1411) /The finances of the Moravian Margrave Jošt/, 68-97.*
- Discussion:
- Karel Pichlík, *Poznámka na okraj jedné poznámky pod čarou /Marginal note to a footnote/ [concerning M.Otáhal's study *The beginnings of Czech politics*, see vol. 3], 98-121*
- M.Otáhal, *Několik slov k "Poznámce na okraj poznámky" dr. Karla Pichlíka /Several comments on Dr Karel Pichlík's "Marginal note to a footnote"/, 122-126*
- Reviews and news:
- E.H.Carr, *The Russian Revolution: from Lenin to Stalin, 1917-1929, (J.C.), 127-139*

- Italští marxisté o dějinách SSSR /Italian Marxists on the history of the USSR/ [Bertolissi, F.Benvenuti, A.Di Biagio, L.Sestano, F.Bettain] (M. Hájek), 140-160*
- S.F.Cohen, *Bolscevismo e stalinismo (mh), 161-168*
- E.Lucas, *Zwei Formen von Radikalismus in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (H. Mejdrová), 169-177*
- A.Aviv, *The SPD and the KPD at the end of Weimar Republic: similarity within contrast (mh), 178-179*
- S.Haffner, *Anmerkungen zu Hitler (J.K.), 180-187*
- Recenze knihy V. Černého "Pláč koruny české" v polském historickém časopise /Václav Černý's "The lamentation of the Crown of Bohemia" reviewed in a Polish historical journal/ [by J.Tomaszewski] (J.K.), 188*

6

STUDIE ČESKOSLOVENSKÝCH DĚJIN. Sborník /Studies in Czechoslovak history. Review/. Prague, December 1980, 226 pp.

Articles:

- Josef Jánský, *Rekatolizace v Čechách – její historický smysl a význam /The historical meaning and significance of re-catholicization in Bohemia/, 4-89*
- Josef Smrček, *Z Kroftova deníku a odjinud /From Krofta's diary and elsewhere/, 90-105*
- Radko Břach, *Na okraj československo-polských vztahů před Locarnem /Comments on Czechoslovak-Polish relations prior to Locarno/, 106-142*
- Reviews and news:
- Eds. H.Brisch – I.Volgyes, *Czechoslovakia: the heritage of ages past: essays in memory of Josef Korbel (J.K.), 144-148*
- M.Reiman, *Die Geburt des Stalinismus: die UdSSR am Vorabend der "zweiten Revolution" (J.C.), 149-158*

- J. Borovanský, *Propaganda namísto historické vědy / Propaganda in lieu of historical study/* [review of the book *Československá revoluce 1944- 48 /Czechoslovak revolution 1944-48/* by Cézár and Snítíl], 159-168
- Eds. M. Machovec – P. Pithart – J. Dubský, *Masarykův sborník VII /Masaryk anthology VII/* (J. Klatovský), 169-213
- P. Wandycz – A. Zaleski, *Minister spraw zagranicznych RP 1926-1932 w swiatle wspomień i dokumentów* (R. Břach), 214-217
- Jan Karel, *The dialectical negation of Josef Haubelt* [comments on J. Haubelt's review *O výkladu českého a slovenského dějepisectví Františka Kutnara /František Kutnar's interpretation of Czech and Slovak historiography/*], 218-226
- 7
- SBORNÍK HISTORICKÝCH STUDIÍ K ŠEDESÁTINÁM MILOŠE HÁJKA /Review of historical studies to mark Miloš Hájek's 60th birthday/. Prague, May 1981, 130 pages.
- Ladislav Sádecký, *Miloš Hájek. Portrét jedné generace /Miloš Hájek: portrait of a generation/*, 3-9
- Miloš Hájek, *Tři studie z dějin marxismu /Three studies in the history of Marxism/*, 10-69
- Vojtěch Mencl, *Mladá léta /The early years/*, 70-78
- Milan Hübl, *Engels a II. internacionála /Engels and the 2nd International/*, 79-98
- Václav Kural, *Bilance 10 let. Lidský potenciál sudetských Němců a vznik Československa /A record of ten years: the human potential of the Sudeten Germans and the creation of Czechoslovakia/*, 99-118
- Zapomenutý dokument z předhistorie povstání na křižníku "Potěmkin" /A forgotten document from the prehistory of the mutiny on the battleship Potemkin/* (edited and translated by J. Sládek), 119-126

*Bibliographical summary of Miloš Hájek's work as a historian*, 127-130

8

Z DĚJIN. Sborník studií /History. Collected studies/. Prague, 1981, 232 pp.

Studies:

Jan Křen, *Češi a Němci na přelomu století. Pokus o historickou bilanci /The Czechs and the Germans at the turn of the century: a tentative historical assessment/*, 2-85

Miloš Hájek, *Vnitřní režim v Komunistické internacionále v letech 1919-1929 /The Comintern's internal regime 1919-1929/*, 86-199

Reviews:

C. Stözl, *Kafkas böses Böhmen: Zur Sozialgeschichte eines Prager Juden* (Jan Křen), 203-211

Chronicle:

J. Jareš, *Pokusil jsem se vidět... /I tried to see.../* [on the death of the historian František Červinka], 217-232

9

HISTORICKÉ A SOCIOLOGICKÉ STUDIE. Sborník /Historical and sociological studies. Review/. Prague, January 1982, 189 pp.

[Studies:]

Radim Palouš, *K Bolzanovu významu v duchovním vývoji a v národním povědomí /Bolzano's importance in the nation's spiritual development and consciousness/*, 2-43

Jozef Jablonický, *Povstanie v Trnave /The Trnava mutiny/*, 44-79

Jaroslav Klofáč, *Sociální struktura ČSSR v pohledu čs. sociologie 70. let /The social structure of the ČSSR as seen by Czechoslovak sociology in the seventies/*, 80-113

Jan Křen – Hana Mejdrová, *Současná československá historická literatura o Mnichovu /Contemporary Czechoslovak historical literature about Munich/*, 114-144

Reviews:

*Munich 1938, Mythes et réalités* [collection published on the occasion of the Paris conference on Munich in November 1978] (J.K.), 145-158

Eds. N.von Lobkowitz – F.Prinz, *Die Tschechoslowakei 1945-1970* (J.K.), 159-164

J.Gebhart – A.Hájková – J.Kuklík, *2245 dnů odporu. Podíl spojů a spojařů na národně osvobozené zápase českého lidu v letech 1939-1945 /2245 days of resistance: the role of post and telecommunications and their employees in the Czech people's national liberation struggle 1939-1945/* (B.V.), 165-167

E.Čejka, *Hrozby a naděje /Threats and hopes/* (K.B.), 168-175

P.Wandycz – A.Zaleski, *Minister spraw zagranicznych RP 1926-1932 w swiatle wspomnień i dokumentów* (R.Břach) 176-179 [the same text as in vol. 6]

E.Kulka, *Židé v československé Svobodové armádě /Jews in Svoboda's Czechoslovak Army/* (O.P.), 180-182

F.Kutnar, *Přehledné dějiny českého a slovenského dějepisců /A brief survey of Czech and Slovak historiography/* (J.N.), 183-184

[Notes:]

J.N., *Notes*, 185-188

10

STATĚ HISTORICKÉ, SOCIOLOGICKÉ, KRITIKY  
A GLOSÝ. Sborník /Historical and sociological articles, criticism and notes. Review/. Prague, November 1982, 279 pages.

[Articles:]

Jan Rohan, *Josef Pekař a jeho odkaz /The legacy of Josef Pekař/*, 2-38

Jindřich Pecka, *Život v zajateckých táborech na našem území /Life in the P.O.W. camps on our territory/*, 39-94

Jozef Jablonický, *Nitra a Slovenské národné povstanie /Nitra and the Slovak national uprising/*, 95-143

Jaroslav Klofáč, *Sociální struktura Československa a její změny v letech 1945-1980 /The changing social structure of Czechoslovakia 1945- 1980/*, 144-227

Adolf Würfel, *Místo nekrologu. Úvaha nad dílem Karla Kazbundy 1888- 1982 /In lieu of an obituary: reflections on the work of Karel Kazbunda 1888-1982/*, 228-245

Criticism and notes:

F.Graus, *Die Nationenbildung der Westslawen im Mittelalter* (Jaroslav Mezník), 246-251

R.Břach, *Ministr a jeho vrahové. Walther Rathenau + 24.6.1922 /The minister and his assassins: Walther Rathenau d. 24.6.1922/*, 252-259

S.Vondráčková, *Mrazilo-tálo. O Jiřím Weilovi /The freeze-cum-thaw: re Jiří Weil/* (J. Kolda), 260-262

V.Kural, *Ústřední vedení odboje domácího /The central leadership of the home resistance/* (-HOR-), 263-272  
*Notes*, 273-279

11

Z ČESKÝCH A SLOVENSKÝCH DĚJIN. Sborník /Czech and Slovak history. Review/. Prague, November 1982, 201 pp.

Studies:

Hana Mejdrová, *Kominternu a vznik KSČ /The Comintern and the creation of the Czechoslovak Communist Party/*, 1-89

Jozef Jablonický, *Nitra a Slovenské národné povstanie*  
/Nitra and the Slovak national uprising/, 90-146 [the  
same text as in vol. 10]

Opinion:

H.Rak, *Romantika historie a súčasny historický román*  
/The romance of history and the modern historical  
novel/, 147-163

Sources:

Jaroslav Mezník, *O nejstarší brněnské městské knize*  
/Brno's oldest municipal register/, 164-170

Reviews:

F.Charvát, *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti a její  
vývoj v Československu* /The social structure of social-  
ist society and its development in Czechoslova-  
kia/ (Stanislav Novotný), 172-186

*Historiografie v Československu 1970-1980* /Historio-  
graphy in Czecho slovakia, 1970-1980/ (Jaroslav  
Mezník), 187-190

J.Galandauer, *Bohumír Šmeral 1880-1914* (Jan Křen),  
191-200

12

SBORNÍK K 65. VÝROČÍ VZNIKU ČESKOSLOVEN-  
SKÉ REPUBLIKY /Review to mark the 65th anniversary  
of the Czechoslovak Republic/. Prague, 1983, 241 pp.

J.K., *První republika: pojem a společenský život* /The First  
Republic as a concept and society/, 2-19

Jaromír Kulhánek, *K případu J. Stříbrného a R. Gajdy  
v r.1926* /Concerning the case of Stříbrný and Gajda  
in 1926/, 20-54

Petr Pithart, *"Fronta" proti Hradu. Úvahy o pravici a nacio-  
nalismu me zi válkami* /The "Front" versus "The  
Castle": reflections on right-wing and nationalist  
politics between the wars/, 55-118

Milan Otáhal, *Ferdinand Peroutka – muž přítomnosti* /F.P. –  
a man of today/, 119-189

Karel Žádný, *Emanuel Rádl – náš současník* /E.R. our  
contemporary/, 190-241

13

STUDIE Z DĚJIN PŘEDMNICHOVSKÉ REPUB-  
LIKY /Historical studies on the pre-Munich Republic/.  
Prague, November 1983, 244 pp.

Articles:

Radko Břach, *Československá zahraniční politika v politic-  
kých proměnách Evropy 1924* /Czechoslovak foreign  
policy in the political transformations of the Europe  
of 1924/, 2-98

Jiří Hájek, *Sociální demokracie a obrana demokratického  
zřízení v Československu 1933-1938* /Social democ-  
racy and the defence of democratic rule in Czecho-  
slovakia 1933-1938/, 99-156

Jindřich Chaloupecký, *Podivný Hašek* /Outlandish Hašek/,  
157-174

Reviews:

Ed. K.Bosl, *Die Erste Tschechoslowakische Republik als  
multinationaler Parteienstaat.* (J.K. & J.C.), 177-214

J.Mezník, *Praha před husitskou revolucí* /Prague before  
the Hussite revolution/ (F.Čermák), 215-236

J.Seifert, *Všecky krásy světa* /All the beauties of the earth/  
(F.Kautman), 237-243

14

ČESKÉ A SVĚTOVÉ DĚJINY. Sborník /Czech and  
world history. Review/. Prague, January 1984, 132 pp.  
Studies and articles:

Miloš Hájek, *Komunistické strany ve 20.letech: Německo  
a Československo* /Communist parties in the twen-  
ties: Germany and Czechoslovakia/, 1-34

Jozef Jablonický, *Ultimátum v Šrobárovom procese* /The ultimatum in the Šrobár Trial/, 35-44

Jaroslav Opat, *Schauerovy "Naše dvě otázky" a Masaryk*, /Schauer's "Our two questions" and Masaryk/, 45-79

Stanislav Vážný, *De Gaulle a česká otázka* /De Gaulle and the Czech Question/, 80-88

Rudolf Stařík, *Příspěvek k dějinám vztahu "Ochranky" a ruských socialistických stran do roku 1917* /A contribution to the history of relations between the "Okhranka" and the socialist parties up to 1917/, 89-112

Criticism:

K.Kaplan, *Cesta k moci. Jak jsme to viděli* /The road to power: how we saw it/ (brk), 113-119

J.Rupnik, *Histoire du Parti communiste tchécoslovaque: dès origines à la prise du pouvoir* (Miloš Hájek), 120-122

A.Kryveljov, *Dějiny náboženství* /The history of religion/ (T.E.Adámek), 123-131

15

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE A RECENZE /Historical studies and book-reviews/, Prague, April 1984, 213 pp.

Articles:

Jiří Doležal, *O českém písemnictví v době protektorátu* /Czech writing at the time of the Protectorate/, 2-77

Jaroslav Mezník, *Dějiny národu českého na Moravě. Nárys vývoje národního vědomí na Moravě do poloviny 19. století* /The history of the Czech nation in Moravia: an account of the development of national awareness in Moravia to the mid-19th century/, 78-121

Ivan Klíma, *Už se blíží meče. K pramenům inspirace Franze Kafky* /The swords are coming nearer: Franz Kafka's sources of inspiration/, 122- 162

Reviews – notes – news:

J.Jesenický, *Strážce času* /The custodian of time/ [reminiscence about F.Kutnar], 164-176

*Přehled dějin Československa* /A survey of Czechoslovak history/ (Jaroslav Mezník), 177-181

J.Morava, *Exilová léta K. H. Borovského* /Borovský's years in exile/; V.Kopecský, *Plno záhad kolem Hanky* /All sorts of mysteries surrounding Hanka/ (M.Otáhal), 182-187

R.Franke, *London und Prag: Materialien zum Problem eines multinationalen Nationalstaates 1919-1938* (J.K.), 188-194

L.Grünwald, *Sudetendeutsche – Opfer und Täter: Verletzung des Selbstbestimmungsrechtes und ihre Folgen 1918-1982* (J.K.), 195-198

*Notes and news* (J.K. – M.O. – J.Mz.), 199-213

16

STUDIE Z MODERNÍCH DĚJIN /Studies in modern history/. Prague, Autumn 1984, 198 pp.

[Studies:]

Milan Otáhal, *Čeští liberálové v roce 1848* /The Czech liberals in 1848/, 3-61

Radko Brach, *Locarno*, 62-106

Jiří Doležal, *Český film za protektorátu* /Czech film at the time of the Protectorate/, 107-171

Reviews – notes:

V.Macura, *Znamení zrodu. České obrození jako kulturní typ* /Birth sign: The Czech revival as a cultural type/ (M.Drozda), 177-184

Ed. M.Machovec, *Problém tolerance v dějinách a perspektivě* /The problem of tolerance: its history and future/ (-ský-), 185-192

*Notes* (JVF), 193-198

17

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE. Sborník /Historical studies. Review/. Prague, August 1984, 173 pp.

Studies:

Stanislav Tomáš, *Společenské vědy a Karel Marx* /The social sciences and Karl Marx/, 3-117

Bibliography:

J.Brabec, *Bibliografie díla Závaše Kalandry* /A bibliography of the work of Závaš Kalandra/, 118-158

Criticism:

R.Kalivoda, *Husitství a jeho vyústění v době předbělohorské a pobělohorské* /Hussism and its repercussions in the periods before and after White Mountain/ (F.Čermák), 159-170

H.Weohner, *Zeugnis* (Miloš Hájek), 171-173

18

HISTORICKÝ SBORNÍK /Historical review/. Prague, May 1985, 178 pp.

Studies:

Jan Křten, *Alternativy nacionalismu. Česká "pozitivní" politika a její obdoby ve střední a východní Evropě* /Alternatives to nationalism: Czech "positive" politics and its counterparts in Central and Eastern Europe/, 1-53

Jozef Jablonický, *Rezistencia a perzekúcia v Bratislave pred frontom* /Resistance and persecution in Bratislava ahead of the front/, 54-118

Anniversary:

Jan Rohan, *Sto let od narození českého historika Jana Slavíka* /One hundred years since the birth of Czech historian Jan Slavík/, 119-129

Josef Krupka, *Jan Slavík a jeho dějiny ruské revoluce* /Jan Slavík and his history of the Russian Revolution/, 130-145

Jaroslav Mezník, *Slavíkův "Vznik českého národa". Osud jednoho díla* /Slavík's "Birth of the Czech nation": the fate of one work/, 146-155

Discussion:

D.Beyrau, *Mezi autonomií a závislostí. Středovýchodní Evropa 1919-1939* /Between autonomy and dependence: Eastern Central Europe 1919-1939/, 156-175

E.J.Hobsbawm, *Marx a historie* /Marx and history/ (-mh-), 176-179

Criticism:

E.H.Carr, *Twilight of the Comintern, 1930-1935* (Miloš Hájek), 180-182

J.Weidenholzer, *Auf dem Weg zum "Neuen Menschen": Bildungs- und Kulturarbeit der österreichischen Sozialdemokratie in der Ersten Republik* (Petr Louda), 183-187

19

HISTORICKÝ SBORNÍK /Historical review/. S.I., October 1985, 178 pp.

Studies and articles:

Miloš Hájek, *Fašismus v analýzách Socialistické dělnické internacionály* /Fascism in the analyses of the Socialist Workers' International/, 3-58

Milena Šimsová, *YMCA v Československu 1919-1929* /The YMCA in Czechoslovakia 1919-1929/, 59-80

Jan Vrána, *Osvícenství, absolutismus a zemský patriotismus. Světonázorová a politická stanoviska stavovské reprezentace českých zemí v 18. století* /Enlightenment, absolutism and territorial patriotism: the philosophical and political attitudes of the representatives of the Czech Estates in the 18th century/, 81-105

Jaroslav Mezník, *Česká a moravská šlechta* /The Bohemian and Moravian aristocracy/, 106-151

Literature:

T.Vojtěch, *Česká historiografie a pozitivismus* /Czech historiography and positivism/ (Jan Křen), 152-159

F.Šamalík, *Úvahy o dějinách české politiky I/5* /Reflections on the history of Czech politics I/5/ (Jaroslav Mezník), 160-162

J.K., *Zpráva o Kritickém sborníku* /News of *Kritický sborník*/, 162-169

Chronicle:

R., *Šedesátiny dr. Jiřího Doležala* /Dr Jiří Doležal's sixtieth birthday/, 171-177

20

SBORNÍK HISTORICKÝ. Studie – prameny – diskuse – kritika /Historical review. Studies – sources – discussion – criticism/. Prague, January 1987, 174 pp.

Studies:

Hana Mejdrová, *Komunistická internacionála a KSČ v letech 1921-1923* /The Communist International and the Czechoslovak Communist Party 1921-23/, 3-66

Sources:

Heda Kaufmannová, *Léta 1938-1945. Válečné vzpomínky* /The years from 1938 to 1945: wartime memories/, 68-136

Discussion:

*Anketa o Historických sbornících* /Questionnaire about the Historical Reviews/, 138-141

Criticism:

*Nad několika publikacemi o druhém odboji* /Re several publications about the second resistance/ [Z.Jelínek, *Operace Silver A. Příspěvek k historii heydrichiády ve středních a východních Čechách* /Operation Silver A: a contribution to the history of the Heydrich assassination in Central and Eastern Bohemia/; *Bojovali za nás* /They fought for us/; J.Gebhart – J.Šimovček,

*Partyzáni v Československu 1941-1945* /Partisans in Czechoslovakia 1941-45/; A.Benčík – V.Kural – J.Paulík – J.Šolc – Z.Štěpánek – J.Tesař, *Partyzánské hnutí v Československu za druhé světové války* /The partisan movement in Czechoslovakia during World War II/; J.Koutek, *Tichá fronta* /The quiet front/; A.Hájková, *Praha v komunistickém odboji* /Prague in the Communist resistance/; V.Kameník – Z.Jelínek, *Noční výsadek* /Night drop/ (J.B.), 143-148

*Na okraj dvou prací o poválečné sociální demokracii* /Comments on two studies of post-war social democracy/ [K.Kaplan, *Das verhängnisvolle Bündnis: Unterwanderung, Gleichschaltung und Vernichtung der Tschecho slowakischen Sozialdemokratie 1944-1954*; P.Vošahlíková, *Československá sociální demokracie a národní fronta* /Czechoslovak social democracy and the National Front/ (-vl-), 149-153

T.Vojtěch, *Česká historiografie a pozitivismus. Světonázorové a metodologické postupy* /Czech historiography and positivism: philosophical and methodological approaches/ (Jan Křen), 153-162

H.Carrère d'Encausse, *Le grand frère* (-brck-), 163-174

21

HISTORICKÝ SBORNÍK /Historical review/. Prague, June 1987, 222 pp.

Studies and materials:

Bedřich Loewenstein, *Hnutí měšťanstva a národní orientace v polovině 19. století* /The burgher movement and national consciousness in the mid 19th century/, 4-26

Pavel Stránský, *Češi ve dvacátém století* /The Czechs in the twentieth century/, 27-58

Otto Täussig, *Josef Pekař a Židé* (J.P. and the Jews/, 59-68

František Kautmann, *Josef Holeček a česká šlechta* /J.H. and the Czech aristocracy/, 69-77



Jindřich Pecka, *Transporty smrti na území jižních Čech* /Death transports in the area of Southern Bohemia/, 78-100

Jindřich Pecka *Obecní kroniky jako pramen k událostem roku 1945 v jižních Čechách* /Local chronicles as a source of information about the events of 1945 in Southern Bohemia/, 101-120

Reviews:

J.Spěváček, *Václav IV. 1361-1419* (Jaroslav Mezník), 122-127

J.Klatovský, *T.G.Masaryk a masarykovská literatura v Československu v letech 1973-1986* /T.G.M. and Masarykian literature in Czechoslovakia in the 1973-86 period/ [Survey of book and periodical output], 127-152

Eds. K.Bosl – F.Seibt, *Kultur und Gesellschaft in der Ersten Tschechoslowakischen Republik* (J.N.), 152-167

J.Krejčí, *Great revolutions compared: the search for a theory* (J.N.), 167-176

E.Krippendorff, *Staat und Krieg: die historische Logik politischer Unvernunft* (Bedřich Loewenstein), 176-181

Jaroslav Mezník, *K šedesátinám Jaroslava Marka* /Jaroslav Marek's sixtieth birthday/, 183-191

-zv-, *Opožděný nekrolog k dílu Václava Krále* /Belated obituary in respect of Václav Král's work/, 191-206

Notes:

207-222

22

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE /Historical studies/. Prague, January 1988, 230 pp.

Editorial introduction, 5

Studies:

J.Jablonický, *Neúspěšná misie v Moskvě* /A fruitless mission to Moscow/, 7-65

V.Kural, *Vojenský moment v česko-německém vztahu r. 1938* /The military aspect of Czech-German relations in 1938/, 66-112

Discussion:

R.Prokop – L.Sádecký – K.Břina, *České dějepisectví dnes a zítra* /The present and future of Czech historiography/, 113-131

Sources:

H.Kaufmanová, *Léta 1938-1945. Válečné vzpomínky* /The years from 1938 to 1945: wartime memories/, 132-186

Bibliography:

*Bibliografický rejstřík historických sborníků za léta 1978-1987 (čísla 1-20) a zvláštního čísla, věnovaného dějinám česko-německých vztahů* /Bibliographical list of collected historical studies 1978-87, issues 1 – 20, and the special issue devoted to Czech-German relations/, 187- 210

Appendix:

W.Eichwede, *Sovětský svaz a Německo v roce 1945* /The Soviet Union and Germany in 1945/, 211-223

Résumé:

224-230 [in English]

23

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE /Historical studies/. Prague, June 1988, Year 11, 134pp.

Studies:

Koloman Gajan, *Mnichov a Beneš* /Munich and B./, 3-13  
Jaroslav Jirů, *Benešovy osudové zkoušky* /B.'s fateful trials/, 14-17

Appendix I:

*Dilemata zahraniční politiky ČSR* [P.Gregory Campbell, *Ztracené sny Edvarda Beneše* /The lost dreams of

E.B./; Walter Ullman, *Prezident Beneš mezi Východem a Západem 1943-1948* /President B. between East and West/; Josef Anderle, *Eduard Beneš v evropské politice 1918-1948* /E.B. in European politics/; abridged translation of essays published in the journal *Kosmas*, vol. 5, No.1, Summer 1986], 18-42

Soundings:

*70th anniversary of the First Republic* [Božena Komárková, Hana Mejdrová, Miloš Hájek, Václav Tomáš, Karel Pichlík, Jaroslav Mezník, Jan Křen], 43-78

Appendix II:

*T.G. Masaryk a první republika* [F.Gregory Campbell, *Empty pedestals?*, reprinted from the journal *150.000 slov*, Vol. 5, 1986, No. 14; see in English: *Slavic Review*, Spring 1985, Vol. 44, No. 1], 78-90

Discussion:

Matěj Linek – Tomáš Svoboda, *O výklad našich nejnovějších dějin* /Interpreting our most recent history/, 91-99

Appendix III:

*Ungarische Mittel- und Osteuropaforschung* [translation of an article published in the journal *Osteuropa*, 1987, No.9], 100-106

Reviews:

*Manfred Alexander o Československu* /M.A. on Czechoslovakia/ a survey all of books on Czechoslovakia by M.A.] (R. Břach), 107-115

Josef Kalvoda, *The Genesis of Czechoslovakia* (Jaroslav Klatovský), 115-124

Jiří Kovtun, *Masarykův triumf* /Masaryk's triumph/ (JO), 124-129

J. George Kovtun, *Masaryk and Amerika* (Jaroslav Opat), 130n.

Edward Táborský, *President Edvard Beneš between East and West, 1938-1946* (Jaroslav Klatovský), 131-134

KNIŽNICE Historických studií /The Historical studies book series/.

1. Václav Kural, *ÚVOD. Ústřední vedení odboje domácího* /ÚVOD: the Central Leadership of the Home Resistance/. Prague: 1985 (2nd edition), 333 pp.
2. Jaroslav Opat, *T. G. Masaryk v Čechách v letech osmdesátých (1882- 1891). Příspěvek k životopisu* /T.G.M. in Bohemia in the eighties, 1882-1891: contribution to a biography/. Prague: 1985, 425 pp.
3. Radko Břach, *Evropské variace* /European variations/, Prague: 1985, 423 pp. (2 vols.)
4. Václav Vrabec, *Zmařená naděje. K historii odbojového seskupení Petiční výbor Věrní zůstaneme* /Dashed hopes: the history of the resistance group "Petition Committee: We will stay true"/. Prague: 1985, 94 pp.
5. Stanislav Tomáš et al., *Křížovatky 20. století* /Twentieth century crossroads/. Prague: 1987, 405 pp.
6. Jan Křen, *Konfliktní společenství. Češi a Němci 1871-1918* A community of conflict: the Czechs and Germans 1871-1918/. Prague: 1986, 248 pp.

\*\*\*

Independent historiography in Czechoslovakia is the subject of the following publications:

Karel Bartošek, *Historians Making History*. In: *Independent Historiography in Czechoslovakia*, 2 vols. 1985 (presented to the 16th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Stuttgart, 26th August- 1st September 1985)

Vilém Prečan, *Acta creationis: Independent Historiography in Czechoslovakia, 1969-1980*. Hannover, 1980. XL+252pp. (An introduction to the book was published in Czech under the title *Nezávislé dějepisectví v Československu 1969-1980* in the journal *150.000 slov*, vol. 4, 1985, No.10, pp. 15-23.)

- H.Gordon Skilling, *Independent Historiography in Czechoslovakia*. Canadian Slavonic Papers, Vol. XXV, No. 4 (Dec. 1983), pp. 518-539.
- H. Gordon Skilling, *The Muse of History – 1984: History, Historians and Politics in Communist Czechoslovakia*. Cross Currents, A Yearbook of Central European Culture, Vol. 3 (1984), pp. 29-47. (Published in Czech under the title: *Historie, historikové a politika v komunistickém Československu* in the journal *150.000 slov*, vol. 4, 1985, No.10, pp. 24-31.)
- H.Gordon Skilling, *Czech and Slovak Independent Writing, 1982-1984*. Kosmas, Vol. 5, No. 1, Summer 1986, pp. 157-161.
- Kosmas*. Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies, Vol. 3, No. 2 – Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter 1984/Summer 1985, a double issue compiled by V.Prečan a H.G.Skilling.

Any additions or corrections to our information about samizdat publications will be most warmly welcomed, and will be published.

### SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977 – 1988

The need has long been felt for systematic information about the output of samizdat periodicals in Czechoslovakia. These past years have seen a veritable publishing boom with the number of journal titles growing so fast that most readers in Czechoslovakia itself, let alone those abroad, are losing track of what is being published.

This has not been merely a quantitative explosion, however. The formidable total of at least fifty, and possibly sixty, samizdat journals in existence at the end of 1988 represents a broad palette of published texts and information covering all kinds of subject-matter and genre, and reflecting different views, generation concerns, and so on.

There are periodicals devoted in a general sense to culture, politics or religion. Others have a more specialised interest in literature, philosophy, theology, history, sociology, theatre, music, art or ecology. Some specialise in providing up-to-date information and commentary on political, economic, social and cultural developments in Czechoslovakia and in other parts of the world. But there are also publications conceived more as newsletters or bulletins of particular citizens' initiatives, or that deal with one very specific area of interest from many different angles, such as *Magazín Společnosti přátel USA* /The Magazine of the Friends of the USA Association/ or, in quite a different sense, the journal *Střední Evropa* /Central Europe/.

But even those journals covering a similar area of interest, such as literature, display great differences in terms of aesthetic outlook or the targeted age-group. One need only compare *Obsah* or *Kritický sborník*, on the one hand, with *Vokno*, *Revolver revue* or *Prostor*, on the other.

What makes for such enormous variety among the samizdat periodicals is not least the fact that many publishing activities are regional or national in character. While some of the journals are "statewide", with contributions from both Czech and Slovak authors, there are also a whole number of periodicals which are published only in

---

Slovak, or which are strictly Slovakian (even though some of them also publish contributions in Czech). And, of course, there are regional and local journals in Moravia, Brno, Ostrava, northern Bohemia, etc.

There is one large and entire autonomous sector of samizdat publishing made up of journals devoted to ecclesiastical, religious, and theological matters, brought out by members of the catholic laity. This category can be further sub-divided in terms of subject-matter, or readership, or according to whether the journals are published in Slovakia or in the Czech-speaking areas.

Wide variation are also displayed in terms of periodicity. There are samizdat monthlies, quarterlies, specialised twice-yearly publications, year-books, or almanachs appearing at regular intervals. Samizdat periodicals also differ greatly in terms of editorial level, graphic presentation, reproduction technique, etc. etc.

There is one thing that they all have in common. They are an expression of a society liberating itself. They reflect the mushrooming of citizens' initiatives independent of the totalitarian state, and are a sign of their increasing self-confidence. They help boost morale and foster a sense of identity. The fact that such a broad spectrum of samizdat periodicals exists, that they are improving all the time and emerging from the ghetto of dissent to reflect increasingly the concerns of all sections of society, while all the time more and more journals appear, catering for specific areas of interests, testifies to the progress made over the past decade by the germinating seeds of civil society in Czechoslovakia. It also highlights the needs of society as a whole and of its component

parts, in national, political, economic and cultural terms. Allow me to illustrate what I mean by recalling the situation that existed fifteen years ago. This brief historical digression is also intended as a tribute to the forerunners of today's samizdat journals.

To my knowledge, only two journals existed during the first half of the seventies. One of them was *Fakta, připomínky, události* /Facts, comments and events/ which bore the sub-title "political monthly" and described itself as follows: "A self-service publication whose 'print-run' is determined by its readers, according to the number of copies they make of each month's issue. It is distributed solely among friends and trusted acquaintances." We have only two issues of that "self-service publication" on which to base any assessment: one – four pages long – from January 1973, the other – seven pages long, excluding the title page – published the following September.

The other journal from that period was *Národní noviny* /National news/ which said the following about itself on its title page: "Published by the Czech nation at its own cost and reproduced by its readers themselves. It is distributed solely for the benefit of trusted and reliable friends; every slip-up could lead to prosecution. The journal is published regularly and is not for sale." We have only managed to obtain four issues of *Národní noviny* dated respectively April, October and November 1973, and April 1974. Their length varied from four to eleven pages of typescript. Both journals carried news of activities that dissented from the normalisation policies of Husák and Brezhnev, and of resistance to them at home and abroad, as well as information and comments on political

---

trials and other forms of persecution of non-conforming citizens, together with foreign news ignored by the official press.

An obvious precursor of today's samizdat periodicals was the series of *feuilletons* initiated by Ludvík Vaculík in March 1975. One of them appeared almost every week, although on occasions there were even two, making up for leaner weeks. These were highly individual, literary comments on current events, which were topical without necessarily referring to the main political issues of the day, and circulated in countless copies among readers. During the first year of the series' existence, 41 *feuilletons* appeared by a total of 24 authors.

The inauguration of Charter 77 at the beginning of 1977 coincided with an explosion of independent journalism. Alongside the various documents and statements of Charter 77 and its spokespersons, which were published in quick succession, there was a wave of declarations by groups or individuals, as well as open letters, reactions to official attacks on human rights activists, legal analyses, protests, etc. distributed in samizdat.

Another feature of that period was a sudden upsurge in the literary genre traditionally known as the *feuilleton*, even if the 1977 variety departed somewhat from tradition in by their use of new means of expression and their choice of topical subject-matter. Mention must also be made of a notable example of samizdat journalism of the time: Ladislav Hejdiánek's series of articles, *Dopisy přáteli* /Letters to a friend/. During its first seven months of publication – from February to September 1977 – the philosopher had issued 21 pieces on ethical and political topics, each of

which circulated in hundreds of typewritten copies.

Nevertheless, the actual era of diverse samizdat periodicals appearing regularly alongside one another in the advanced and polished form we now know them did not commence until the end of 1977 and the beginning of 1978. The first four titles of that period – two of which went out of existence while the others are still with us – were of quite a different order. *Dialogy* /Dialogues/, published by Rudolf Battěk, Ladislav Hejdiánek and Jan Tesař, started life as a series of tracts on historical, political and philosophical themes. The untitled literary and cultural journal that was reprinted abroad under the name *Spektrum* would seem to have been conceived as a regular almanach covering all fields of literature and thought; it was also very ambitious in terms of content, layout and artwork. *Informace o Chartě 77* /News of Charter 77 – “Infoch”/, originally 4-6 pages in length, was conceived at the outset as a newsletter, whereas *Historické studie* /Historical studies/ was planned as a specialised periodical devoted to a historiography, independent of official concepts of history and historical study.

An idea of how the situation developed up to the end of 1988 can be gained from the following *Preliminary list of Czechoslovak samizdat periodicals 1977-88* prepared with the assistance of Lubomír Martínek. This alphabetical list comprises brief descriptions of a total of eighty samizdat periodicals about which we have at least some information, plus details of two new titles from January 1989. There then follow several tables in which periodicals are listed according to specific criteria, providing a broader picture of this area

of self-help publishing activity. We make no bones about the fact that the details in the main list are incomplete and fragmentary. There were even some aspects of the record that we were obliged to pass over for the time being. Neither the main list nor the subsequent breakdown analyses tell us anything about the growing print runs of the samizdat journals. Little can be learnt of the clearly rapid evolution from the almost exclusive use of typewriters to the other methods of reproduction which have started to come in over the recent period. They tell us nothing about increasingly ambitious standards of editing fostered by the publishers. They reveal nothing of the enormity of the task undertaken by the publishers of *Lidové noviny*, for instance, which has managed to thrive for twelve whole months already.

Anyone with even a vague notion of the state of affairs in Czechoslovakia over the past twenty years will realise that each the journal listed was a story of intense drama for the individuals or groups of people involved in their production: countless hours of laborious work; battling against all odds to create some kind of editorial and writing environment; the tricky and hazardous task of finding technical and financial support – all in a situation of permanent tension: convinced, on the one hand, of the vital need to public texts and information, while realising, on the other, that their publishing activity would inevitably attract the attention of the State's repressive apparatus and could lead to persecution and penalties of all kinds.

The following lists are also intended as a reminder and an appeal to all those in any way involved. Never forget to record for posterity

everything done and achieved in the field of independent publishing, while there is still time and while it is still fresh in your memories. *Acta* was created precisely to carry such testimonies.

\*\*\*

The list has been compiled on the following pattern:

1. The first line of the entry gives the precise TITLE and, where applicable, SUB-TITLE of the periodical, where these data appear on the cover or title page. Any changes that occurred during the periodical's existence are recorded in round brackets.

2. For reasons of space and simplicity, all other details, such as the periodical's objectives, editor(s), place and frequency of publication, etc., are entered according to the following system:

D: Brief description of the periodical where not evident from its title or sub-title

E: Editor(s), place of publication

L: Date when the periodical was launched, and, where applicable, the year it ceased publication

P: Frequency of publication

F: Format, number of pages, reproduction technique, binding, illustrations

T: Total number of issues or volumes published

A: Those issues or volumes available in the Centre's archives

#### METHODICAL NOTES AND EXPLANATIONS:

a) The list has been compiled from data available within the ČSDS archives, bearing in mind that the Centre does not have complete sets of all

---

samizdat periodicals. Where details were unobtainable, certain headings were omitted.

b) Details obtained elsewhere than from the title page or imprint are given in square brackets; these include, for instance, the names of publishers or editors, as given in the list of signatories to the Declaration of Solidarity with Ivan Polanský, or details about place of publication.

In the case of undated issues, an approximate date of publication has been deduced from the content. Remarks printed within inverted commas are quotations from the publication in question.

c) Because of the very nature of samizdat periodicals, their content and, above all, their extent vary a great deal over a given period of time. Very few of them start life with a distinct concept. The description given here applies in general a given journal's current profile. Since most of the periodicals have tended to expand, we have recorded their lowest number of pages – usually in their first issues – and the number of pages in their largest – most recent – issues. The figures correspond to issues in the ČSDS archives (and in some cases refer to the single issue available to us at the time). As one might expect, the greatest differential occurs in those periodicals longest in existence.

d) Information about periodicals not in the Centre's archives was obtained from outside sources such as the "Periodicals" section of *Kritický sborník* or the regular feature on new periodicals in *Infoch*.

e) Entry "A" is intended to serve a dual purpose. Firstly, it will inform those wanting to consult samizdat periodicals which issues are available at the Centre for *in situ* perusal or of which copies may be obtained. Secondly, it constitutes a list of our wants and an appeal to the publishers and to ČSDS supporters to help us fill these lacunae in our collections.

\*\*\*

The list of periodicals which is compiled alphabetically by title, irrespective of when the journal was launched or any other considerations (such as whether it still exists or has since ceased production), is followed by FIVE TABLES in which the periodicals are listed by SUB-CATEGORY. These are intended only as appendices to the main list, but in many ways they are extremely informative about this particular area of samizdat publishing.

In these tables, the only data given are the periodical's title and its lifespan, or alternatively the date of its launch if it has been published continuously to the present. For ease of reference, the titles of periodicals which have ceased publication are preceded by a cross (+). Those periodicals where we lack sufficient evidence of their continued existence at the end of 1988 are preceded by a question-mark (?). One of the tables lists periodicals in Slovak about which we had information at the end of 1988. Tables 1 to 5 give only the Czech or Slovak titles of the periodicals; readers are kindly asked to refer to the main list for the English equivalents.

Vilém Prečan

PRELIMINARY LIST OF CZECHOSLOVAK  
SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977-88

**ATTACK**

D: punk magazine continuing "10 Years Flexi Disc"; E: [Václav Žufan]; L: 23.3.1988; P: irregular; F: 52pp.; T: 1; A: 0; information from *Infoch* 18/1988

**ALTERNACE.** Časopis nesocialistické opozice /Alternation. Journal of the non-socialist opposition/

L: [1986]; P: quarterly; F: A4; 33pp.; T: minimum 2; A: 0; information from *Infoch* 1/1987

**BRATISLAVSKÉ LISTY** /Bratislava gazette/

D: Slovak Christian current affairs journal; E: edited by Ján Čarnogurský.- Bratislava; L: June 1988; F: A4; 9 and 13pp.; photocopied; stapled; T: 2 (2nd issue published in October 1988); A: 2

**BULLETIN NEZÁVISLÉHO MÍROVÉHO SDRUŽENÍ – INICIATIVY ZA DEMILITARIZACI SPOLEČNOSTI** /Bulletin of the independent peace association – the initiative in favour of a demilitarised society/

E: Tomáš Dvořák, Hana Marvanová, Luboš Vydra.- Prague; L: May 1988; P: irregular; F: A4; 10-28pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 3 plus special issue (of July 1988); A: 1 – 3 (special issue lacking)

**ČTVEREC.** Sborník pro mezinárodní politiku /Square. A review devoted to international politics/

E: J.Dienstbier and "R".- [Prague]; L: 1979-80; P:

irregular; F: 20 x 20 cm; 109-250pp.; typescript; cloth or stiff paper binding; maps; T: minimum 3; A: 2 (No.1 of January 1979, 109pp.; No.3 of June 1980, 250pp)

**DIALOG 88** /Dialogue 88/

E: published by "a distinct group of socialist-minded citizens, some of whom took part in the renewal movement of the sixties"; L: Summer 1988; F: A4; 16pp.; typescript, stapled; T: at least 3 (No.2, 34pp., No.3, 30pp.; information from *Infoch* 21/1988); A: first issue (Policy statement)

**DIALOGY** /Dialogues/

D: journal devoted to culture and politics; E: first issues conceived as a discussion forum for Ladislav Hejdánek, Jan Tesař and Rudolf Battěk; during 1978, the journal expanded, widening its circle of contributors and subject-matter; L: October 1977 to June 1980; P: irregular; F: for the first two years (1977-78) texts apparently typed out on loose A4 sheets, later issued as a journal of roughly B5 format with soft card binding; the size of individual issues increased from cca. 10pp. (A4) in the first issues to 160 pp.(B5); T: minimum 21 issues; A: 19 (1977/Vol.I: 1, 2; 1978/Vol.II: 1, 2, 5, 6 (A4, incorporated in bound double-issue 6-7), 6-7, 8-9, 10; 1979/Vol III: 1, 2-3, 4-5; 1980/Vol.IV: 1, 2-3)

**DISKUSE.** Teoreticko-politický občasník /Discussion. Occasional theoretical and political journal/

E: Brno; L: probably 1985; P: irregular; F: A4; 14-30pp.; typescript; stapled; T: minimum 68 (No.68 published in November 1988: cf. *Infoch*



20/1988); A: 3 (Nos.26/June 1985; 34/February 1986; 40/June 1986)

#### DRUHÁ STRANA /The other side/

D: underground-style magazine; L: [1985]; F: A4; 34-50pp; cyclostyled; T: minimum 3; A: 0; information taken from *Infoch* 10/1986

#### DVANÁCTKA /Number 12/

See SPEKTRUM

#### DVEŘE /Doors/

D: collections on a single topic published as supplements to the journal JAZZSTOP; conceived in 1986 as a publication in the framework of the Jazz Section; L: 1987; F: A5; 21-38pp.; cyclostyled, stapled, card covers; T: minimum 3; A: 2 (No.2/1987 suppl. to JAZZSTOP 1987/2: Labuť na jezeře: několik poznámek o indické hudbě /Swan on the lake: some notes on Indian music/; No.3/1987 suppl. to JAZZSTOP 1987/3-4: Sen; Cesta vůní /Dream; Scented path/) See also JAZZSTOP

#### EKOLOGICKÝ BULLETIN /Ecological bulletin/

E: Ed. Josef Danisz, Ivan Dejmal, Lenka Marečková-Hrachová, Martin Palouš.- [Prague]; L: September 1987; P: [irregular]; F: A4; cca 25pp.; since No.3 format A5, cca 50pp.; photocopied; stapled; T: 6 issues (latest in October 1988); A: Nos.1 – 5

EKONOMICKÁ REVUE. Úvahy o ekonomii a dalších přidružených oblastech /Economic review. Essays on economics and other related fields/

L: Summer 1978 – Summer 1980; P: quarterly; F: A4; 48-70 pp.; typescript; loose leaves in folder; T: 7 issues; A: complete set

#### FORUM

D: reports and commentaries on current political and cultural issues; E: [Prague]; L: apparently from May to December 1980 only; F: A4; 14-31pp.; typescript or cyclostyled (“ormig”); stapled; L: [1980]; T: probably 4; A: 4 (May [1980], 14pp.; [July 1980], 15pp.; September [1980], 13pp. + appendix of 12pp.; December [1980], 31pp.)

#### FRAGMENT

D: literary and cultural journal with texts in Slovak and Czech; E: [Bratislava]; L: from [1986] to 1987; P: irregular; F: A4; 104pp., 101pp., 118pp.; typescript; bound in soft covers; T: 3; A: complete set See also FRAGMENT-K

#### FRAGMENT-K

D: literary and cultural journal created by a merger of Fragment a “K” (viz); E: [Ivan Hoffman, Martin M.Šimečka].- [Bratislava]; L: April 1988; F: A4; 104-136pp.; typescript; bound in soft covers; photographic illustrations; T: 4; A: complete set See also K

N.B.: Associated with this periodical is the *Knižná edícia časopisu FRAGMENT-K* /Fragment-K book series/, in which a total of seven titles were published. The Documentation Centre has a copy of No.7, Martin M. Šimečka: *Light signals: thoughts on my father's prison letters, 1981- 82*. Bratislava 1988, 192pp., typescript.

### GLOSÁŘ /Glossary/

D: articles on social, legal, political and cultural issues; E: Demokratická iniciativa /The democratic initiative/. – [Prague]; L: 1987 (1 issue in first year); P: irregular; F: A4; cca 25pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 3; A: 2 (No.VII/1987, 23pp. A5; No.I/1988, 50pp. A4)

### HADR /Rag/

D: underground-style literary and cultural magazine; L: [1988]; F: A4; 49pp.; typescript and photocopied; loose sheets in soft folder; T: minimum 2; A: 1 : the issue following the “zero issue”

### HISTORICKÝ ZÁPISNÍK /Historical notebook/

D: Slovak historical review of Catholic orientation; E: [Ivan Polanský.- Dubnica nad Váhom]; L: 1986-87; F: A4; 64 and 43pp; cyclostyled; stapled; photos; T: 2; A: 2 (No.1/1986 on Josef Tiso and No.1/1987 dedicated to the memory of Andrej Hlinka)

### HLAS SLOVENSKA /Voice of Slovakia/

D: Slovak catholic journal; E: Nitra, Bratislava; L: 1988; F: A4; cca 30pp.; cyclostyled, stapled; T: 4; A: 2 (No.3 of 14th August 1988 and No.4 of 6th October 1988)

### HISTORICKÉ STUDIE /Historical studies/

D: review with historical, sociological, literary and philosophical articles; E: editors (since issue 22): Jaroslav Mezník, Milan Otáhal, Jan Křen as part of an editorial group.- Prague; L: 1978; P: essentially biannual – four issues published in 1984, none in 1986; F: A4; 130-280pp.; typescript, photocopied since No.22; stapled; cloth or card

binding; T: 24 (1-23 plus one unnumbered issue); A: complete set

See more detailed separate article in this issue of Acta

N.B.: Associated with this periodical is the *Knižnice Historických studií* /Historical studies book series/, in which a total of six titles were published in the 1985-87 period. The Documentation Centre has a copy of No.6: Jan Křen, *Konfliktní společenství Češi a Němci 1780-1918* /A community in conflict, Czechs and Germans 1780-1918/, 248pp.

### HORIZONT /Horizon/

D: cultural and political magazine; E: [Prague]; L: [1982-1984]; P: [biannually]; F: A4; cca 50-70pp.; typescript and cyclostyled; stapled; soft covers; photographic illustrations; T: minimum 8; A: 2 (No.6 [1983], 61pp.; No.7, 1984, 67pp.)

### HOST /Guest/

D: literary journal publishing original poetry, prose and drama and translations; E: from No.4 Dušan Skála.- [Brno]; L: 1986; P: irregular; F: A4; 126-212pp.; cyclostyled; bound in soft covers; illustrated; T: three issues; the most recent, No.IV of August 1988 is 830 pp. long according to *Infoch* 20/1988; F: A4; A: 2 (I/1986, 126pp.; II-III/1986/1987, 424pp.)

### INFORMACE O CHARTĚ 77 (INFOCH) /News of Charter 77 (Infoch)/

D: documents of Charter 77 and news of its activity; communiqués of the Committee for the Defence of the Unjustly Prosecuted (VONS); reports of action by individual citizens in defence of human rights; over the years it has expanded to include feuillets, news of samizdat publications,

etc. E: *Infoch* is not published by the Charter spokespeople but by ordinary signatories; editors since 1988: Petr Uhl, together with [Heřman Chromý, Pavla Paloušová].- [Prague]; L: published without a break since January 1978; P: initially about once every three weeks; monthly in 1981-85 period; fortnightly in 1988; F: A4; 4-34pp.; typescript, cyclostyled, photocopied; stapled; T: 1978: 15 issues; 1979: 16 + 1 special issue; 1980: 16 + 1 special issue; 1981: 12; 1982: 12; 1983: 12; 1984: 11 (July-August double-issue); 1985: 12; 1986: 14 plus 2 special issues; 1987: 17; 1988: 22; A: almost a complete set except for issues: 9/1981, 5/1983, 8/1986 and 12/1986

#### INFORMACE O CÍRKVI /Church news/

D: catholic magazine; L: 1980; P: monthly; F: A4; 9-32pp.; typescript, cyclostyled, photocopied; stapled; T: 98 (the latest issue recorded in *Infoch* 18/1988 is of September 1988: 9/1988); A: 65 (1980: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6; 1981: 6, 7; 1982: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; 1983: 5; 1984: 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12; 1985: complete set; 1986: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12 + appendix to No.8; 1987: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12; 1988: 1, 2, 3, 4)

#### INFORMAČNÍ BULETIN ČESKOSLOVENSKO-POLSKÉ SOLIDARITY /Czechoslovak-Polish Solidarity Information Bulletin/

E: "editorial contact addresses: Petr Pospíchal, Petr Uhl"; L: July 1988; F: A4; 8pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: minimum 2; A: one copy marked as issue 0 (of July 1988; No.1 of October 1988 recorded in *Infoch* 21/1988)

#### JAZZSTOP

D: journal of cultural information; E: "published by an independent group of Jazz Section members"; editor-in-chief Ota Hovorka; [Ota Veverka].- [Prague]; L: 1987; P: several times a year; F: A4; 30-100pp.; cyclostyled; stapled in card covers; photographic illustrations; T: minimum 7 (the latest issue recorded in *Infoch* 21/1988 is from October 1988: 7/88); A: 4 (Nos.1, 2, 3-4 of volume 1/1987, and 7/88)

See also DVEŘE

#### JEDNOU NOHOU

See REVOLVER REVUE

#### K

D: Slovak literary and cultural journal; E: [Bratislava]; L: March to June 1987; 4: monthly; F: A4; 32-65pp.; typescript; loose leaves in soft folder; T: 3; A: complete set

See also FRAGMENT-K

#### KATOLÍCKY MESAČNÍK /Catholic monthly/

D: Slovak religious journal; L: approx. mid-1988; F: A4; 25-35pp.; photocopied; stapled; T: 6; A: 3 (Nos.4, 5 and 6 of September, October and November 1988 respectively)

#### KOMENTÁŘE /Commentaries/

D: Review devoted to international politics; E: [Prague]; L: 1985; P: irregular; F: A4; A5 from No.10 onwards; 18-124pp.; initially typescript, later photocopied; stapled; T: 10 (No.10 dated Winter 1987/88); A: complete set

### KONTAKT /CONTACT/

D: Slovak cultural and political journal; E: [Bratislava]; L: probably 1981-1984; P: [quarterly]; F: A4; 87pp.; typescript; stapled; illustrations; T: minimum 7 (No.7 announced the closing date for No.8 as 30th March 1984); A: 1 (No.7 dated 8.12.1983)

### KRITICKÝ SBORNÍK /Critical Review/

D: journal devoted to literary, art and music criticism; E: [Luboš Dobrovský].- [Prague]; L: published without a break since 1981; P: quarterly; F: A4; 90-134pp.; initially typescript, later photocopied; stapled in soft covers; T: 30 issues by Autumn 1988 (N.B.: only three issues were published in 1981) plus 3 yearbooks (1983, 1984 and 1985); A: complete set, including No. 3/1988

### KŘEŠŤANSKÉ OBZORY /Christian outlook/

D: the first issue was subtitled "journal devoted to religion, ecumenism and public activity"; E: [Augustin Navrátil, Augustina Navrátilová, Pavel Záleský]; L: 15th June 1988 - ; P: twice monthly; F: A4; 25-40pp., double issue 8-9: 57pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 12 (No.12 dated December 1988); A: complete set except for No.11

### LIDOVÉ NOVINY /People's news/

D: articles, news and commentaries on events at home and abroad; E: editorial board: Jiří Dienstbier, Václav Havel, Ladislav Hejdiánek, Miroslav Kusý, Petr Pithart, Jiří Ruml, Jaroslav Šabata, František Ša malík, Zdeněk Urbánek, Josef Zvěřina; [Jan Dobrovský, Jiřina Hrábková, Jaroslav Jírů, Vladimír Mlynář, Jan Šabata, Olga Šulcová, Rudolf Zeman]; editor Jiří Ruml; L: Autumn

1987; P: monthly; F: A4; usually 24pp.; photocopied; stapled; T: 2 so-called "zero" issues in September and November 1987 and 12 issues in 1988 (including 7-8 as a July- August double-issue with 36 pages; A: complete set

N.B.: Linked to *Lidové noviny* is the *Knižnice Lidových novin /LN book series/*, in which two book titles have been published to date.

### LOGOS

Title recorded in the list of signatories of the Ivan Polanský Solidarity Declaration; E: [Josef Adámek]

### MAGAZÍN SPOLEČENSTVÍ PŘÁTEL USA – "SPUSA" /Magazine of the Friends of the USA Association "SPUSA"/

E: anonymous editorial board [Petr Bartoš, Pavel Jungman, Bedřich Koutný, Vladimír Trlida]; 1st issue prepared under the supervision of Jaromír Šavrda; Zlín; L: March 1988; F: A4; 62 and 147pp.; cyclostyled; stiff binding; T: 2 issues dated 7th March and 30th June 1988; A: both issues

### MORAVSKÁ ČÍTANKA /Moravian reader/

D: literary yearbook of Moravian authors; E: [Brno]; L: [1981]; P: annual; F: A4; cca 135-200pp.; typescript; cloth-bound; T: minimum 6; A: 3 (1981, 1983 and 1984)

### NÁBOŽENSTVO A SÚČASNOSŤ /Religion now/

D: Slovak catholic journal; L: 1983; P: quarterly; F: A4; 16-34pp.; cyclostyled, photocopied, stapled; T: minimum 24 by end 1988; A: 17 (1983: No.4; 1984: Nos.1, 2, 3, 4; 1985: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4;

1986: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4; 1987: Nos. 4, 5 (sic!); 1988: Nos. 1, 3, 4)

#### NĚKDO NĚCO /Someone something/

D: cultural journal mainly concerned with painting and art; L: cca. 1985; P: two or three times yearly; F: A4; 88-192pp.; photocopied or typescript paperback; illustrations; T: minimum 9; A: 6 (4/1986; 5/1986; 6/1986; 7/1987; 8/1987; 9/[1988])

#### NOVÝ BRAK /New trash/

D: underground magazine with writing from home and abroad; E: anonymous editorial team [Olga Havlová; Olga Stankovičová] and fictive publication details.- [Prague]; P: irregular; F: A4; 51-72pp.; typescript; bound in soft covers; illustrations; T: minimum 9 issues; A: 5 (Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 plus 8 more – all of them bearing the date 18.3.1981, Vol. I.)

#### OBSAH /Contents/

D: literary and critical magazine; E: [Prague]; L: 1981; P: monthly (10 issues per year, usually none in July and August; F: A4; 40- 200pp.; typescript; loose leaves in card folder, the pages of individual contributions within each issue numbered separately; T: 76; A: complete set until end 1988 except for issues of September, October, November and December 1982 and February 1983)  
See also *Acta* 2/87, p.25

#### O DIVADLE /About theatre/

D: journal devoted to theatre, drama, theatre criticism and acting; E: [Václav Havel]; Prague; L: July 1986; P: irregular; F: A4; 244-450pp.; type-

script, photocopied; card or cloth binding; T: 4 (I/July 1986, 244pp.; II/February 1987, 450pp.; III/November 1987, 406pp.; IV/October 1988, 391 pp.)

See also *Acta* 2/87, pp.26-29

#### PARAF. Paralelní akta filozofie /PARAF. Parallel philosophical papers/

D: philosophical journal; E: “editorial address: Dr.Václav Benda, Karlovo nám. 18, Prague 2”; L: 1985; P: 1-3 times yearly; F: A4; 111- 144pp.; typescript, photocopied; card binding; T: 9 issues; A: complete set

#### PIKOLE

D: literary almanach of underground prose and poetry; E: [Zdeněk Bálek].- Příbram; L: [1987]; F: A4; 42pp.; typescript; hard binding; photographic illustrations; T: minimum 1; A: 1 (No. 1/[1987], marked on its back cover as the 14th “Noční město” /“Night city”/ publication)

POHLED SPOTŘEBITELE. Časopis pro spotřebitele, jeho zájmy a pro výměnu názorů o spotřebitelských problémech /Consumer's outlook. Magazine for consumers and their interests and for discussion of consumer issues/(No1/1987 published under the title POHLEDEM SPOTŘEBITELE /Through consumers' eyes/)

E: published by *Demokratická iniciativa* /The democratic initiative/; run since No.1/1988 by an editorial team headed by Karel Štindl; L: first issue appeared in Autumn 1987 marked “Series 0 – No.1/1987”; P: the imprint of the first two issues of 1988 indicates it to be a bi- monthly; F: A4; 36-41pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 1 issue in 1987

and a minimum of two issues in 1988; A: 3 (1/1987, 1/1988 and 2/1988)

**POKOJ A DOBRO** /Peace and good/

D: Slovak catholic periodical; L: 1985 at latest; P: probably quarterly; F: A4; cca 80pp.; cyclostyled; A: 0 (sole information about the content and size of No. 3/85)

**POKUS. POLITIKA-KULTURA-SPOLEČNOST** /Experiment. Politics-Culture- Society/

D: pamphlet-style periodical of comments on current political and cultural issues; L: [1985]; P: irregular; only the year of publication given; F: A4; 1-4pp.; typescript; loose leaves; T: minimum 64; A: 33 (Nos. 9, 13, 16, 17, 18/1985; twice 23 and 24, 26, 28/1986; 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 46, 47, 48/1987; 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64/1988)

**PRAŽSKÉ KOMUNIKACE** /Prague communications/

D: Christian-oriented literary and arts review; L: 1984; P: irregular; F: A4; 97-134pp.; typescript; cloth or paper binding; T: minimum 4; A: 4 (No.1/1985, 134pp.; No.2/1985, 100pp.; No.1-2/1986, 180pp.)

**PRKNA PRAHY** /Prague boards/

Title recorded in the list of signatories of the Ivan Polanský Solidarity Declaration. E: [Petr Placák]

**PROSTOR. Nezávislý časopis** /Space. An independent journal/

D: cultural and political journal; E: the imprint gives fictive names of the editors; in reality they include [Aleš Lederer].- Hradec Králové [actually Prague]; L: June 1982; P: 4 issues a year up to

No.4, then annually (18-month interval between Nos.6 and 7); F: A4; A5 since No.6; 49-170pp.; initially cyclostyled, since No.6 photocopied; stapled, art-paper cover; T: 11; A: complete set

**PROTĚJŠÍ CHODNÍK** /The opposite pavement/

D: magazine with reprints from samizdat or exile publications; E: Ostrava; L: May 1987; P: twice a year; F: A4; cca 200pp.; typescript; photographic illustrations; T: minimum 3; A: 0; information taken from *Infoch* 14/1988

“PSÍ” [after the Greek letter psi on the cover]

D: Psi here is short for *psukhé*: individual collections devoted to one single anthropological topic, either theoretical or practical; P: once a year; F: A4; cca 50pp.; photocopied; stapled; T: minimum 2; A: 2 (Vina /Guilt/, [1986], 36pp.; Freud a psychoanalýza /Freud and psychoanalysis/, 1987, 42pp.)

See *Acta* 2/87, pp.32f.

**RADOSTĚ A NÁDEJ** /Joy and hope/

D: Slovak cultural and religious journal; L: probably from the beginning 1988; P: [quarterly]; F: A5; 116pp.; photocopied; stapled; soft card covers; illustrations; T: 4; A: 1 (from end-1988; editorial indicates it to be the fourth issue)

**REFLEXE** /Reflections/

D: philosophical journal; E: [Ladislav Hejdněk].- [Prague]; L: 1985; F: A4; 166pp.; typescript, card covers; T: minimum 1; A: 1 (No.1/1985, 166pp.)

## REVOLVER REVUE

D: literary and art magazine; E: the pseudonyms Sweet Jane and Nevadský plyn /Nevada gas/, actually [Ivan Lamper, Jáchym Topol, Saša Vondra], inter alia; L: 1985; P: irregular; F: A4; 120-470pp.; cyclostyled; soft covers; illustrations; T: 11 (entitled "Jednou nohou" /One leg/ until No.4, No.5 entitled "Jednou nohou/Revolver Revue"); A: complete set except for No.6/1987

## REVUE 88 /REVIEW 88/

*Infoch* 20/1988 describes this periodical as an independent university student review devoted to informal initiatives and youth cultural activity, published in Brno; trial issue 5/88 had 32 A5 pages, No.1/88 of 30.9.1988 (the first regular issue) had 36 A5 pages; the magazine lists eight editors; E: [Roman Ráček]

## RODINNÉ SPOLOČENSTVO /Family community/

D: Slovak catholic journal for a general readership; L: 1985; P: five issues a year; F: A4; 33-69pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 20 issues; A: 13 (1985: Nos. 1 and 5; 1986: Nos. 6, 8, 9, 10; 1987: Nos. 11, 14; 1988: Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)

## SADO-MASO (No.5, subtitled "konstruktivně pesimistický magazín"/constructively pessimistic magazine/

D: underground magazine devoted to literature, music and philosophy; L: [No. 5 dated "Autumn 1985, No.7 and a half, probably during the spring of 1986: one news item being dated 15th April 1986]; F: A5; 119pp. and 186pp.; typescript; photographic illustrations; stapled; T: minimum 7

issues; A: No.5 and the issue number "7 and a half"

## SALISBURSKÝ VÝBĚR /Salisbury selection/

D: selected texts from the British journal *The Salisbury Review*; E: Prague; L: [1984-85]; P: irregular; F: A4; cca 80pp.; T: minimum 5 (latest available information mentions No.5 of 1985); A: 0; information taken from *Kritický sborník*

## SKLEPNÍK /Cellarman/

According to *Infoch* 20/1988, a cultural and literary fortnightly first published in April 1988 with 120-140 A4 pages

## SLOVO /Word/

D: Cultural and literary journal; E: publisher given as CAD Press, or CAD Press Prague; L: probably 1980-81; P: probably monthly; F: A4; cca 80pp.; typescript; stapled in card covers; photographic illustrations; T: minimum 9; A: 3 (No.7, Vol.I, December 1980, 80pp.; No.8, January 1981, 85pp.; No.9, 1981, 83pp.)

## SOCIOLOGICKÝ OBZOR /Sociological outlook/

L: early 1987; P: quarterly; F: A4; cca 100pp.; photocopied; loose leaves; T: minimum 6; A: 6 (No.1/1987, 105pp.; No.2/1987, 103pp.; No.3/1987, 98 s; No.4/1987, 102pp.; No.1/1988, 137pp.; No. 2/1988, 110pp.)  
See also *Acta* 2/87, p. 31f.

## [SPEKTRUM]

D: cultural and literary journal; L: December 1977 – Autumn 1978; F: 30 x 21 cm (horizontal

A4); 149-251pp.; typescript; cloth-bound; photographic illustrations; T: 3 issues; A: complete set (first issue only a photocopy of the mock-up with the title *Dvanáctka* /Twelve/)

N.B. This was the first attempt at publishing a quality cultural and literary samizdat periodical. The journal had no title; the mock-up of the first issue was circulated under the title *Dvanáctka*, which probably referred to the month of December (1977). All three issues were reprinted by the London magazine *Index on Censorship* in 1978, 1979, and 1981, in facsimile, with only the arrangement of articles slightly altered.

#### SPUSA

See MAGAZÍN SPOLEČENSTVÍ PŘÁTEL USA – SPUSA

#### STŘEDNÍ EVROPA /Central Europe/

D: journal devoted to politics, history and culture; E: Prague; L: 1984; P: irregular; F: A4; 114-198pp.; typescript; card covers; T: 11 issues (the latest in July 1988); A: issues 1 – 10

#### STŘEDNÍ EVROPA /Central Europe/

D: version of the previous journal published in Brno; E: Brno; L: July 1988; F: cca 100pp.; minimum 1; A: 0; information taken from *Infoch* 17/1988

#### SURSUM

D: religious cultural review; L: 1986; P: irregular; F: A4; cyclostyled; T: minimum 4 (1, 2-3, 4); A: 0

TEOLOGICKÉ TEXTY /Theological texts/ (first three issues published under the title TEXTY /Texts/)

L: 1980; P: irregular; F: A4; cca 50pp.; cyclostyled; T: minimum 16; A: 3 (No.3 [1980-81] 53pp.; No.14 [1987], 46pp.; No. 16 [1988], 51 pp.)

#### TEOLOGICKÝ SBORNÍK /Theological review/

L: Spring 1978 – Summer 1979; P: irregular; F: A5; 50-60pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; soft covers; T: probably 5 issues; A: 1 (No.1/1978, 52pp.)

#### TEXTY

See TEOLOGICKÉ TEXTY

#### TUTÁČ RECORD /Tooter record/

Title recorded in the list of signatories of the Ivan Polanský Solidarity Declaration; E: [Lukáš Hraběta]

#### UNA SANCTA CATHOLICA

D: Slovak catholic journal; L: probably published only in the 1983-84 period; P: several issues per year, mostly to mark main catholic feast days; F: A4; cca 60pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: minimum 4; A: 4 (Advent 1983, 56pp.; Velká noc /Easter/ 1984, 59pp., Turice /Whitsun/ 1984, 51pp.; Cez rok /Year through/ 1984, 62pp.;)

#### VÁHY /Scales/ (title used since second issue)

D: cultural and literary journal of Charter 77 signatories employed as industrial workers in northern Bohemia; E: Liberec; P: irregular; L: [October] 1979 – cca. mid-1980; F: A4; 26-58pp.; typescript; stapled; hard covers; photographs and other illustrations; T: minimum 5; A: 5 (No.1/1979, 26pp.; No.2/November 1979, 33pp.; No.3/1980, 38pp.; No.4/1980, 58pp.; No.5/1980, 56pp.)



VOKNO. Časopis pro druhou a jinou kulturu /Window. Journal of the second and other culture/ E: editors: Čuñas /Dirty Pig/ (František Stárek), Magor /Loony/ (Ivan M.Jirous). – [Prague]; L: July 1979; P: irregular; No.6 of December 1981 was confiscated, No.7 appeared after approx. four-year break when the publishers were in prison; F: A4; 99-226pp.; cyclostyled; bound in soft covers; illustrations; T: 14 issues; A: 5 (No.5, 99pp.; No.7, 99pp., No.11, 143pp.; No.12, 182pp.; No.13, 202pp.; No.14, 226pp.)

#### VOKNOVINY

D: pamphlet-style periodical intended chiefly for readers of the journal VOKNO; E: Čuñas (František Stárek), Magor (Ivan M.Jirous), Bondy (Zbyněk Fišer); L: 1987; P: usually monthly; F: A4; cca 10pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 11 issues (No.11. with materials dated October 1988 seemingly came out in November 1988); A: complete set

VÝBER /Selection/ (usually subtitled “z rozhlasových relací a článků z časopisů” /from radio broadcasts and magazine articles/)

D: Slovak catholic journal; L: at least 1984-85; P: min. four times a year; F: A4; 35-102pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: minimum 11; A: 6 (No.2/1984, 70pp.; No.3/1984, 102pp.; No.4/1984, 69pp.; No.4/1985, 35pp.; No.6-7/1985, 54pp.)

VÝBĚR /Selection/

D: Pataphysical literary periodical; L: [1986]; P: irregular; F: A4; cca 40pp.; T: minimum 3; A: 0; information taken from *Infoch* 14/1986

VÝBĚR Z ČS. ČTENÁŘSKÉ SAMOOBSLUHY /Selection from the Czechoslovak readers' self-service/

D: cultural and literary miscellany; L: probably 1982-1984; P: irregular; F: A4; 75-89pp.; typescript; stapled; soft covers; T: minimum 6; A: 5 (No.1/1982, 89pp.; No. 1/1983, 77pp.; No.2/1983, 74pp.; No.3/1983, 75pp.; No.2/1984, 56pp.)

VV. Nezávislá revue pro výchovu a vzdělání /Independent review devoted to upbringing and education/

E: editor: Radim Palouš, Prague; L: 1988; P: “occasional miscellany”; F: A4; 80pp.; typescript; bound in soft covers; T: 1 issue; A: 1

VZKŘÍŠENÍ /Resurrection/

D: journal for catholic families; L: 1979; P: now issued 5 times a year (Lent, Easter, Whitsun, Feast of St. Wenceslas, Christmas; F: A4, exceptionally A5; cca 20pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: minimum 20; A: 2 (Velikonoční /Easter/ 1984, 24pp.; Postní /Lent/ 1985, 23pp.)

XXX

D: *Infoch* 13/1986 included the following information about the journal's first issue: “Untitled journal of the Organisation of Sock-wearers; the journal's mission and objectives are best described by V.Havel in his editorial: “The Czech section of the Organisation of Sock-wearers was founded a year ago on 25th October 1985. After a year of intensive preparation and efforts to achieve a joint consensus within this pluralist community, the Czechoslovak section now enters a new phase of its

activity with the publication of the first issue of its own journal. It aims to fill a void in the palette of independent magazine publishing which many have been seriously, and even painfully aware of for some time.”

[ZEBRA]

D: cultural and literary magazine; L: appeared during 1978; F: 17.5 x 25 cm and 19 x 27.5 cm; 26 and 40pp.; photocopied; bound in soft covers; illustrations, photos, cartoons; T: probably at least two (June 1978, 26pp.; October 1978, 40pp.)

N.B.: The magazine was untitled; the name *Zebra*, under which it was known, derived from the design of the cover; also know as *Jonathan* from the title of the leading article of the first issue *Misto pro Jonathana* /A place for Jonathan/.

ZE ZÁSUVKY I Z BLOKU /From the desk-drawer and note-book/

D: journal devoted politics, economics and culture; E: [Olga Šulcová et al. – Prague]; L: probably 1985; P: several issues yearly; F: A4; 123-185pp.; typescript; loose leaves in a soft folder; T: 19; A: No.6 – No. 19 (December 1988)

\*\*\*

Stop press:

The beginning of January 1989 saw the appearance of a new samizdat periodical with the title *TO /It/*, dated January 1989 and entirely devoted to the phenomenon of Stalinism. To judge from the editorial statement, as well as from the content

and design of the issue, it would appear to be a very ambitious publishing initiative.

TO /It/

D: magazine devoted to politics, history and literature; E: the imprint gives the editorial address as: Vuk Kratěna, Bělohorská 84, 636 00 Brno; L: 1989; F: A5; 187pp.; photocopied; soft card covers; T: 1; A: 1

\*\*\*

The latest addition to our collections as we were going to press was the first issue of a new samizdat journal from northern Bohemia:

NEZÁVISLÉ MÍROVÉ SDRUŽENÍ V LIBERCI /The Liberec independent peace association/

D: journal of Independent Peace Association members in the town of Liberec; L: January 1989 (“deadline: 5.1.1989, Liberec”); F: A4, 7pp.; cyclostyled; stapled; T: 1 (marked No.1, Vol.1); A: 1

\*\*\*

I. LIST OF SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977-1988 ACCORDING TO THEIR DATE OF INCEPTION (SHOWING LIFESPAN WHERE APPLICABLE)

1977:

+ DIALOGY: October 1977 – June 1980  
+ [SPEKTRUM], DVANÁCTKA: December 1977 – Autumn 1978

1978:

+ EKONOMICKÁ REVUE: Summer 1978 – Summer 1980

HISTORICKÉ STUDIE: January 1978

INFORMACE O CHARTĚ 77: January 1978

+ TEOLOGICKÝ SBORNÍK: Spring 1978 – Summer 1979  
+ [ZEBRA]: 1978

1979:  
+ ČTVEREC: 1979-80  
+ VÁHY: Autumn 1979 – mid-1980 approx.  
VOKNO: July 1979  
? VZKRŘÍŠENÍ: 1979

1980:  
+ FORUM: apparently published May – December 1980 only  
INFORMACE O CÍRKVI: 1980  
+ SLOVO: probably 1980-1981  
TEOLOGICKÉ TEXTY: 1980 (initially entitled TEXTY)

1981:  
+ KONTAKT: probably 1981-1984  
KRITICKÝ SBORNÍK: 1981  
? MORAVSKÁ ČÍTANKA: 1981  
NOVÝ BRAK: cca. 1981  
OBSAH: 1981

1982:  
+ HORIZONT: probably 1982-1984  
PROSTOR: June 1982  
+ VÝBĚR Z ČS. ČTENÁŘSKÉ SAMOOBSLUHY: probably 1982-1984

1983:  
NÁBOŽENSTVO A SÚČASNOSTĚ: 1983  
+ UNA SANCTA CATHOLICA: probably 1983-1984 only

1984:  
? PRAŽSKÉ KOMUNIKACE: 1984  
+ SALISBURSKÝ VÝBĚR: 1984-1985  
? SADO-MASO: probably 1984  
STŘEDNÍ EVROPA: 1984  
+ VÝBER: published at least during 1984-85

1985:  
DISKUSE: probably 1985  
? DRUHÁ STRANA: probably 1985  
KOMENTÁŘE: 1985  
NĚKDO NĚCO: cca. 1985  
PARAF: 1985  
? POKOJ A DOBRO: at the latest 1985  
POKUS: cca. 1985  
? "PSÍ": cca. 1985  
? REFLEXE: 1985  
REVOLVER REVUE : 1985 (initially entitled JEDNOU NOHOU)  
RODINNÉ SPOLOČENSTVO: 1985  
ZE ZÁSUVKY I Z BLOKU: probably 1985

1986:  
? ALTERNACE: 1986  
+ FRAGMENT: 1986-1987, thereafter FRAGMENT-K  
+ HISTORICKÝ ZÁPISNÍK: 1986-1987  
HOST: 1986  
O DIVADLE: July 1986  
? SURSUM: 1986  
+ VÝBĚR: probably published during 1986 only  
? XXX: 1986

1987:  
? DVEŘE: 1987  
EKOLOGICKÝ BULLETIN: September 1987  
GLOSÁŘ: 1987  
JAZZSTOP: 1987  
+ K: March – June 1987, thereafter FRAGMENT-K  
LIDOVÉ NOVINY: Autumn 1987  
? PIKOLE: 1987  
POHLED SPOTŘEBITELE: Autumn 1987  
? PROTĚJŠÍ CHODNÍK: May 1987  
SOCIOLOGICKÝ OBZOR: early-1987  
VOKNOVINY: 1987

1988:  
? ATTACK: 23.3.1988  
BRATISLAVSKÉ LISTY: June 1988

**BULLETIN NEZÁVISLÉHO MÍROVÉHO**

SDRUŽENÍ: May 1988

DIALOG 88: Summer 1988

FRAGMENT-K: April 1988

? HADR: 1988

HLAS SLOVENSKA: Spring 1988

INFORMAČNÍ BULETIN ČS.-POLSKÉ SOLIDARI-

TY: July 1988

KATOLÍCKÝ MESAČNÍK: mid-1988

KŘEŠŤANSKÉ OBZORY: 15.6.1988

? LOGOS

MAGAZÍN SPOLEČENSTVÍ PŘÁTEL USA –

“SPUSA”: March 1988

? PRKNA PRAHY

RADOŠŤ A NÁDEJ: probably early-1988

REVUE 88: probably May 1988

? SKLEPNÍK: cca. April 1988

STŘEDNÍ EVROPA (Brno version): July 1988

? TUTÁČ RECORD

VV: second half of 1988

1989:

TO: January 1989

NEZÁVISLÉ MÍROVÉ SDRUŽENÍ V LIBERCI:

January 1989

**2. LIST OF SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977-1988, NO LONGER IN PUBLICATION**

+ ČTVEREC: 1979-80 + DIALOGY: October 1977 – June 1980

+ EKONOMICKÁ REVUE: Summer 1978 – Summer 1980

+ FORUM: apparently published May – December 1980 only

+ FRAGMENT: 1986-1987, thereafter as FRAGMENT-K

+ HISTORICKÝ ZÁPISNÍK: 1986-87 (up to the arrest of I.Polanský)

+ HORIZONT: probably 1982-1984

+ K: March – June 1987, thereafter as FRAGMENT-K

+ KONTAKT: probably 1981-1984

+ SALISBURSKÝ VÝBĚR: 1984-85

+ SLOVO: probably 1980-81

+ [SPEKTRUM], DVANÁCTKA: December 1977 – Autumn 1978

+ TEOLOGICKÝ SBORNÍK: Spring 1978 – Summer 1979

+ UNA SANCTA CATHOLICA: probably 1983-84 only

+ VÁHY: Autumn 1979 – mid-1980 approx.

+ VÝBER: at least 1984-85

+ VÝBĚR: possibly 1986 only

+ VÝBĚR Z ČS. ČTENÁŘSKÉ SAMOOBSLUHY: probably 1982-84

+ [ZEBRA]: 1978 only

**3. LIST OF SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977-1988, ABOUT WHICH THERE IS INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION**

A: 1979-1987

? ALTERNACE

? DRUHÁ STRANA

? DVEŮE

? MORAVSKÁ ČÍTANKA

? PIKOLE

? POKOJ A DOBRO

? PRAŽSKÉ KOMUNIKACE

? PROTĚJŠÍ CHODNÍK

? “PSÍ”

? REFLEXE

? SADO-MASO

? SURSUM

? VZKŮŠENÍ

? XXX

B: PERIODICALS FOUNDED SINCE 1988

? ATTACK

? HADR

? LOGOS

? PRKNA PRAHY

? SKLEPNÍK  
? TUTÁČ RECORD

4. LIST OF SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS 1977-1988, WHICH WERE  
DEFINITELY STILL IN PRODUCTION AT THE END OF 1988  
(WITH THE DATE OF INCEPTION)

BRATISLAVSKÉ LISTY: June 1988  
BULLETIN NEZÁVISLÉHO MÍROVÉHO  
SDRUŽENÍ: May 1988  
DIALOG 88: Summer 1988  
DISKUSE: probably 1985  
EKOLOGICKÝ BULLETIN: September 1987  
FRAGMENT-K: April 1988 (replacing the journals  
K and FRAGMENT)  
GLOSÁŘ: 1987  
HISTORICKÉ STUDIE: January 1978  
HLAS SLOVENSKA: Spring 1988  
HOST: 1986  
INFORMACE O CHARTĚ 77: January 1978  
INFORMACE O CÍRKVI: 1980  
INFORMAČNÍ BULETIN ČS.-POLSKÉ SOLIDARI-  
TY: July 1988  
JAZZSTOP: 1987  
KATOLÍCKY MESAČNÍK: Mid-1988  
KOMENTÁŘE: 1985  
KRITICKÝ SBORNÍK: 1981  
KŘESŤANSKÉ OBZORY: 15.6.88  
LIDOVÉ NOVINY: Autumn 1987  
MAGAZÍN SPOLEČENSTVÍ PŘÁTEL USA  
("SPUSA"): March 1988  
NÁBOŽENSTVO A SÚČASNOST': 1983  
NĚKDO NĚCO: cca. 1985  
NOVÝ BRAK: cca. 1981  
OBSAH: 1981  
O DIVADLE: July 1986  
PARAF: 1985

POHLED SPOTŘEBITELE: Autumn 1987  
POKUS: cca. 1985  
PROSTOR: June 1982  
RADOST' A NÁDEJ: probably early-1988  
REVOLVER REVUE: 1985 (initially entitled JEDNOU  
NOHOU)  
REVUE 88: probably May 1988  
RODINNÉ SPOLOČENSTVO: 1985  
SOCIOLOGICKÝ OBZOR: early-1987  
STŘEDNÍ EVROPA: 1984  
STŘEDNÍ EVROPA (Brno version): July 1988  
TEOLOGICKÉ TEXTY: 1980 (initially entitled TEXTY)  
VOKNO: July 1979  
VOKNOVINY: 1987  
VV: 1988  
ZE ZÁSUVKY I Z BLOKU: probably 1985

\*\*\*

SUPPLEMENT:

TO: January 1989  
NEZÁVISLÉ MÍROVÉ SDRUŽENÍ V LIBERCI:  
January 1989

5. LIST OF SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS IN SLOVAK

(as of December 1988; with the date of incep-  
tion)

BRATISLAVSKÉ LISTY: June 1988  
FRAGMENT-K: April 1988 (replacing K and Fragment)  
HLAS SLOVENSKA: 1988  
KATOLÍCKY MESAČNÍK: mid-1988  
NÁBOŽENSTVO A SÚČASNOST': 1983  
RADOST' A NÁDEJ: probably early-1988  
RODINNÉ SPOLOČENSTVO: 1985

---

## JIŘÍ THEINER: IN MEMORIAM

1927 – 1988

Jiří (George) Theiner, editor of the journal *Index on Censorship*, died in London on 17th July 1988. The Documentation Centre and *Acta* have lost not just a friend, but also a colleague always ready to give advice and reliable information, and above all to offer assistance with his exceptional talents as a translator. His legacy in the field of translation has done an enormous amount to promote knowledge of Czech literature in the English-speaking world. His achievement is richer and far more extensive than any of us yet realise. This will be evident from the bibliography of Theiner's translations being prepared for publication in a future issue of *Acta*.

In the meantime, we have decided to publish a survey of his main translations prepared by *Index on Censorship*. We are grateful to the editors of *Index* for this material and for their kind permission to reprint, in Czech and English, Václav Havel's reminiscence written for that journal shortly after George Theiner's death.

\*\*\*

When members of the Royal Shakespeare Company who staged my play *Temptation* visited me in Prague and presented me with a video of their production, I invited several of my friends

and we all watched it together. The video ended with the entire cast dressed in their ordinary clothes assembled on the stage: in the middle of them stood George Theiner, translator of the play, who looked warmly straight at me, lifted his glass in toast and congratulated me in Czech. It was such a truly touching little surprise that I had a hard time trying not to get all emotional in front of my friends. I think that forever now, George Theiner will remain in my memory in his role of toast-master on that stage.

I never met him in person. Several times I spoke with him on the telephone, I saw him on several videos, and of course I knew his work as the author of excellent translations from Czech into English and as the editor of *Index on Censorship*. From all this I formed an impression of him as an exceptionally nice and gentle, modest and hard-working man. I owe him much gratitude, as do many Czechoslovak writers. And I firmly believe that after his departure, *Index on Censorship* will not only keep its high standards but will also continue to play its unique and irreplaceable cultural role, as it did under the editorship of George Theiner.

Václav Havel, playwright, Prague

(*Index on Censorship*, August 1988, Vol.17, No 7, p.2)

---

## GEORGE THEINER: BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

4 November 1927 born in Prague, Czechoslovakia  
March 1939 emigrated to England with his parents, shortly after the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia  
1939-45 educated in England  
end of 1945 return to Prague  
1946-50 news editor of English-language service of ČTK (the official Czechoslovak News Agency). Refusal to join the Communist Party and the Youth Union following the Communist coup of February 1948 and unwillingness to adapt himself to standards of a "revolutionary" journalism, led to the end of his journalistic career and, in 1950-53, to three years in labour camps attached to Silesian coalmines  
1954-56 technical editor in a Prague educational publishing house  
1957-62 worked as English editor of Artia foreign-language publishing house in Prague and translated Czech literature into English  
1962-68 freelance writer of children's stories and literary translator (Czech into English)  
1968 left Czechoslovakia three weeks after the Soviet invasion of August of that year and returned to England  
1969-72 employed by London publishers Thames & Hudson, Weidenfeld, and the British Printing Corporation

1973 joined the newly founded Writers and Scholars International (WSET) as assistant director (editorial) and assistant editor of *Index on Censorship*  
1982 appointed director of WSET and editor of *Index of Censorship*  
Married 1954 Anna Marta Helisová (died 1971); one son, Pavel, born 1957. Married 1975 Shirley Patricia Harris.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF GEORGE THEINER'S TRANSLATIONS:

### Translated books:

*Temptation* by Václav Havel. London: Faber and Faber, 1988.  
*A cup of coffee with my interrogator* by Ludvík Vaculík. London: Readers International, 1987.  
*My merry mornings* by Ivan Klíma. London: Readers International, 1985.  
*Seven short stories*. Praha: Orbis, 1967. [Translated the stories by Dušan Kužel, Jaroslava Blažková, Josef Škvorecký, Peter Balgha.]  
*Ditta Sax* by Arnošt Lustig. London: Hutchinson, 1966.  
*Selected poems* by Miroslav Holub, introduced by Al Alvarez (Ian Milner's translation also included). London: Penguin, 1967.  
*Night and hope* by Arnošt Lustig. London: Hutchinson, 1962. New York: Dutton, 1962.  
*Indigo blueprints in Slovak folk art*. Prague: Artia, 1954.  
Numerous books for Artia (Prague): children's books, art-books, nature books, etc., 1954-62

### Editor:

*They shoot writers, don't they?* London: Faber and Faber, 1984. Dutch version: Amsterdam: Ambo, 1985. Danish version: Copenhagen: Fremad, 1986.

**Editor and translator:**

*The new writing in Czechoslovakia*. London: Penguin, 1969.  
[26 writers were represented.]

Co-author: *Killdog* by Jonathan George. [A political thriller by John Burke and George Theiner.] London: Macmillan, 1970. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

George Theiner also translated for *Index on Censorship* a large amount of works and comments by banned writers from Czechoslovakia (as well as from elsewhere). A selection of these translations include poems, plays, extracts from novels, feuilletons, essay and so on by these author:

**Jiří Gruša**

*The questionnaire* (novel extract) ..... 5/1979

**Václav Havel:**

*Conversation (Audience)* (play) ..... 3/1976

*Breaking the ice barrier* (interview) ..... 1/1978

*Reflections on the theatre* ..... 2/1983

*Mistake* (sketch) ..... 1/1984

*A play's fate* (on the play *Audience*) ..... 5/1986

*My temptation* (interview) ..... 10/1986

*Temptation* (play) ..... 10/1986

**Bohumil Hrabal:**

*An ordinary day* ..... 3/1984

*Mr. Stránský's Good Luck* (novel extract) ..... 1/1988

**Ivan Klíma:**

*The girl athlete* ..... 1/1981

*Variations on an eternal theme* ..... 6/1981

*Judge on trial* (novel extract) ..... 9/1986

**Alexandr Kliment:**

*Mr Feuilleton* ..... 3/1978

**Pavel Kohout:**

*Double Trouble* ..... 4/1987

**Iva Kotrlá:**

*The fishing line* ..... 5/1985

**Milan Kundera:**

*Life is elsewhere* (novel extract) ..... 4/1974

*Comedy is everywhere* (interview) ..... 6/1977

**Karel Michal:**

*Purvis* ..... 4/1985

**Jan Pelc:**

*It's gonna get worse* (novel extract) ..... 6/1986

**Jaroslav Seifert:**

*A tribute to Vladimír Holan* (poem) ..... 2/1985

*In Lenin's Mausoleum* (poem) ..... 2/1985

**Milan Šimečka:**

*Hostages* ..... 3/1977

*A Czech Winston Smith* ..... 1/1984

**Josef Škvorecký:**

*Dvořák in love* (novel extract) ..... 6/1981

**Dominik Tatarka**

*They should have killed me* (novel extract) ..... 2/1984

**Milan Uhde:**

*The blue angel* (play) ..... 1/1985



<b>Ludvík Vaculík:</b>	
<i>Impermissible thoughts</i> .....	4/1975
<i>A cup of coffee with my interrogator</i> .....	4/1977
<i>Free to use a typewriter</i> .....	3/1978
<i>My philosophers</i> .....	5/1978
<i>Reluctant exile</i> .....	2/1983
<i>The Spring is here</i> .....	2/1983
<i>Thus spake Švejk</i> .....	7/1986
<i>Walking down Příkopy</i> .....	7/1986
<i>Words</i> .....	7/1986
<i>Happy Easter</i> .....	6/1987
<i>A day in August</i> .....	2/1988
<i>In praise of the censor</i> .....	5/1988

<b>Jan Vladislav:</b>	
<i>A parallel world</i> .....	6/1981
<i>Homeland</i> (poem) .....	1/1981
<i>All you need is a typewriter</i> (interview) .....	2/1983

## SOLIDARITY WITH IVAN POLANSKÝ

Slovak Catholic lay activist, Ivan Polanský, who has been involved for several years in duplicating and distributing religious literature and has edited samizdat compilations on Josef Tiso and Andrej Hlinka, was arrested in November 1987 and held on remand until June 1988 when he was found guilty of "subversion of the Republic" by the Regional Court in Banská Bystrica, and sentenced to four years imprisonment.

From the moment of his arrest, Ivan Polanský's case was monitored by VONS (the Committee for the Defence of the Unjustly Prosecuted),

the independent citizen's initiative established in 1978 by Czech signatories of Charter 77. VONS issued reports about Polanský's arrest, his interrogation and his state of health, as well as about the sentence and its confirmation by the Slovak supreme court. In October 1988 an Ivan Polanský Solidarity Committee was set up in Czechoslovakia.

The Committee's Declaration was signed by 83 independent journalists and publishers of samizdat periodicals and literature from all over the Republic. Most of the signatories appended the title of the journal or book series to which they contribute, or which they help to produce or distribute. There were a good thirty journals or book series listed in this way. Until that moment, much of the information had been only known to those directly involved since many independent editors have been in the practice of using pseudonyms as a cover or have published journals anonymously.

We are printing in full the Committee's Declaration and the list of its signatories as a noteworthy example of solidarity with all those whose civil and human rights are denied or whose exercise of them is restricted. Such solidarity without regard to nationality, political views, religious beliefs, age or occupation, has become the rule within independent circles in Czechoslovakia over the past ten or twelve years.

On the back cover of this present issue we are printing a facsimile of a letter sent to Ivan Polanský's wife by Cardinal František Tomášek, Archbishop of Prague.

While the present issue of *Acta* was going to press, it was announced that Ivan Polanský's sentence had been reduced to two years' imprison-

---

ment as a result of an amnesty at the end of October 1988. He was conditionally released on 15th December on four years' probation.

*The editors*

DECLARATION OF THE IVAN POLANSKÝ  
SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE

Fifty-two-year-old Catholic lay activist Ivan Polanský from Dubnica nad Váhom was recently sentenced to four years imprisonment for duplicating and distributing publications and literature, mostly on religious or historical topics. It is our view that everyone has the right to engage in independent journalism, as well as in the publishing and distribution of literature of all kinds. This right is also guaranteed under article 19 of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights which has been in force in Czechoslovakia since 23rd March 1976. Ivan Polanský's conviction is unlawful, among other reasons, because his activities in no way impinged the limitations to which the exercise of the right of freedom of expression is subject under article 19 of the covenant in question: both as author and publisher he respected the rights and reputations of others and in no way threatened national security, public order, or public health and morals. The arrest and conviction of Ivan Polanský are yet another demonstration by the organs of state power that they have no intention of upholding the human rights covenants and that they regard the international pacts which they sign as no more than worthless scraps of paper.

The absence of freedom of speech affects us all. Our country's state and party leaders are usur-

ping the right to limit, curtail and suppress any utterance that they regard as detrimental to their power, even though their monopoly of power extends to every area of society's life. In the circumstances, independent publishing activities are virtually indispensable as a form of self-preservation; ranging from fiction to specialised and religious literature, and encompassing political texts and documents about the violation of human rights, as well as independent newspapers and free information media, they help maintain the historical continuity of culture and truthful information. It is not only a legitimate form of civil defence against the totalitarian manipulation of society, it is also a promise of freer conditions. In exercising his right to freedom of expression Ivan Polanský was motivated chiefly by his awareness of this vital social need, and it was his religious faith that caused him to regard free publishing activity as a moral imperative and his own personal mission.

Freedom is indivisible. A system of justice which permits special exceptions must eventually turn into arbitrary power. The persecution of Ivan Polanský by the organs of state power is an attack on all of us involved, like him, in independent journalism, and motivated by the same or similar principles. As independent publishers and journalists of various cultural and political persuasions, as well as of different religious faiths and none, we are engaged in precisely the same activity as Ivan Polanský. Many of us have been involved in it publicly for years now. We cannot and will not remain silent about the fact that Ivan Polanský is actually in prison on behalf of us all. As members of the Ivan Polanský Solidarity Com-

mittee, we issue the following urgent and resolute call to our country's state and political leaders – Put an end to the situation of legal abuses, stop flouting people's rights, and halt selective prosecutions whose sole aim is to maintain the whole of society in a state of fear. Either release Ivan Polanský or show some consistency in your perverted system of justice by gaoling the rest of us.

Our solidarity with Ivan Polanský can only be effective if the demand for his release wins the support of Czechoslovak and international public opinion. We appeal to all people of good will to help. An information service has been set up under the aegis of the Solidarity Committee to act as a clearing-house for information about Ivan Polanský's conditions of imprisonment and the situation of his family, as well as about actions in his support.

The information service can be contacted at the following addresses:

PhDr. Václav Benda, Karlovo nám. 18, 120 00  
Praha 2

JUDr. Ján Čarnogurský, Karola Adlera 10, 841  
02 Bratislava

Jiří Gruntorád, Oldřichova 23, 120 00 Praha 2  
Heřman Chromý, Sídliště Podolí 2762, 276 01  
Mělník

Membership of the Ivan Polanský Solidarity Committee is open to all independent Czechoslovak publishers and journalists on an individual basis. An indication of the journal or publishing activity in which the member is involved is welcomed but is not conditional. (Indications in brackets after members' names do not imply that

membership extends to the entire editorial board or to other participants in a given venture.)

12th October 1988

Josef Adámek (Logos)

František Adamfk (Catholic samizdat)

Zdeněk Bálek (Pikole)

Petr Bartoš (Magazín SPUSA /Magazine of the Friends of the USA Association "SPUSA"/)

Václav Benda (Paraf)

Petr Cibulka (Samizdat Tapes and Cassettes and Videos: Půjčuj! Rozmnožuj!! Rozšiřuj!!! /Lend! Copy!! Distribute!!!/)

Ján Čarnogurský (Bratislavské listy /Bratislava gazette/)

Jiří Daníček

Josef Danisz (Ekologický bulletin /Ecological bulletin/)

Ivan Dejmal (Ekologický bulletin)

Jiří Dienstbier (Lidové noviny /People's news/)

Zuzana Dienstbierová

Jan Dobrovský (Lidové noviny)

Luboš Dobrovský (Kritický sborník /Critical review/)

Jan Dus

Tomáš Dvořák (Bulletin of the Independent Peace Association)

Jaromír Erben (religious samizdat)

Přemysl Fialka

Jiří Gruntorád

Ivan M. Havel (Edice Expedice /"Expedice" samizdat book series/)

Václav Havel (Edice Expedice; O divadle /About theatre/)

Olga Havlová (Nový brak /New trash/)

Zbyněk Hejda

Ladislav Hejdánek (Lidové noviny; Reflexe)

Ivan Hoffman (Fragment-K)

Michal Holeček

Lukáš Hraběta (Tutáč Record)

Jiřina Hrábková (Lidové noviny)

Heřman Chromý (Informace o Chartě 77 /News of Charter 77/)

Ivan M. Jirous (Vokno /Window/)

Jaroslav Jířů (Lidové noviny)  
Pavel Jungmann (Magazín SPUSA)  
Petr Kabeš  
Pavel Kačferek  
Jiří Kantůrek (Originální videojournal /Original videojournal/)  
Jan Kaplan  
Luboš Kohout  
\*Iva Kotrlá  
Bedřich Koutný (Magazín SPUSA)  
Petr Krejčí  
Andrej Krob (Originální videojournal)  
Miroslav Kusý (Lidové noviny)  
Ivan Lamper (Revolver Revue)  
Aleš Lederer (Prostor /Space/)  
Jan Lopatka  
Radomír Malý (Společenství /Community/)  
Václav Malý (religious samizdat)  
Lenka Marečková-Hrachová (Ekologický bulletin)  
Luděk Marks  
Hana Marvanová  
Vladimír Mlynář (Lidové noviny)  
Michal Mrtvý (Catholic samizdat)  
Augustin Navrátil (Křesťanské obzory /Christian horizons/)  
Augustina Navrátilová (Křesťanské obzory)  
\*Milan Ohnisko (Almanach Bich)  
Martin Palouš  
Radim Palouš (Nové cesty myšlení /New thought trails/)  
Pavla Paloušová (Informace o Chartě 77)  
Petr Placák (Prkna Prahy /Prague boards/)  
\*Oliver Polakovič  
Petr Pospíchal (Polish-Czechoslovak solidarity)  
Lenka Procházková  
\*Roman Ráček (Revue 88)  
Miloš Rejchrt  
Zdeněk Rotrekl  
Jan Ruml (Originální videojournal)  
Jiří Ruml (Lidové noviny)  
\*František Rychlík  
Dušan Skála (Host /Guest/)  
Andrej Stankovič (Originální videojournal)  
Olga Stankovičová (Nový brak)

František Stárek (Vokno)  
Jan Šabata (Lidové noviny)  
František Šamalský (Lidové noviny)  
Martin Milan Šimečka (Fragment-K)  
Olga Šulcová (Ze zásuvky a z bloku /From the desk-drawer and note- book/; Lidové noviny)  
Petruška Šustrová  
Jáchym Topol (Revolver Revue)  
Vladimír Trlida (Magazín SPUSA)  
Petr Uhl (Informace o Chartě 77)  
Jan Urban (correspondent for the independent Soviet weekly  
Ekspres-Chronika)  
Zdeněk Urbánek (Lidové noviny)  
Ludvík Vaculík  
Ota Veverka (Jazzstop)  
\*Luboš Vlach (Hudební magazín Šoe /Musical magazine "Šoe")  
Josef Vohryzek  
Saša Vondra (Revolver Revue)  
Luboš Vydra (Bulletin of Independent Peace Association)  
Pavel Záleský (Křesťanské obzory)  
Rudolf Zeman (Lidové noviny)  
Václav Žufan (Attac)

\* signed the Declaration after 12th October

The Documentation Centre is grateful to all those authors, translators and publishers who have sent us publications. These have greatly enhanced the Centre's reference library and are of immense assistance in our task of cataloguing independent Czech and Slovak literature.

---

## GRANT IN MEMORY OF BEDŘICH FUČÍK

*The samizdat journal Kritický sborník /Critical review/ announced in its No.2, Vol. VIII, 1988, the establishment of a grant in memory of Bedřich Fučík in 1987. To quote from the journal:*

The grant in memory of Bedřich Fučík will be awarded annually by a panel of specialists to young literary critics, theoreticians, historians or editors on the basis of proven creative achievement, as an encouragement for them to continue work on topics which have no hope of being published, except in typescript, in the present status quo.

The panel has decided to issue the following appeal to coincide with the announcement of the award:

The Bedřich Fučík Grant bears the name of a man who spent his whole life in tireless, devoted, unassuming and self-sacrificing service to Czech literature. For years and years, right up to his death, he worked without respite, preparing critical editions of silenced poets, thereby saving them from oblivion. In the spirit of his legacy, we appeal to the younger generation of literary specialists and critics to turn their attention also to the neglected problems of most recent Czech literary output and to the gaps in the study of modern Czech literature. The growing number and range of such gaps are an alarming sign of ongoing crisis.

We would point out that in terms of objective academic treatment, literary theory and history in

Czechoslovakia have never got further than the 1945 watershed. The current preparatory work for a standard overall history of modern Czech literature displays a lack of responsibility which will result in a tendentious and partial historical account. Critical assessments of such prominent representatives of post-war (and sometimes even pre-war) poetry and prose as Deml, Zahradníček, Čep, Seifert, Holan, Kolář, Hrabal, Škvorecký, etc. are virtually non-existent. Often there is not even any reference to a whole number of banned authors, let alone to their bibliographies or critical editions of their works. University departments and other academic institutions are able to include such topics in their curricula only in so far as they conform to current cultural policies, i.e. so long as it ignores or distorts information about key literary currents or personalities. It is up to us alone. We feel that everyone involved in literature in one way or another should keep this vacuum constantly in mind and regard this work as their personal duty.

We offer our assistance to all those wishing to work with commitment in the field of literary study or history. For instance, we are able to help them in defining areas of study and locating source material, as well as in terms of methodology, etc. Precise details are available via the editors of this journal.

*Kritický sborník, 1988, Vol. VIII, No.2.*

## VLADIMIR SOLOVYOV PRIZE AWARDED

The members of the judging panel for the one-off prize offered in honour of the Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov to mark the thousandth anniversary of the adoption of Christianity by Kievan Russia, met in Prague on 30th June 1988. (Cf. *Acta*, 3 & 4/87, inside back cover.) They read and appraised an essay entitled "Could it be a case of *ex oriente lux*, after all?", by Ivan Brod, further, a historical study: *Russia and religion* with the subtitle *To mark the thousand-year pilgrimage through Russian history of God's people* by František Op, and finally a poem by Iva Kotrlá entitled *Famed land*.

The group commended the standard of the contributions received and voiced its thanks to the contributors. The hope was also expressed that authentic spiritual activity would continue to grow spontaneously, independent of the official structures and free of ideological interference. This process would be assisted if the practice of awarding one-off or regular prizes were to continue in future.

The winner of the Vladimir Solovyov Competition was declared to be: *Could it be a case of ex oriente lux, after all?*

The author of the winning contribution receives our congratulations and the prize of 3,000 crowns. At the same time, we would thank all those who showed an interest in the topic of "Russia and Christianity" and supported our competition's underlying idea, and wish them every success in their quest for enduring and authentic human values.

Prague, 30th June 1988

Bohumír Janát

Martin Palouš

Miloš Rejchrt

## DONATIONS TO THE ČSDS

The transfer of the Documentation Centre's headquarters to Castle Schwarzenberg has meant a change in the procedure for making donations to the ČSDS which are tax deductible and for which the donor receives confirmation for the appropriate tax authorities.

As of now, donations are made by means of a bank transfer to *Stadt Scheinfeld, 8533 Scheinfeld* marked *Spende für Dokumentationszentrum e.V., Schloß Schwarzenberg, Account No.810 000 026, Sparkasse Scheinfeld, BLZ 762 510 20*. Cheques made out in similar manner (*Stadt Scheinfeld, Spende für Dokumentationszentrum e.V., Schloß Schwarzenberg*) may be sent directly to us and we will undertake to pass them on to the Scheinfeld municipal authorities who will then supply the necessary receipt.

Please indicate clearly your precise address when sending bank drafts or cheques so that we may send you the necessary receipt for your own tax authorities. To simplify matters, "Sparkasse Scheinfeld" has had some transfer forms specially printed for us and some of our subscribers will receive these with the present issue of *Acta*. We will send out these forms as and when they are required and we will happily take requests for them by telephone.

We wish to thank all those in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere who communicated to us, either by phone or in writing, various corrections and additions to our bibliography: *Edice Petlice 1973-87*. We shall be publishing these along with information about Petlice's 1988 titles in a future issue of *Acta*.

---

## NEWS ABOUT THE CZECH EDITION OF PATOČKA'S WORKS

The discussion about the different schemes for the publication in Czech of Jan Patočka's Collected Works has had a number of repercussions.

1. There is agreement both in independent circles in Czechoslovakia and in the Czechoslovak exile community that Jan Patočka's writings are a major component of the Czech spiritual heritage and that conditions should be created so that Jan Patočka's collected works be made available in definitive form in the Czech language.

2. An editorial group is already working on the project. It consists of a core of experts on Jan Patočka's work – philosophers who studied under Patočka – assisted by other scholars and technical personnel. The group plans to prepare three volumes of the manuscripts per year, on the basis of a scheme for 12-15 volumes. At this rate, work on the entire manuscript will be completed by 1993 at the latest.

3. The Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature (ČSDS) plays a coordinating role between the editorial group and institutions supporting the project in various ways. The latter include the Charta 77 Foundation in Stockholm and the Oxford-based "Central and East European Publishing Project" (CEEPP), whose assistance will enable the editing of the first four volumes of the

Collected Works. There is widespread support among European intellectuals for the view that the Czech edition of Patočka's writings is not solely a Czech affair, but a matter of European cultural importance and as such merits international support.

4. Following the publication of the complete bibliography of Patočka's works and the discussion about the formal arrangement of the edition and how it is to be printed, a consensus has been reached that the most practical approach is to undertake the work in two stages:

a) Continuing the work of preparing the manuscripts of the 12-15 volumes of the definitive text, complete with all supplementary material, including footnotes, indexes, etc. (Preparation of the manuscripts involves writing the entire text to computer diskettes as a basis either for normal typesetting or for printing out on a computer printer.)

b) The actual publication, in terms of printing (including print-run) and distribution, about which no final decision will be taken until early 1991, when the manuscripts of the first six volumes should be ready. Alternatively, it might be possible to publish individual volumes either as printed books (particularly in the case of those intended for a wider readership) or in the form of photocopies for study purposes.

5. *Acta* will continue to provide news of the progress of the work as well as information about foreign language editions of Jan Patočka's writings.

6. The publication of Patočka's works in Czech is an enormous task. Its successful fulfilment will require not only the cooperation of the exile publishing houses, but also – and above all, in the present phase – the support of sponsors and subscribers. We are therefore issuing a further appeal for help. Contributions can be sent as a (tax-deductible) donation to the ČSDS earmarked "Patočka's Writings". All such donations will be deposited in a special account and donors will be notified in writing of the use made of them.

-vpn-

## ČSDS PUBLICATIONS 1986-88

### The ACTA CREATIONIS book series

Reprints and collections of works originally published in samizdat; reference material about independent literature, and its individual varieties and genres.

#### Volume 1

*Acta creationis: Unabhängige Geschichtsschreibung in der Tschechoslowakei 1969-1980; Independent Historiography in Czechoslovakia, 1969-1980. Ed. V.Prečan. Scheinfeld-Schwarzenberg: ČSDS, 1988. – LX+252 pp.*

Reprint of a collection published in 1980 for the participants of the 15th International Congress of Historical Sciences in Bucharest. Contents: 1. Annotated bibliography of 183 historical studies completed in Czechoslovakia in the period

from the late sixties to 1980. 2. German translations of nine studies by historians in Czechoslovakia. 3. Reflections on the eightieth birthday of Zdeněk Kalista and an account of the case of Slovak historian Jozef Jablonický (both in English). 4. Introductory article on independent historiography by the volume's editor (in German and English).

#### Volume 2

*T. G. Masaryk and Our Times (T. G. Masaryk a naše současnost). Ed. V.Prečan. Hannover: ČSDS 1986. – 112 pp.*

A collection devoted to independent Masarykian scholarship in Czechoslovakia published in conjunction with the international conference "Thomas Garrigue Masaryk 1850-1937" organised by London University in December 1987.

Contents: Collected summaries of all contributions to the publication *T.G.Masaryk and our Times (Masarykian anthology VII)*, including essays, reminiscences and documents, together with a bibliography of works by and about Masaryk covering the years 1935-78, issued in manuscript (samizdat) form in Prague in 1980; an essay by Petr Pithart about Jaroslav Opat's book *Masaryk's first years in Prague*; an essay by Ladislav Hejdlánek entitled *Masaryk as a philosopher for today*.

#### Volume 3

*About theatre (O divadle). Stockholm: The Charta 77 Foundation, 1989. 96 pp. (Voices from Czechoslovakia; 3-4.)*

Published jointly by the Charta 77 Foundation in Stockholm (in its series *Voices from Czechoslovakia*) and the ČSDS.



English translation of a collection of texts from the first two issues of the eponymous samizdat magazine dealing with theoretical and practical aspects of theatre, dramatic art and theatrical production in Czechoslovakia.

#### Volume 4

*Miroslav Synek, Naděje a zklamání. Pražské jaro 1968 /Hopes and disillusionment. Prague Spring 1968/. Ed. V.Prečan. Scheinfeld-Schwarzenberg: ČSDS, 1988. 157 pp.*

A concise historical account of events in Czechoslovakia from Spring 1968 to May 1969 by an author living in the home country, supplemented with a collection of some of the most important documents of the period.

The ARCHÍVNÍ DOKUMENTY /Documents from the archive/ book series

#### Volume 1

*Sedm pražských dnů: 21.-27. srpen 1968. Dokumentace /Seven Prague days: 21st-27th August 1968. Documentation/. Cca 350 pages of text plus 50 pages of illustrations. Ready for printing but publication postponed for technical reasons. Orders may be sent to the ČSDS.*

A chronologically arranged collection of source materials about the military invasion of Czechoslovakia and the non-violent resistance movement. Reprint of a book which was published in Autumn 1968 by the then Historical Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in Prague and achieved world renown as *The Czech Black Book*. The book's original text – dealing with the period 20th-28th August – is sup-

plemented by a chapter entitled *Zpráva o Černé knize (1968-71) /Documentary account of the Black Book (1968-1971)/* by Vilém Prečan, one of the compilers of that original collection.

#### DOSSIER

This series is intended for the publication of latest documentation about the activity of independent citizens' initiatives in Czechoslovakia.

#### No.1

*Demokracii pro všechny. Dokumenty Hnutí za občanskou svobodu.- Scheinfeld-Schwarzenberg: ČSDS, listopad 1988. – 19 pp.*

*Democracy for all. Documents of the Movement for Civil Liberties.- Scheinfeld-Schwarzenberg: ČSDS, November 1988.- 20 pp.*

Pamphlet published in Czech and English versions containing the following documents: The Manifesto of the Movement for Civil Liberties (HOS) of 15th October plus a list of the first 126 signatories; the appeal addressed to European public opinion by Rudolf Battěk and Ladislav Lis on 28th October; and the statement of the provisional coordinating committee of HOS issued on 4th November 1988.

Separate publications:

*Ten Years of Charter 77. Ed. V.Prečan. Hanover: ČSDS, 1986.- 111 pp.*

Documentary publication published in English for the purposes of several international gatherings organised to mark the tenth anniversary of Charter 77.

Contents: Václav Havel, On the meaning of Charter 77; H.G.Skilling, Charter 77: The international impact; annotated list of Charter 77 documents 1977-86; biographical details of Charter 77's 26 spokespersons in the course of its existence.

\*\*\*

*ACTA. Čtvrtletník Čs. dokumentačního střediska nezávislé literatury.*

*ACTA. Quarterly of the Documentation Centre for the Promotion of Independent Czechoslovak Literature.*

Published in Czech and English versions.

It features: studies, articles and discussion about independent literature, plus material on individual works and authors; reviews and news of books and periodicals; bibliographical surveys and lists of samizdat series; reports on the activity of the ČSDS and information about its collections.

The output of the first year (1987) – Nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4 – included:

CZECH WRITING IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE: papers contributed by Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz, Jan Vladislav, Jiří Gruša and Paul Wilson to the annual conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Boston, November 1987.

THE TERMINOLOGY OF INDEPENDENT LITERATURE: contribution by Eva Kantůrková plus two texts

reprinted from the samizdat journal *Kritický sborník*.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SYMPOSIUM "BOOKS, WRITERS, TRANSLATORS AND PUBLISHERS, both Czech and Slovak, at home and abroad 1970-87", by Václav Havel, Milan Šimečka and Ludvík Vaculík.

"PADLOCK BOOKS" 1973-1987: Vaculík on "Edice Petlice", list of EP 1- 367.

SAMIZDAT SERIES: NEW THOUGHT TRAILS

NEWS ABOUT THE SAMIZDAT PERIODICALS: *O divadle, Obsah, Sociologický obzor, Fragment, "K"*.

NEW TITLES by Hana Ponická, Zdeněk Rotrekl, Ivan Kadlečík, Milan Uhde, František Kautman

TWO SCHEMES FOR THE PUBLICATION IN CZECH OF JAN PATOČKA'S COLLECTED WORKS plus a discussion forum about the proposals.

\*\*\*

All above publications, except for *Ten Years of Charter 77*, are still in stock. Orders should be sent to: Dokumentationszentrum, Schwarzenberg 6, 8533 Scheinfeld.

Prices of the above publications (solely to cover printing costs):

Unabhängige Geschichtsschreibung: DM 30

T.G. Masaryk and Our Times: DM 11

About theatre: DM 10

Synek, Pražské jaro 1968: DM 17

Sedm pražských dnů: DM 35

Demokracii pro všechny: DM 3

Democracy for all: DM 3

ACTA 1987: DM 40 (per issue DM 11)

ACTA 1988: DM 40

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Board of Management wishes to express its gratitude to those whose contributions have permitted the enlargement of the Centre and its collections. During the period from June to December 1988 these were:

Erika Abrams, Paris  
Luciano Antonetti, Rome  
Dr Zdenka Brodská, Farmington Hills  
Dr Josefina Brügel, London  
Jan Čulík, Glasgow  
Marie Dubina, Paris  
Freiherr von und zu Guttenberg, Neustadt  
a.d.Saale  
Ivan Diviš, Munich  
Jan Filípek, Palm Springs  
Ota Filip, Munich  
Helena Goetz, Vancouver  
Prof. Dr Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz,  
Vancouver  
Dr Vladimír Kabeš, Washington  
Pavel Kohout, Vienna  
Jiří Kolář, Paris  
Prof. Dr Jiří Kosta, Frankfurt am Main  
Michael Konůpek, Oslo  
Prof. Jaroslav Krejčí, Lancaster  
Zdeněk Mastník, London  
Franz Metternich Sandor, Herzog von Ratibor  
und Corvey, Höxter  
Meda and Jan Mládek, Washington  
Olga Neveršil, Bern  
Josef Novák, Asnières  
Patrick Ouředník, Paris  
Prof. Dr Ota Šik, St. Gallen  
František Vančček, Vienna  
Jiří Veltruský, Paris

## AUTHORS AND CONTRIBUTORS to the volume of Acta 5-8/88

Jiří Gruša (1938), poet and writer, since 1980 in the FRG  
Václav Havel (1936), playwright and essayist, lives in  
Prague  
Milan Jungmann (1922), literary critic, lives in Prague  
John Keane (1949), political philosopher, Professor of  
*The Polytechnic of Central London*  
Lubomír Martínek (1954), prose writer, since 1979 in  
Paris  
Vilém Prečan (1933), historian, Executive Director of the  
ČSDS, since 1976 in the FRG  
Jacques Rupnik (1950), historian, Professor of the *Fonda-  
tion nationale des sciences politique*, Paris  
Milan Šimečka (1930), philosopher and political writer,  
lives in Bratislava  
Ludvík Vaculík (1926), writer, lives in Prague  
Jan Vladislav (1923), poet, essayist and translator, since  
1981 in Paris

English translation  
of Cardinal Tomášek's letter to  
Ivan Polanský's wife  
reprinted on the back cover

Prague 8th October 1988

Dear Mrs. Polanská,

Please accept my best wishes and the assurance of my sympathy with your family at this trying time.

I have been informed of your husband, Ivan Polanský's commendable efforts in the field of catholic samizdat publishing. Over the past years he has printed dozens of titles and thousands of copies of different religious publications. At a time when the Church was unable to publish its own literature officially, your husband, through his activity, helped assuage our believers' thirst for religious literature.

By providing news of the afflictions suffered by catholic believers at the hands of the police and the courts, he helped promote wider solidarity with those brothers and sisters bearing witness to their faith.

Your husband's publishing activity was safeguarded by the international civil rights covenants which have also been signed by Czechoslovakia.

We ask the Lord's protection for your husband and all your family.

I send my blessing as Archbishop to you, your husband and all your family.

Locus sigili:

Archbishop's Palace, Prague

František Cardinal Tomášek  
Archbishop of Prague

Ida Polanská  
Nová Dubnica  
Hviezdoslavova Street

Registered

Facsimile of Cardinal  
Tomášek's letter  
to Ivan Polanský's  
wife

(For English translation  
see inside back cover.)



V Praze dne 8. října 1988

Vážená paní Polanská,

přijměte můj pozdrav a projev mé účasti v současném těžkém postavení Vaší rodiny.

Jsem informován o záslužné práci Vašeho manžela, Ivana Polanského při vydávání katolického samizdatu. V uplynulých letech vytiskl desítky titulů a tisíce exemplářů různých náboženských publikací. V době, kdy Církev neměla možnost oficiálně vydávat svou literaturu, Váš manžel vlastní činností pomáhal hasit žízeň našich věřících po náboženské literatuře.

Informace o policejních a soudních postizích četných katolických věřících pomáhaly šířit solidaritu s těmito našimi bratřími a sestrami, vydávajícími svědectví o víře.

Vydavatelskou činnost Vašeho manžela chránily mezinárodní smlouvy o občanských právech, které podepsalo i Československo.

Prosím našeho Pána o ochranu pro Vašeho manžela a celou Vaši rodinu.

Vám, Vašemu manželovi a celé rodině posílám své arcibiskupské požehnání.



*František Tomášek*  
František kardinál Tomášek  
arcibiskup pražský

Ida Polanská  
Nová Dubnice  
Hvězdoslavova

DOPORUČENĚ

