



**Crisis of the Journal
Problemi in 1968**

Kriza časopisa *Problemi*
1968. godine

✉ **ANDREJ TOMAŽIN** · an.tomazin@gmail.com

SLAVICA TERGESTINA
European Slavic Studies Journal

ISSN 1592-0291 (print) & 2283-5482 (online)

VOLUME 24 (2020/I), pp. 184-206
DOI 10.13137/2283-5482/30676

This article addresses the formal resolution of the crisis which emerged in early 1968 within the editorial board of the Slovenian scholarly and literary journal *Problemi*. It attempts to follow and analyse the new mechanism of censorship which followed the abolishment of a number of literary journals in the past by the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia. The formal fragmentation of the idea of a general cultural journal into separate divisions (philosophy, literature, sociology, literary criticism) introduces an innovative scheme of atomisation of responsibility—and with it the journal's major influence on the political processes in Slovenia.

1968, SLOVENIAN LITERATURE,
LITERARY JOURNALS,
CENSORSHIP, POST-WAR HISTORY,
CULTURAL POLITICS

U radu nas interesuje formalni aspekt razrešenja krize nastale početkom 1968. u redakciji naučnog i književnog časopisa *Problemi*. Istražuje se i analizira nov mehanizam cenzure nastao nakon što je Centralni komitet Saveza komunista Slovenije ukinuo nemali broj časopisa za književnost i kulturu. S formalnom razdeobom opšteg časopisa za kulturu, kakva je bila prvobitna zamisao, na odvojene edicije (filosofija, književnost, sociologija, književna kritika) dolazi do inovativne sheme atomizacije odgovornosti – a time i uticaja časopisa *Problemi* na političke procese u Sloveniji.

1968, SLOVENAČKA KNJIŽEVNOST,
KNJIŽEVNI ČASOPISI, CENZURA,
POSLERATNA ISTORIJA,
KULTURNA POLITIKA

POST-WAR JOURNAL PRODUCTION

In her research on the French literary field, Anna Boschetti (51–65) came to the conclusion that the most important development in twentieth-century literature was probably the rising importance of journals as a means of intervention in the literary field and its balance of power, most often with the aim of establishing more progressive positions. Moreover, according to Taja Kramberger (2011: 105), cultural and literary journals represent a ‘privileged subject in the study of the dialectic in the literary field and the habitus of the agents that work within it’. In Pierre Bourdieu’s conceptualisation (1991: 4–5), the literary field is a space of ‘competitive struggles that show tendencies to preserve or transform the field of forces’ according to the internal logic of the cultural field, which is lodged between new structural places and the lines of forces external to the field (including political, ideological and economic forces). Historically established in the late nineteenth century, the literary field was organised around two poles: the subfield of the production mentioned above, whose purpose was to accumulate symbolic capital, and the subfield of mass production (see Koffeman: 11). Individual fields are further divided into more or less autonomous subfields where ‘the weakness of a field or its autonomy means that social relations that are supposedly external to a field play a decisive role in determining the relations within the field as well; a weak field is deeply submerged into the existing social relations and has neither the strength nor the capital to separate itself from them’ (Kramberger 2011: 107). According to Bourdieu, the division of the literary field was parallel to its empowerment in relation to the field of power and its economic development. As the literary market grew, giving rise to the function of the professional writer, critical counter-currents emerged

as well, although, as Bourdieu shows, this kind of literary doxa has a logic of its own:

There are economic conditions for the economic challenge which leads to its being oriented towards the most risky positions of the intellectual and artistic avant-garde, and for the aptitude to maintain oneself there in a lasting way in the absence of any financial counterpart; and there are also economic conditions of access to symbolic profits—which are themselves capable of being converted, in the more or less long term, into economic profits. (Bourdieu 1996: 216)

As the central event of the Slovenian twentieth-century journal publishing and the cultural and literary fields created by it during the Second World War, the establishment of 'cultural silence'—declared in 1942 when periodicals were no longer published due to the Italian occupation, with *Ljubljanski zvon*, *Sodobnost*, *Dejanja* and *Modra ptica* being discontinued by their respective editors-in-chief, Juš Kozak, Fredo Kozak, Edvard Kocbek and Janez Žagar (see Gabrič 1989: 388)—along with the altered political situation after the war meant that *Novi svet*, the ideological successor to *Sodobnost*, was given centre stage: acting precisely in the sense of Bourdieu's above argumentation, *Novi svet* was able to 'quickly capitalise on and operationalise the capital that it had before and during the war' (Kramberger 2011: 146). Further evidence that the decision to establish only one general cultural journal was closely tied to the continuity of political and social activity by individual journals before the war can be found in the writings by Dušan Pirjevec, according to whom, 'in 1945 and 1946, Boris Kidrič warmed up to the idea of two journals, but Juš Kozak opposed it so decidedly that it was not realised' (Pirjevec: 1270).¹ It was Juš Kozak, in fact, who in 1946, when the agitprop

1 In the post-war period, the pre-war role of the project of *Sodobnosti* coincided mostly with the activity of *Novi svet* (later on *Naša sodobnost* and *Sodobnost*), in which it stood in opposition to the heterogeneous critical social habitus which in the post-war period included the journals *Beseda*, *Revija* 57, partially *Problemi* and later on the student journal *Tribuna*.

movement began, became the first editor-in-chief of *Novi svet*, which was first published at a time when the early political pressures to cooperate with the Soviet Union (see Štuhec: 486) were already noticeable and were even reflected in the title *Novi svet*, which was clearly reminiscent of the Soviet journal *Noviy mir*.

Until the early 1950s, communist authorities shaped the post-war cultural policy through hierarchically run commissions for agitation and propaganda called agitprops (see Dovič: 206–210, Gabrič 1991: 60); Boris Zihlerl's responses to the journal *Beseda* in 1952 are symptomatic in this sense (see Gabrič 1995: 50). The authorities found a cause for administrative censorship, which meant the termination of subsidies, five years later, in 1957, in Lojze Kovačič's *Zlati poročnik* (Golden Lieutenant) (see Štuhec: 493). The youth journal *Mlada pota* was also established in the early 1950s by the authorities, and 'political leaders allocated substantial subsidies to their own journals and provided the means for high circulation, adopting soft methods in their attempt to diminish the public influence of controversial ideological currents' (Dovič: 209). In the mid-1950s, Stane Kavčič, Boris Kraigher and some of the other leading members of the Communist Party of Slovenia changed their opinion, which now differed substantially from Zihlerl's own (see Gabrič 1995: 123). In contrast to 'Zihlerl, Kraigher stressed the autonomy of the collective'; however, as was evident from the subsequent discontinuation of *Beseda*, *Revija 57* and *Perspektive*, the supervision of the Communist Party 'remained strict and unusually meticulous practically up to the mid-1980s' (Dovič: 209).

Revija 57 was discontinued after six issues and its editorial board was relieved of its duties in late 1958 (see Štuhec: 494). Later on, many contributors to *Beseda* (1951–1957) and *Revija 57* (1957–1958) became affiliated with *Perspektive* (1960–1964), which was hence immediately placed under

the watchful eye of the ideological committee of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Slovenia (CC LCS) (see Lukšič: 70, Repe: 17–18). The increasingly critical contributions and, in particular, the establishment of direct criticism of the agricultural policy were labelled as *djilasovstvo* (Djilasism), a highly negative designation referring to the dissident Milovan Djilas. Consequently, in the spring of 1964 the new issue of the journal was denied printing and Jože Pučnik was imprisoned for writing the article 'O dilemah našega kmetijstva' (On the Dilemmas of Our Agriculture), published in issue 33–34, as was the journal's editor-in-chief, Tomaž Šalamun, officially for authoring the poem *Duma 64*.² At that time, the staff of *Perspektive* published a public letter, expressing their own cultural silence as a repetition of the one from 1942. Peter Božič, Lojze Kovačič, Marjan Rožanc, Veljko Rus, Dominik Smole, Rudi Šeligo, Dane Zajc, Vital Klabus and Taras Kermauner wrote:

Because we have no other means to express our deep disagreement with the procedures we have been witness to, and because the publication of our literary works and essays has become nothing more than an illusory activity and a silent approval of this state of affairs [...], we shall relinquish our cooperation until we reach the conclusion that the situation has changed. (Kermauner: 104)

However, the idea of a second cultural silence in the name of social change fell apart: the socio-economic situation did not change in the same way as it did during the Second World War, and the Bourdieusian tactic of changing symbolic capital into economic capital came to nothing. It was only after the changes in the social order in the late 1980s and early 1990s that some of those who took part in the cultural silence were able to turn symbolic capital into economic capital.

2 The journal's publisher demanded that the editorial board, headed by Kermauner and Zajc, be replaced, which happened in April 1964, but issue 38–39 was not published nonetheless because the publisher gave a statement, published on page 6 in *Naši razgledi* on 9 May 1964, that there was an attempt by a narrow group within the journal to exploit young co-workers in the editorial board for politically reactionary purposes.

3 This brought about the first cracks in the understanding of the generality of journals. However, as groups gathered around individual journals could not be classified according to formal logic, it was impossible to avoid mandatory changes in the editorial boards of journals.

The abolishment of *Perspektive* elicited a direct response from *Sodobnost*, which resulted in Dušan Pirjevec being relieved of his duties as the editor-in-chief. Between 1960 and 1964, significant changes occurred at *Sodobnost*, a direct descendant of *Novi svet*. According to Pirjevec (1271), at the time *Perspektive* became a model for ‘a different model of journal publishing’ and ‘the idea of a different method of editorial work began to mature’. As a result, in the late 1960 the contributors’ assembly as the deciding body was established, and even editorial boards were elected and assessed by such assemblies. The main accusation of the editorial board of *Sodobnost* was that the journal had ‘increasingly closed in on itself’ and had thereby ‘changed into the voice of a narrow group that is nothing more than a clique’ (Pirjevec: 1273). Pirjevec replied that the logic of the Socialist Alliance of Working People, which divided people into two camps, would lead to

a formalised internal schism that in its most grotesque extremes would look somewhat as follows: on the one hand, prominent cultural workers with no stain to their name, on the other, ad hoc workers burdened by the dark stamp of a doubtful past. In the concrete situation and in relation to the future of the journal, such a schism would greatly endanger the very existence of the journal and was therefore to be avoided, which was only possible through a unique differentiation that caused the process of devaluation to move in a new direction. The first demand of this new direction was that the structure and physiognomy of the journal were no longer to be considered as the result of a collective endeavour of the whole, that is, a relatively broad circle of contributors, but had to be replaced by an uncomfortably narrow group, if not even just a small number of individuals, which meant that responsibility needed to be narrowed down. (Pirjevec: 1276)³

In 1962, when *Sodobnost* was going through these changes and *Perspektive* was still a relatively new journal, the journal *Problemi* was established under the auspices of the Central Committee of the People's Youth of Slovenia (CC PYS) to replace *Mlada pota*, which was discontinued. This move was severely criticised by the CC LCS because, according to Zihel's words at the committee's meeting of 16 October 1962, 'the youngsters did it quietly' (see Repe: 20). At this same meeting, Vida Tomšič defended *Problemi*, claiming that this was 'a group of people that even at the last CC PYS congress saw themselves as the main polemicists against *Perspektive*, as the only ones whose position was rooted in Marxism'. The group included Božidar Debenjak, Janez Dokler and Vladimir Kavčič, who, as Božo Repe writes (20), were still 'young people, though they no longer belonged to the kind of youth that had believed that Marxism should be openly defended against *Perspektive*'.

In the two years following the discontinuation of *Perspektive* in 1964, in particular after the rise of a more liberal branch of the Communist Party of Slovenia under the leadership of Stane Kavčič—who was in fact directly involved in the discontinuation of *Perspektive*—the majority of the contributors to *Perspektive* joined *Problemi*. This migration also helped the younger generation (whose central figures—Franci Zagoričnik, Tomaž Šalamun and others—had already contributed to *Perspektive*) introduce elements of concrete poetry, neo-avant-garde tendencies, elements of structuralism, post-Marxism and the French *nouveau roman* into the Slovenian public sphere. In 1965, Dušan Pirjevec, former editor-in-chief of *Sodobnost*, joined *Problemi*, as did many former contributors to *Perspektive* (or *perspektivovci*, as they were called), including Peter Božič, Rudi Šeligo, Irena Pučnik, Jože Snoj and Janez Jerovšek, who were joined in 1966 by Dušan Jovanović, Veno Taufer, Braco Rotar, Aleš Kermavner, Saša Vegri, Spomenka Hribar, Taras

4 The three main figures of *Problemi* between 1962 and 1968 later found their place at *Prostor in čas*, a journal established in 1969 with the intention 'to offer a podium to a quite large group of writers and theorists, especially from the middle and older generations, who were left without a central journal after *Problemi*'s editorial board was taken over by the younger, more avant-garde generation' (Ramšak: 135).

Kermauner, Veljko Rus and Ivo Urbančič. In the short period from 1965 to 1968, the changes in the pool of contributors directly undermined the power of Kavčič, Debenjak and Dokler as the founding fathers of *Problemi*.⁴

PROBLEMI IN EARLY 1968

In early 1968, the editorial board of *Problemi* was beset by an internal rift which, according to Ivo Urbančič, a member of the editorial board at the time who wrote on the matter in a March 1968 issue of *Tribuna*, was the reason why, 'for many authors who have or have not contributed to *Problemi* [...] the very positive initial direction of *Problemi* began to turn negative'. These authors 'realised that *Problemi*, with its across-the-board openness, obscured the differentiation in our culture and thereby enlarged its already substantial amorphousness' (Urbančič: 2). In Urbančič's words, the basic programme of the journal was

non-exclusivity, openness for the different conceptual, aesthetic and critical blueprints in our cultural milieu, with the aim to make possible, maintain and expand the narrow communication channel in culture. [...] Every living conceptual, aesthetic and critical direction wishes to express itself clearly according to its immanent logic, to differentiate itself from others and thereby realise itself—'to live itself out'. However, in our situation, in the objective situation of our culture as a whole, this is for various reasons most often impossible. (Urbančič: 2)

At the time, there was another cause for conflict in the editorial board of *Problemi*, namely the actions of both the editor-in-chief and the secretary of the journal's editorial board, who insisted on excluding

Braco Rotar from the editorial board due to the text he had published in the Trieste journal *Most*. Kavčič, editor-in-chief, provided additional evidence for his decision, 'claiming that *Most* is a politically suspicious journal funded by the CIA' (Urbančič: 2). In early 1968, Urbančič's idea of the journal's openness was tied to keeping Rotar, but also Franci Zagoričnik, who also published a text in *Most* soon after, in the editorial board, which preserved the journal's initial openness, yet crushed a different kind of openness, for it gave the opportunity to 'the informal permanent group in the editorial board [...] to preserve itself as the sole legitimate pillar of the concept of the general openness of the journal' (Urbančič: 3). Dokler, a founding member of *Problemi*, took a stand in defence of the journal and wrote in a March 1968 issue of *Tribuna* that the journal's concept 'did not include choosing contributors on the basis of aesthetic or social affiliations, and should that principle establish itself in the future, the journal will no longer be what it was initially meant to be'. The demand to depoliticise culture 'was at the very core of the concept', Dokler added (2). These words were directly addressed at *Perspektive* and the well-known narrow-mindedness and exclusivity that had resulted in the journal's discontinuation four years earlier.

Another concrete cause for the divide within the editorial board of *Problemi* in early 1968 was the proposal that Dušan Pirjevec and Taras Kermauner become members of the editorial board. Vladimir Kavčič, editor-in-chief, rejected the proposal in advance and, with the help of the journal's secretary, disclosed the information to the Central Committee of the Youth League of Slovenia (CC YLS) without the board's knowledge (see Urbančič: 2). According to the *Zabeleške o sestanku uredništva 'Problemov'* (Notes on the Meeting of the Editorial Board of 'Problemi'), the addition of Pirjevec to the editorial board of *Problemi* was opposed by 'Kavčič, Dokler, Kerševan, Debenjak'.⁵ At the

5 SI (Arhiv Republike Slovenije) AR 538 (Republiška konferenca Zveze socialistične mladine Slovenije, 1941-1990), AŠ 150, AE 20. (Here and elsewhere, archival sources are given in footnotes.)

meeting, the representatives of the CC YLS opposed these newcomers as authoritative personalities who could jeopardise the general openness of the journal. In the April 1968 issue of *Tribuna*, this was further corroborated by Milan Kučan, the member of the CC YLS who signed the notes of the meeting; Kučan wrote that, at the meeting, the position of the president of the CC YLS, Janez Kocijančič, regarding Pirjevec was that, ‘through the principle of openness, the journal *Problemi* makes it possible to publish literary and sociological contributions by individuals from different currents of thought and aesthetics’; hence, ‘[t]he addition of strong, authoritative personalities to the editorial board would mean that one group would prevail over everyone else, and the journal would thereby become exclusivist’ (Kučan: 2). At the time, candidacies of both Kermauner and Pirjevec were not only politically unfeasible but also represented a formal opposition to the concept of the openness guaranteed by the internal unity of the journal. The contradiction surrounding the question of openness and prevalence of one group within the editorial board was undoubtedly a response to the past events in *Perspektive* and *Sodobnost*, where the main protagonists were none other than Kermauner and Pirjevec.

The growing discontent with the internal contradiction at *Problemi* brought about a formal division of the journal on 26 March 1968, when the new editorial board held its first meeting and confirmed the division established by the editorial board one or two weeks before. According to the document *Informacija o aktivnosti centralnega komiteja Zveze mladine Slovenije med 17. in 18. plenarno sejo CK ZMS (od 29.1.1968–29.3.1968)* (Information on the Activity of the CC YLS Between the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Plenary Meeting of the CC YLS [from 29 January 1968—29 March 1968]), ‘the contradiction over the concept of the journal *Problemi* [...] introduced a clear

polarisation of forces within the editorial board'. This polarisation then escalated into 'bitter personal conflicts',⁶ which was also corroborated by Kučan in *Zabeleške o sestanku uredništva 'Problemov'*, where he wrote that, at the meeting, 'the atmosphere was quite undemocratic and intolerant', because Ivo Urbančič and Milan Pintar, both members of the editorial board, claimed that, 'with its bureaucratic interference in the cultural sphere, the CC YLS is to blame for all of this, and people such as themselves are only useful for maintaining the façade of democracy', while 'Urbančič and Pintar refused to discuss the physiognomy of the editorial board and the number of members', and Kavčič suggested 'that the editorial board be appointed by the journal's two publishers'.⁷ The leadership of the CC YLS then authorised two of its members, Kučan and Mitja Rotovnik, to draft a proposition for a new editorial board of *Problemi* in cooperation with the representatives of the journal's other publisher, the Executive Committee of the Association of Slovenian Students (EC ASS), and the members of the previous editorial board. What is more,

⁶ SIAR 538, AŠ 150, AE 20.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ SIAR 538, AŠ 153.

*the group that was responsible for drafting the proposition for a new editorial board [...] had quite a difficult task at hand, as the spirits were so restless that it was necessary to exclude some of the former editors from the proposition. The group analysed the level of democracy in the functioning of the editorial board of the journal and further refined some of the fundamental elements of the journal's concept, then used these results to draw up a proposition that was subject to two amendments before it was passed by the contributors' assembly. The contributors' assembly of Problemi confirmed the political views of the CC YLS and the EC ASS regarding the editorial board and the concept of Problemi.*⁸

The newly elected editorial board wrote in an April 1968 issue of *Tribuna* that,

content-wise, Problemi remains a general journal that covers all fields, although it should do so in a more meaningful, thematically adapted, stylistic and content-oriented manner. To give the editorial board the means to pursue this general direction, the decision has been made to divide the board into four field-specific groups. The members of the group for literature and art are: Iztok Geister, Niko Grafenauer, Dušan Jovanović, Saša Vegri and Franci Zagoričnik; the members of the group for literary and art theory and criticism are: Taras Kermauner, Lado Kralj, Andrej Medved and Rastko Močnik. Sociology and political science is edited by: Ivan Hvala, Marko Kerševan, Rudi Rizman and Marjan Tavčar; and the members of the group for philosophy are: Spomenka Hribar, Milan Pintar, Ivo Urbančič and Mitja Rotovnik. (Uredniški: 1)

Vladimir Kavčič, a founding member and the editor-in-chief of *Problemi* until 1968, claimed in his article 'Slovenski revialni tisk 1952–1974' (Slovenian Journals 1952–1974) that the usurpation of *Problemi* was brought about by the new president of the commission for ideological and political work, Mitja Rotovnik, who

organised and carried out the change, [...] a crowd gathered at the contributors' assembly, for the first time the hall was quite full of young people, potential future contributors to the journal, but with the exception of the editors there were none of the contributors who had filled the pages of the journal and designed it all these years, [...] the majority of the members of the editorial board were not present at the elections, they probably agreed to participate beforehand. (Kavčič 2000: 136–38)

It seems that the disintegration of groups depicted by Kavčič was not as important as the formal solution regarding the journal's openness. Kavčič (2000: 142) noticed that the journal gave up on 'general social subjects' and promised 'that work, thought and poetry would no longer be instruments for battles between groups or even against the group in power'. He also wrote that there were in *Problemi* 'some attempts to thematise the problematic and divide it by branches'; however, 'in our situation these attempts could not replace a general journal' (Kavčič 2000: 142) Less than two years after the events, in January 1970, Dušan Jovanović wrote that 'the division into four basic fields, that is, sociology, philosophy, literature and journalism, [...] in our opinion turned out rather favourably, because the journal as a whole lost its traditionalist meaning and began to function more coherently' (Grafenauer et al.: 23).

In the editorial board's meeting in March, internal disagreements were resolved with a generally neutral formal division into four sub-groups (literature and art; literary and art theory and criticism; sociology and political science; philosophy). This solved the problem of 'strong, authoritative personalities' by fragmenting those sections of the journal that were edited by such persons—Kermauner was a member of the editorial board from the very beginning, and Pirjevec joined later on as well.

Within a journal which became 'purer, style- and content-wise' (see Urbančič: 2), each and every individual subject by its very nature prevented a more direct cooperation. With the journal's fragmentation, which in a few years manifested through different names for individual expert fields (*Problemi-Literatura*, *Problemi-Eseji*, *Problemi-Razprave* and *Problemi-Aktualnosti*), the concept of 'non-exclusivity, openness for the different conceptual, aesthetic and critical

blueprints in our cultural milieu' (Urbančič: 2), which was also the journalistic concept of the CC YLS, was preserved. Fragmentation also confirmed that, in both *Sodobnost* and *Problemi*, the 'the structure and physiognomy of the journal were no longer to be considered as the result of a collective endeavour of the whole, that is, a relatively broad circle of contributors, but had to be replaced by an uncomfortably narrow group, if not even just a small number of individuals, which meant that responsibility needed to be narrowed down' (Pirjevec: 1276).

The autonomy of literature within *Problemi*, discussed by Andraž Jež in his article on the globalisation and Americanisation of Slovenian literature, therefore has its own history: the exclusion of autonomy in the mid-1970s and the later desire for it found a path precisely through the division into different fields of expertise in the late 1960s. Jež writes that this

did not arise merely from the increased distance from the traditional Slovenian literary engagement that Dušan Pirjevec brought under the general term 'the Prešeren structure', but was most likely to a great extent linked to the situation in the journal. Problemi-Literatura was in fact the literary branch of the journal with a marked focus on structuralism and psychoanalytical theory and, for more than fifteen years, philosophers of the Lacanian school were in a very ambivalent relation with literary authors and editors. Throughout the 1970s, literary editions in many ways represented a shift away from the theoretical foundation of the journal, to which the tense relationship between the philosophical conception of Problemi and the literary autonomy, which writers for the literary editions of the journal sought and were increasingly outspoken about, contributed substantially. (Jež: 329)

However, the above division into specialised fields took place as early as the late 1960s: the November–December 1969 issue included a list that suggest the following thematic division of the journal's 1969 volume: issue 73–74, January–February: sociology; issue 75, March: literature; issue 76, April: philosophy; issue 77, May: literary theory; issue 78–79, June–July: literary theory; issue 80, August: literature; issue 81–82, September–October: philosophy; issue 83–84, November–December: literature. Accordingly, the journal's subtitle was also changed from *Revija za kulturo in družbena vprašanja* (Journal for Culture and Social Issues) to *Časopis za mišljenje in pesništvo* (Journal for Thought and Poetry). Gradually, every field became increasingly independent and achieved greater autonomy. The section *Problemi–Razprave* was established with issue 98–99 issue of *Problemi* in 1971 and was edited by Braco Rotar. *Problemi–Literatura* broke away with issue 109. The gap widened in the 1980s, when at the end of the decade the journal *Problemi–Literatura* became completely autonomous under the aegis of the LUD Literatura association and its title was changed to *Literatura*.

The forecast made by Pirjevec four years earlier in *Sodobnost* came true at a very important time that already provided a glimpse into the student protests in Yugoslavia and, more importantly, into the end of the liberal thaw from the early 1970s. This was the time when it was finally possible to bring into life an idea from 1957, when the CC LCS, reacting to the discontinuation of *Besede*, decided that the successor of *Besede*, *Revija 57*, 'need not be met with administrative measures: what is needed is more cooperation with the communists that manage or contribute to the journal in order to resolve the individual issues in the political struggle among the journal's contributors' (Gabrič 1994: 1077). Such approaches of internal solutions to particular problems were not successful until 1968, because up to then external

9 Right up to the end of the 1980s, in fact, as literary and cultural journals were censored in the 1908s as well. *Tribuna*, which played an important role in establishing the public discourse on the division within the editorial board of *Problemi* in 1968, was censored at least five times throughout the 1980s (see Sela: 34–41).

administrative measures as methods of censorship were used to abolish both *Revija 57* and *Perspektive*, even though it is clear that in the case of *Problemi*'s internal disagreements we are also dealing with a struggle between two different kinds of intellectuals.

**SELF-CENSORSHIP OF THE CULTURAL FIELD
AS THE SUBORDINATION TO THE FIELD OF POWER
AND THE SPECIFIC GENEALOGY OF THE INTELLECTUAL
IN THE SLOVENIAN CULTURAL FIELD**

In the post-war period, general cultural journals in Slovenia were published from the end of the Second World War onwards, representing a continuity with the cultural journals of the 1930s, which at that time were explicitly political and increasingly involved in public debates (hence the crisis of *Dom in svet*, the question of Marxism in *Sodobnost*, and so on). The formal transformation of these so-called general journals was not gradual; it occurred with the crisis of the editorial board of *Problemi*, a crisis which was resolved with the help of the founder of the CC YLS. The thematic division of the social and aesthetic groups into different branches most definitely is a reflection of two things: on the one hand, the weak autonomy of the literary field in relation to the fields of power and economy, in this case the Party and the institutionalised management of cultural policy; and, on the other hand, the development of the figure of the intellectual in Slovenia. If we agree with Dovič that the Party's control up to the 1980s was minutely thorough (see Dovič: 208–210),⁹ and that the method of authoritative censorship changed in concert with the substitutions in political leadership (see Gabrič 1995), then it becomes clear that, despite the liberalisation of the Party in the 1960, which in the imagery of the time is most

distinctly expressed in the persona of Stane Kavčič,¹⁰ the need to censor certain social groups and the dynamics they had set off was still present. After *Perspektive* was abolished in 1964, *Problemi* became a safe haven for many writers and theorists who were left without a publishing platform,¹¹ thereby providing space for a diverse range of literary, philosophical and theoretical approaches. There is no doubt that the CC YLS preserved the concept of openness in the desire to limit narrow groupings in the new editorial board as well; however, the manuscript draft of the statement from 1968 also states that the CC YLS (or at least one of the branches in the organisation) supports 'the openness of the concept of the editorial board of *Problemi* in the conviction that their editorial policy guarantees the general possibility of publishing; the editorial board's sovereignty is conditioned by its full responsibility'. Hence the following conclusion: 'The demagogical demand for an administrative block by withdrawing funds repeatedly appears in the renouncement of individual literary phenomena. We are convinced that such things cannot be solved by withdrawing funds: it is impossible to eliminate the problem of disparate ideas, if it indeed exists, by removing it from the pages of journals and newspapers.'¹²

The contradiction in the activity of the CC YLS, which condemned administrative censorship while clearly trying to control the activity of the groups centred around *Problemi*, indicates that the literary field itself can, in the words of Taja Kramberger, "spontaneously" practice censorship of the "deviant discourse" that the supervising bodies in the field wish to eliminate, thereby forcing the field to only speak that which is acceptable, decent and appropriate' (Kramberger 2011: 143). In the case of *Problemi*, it seems that in the fragmentation into specialised subfields, by which the unity of the group was somewhat

10

It was Stane Kavčič, for example, who, as the president of the ideological committee of the CC LCS between 1963 and 1966, was responsible for the abolishment of *Perspektive* (see Repe).

11

The political leadership attempted to replace *Perspektive* and other abolished general journals with *Teorija in praksa*, a journal with a more limited scope that was more directly managed by the CC LCS and was established 'in the context of troubles that the leadership of the LC encountered in the discussion about *Perspektive*'s change of direction'. In brief, '[t]he leading faction of the LC realised that, by abolishing journals, that is, by using raw force, it was no longer possible to secure legitimate power' (Lukšič: 70).

12

SI AR 538, AŠ 153.

13

In the changed historical circumstances, the establishment of a new journal also brought about the consolidation of its power and the possibility to influence social and political activity.

lost, a form of censorship coincided both in the contributors' assembly as autonomous labour and in the journal's publishers (the CC YLS in particular) as the acting bodies that exercised power, that is, the representatives of the field of power and authority, and that so-called spontaneous censorship had far-reaching consequences in the fields of culture and literature. In their later historical development, the groups within *Problemi* increasingly distanced themselves from one another, which led to the establishment of *Nova revija*¹³ in 1982 and of *Literatura* in the years directly preceding the destruction of Yugoslavia. And if it was easier to establish the figure of the autonomous intellectual in that period than in the 1960s or 1970s (see Rupel), there is no doubt that the formal resolution of the crisis in *Problemi* was in many ways possible due to the increasing specificity of individual intellectuals, in particular Kermauner and Pirjevec, and their decision to abandon the generality of their calling. In the first months of 1968, the broader contradiction, which in the case of *Problemi* was clearly observable from the late 1960s onwards as the consequence of both the socio-political situation and the specific genealogy of the figure of the intellectual, could only be resolved in the way in which it was resolved: by formally resolving the tensions caused by the facts mentioned above. ♡

References

- BOSCHETTI, ANNA, 1994: Des revues et des hommes. *La Revue des revues*, no. 18. 51–65.
- BOURDIEU, PIERRE, 1994. Le champ littéraire. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no. 89. 4–46.
- , 1996: *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- DOKLER, JANEZ, 1968: Spoštovano uredništvo. *Tribuna* 16, no. 16. 2.
- DOVIĆ, MARIJAN, 2007: *Slovenski pisatelj*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- GABRIČ, ALEŠ, 1989: Kulturni molk. *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino* 29, no. 2. 385–413.
- , 1991: *Slovenska agitpropovska kulturna politika: 1945–1952*. Ljubljana: Mladika.
- , 1994: *Od Mladinske revije do Perspektiv*. *Borec* 46, no. 535–37. 1069–86.
- , 1995: *Socialistična kulturna revolucija: slovenska kulturna politika 1953–1962*. Ljubljana: CZ.
- GRAFENAUER, NIKO, DUŠAN JOVANOVIĆ, RASTKO MOČNIK and MILAN PINTAR, 1970: Revija Problemi: Tribuna »Estetski programi revij« na tretjem programu radia Beograd. *Problemi* 8, no. 85. 22–24.
- JEŽ, ANDRAŽ, 2012: Globalizacija in amerikanizacija književnosti ter njuni odmevi na Slovenskem. *Primerjalna književnost* 35, no. 3. 317–33.
- KAVČIČ, VLADIMIR, 1962: Stolp v Babilonu. *Problemi* 1, no. 1. 1–6.
- , 2000: Slovenski revialni tisk 1952–1974. *Borec* 52, no. 579–82. 51–185.

- KERMAUNER, TARAS, 1983: *Mala odisejada slovenskog intelektualca*. Zagreb: Liber.
- KOFFEMAN, MAAIKE, 2003: *Entre classicisme et modernité: La Nouvelle revue française dans le champ littéraire de la Belle Époque*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- KRAMBERGER, TAJA, 2009: *Memorija in spomin: zgodovinska antropologija kanonizirane recepcije*. Koper: Fakulteta za humanistične študije Koper.
- , 2011: Kdo je za koga reprezentativen in zakaj? *Nevidne evidence: misliti idola tribus*, by Taja Kramberger and Drago Braco Rotar. Ljubljana: Sophia. 99–176.
- KUČAN, MILAN, 1968: Spoštovano uredništvo. *Tribuna* 16, no. 17. 2.
- LUKŠIČ, IGOR, 2004: *Teorija in praksa: Presek ob štiridesetletnici*. *Teorija in praksa* 41, no. 1–2. 67–83.
- PIRJEVEC, DUŠAN, 1964: O 'Sodobnosti' in ob njeni usodi. *Problemi* 2, no. 24. 1270–77.
- RAMŠAK, JURE, 2013: *Oporečništvo v samoupravnem socializmu*. Koper: Univerza na Primorskem.
- REPE, BOŽO, 1990: *Obračun s Perspektivami*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče.
- RUPEL, DIMITRIJ, 1989: *Slovenski intelektualci: od vojaške do civilne družbe*. Ljubljana: MK.
- ŠELA, ANA, 2016: *Nova revija pod budnim očesom komunistične oblasti: magistrsko delo*. Maribor.
- ŠTUHEC, MIRAN, 2001: Literarne revije in programi. *Slovenska književnost. III*. Ed. Jože Pogačnik. Ljubljana: DZS. 469–508.
- URBANČIČ, IVO, 1968: O problemu *Problemov*. *Tribuna* 16, no. 16. 2–3.
- UREDNIŠKI ODBOR PROBLEMOV, 1968: *Revija Problemi v letu 1968*. *Tribuna* 16, no. 17. 1.

Povzetek

Kulturniške revije splošnega tipa v povojnem obdobju so na Slovenskem izhajale vse od konca druge svetovne vojne naprej in predstavljajo kontinuiteto s slovenskimi kulturniški revijami iz tridesetih let 20. stoletja, ko so te postajale eksplicitno politične in so se močneje vpenjale v javni diskurz in javne polemike (od tod kriza revije *Dom in svet*, vprašanje marksizma v *Sodobnosti* itn.) Formalna preobrazba tovrstne revije splošnega tipa se ni zgodila postopoma, temveč je do njene kulminacije prišlo v trenutku krize uredništva revije *Problemi* v letu 1968, ki je bila rešena s pomočjo CK ZMS kot ustanovitelja. Tematska razdelitev t. i. socialnih in estetskih grupacij, dejavnih v slovenskem kulturniškem polju, na različne stroke je na eni strani zagotovo znak šibke avtonomije literarnega polja, ki je podrejeno polju moči in ekonomije, v tem primeru partiji in institucionaliziranemu upravljanju kulturne politike, na drugi strani pa je znak razvoja figure intelektualca na Slovenskem.

Revija *Problemi* je po ukinitvi *Perspektiv* leta 1964 postala pribežališče mnogih piscev in pisk, ki so ostali brez platforme za javno objavlanje, s čimer je odprla prostor za najrazličnejše literarne, filozofske in teoretske pristope. Nedvomno je CK ZMS v želji po zamejitvi ozkega grupiranja tudi v novem uredništvu ohranjal koncept odprtosti, ki zagotavlja načelno možnost objavljanja. Oblika cenzure v fragmentaciji revije na strokovna področja, s čimer se je delno izgubila enotnost grupacije, zbrane okrog revije, je sovpadala tako pri zboru sodelavcev kot avtonomnem delu kakor pri izdajateljih (predvsem pri CK ZMS) kot vršilcu izvajanja moči, tj. predstavniku polja moči in oblasti, posledice t. i. spontane cenzure znotraj kulturnega in literarnega polja pa so bile daljnosežne. V kasnejšem zgodovinskem

razvoju so se grupacije v okviru revije *Problemi* vse bolj odmikale druga od druge, kar je vodilo k ustanovitvi *Nove revije* leta 1982, malo pred razpadom Jugoslavije pa se je literarni del, *Problemi-Literatura*, povsem osamosvojil v revijo *Literatura*. Širše protislovje, ki se v reviji *Problemi* jasno izkazuje od konca šestdesetih let naprej in je posledica tako družbeno-politične situacije kakor specifične genealogije figure intelektualca, se je v prvih mesecih leta 1968 razrešilo s formalno razrešitvijo napetosti, ki so nastajale tako zaradi notranjih nesoglasij kakor zaradi zunanjih vplivov.

Andrej Tomažin

Andrej Tomažin is a writer and literary scholar. He graduated in comparative literature studies and Slovenian studies at the University in Ljubljana. He sits on the editorial board of Šum, an English-language open-access journal of contemporary art theory. He published four books of prose—Stramorjevi koraki (Stramor's Steps [Litera, 2014]), Črvi (Worms [Litera, 2016]), Anonimna tehnologija (Anonymous Technology [LUD Literatura, 2018]) and Izhodišča (Starting Points [Hiša poezije, 2018])—some of which have been nominated for various Slovenian literary prizes. His academic interests include the sociology of literature, especially twentieth-century Slovenian literature and contemporary world literatures in relation to the philosophy of technology.