'Centos’ [The National Society for the Care of Orphans] … were not always just.”59 In other documents controversial passages were cut out from the text without any indication.60

As late as 1988, historian Artur Eisenbach described direct pressure from state censorship to alter part of Emanuel Ringelblum’s Polish-Jewish Relations (written after Ringelblum’s escape from the ghetto). He was allowed to publish it only after long and humiliating (in his own words) conversations in the Central Bureau of KPPIW and removal of over a dozen pages from the introduction and one footnote.61 Eisenbach considered this to be a price worth paying to ensure publication of Ringelblum’s essay.

Conclusion

Current research regarding the mechanisms of censorship shows that the burden of responsibility for carrying out socialist censorship guidelines was placed mainly on publishing houses.62 It was employees (here, editors of sources) who were expected to carry out self-censorship according to the ideological expectations of the time. In exchange for that they received certain (limited) freedoms.63 The Jewish Historical Institute was no exception. As Stephan Stach writes, it was probably only thanks to Ber Marks’ ideological involvement that the Jewish Historical Institute survived the attack on independent Jewish communal life that took place under Stalinism.64

60 This happened for example to the following passage from Leyb Goldin’s Chronicle of One Night: “A burly prostitute hands out sweets to her girlfriends. The light brings out their ghostly, calcified faces, skin and bones painted with lipstick, dark contour of their eyebrows.” AŻIH, ARG I 1219, 7. Compare with Lejb Goldin, “Kronika jednej doby” [Chronicle of one day], in Dwa etapy, 84–96.
62 See Nalewajko-Kulikov, “The Last Yiddish Books Printed in Poland.”
63 This is discussed in Zbigniew Romek, “Wstęp” [Introduction], in Cenzura a nauka historyczna w Polsce 1944–1970, 10. Zbigniew Romek argues against the long standing perception of state censorship having a dominating role in controlling publications.
64 Stach, “Walka klas w getcie?,” 276. Mark’s attitude can be witnessed in his 1954 letter to the Press Department of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Describing documents that he had sent to former inhabitants of Hrubieszov in Israel, Mark wrote: “We found only a limited number of such materials relating to the time of the occupation. But since the majority of this material has a more or less anti-Polish attitude, we found only two documents which we could with full responsibility send to the above-mentioned association. These are two descriptions of martyrlogy of the Jewish population of Hrubieszov located in the Ringel-
There is no doubt that Mark carried out the political censorship of documents from the Ringelblum Archive very thoroughly. As Joanna Nalewajko-Kulikov indicated, the Main Office of the Press Publishing and Performances did not have particular problems with Yidish Bukh. Yet, the requirements of state censorship cannot explain all cuts introduced in their publications. What the documents above show is that some part of internal censorship was initiated by the editors for ideological or personal reasons. They thus removed passages which they found “controversial,” “shameful,” or ideologically unsound. The fact that they were carried out in Yiddish-language publications indicate that these changes were not done only to safeguard the image of Jews in the eyes of the surrounding Polish society. They were done also for the sake of the Jewish community. They should also be seen as a conscious step taken to strengthen the collective, through what those considering themselves to be leaders of this community saw as its “appropriate” image, based in particular on what was seen as “acceptable” experience of the Holocaust. Hence, this editorial line—or self-censorship—has to be seen as part of the construction of a Jewish Holocaust memory in postwar Poland.