

MILENA BARTLOVÁ

1968: IN SEARCH OF “SOCIALISM WITH HUMAN FACE” IN CZECH ART HISTORY

The half a century that passed last year since the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact troops in August 1968 provides the basic prerequisite for historicising the event: many of those involved have already passed away and the archive collections are now accessible. Yet the number of historical publications evaluating the events is growing slowly. Apart from biographies, only one historical analytical monograph was published in the jubilee year, and that was a translation from German¹. The reason for this caution or diffidence is the uncertainty of how Czech society perceives the historical moment when Czech (and Czechoslovak) history reached something of a climax, although it was only one landmark moment in the long period of four-decade-long Communist Party dictatorship and authoritarian rule. Despite the rhetoric of the Communist victors of the conflict, political liberalization, which was forcibly suppressed by the troops led by the Soviet Union and by Czechoslovak “conservative” forces, did not seek to abolish a dictatorship, but to strive rather for its economic, cultural and social transformation, a process that was dubbed “socialism with a human face” by those whose attempts were thwarted. In the following text, I will look at the subject from the benefit of historical distance, and referring to Jasper’s famous philosophical view on the attitude to the totalitarian regime, I will not, however, deal with moral criticism of individual people.

I specify the object of my study as a scientific discipline in the sense of a self-defining epistemic community whose members work in the institutional complex of universities, the Academy of Science and museums, and as experts on the preservation of monuments, restoration-conservation, and the art market.² Its boundaries distinguish the discipline from historiography,

¹ M. Schulze Wessel, *Pražské jaro. Průlom do nového světa*, Praha 2018.

² An epistemic community is a community of people, defined by shared epistemic perspectives and objectives; expert work of a scientific discipline is the sphere where the

philosophy, aesthetics and sociology on the one hand, and from contemporary art on the other. The latter, however, is partially related to the discipline in the area of art criticism, writing about contemporary and recent art, and exhibition making. After briefly outlining the cultural and political environment, I will deal with two specific instances of the short period leading to the year 1968, namely with the project of so-called “imaginative art” in researching the art of the first half of the 20th century, which caused a unique conflict with the political regime, and with the so-called “Prague School of Marxist Iconology” that prevailed in the research of old art. My questions will be: In what ways did Czech art history participate in the culminating politicization of culture? Did they specifically reflect “humanist Marxism” as the main discursive topic of the liberalization period? What remained of the Czech art history of the “Reformist period” after its defeat?

The beginning of the period of interest in Czechoslovakia, particularly in the Czech part of the country, dates back to five years before 1968.³ The post-Stalinist “thaw” in 1955–1958 was ended by the increased back-pressure of the state power controlled by the Communist Party in 1959 and the new constitution issued the following year. The constitution codified the fundamental changes concerning property rights, economic and social system and the installation of the state power identified with the party system that took place in the Czechoslovak society after the Communist Party seized power in February 1948. The successful construction of socialism was solemnly decreed. The newly confirmed confidence of the party dictatorship was accompanied by an important shift: after the Cuban Missile Crisis, the proclamation of the “intensification of the class struggle” was replaced with the declaration of the “peaceful coexistence of socialism and capitalism” and competition between them. At that time, Czechoslovakia still benefitted economically from its developed industrial traditions and from the fact that its economy had been relatively little affected by World War II. It was clear, however, that a significant role in the Cold War rivalry, transferred from the military sphere to a symbolic and value level, will have to be played by culture and education. Therefore, from 1963, the ruling regime did not directly prevent the onset of

discipline interferes with practical operation (according to historians Michal Kopeček and Vítězslav Sommer, whom I thank for consultation). A broader context and further relations will be elaborated in the final publication of the research project “The History of Czech Art History of Second Half of the 20th Century I. 1945–1970” supported by the GAČR (Czech Science Foundation) grant Nr 17-20229S, of which this study is an intermediate result.

³ J. Rákosník, M. Spurný, J. Štaif, *Milníky moderních českých dějin. Krize konsenzu a legitimacy v letech 1848–1989*, Praha 2018, pp. 211–250; P. Kolář, *Der Poststalinismus. Ideologie und Utopie einer Epoche*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2016.

"revisionism," and the limits of what was possible, set by the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party (CCP) in 1959, were being progressively blurred, despite the continuous attempts of the "conservatives" to reverse the trend.⁴ As for visual arts, a key gain in the ensuing confrontation was the undisputed international success of the Czechoslovak exposition at Expo 58 in Brussels.⁵ The advantages of the political system of "people's democracy" ruled by the Communist Party were presented rather through the aesthetics of modernism than through social realist visual propaganda.

Despite the aggressive-defensive rhetoric used by the conservative forces of the ruling power to express their feeling of danger, in the mid-1960s, the hegemonic drive was not represented by resistance against the socialist system and the policies of the CCP, but by the efforts to "humanize" the system from the inside. Dominant actors were still members of the Communist Party, and although liberalization also meant more opportunities for non-Communist intellectuals, journalists and artists such as writer Josef Škvorecký, playwright Václav Havel and painter Mikuláš Medek, they remained marginal.⁶ Even relatively "progressive" forces within the Communist Party used methods of covert control to exercise the power they had. After the third Congress of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union in 1963, which significantly contributed to the liberalization of the broad intellectual and cultural environment, the second Congress of the Union of Czechoslovak Fine Artists in December 1964 played a similar role in fine art.⁷ Although it was not controlled by the apparatus of the Central Committee of the CCP, its freedom ("spontaneity" in the period terminology) was limited to the election of the committee bureau members, and remained within the limits defined by the Party; compliance was ensured by the art historian Jiří Kotalík on the suggestion committee.⁸ Together with Václav Formánek, Kotalík prepared materials for the congress, defended them

⁴ M. Kopeček, *Hledání ztraceného smyslu revoluce. Zrod a počátky marxistického revisionismu ve střední Evropě 1953–1960*, Praha 2009.

⁵ M. Bartlová, J. Vybíral et al., *Building a State. The Representation of Czechoslovakia in Art, Architecture and Design*, Prague 2015, pp. 92–105, 115–118 (further bibliography).

⁶ J. Mervart, *Naděje a iluze. Čeští spisovatelé v reformním hnutí šedesátých let*, Brno 2010, esp. pp. 342–348.

⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 125–140; A. Binarová, *Svaz výtvarných umělců v českých zemích 1956–1972*, Olomouc 2017; J. Lomová, K. Šima, "Sjezd SČSVU v roce 1964. Poznámky k úspěšnosti performance," in: *Umění a revoluce. Pro Milenu Bartlovou*, eds. J. Lomová, J. Vybíral, Praha 2018, pp. 512–544.

⁸ For further information on persons mentioned in this article, see the encyclopaedic dictionary L. Slaviček et al., *Slovník historiků umění, výtvarných kritiků, teoretiků a publicistů v českých zemích*, Praha 2016.

against the conservatives in the cultural commission of the Central Committee of the CCP led by the leading Party conservative, literary historian Ladislav Štoll, and assured that the congress session was accepted almost unchanged.⁹ Thus, the Union of Fine Artists actually made it impossible to support the Writers' Union in the current political situation several years later.

Štoll, Kotalík and Formánek were influential men who used different ways to constitute the Stalinist cultural system after 1949; Kotalík was a key member and president of the College of Arts at the Czechoslovak Academy of Science since the early 1960s, and also the rector of the Academy of Fine Arts since 1960. The engagement of Kotalík and Formánek in this case demonstrates the range of actions available to art historians in the period examined. Both of them held a Prague university degree and a doctorate in art history, they worked for art and historical institutions and engaged in the activities of the Union of Fine Artists. Such Unions, as collective actors from the late 1950s to their dissolution in 1969, enabled actual interventions that not only affected the role of art in society, but also enabled effective political influence.¹⁰ By contrast, humanities, including art history in the modern scientific classification system and its institutional operation, lacked similar options. However, the related professions that could use the synergy of active artists, namely the history and theory of fine art, theatre, music and, in particular, literature, were able to compensate their marginalization and practical impotence. Art history was a "minor" and therefore less controlled scholarly discipline in the Soviet Bloc countries, especially in comparison with historiography or philosophy. Moreover, art history in the economic system of state socialism lost its central sphere of expert influence, i.e. the art market.¹¹ It could only deal with monument conservation, an area shared with architecture and seen as a marginal subject of research, although it did have a great influence on the general public. The close coexistence of art historians and contemporary fine artists was also supported by a specific practice, which was a relic of the Stalinist system of the early 1950s: many art historians were members of the theoretical section of the Union of Czechoslovak Fine Artists,

⁹ The National Archives Prague, collection 1261/10/5 Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party 1945–1989, the Ideological Commission 1958–1968, vol. 12, archival unit 48: Minutes and resolution of the 7th meeting of the ideological commission of the Central Committee of the CCP, May 18th, 1964; Binarová, *Svaz výtvarných umělců...*, pp. 169–187; Lomová, Šima, "Sjezd SČSVU..." p. 542.

¹⁰ See: Mervart, *Naděje a iluze...*

¹¹ The systematic repression of private collectors has been described by M. Rusinko, *Snad nesbíráte obrazy? Cesty soukromého sběratelství moderního umění v českých zemích v letech 1948–1965*, Brno 2018.

often just because it provided a platform for permitted and subsidized tours to the otherwise inaccessible "West."

Art history was involved in the following important case from 1963–1964 in its own proper role of historicizing the recent past. František Šmejkal, a young graduate of art history, together with Věra Linhartová, his colleague, a poet and curator, prepared an exhibition titled "Imaginative Art 1930–1950" for the regional Aleš South Bohemian Gallery in Hluboká nad Vltavou.¹² It presented a significant episode in Czech surrealism during the pre-war and war periods, today internationally known mainly thanks to Toyen and Karel Teige.¹³ The exhibition was conceived not only as one in a line of efforts to rehabilitate the art that was forbidden in the 1950s (Teige died as a victim of political baiting in 1951 and Toyen emigrated to France in 1948), but also as legitimization of the emerging trend of contemporary non-realistic and non-figurative art through showing its continuity with a period that has already become history. The idea that a regional gallery could hold an exhibition that would be otherwise impossible in the centre of action, which was under more intense censorship, proved to be wrong.¹⁴ The reverse was the case: the exhibition, which radically exceeded his educational horizons, caught the attention of Jan Trojan, the chief secretary of the regional committee of the CCP in České Budějovice, and, after his warning, the attention of the first secretary of the Central Committee and President Antonín Novotný.¹⁵ In early March, the exhibition was banned and cancelled; a year later, František Šmejkal and Věra Linhartová, together with their colleague Jan Kříž, became suspects watched by the StB (State Security,

¹² F. Šmejkal, V. Linhartová, *Imaginativní malířství 1930–1950*. Exh. cat. Alšova jihočeská galerie Hluboká nad Vltavou, 1964. Šmejkal died in 1988, and after the fall of the dictatorship of the CCP, the exhibition was reenacted by his widow in the Rudolfinum exhibition hall; see *České imaginativní umění*, ed. J. Šmejkalová, Praha 1996. The stylistic concept of "imaginative art" was refused again.

¹³ See: Karel Teige, eds. E. Dluhosh, R. Švácha, Cambridge–London 1999; K. Srp, *Toyen*, Praha 2000.

¹⁴ For the specific practice of the censorship of art prints and exhibitions, see J. Lomová, "Co je politického v psaní o umění. Cenzura výtvarných časopisů v Československu 60. let 20. století," in: *Umenie – politika – estetika. Sborník konferencie Slovenskej asociácie pre estetiku*, eds. P. Brežňan, M. Paštéková, Bratislava 2019, pp. 118–125.

¹⁵ The case is explained in texts by Jaroslav Hes, the head of the ideological department of the Central Committee of the CCP, and by František Šmejkal himself published in *Výtvarná práce* 1968, 16(10), p. 12 and 16(15), p. 10; Binarová, *Svaz výtvarných umělců...*, pp. 162–164.

i.e. secret political police), the only ones thus pursued for their professional activity during this period.¹⁶

The attempt to publish a catalogue and install the exhibition was not the only sign of liberalization; the important thing was what followed *after* the ban. Jaroslav Hes, who worked at the ideological department of the Central Committee of the CCP, together with Jiří Kotalík and Jaromír Neumann, a professor at Charles University and director of the Institute of the Theory and History of Arts at the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, allowed a “study” rerun of the exhibition in Prague in September 1964. It was held during the summer holidays, could not be written about or otherwise promoted, and was conceptually reduced so that it did not include the legitimizing line extending to the present.¹⁷ At the end of the exhibition, a colloquium was held and the papers presented there were published in the academic journal *Umění*, which was the normative platform of Czech art history.¹⁸ Some of the most erudite texts were written by foremost scholars of the young and middle generation, such as Jindřich Chaloupecký, Luděk Novák, Eva Petrová, Vratislav Effenberger, the authors of the exhibition, and Jiří Kotalík. The texts fundamentally challenged the analytical functionality of Šmejkal’s specific concept of “imaginative art.” Šmejkal borrowed the term from Teige, but he was able to legitimize it only because it became part of the normative post-Stalinist discourse. In 1964, however, the term proved to be “too weak” and unacceptable.¹⁹ The concept of “creative imagination” as a key category that could become a link between the former dogmatism of socialist realism and its post-Stalinist form was coined by Jaromír Neumann in 1958. Being the director of the Institute of the Theory and History of Arts at the Czechoslovak Academy of Science, he patronized the conference and wrapped it up with his paper, which was

¹⁶ The Archives of the Security Forces of the Czech Republic, reg. no. 9394 cover name FRANTA, later CESTOVATEL.

¹⁷ The National Archives Prague, collection 1261/10/5 Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party 1945–1989, the Ideological Commission 1958–1968: Minutes and resolution of the 7th meeting of the ideological commission of the Central Committee of the CCP, vol. 13, archival unit 50: The opinion of the ideological department of the Central Committee of the CCP on the exhibition of imaginative art. Annex II to the minutes of the 15th meeting of the Ideological Committee of the Central Committee of the CCP on May 27th, 1964; J. Hes, “Ještě ke křivdologii,” *Výtvarná práce* 1968, 16(10), p. 12.

¹⁸ The thematical block “K problematice umění třicátých let”, *Umění* 1965, 13(5), pp. 433–539.

¹⁹ J. Neumann, “K dnešním metodologickým otázkám dějepisu umění. Poznámky o výtvarné představivosti”, *Umění* 1958, 6(2), pp. 178–187; for context see M. Bartlová, “Není možno se vzdát svobody myšlení. Vincenc Kramář a marxismus 1945–1960,” *Umění* 2018, 66(4), pp. 246–263.

not eventually published: as an art historian, he dealt with the interpretation of mannerist and baroque paintings in the Picture Gallery of Prague Castle and ceased to interfere in the discussions on contemporary and modern art. At the same time, the conference papers dealt with the historicising of the exhibition theme, i.e. the definition of a clear normative boundary between the contemporary art and the art that was in the competence of art history. In terms of expanding opportunities for contemporary art which did not follow the doctrine of socialist realism, this was a kind of "betrayal" on the part of art history. At least that is how Šmejkal understood the situation at the moment, although he tried to promote his concept of imaginative art in the next decade, only to drop the key term "imagination" in the 1980s. In terms of art history, however, it was a major step that opened the discipline up to the need to create new conceptual and discursive tools to study the art of the "last generation" (most artists represented at the "Imaginative Art" exhibition were still alive and active, and some of them in political exile).

The case of "imaginative art" showed that art history did play a role in the dynamics of the political change. However, it professed the dominant intellectual discourse of the times in a different and specific way. Not surprisingly, these two aspects can be seen in Jaromír Neumann, a key figure in the Czech art history of the 1950s and 1960s. Four years after the above-mentioned article on the art and historical concept of artistic imagination was written, Neumann published an extensive study, inaugurating the concept of "Marxist iconology," in the same magazine, *Umění*. In 1966, a leading representative of Marxist iconology, Karel Stejskal, when reviewing a book written by the co-founder of this school, Rudolf Chadraba, wrote that "we can legitimately talk about a distinct Prague school of iconology."²⁰ In this concept, iconology claimed to refer to the basic principles of Erwin Panofsky and Aby Warburg, but in reality, it was much more based on the reception of Max Dvořák's late texts, mediated by unacknowledged reading of Hans Sedlmayr. Marxist iconology did not compare images with the texts of that time, but rather "focused on" and "empathized with" hidden clues and meanings of the images revealed according to Gestalt psychology and without demanding intermedia interpretations. Czech iconologists of the 1960s mainly searched for ways in which non-Christian cosmological meanings were expressed through images in "the era of feudalism," regardless of the control mechanisms provided by general and cultural history. Chadraba and Stejskal provided a coherent and

²⁰ K. Stejskal, "Nový výklad Dürerovy Apokalypsy," *Umění* 1966, 14(1), pp. 1–60, cit. p. 18; R. Chadraba, *Dürers Apokalypse – eine ikonologische Deutung*, Praha 1964.

strikingly original re-phrasing of Warburgian iconology that wanted to give voice to the illiterate medieval classes.²¹

The key text of the Czech intellectual milieu of the 1960s was *Dialektika konkrétního* (Dialectics of the Concrete) by the philosopher Karel Kosík, which had a timely and extensive impact abroad as well, and was translated into many languages; its local impact was strengthened by Kosík's engagement as a citizen and journalist.²² His integration of impulses from (Western) Marxism and Heideggerian existential phenomenology can be seen as a cardinal formulation of the "humanistic Marxist" discourse. Chadraba's review of Kosík's book, published in *Umění*, proved that Kosík was indeed read by Czech art historians.²³ In his reading, however, Chadraba was selective and ignored any suggestions that would seem too critical, if not revolutionary, as far as the discourse tradition of art history was concerned, and noted only the ideas that could be used for critical refutation both of the "vulgar Marxism" of the Stalinist period (Chadraba borrowed Kosík's term "sociologism") and of the surviving "positivist" tradition. Yet Chadraba was not an uninformed reader and he used extensive citations of the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* of the "young Marx" (unfortunately, without specific references) to make clear that he was well versed in the current intellectual trends. The reasons for his selective understanding of Kosík's suggestions lie in the need for a dominant discourse to be firmly rooted in the local art historical tradition. The post-Stalinist opening of the methodological horizons of Czech art history was based on recalling the authority of Max Dvořák (Rudolf Chadraba basically adored this great personality of the Viennese school of art history until the 1980s), who was a "bourgeois idealist," rehabilitated by an instrumental claim that he used the dialectical method.²⁴ Despite – or perhaps rather be-

²¹ The concept of Marxist iconology has been derided and refused by I. Gerát, "Marxism and Iconology in Czechoslovakia during the Cold War," in: *A Socialist Realist History? Writing Art History in the Post-War Decades*, eds. K. Kodres, K. Jöekalda, M. Marek, Wien-Köln-Weimar, pp. 100–117. His text, unfortunately, does not analyze its object in a historical way but is based on ideological criticism and an idea of a single "true" iconology. For more detail, cf. my "The Prague School of Marxist Iconology" presented at the international conference "Iconologies. Global Unity and Local Diversities in Art History" held in Kraków in May 2019 (to be published).

²² K. Kosík, *Dialektika konkrétního. Studie k problematice člověka a světa*, Prague 1963, esp. pp. 81–103; Mervart, *Naděje a iluze...*, pp. 93–94; idem, "Dialektika konkrétního v zrcadle sporů mezi aparátem ÚV KSČ a kulturní obcí," in: M. Hrubec et al., *Myslitel Karel Kosík*, Praha 2011, pp. 55–78.

²³ R. Chadraba, "Dvě knihy o smyslu věcí," *Umění* 1964, 12(3), pp. 214–215.

²⁴ Tematický blok k výročí Maxe Dvořáka, *Umění* 1961, 9(2), pp. 165–185, 9(6), pp. 525–640.

cause of – this fact, the discourse of Czech art and history of the 1960s was not willing to accept Kosík's outline of the real, even rigorous, application of materialist dialectics to the concept of art and to the interpretation method of art history.

On a practical level, the cultural liberalization of the second half of the 1960s did not only bring more publishing options for art historians, but it also eased the fairly strict blockade of communication with other countries, opened up more possibilities to travel outside the Soviet bloc and to cooperate with foreign experts. Besides Vienna, art historians collaborated with their colleagues in Munich, and medievalists participated in the summer schools at Poitiers. Viktor Kotrba even lectured at the University of Bonn in 1964 and for the whole summer semester in 1967.²⁵ His important contact was Götz Fehr, German architectural historian, native of Czechoslovakia and post-war forced exile.²⁶ The Czechoslovaks were helped to sustain contacts with the world outside the Soviet bloc also by other Czech Germans. The restriction of travel, so typical for most of the four decades of the Communist dictatorship, was a much harsher blow for art historians than for other humanities. For art historians, learning about art and architecture through personal experience, or "autopsy," is methodologically crucial and absolutely indispensable. Various institutional bureaus repeatedly pointed this fact out from the mid-1950s on, but more possibilities did not occur until the mid-1960s, culminating in 1968–1969.

The new radical restriction of travels to "the West" after 1970 and the enforced weakening of foreign professional contacts had a great impact. Like the entire Czechoslovak intellectual environment, Czech art history was also affected by political and employee purges at the turn of 1969 and 1970 that sealed the final victory of the Soviet-backed "conservatives" over "reform Communism" with its "humanist Marxism." In the case of art history, the result more concerned individual researchers and did not mean the elimination of entire departments, as was the case in other humanities. Yet it is obvious that the achievements of Czech art history of the 1960s, the genesis of which

²⁵ Institute for the History of Art, Czech Academy of Science, Dept. of Documentation, collection Viktor Kotrba, vol. 23 (newspaper clippings) and volume Correspondence 1 (Kurt Bauch, Götz Fehr); Masaryk Institute and the Archives of the Academy of Sciences in Prague, collection ČSAV – ÚTDU, vol. 17, inv. no. 314, sig. 602: Report for the Foreign Dept. of the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, November 29th, 1966.

²⁶ For G. Fehr see M. Winzeler, "Götz Fehr: Poznámky k česko-německému historikovi umění a staviteli kulturních mostů v těžkých časech," in: *Umění a revoluce. Pro Milenu Bartlovou*, eds. J. Lomová, J. Vybíral, Praha 2018, pp. 596–618.

I have tried to sketch in a broader social context, contributed significantly to the definition of the discursive horizon of the discipline in the coming period of the so-called "consolidation" and "normalization." Such demarcation not only meant to keep up the intellectual level achieved in the previous decade and to defend it against the ideological pressure of the CCP and the state; it also comprised attempts to overcome the methodologies of the 1960s, although this fact was not explicitly talked about due to the political situation. Selective historicizing of the interwar avant-garde remained a sensitive, but existing research topic. In the 1970s, Marxist iconology finally persuaded even more traditional and reserved researchers like Jaroslav Pešina about its advantages. At the same time, however, Jaromír Neumann in his texts on the Baroque art, and also Lubomír Konečný and others from the younger generation, returned to Panofsky's original methodology, when the interpretation process of iconology was to be checked against contemporary texts. Other representatives of the younger generation, who managed to attend university lectures by Jan Patočka in 1967–1969, examined other possible uses of phenomenology than those offered by Kosík's integration of Marxist dialectic and materialism.²⁷

The short period between 1963 and 1969 in Czech art history, as well as in other scientific disciplines and cultural fields in Czechoslovakia, was the time of an extraordinary release of intellectual and creative energy. Art historians not only profited from the generally more liberal situation that allowed them more travel and foreign contacts, but were also able to create their own original concepts of "humanist Marxism." They did it in their own field-specific ways and not through participating directly in the hegemonic discourse. The process of self-assertion was, however, still arduous and complicated, and it demanded active political participation of art historians themselves, at least some of them. Nor should we forget that the the most original art historian of the period, the Roman Catholic priest Josef Zvěřina, was only released from political jail in 1960, while his older colleague Růžena Vacková was detained until 1966.

While the ruling power did see the sixties as a lasting threat until the fall of the Communist dictatorship, the generation of new students of art history in the seventies and eighties, including myself, looked to the texts published in the sixties as a basic reference to form our intellectual horizons. Despite the personal engagement of major art historians both at universities and

²⁷ Václav Richter's phenomenological art history remained outside the mainstream of the 1960s and its impact in the following decades was felt only among his students in Brno.

in the National Gallery in Prague, as well as a covert intellectual life in the "underground," Czech art history in the period of "normalization" was most weakened by the stifling of internal theoretical debate, which has not properly evolved even since 1989.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartlová M., "Není možno se vzdát svobody myšlení'. Vincenc Kramář a marxismus 1945–1960," *Umění* 2018, 66(4), pp. 246–263
- Bartlová M., J. Vybíral et al., *Building a State. The Representation of Czechoslovakia in Art, Architecture and Design*, Prague 2015
- Binarová A., *Svaz výtvarných umělců v českých zemích 1956–1972*, Olomouc 2017
- České imaginativní umění, ed. J. Šmejkalová, Praha 1996
- Gerát I., „Marxism and Iconology in Czechoslovakia during the Cold War," in: *A Socialist Realist History? Writing Art History in the Post-War Decades*, eds. K. Kodres, K. Jöekalda, M. Marek, Wien–Köln–Weimar, pp. 100–117
- Karel Teige, eds. E. Dluhosh, R. Švácha, Cambridge–London 1999
- Kolář P., *Der Poststalinismus. Ideologie und Utopie einer Epoche*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2016
- Kopeček M., *Hledání ztraceného smyslu revoluce. Zrod a počátky marxistického revizionismu ve střední Evropě 1953–1960*, Praha 2009
- Lomová J., K. Šima, "Sjezd SČSVU v roce 1964. Poznámky k úspěšnosti performance," in: *Umění a revoluce. Pro Milenu Bartlovou*, eds. J. Lomová, J. Vybíral, Praha 2018, pp. 512–544
- Lomová J., "Co je politického v psaní o umění. Cenzura výtvarných časopisů v Československu 60. let 20. století," in: *Umenie – politika – estetika. Sborník konferencie Slovenskej asociácie pre estetiku*, eds. P. Brežňan, M. Paštéková, Bratislava 2019, pp. 118–125
- Mervart J., *Naděje a iluze. Čeští spisovatelé v reformním hnutí šedesátých let*. Brno 2010
- Mervart J., "Dialektika konkrétního v zrcadle sporů mezi aparátem ÚV KSČ a kulturní obcí," in: M. Hrubec et al., *Myslitel Karel Kosík*. Praha 2011, pp. 55–78
- Schulze Wessel M., *Pražské jaro. Průlom do nového světa*. Praha 2018
- Slaviček L. et al., *Slovník historiků umění, výtvarných kritiků, teoretiků a publicistů v českých zemích*, Praha 2016
- Šmejkal F., V. Linhartová, *Imaginativní malířství 1930–1950*. Exh. cat. Alšova jihočeská galerie Hluboká nad Vlavou, 1964
- Srp K., *Toyen*, Praha, 2000
- Rákosník J., M. Spurný, J. Štaif, *Milníky moderních českých dějin. Krize konsenzu a legitimacy v letech 1848–1989*, Praha 2018
- Winzeler M., "Götz Fehr: Poznámky k česko-německému historikovi umění a staviteli kulturních mostů v těžkých časech," in: *Umění a revoluce. Pro Milenu Bartlovou*, eds. J. Lomová, J. Vybíral, Praha 2018, pp. 596–618

Milena Bartlová

Academy of Arts, Architecture and Design, Prague

1968: IN SEARCH OF "SOCIALISM WITH HUMAN FACE"
IN CZECH ART HISTORY

Summary

The five or eight years leading up to the failed "Prague Spring" represent the most important period of Czech humanities tradition during the Communist Party dictatorship. Art history did not directly participate in either of the most prominent period discourses, but it was able to develop its own specific methodologies following the Czech continuation of the Vienna School legacy. The contribution analyzes the discourse of Marxist Iconology, developed by J. Neumann and R. Chadraba, and presents the case of F. Šmejkal and his concept of Imaginative Art, which was, interestingly, the sole case during the whole 40 years of the Communist Party rule when the highest Party officials became directly involved in Czech art historical practice. From the point of view of art historical practice, the most important feature of the brief period 1963–1969 was the new possibility of contacts with foreign art historians and of traveling abroad.

Keywords:

history of art history – Czechoslovakia 1968 – humanist Marxism – Marxist iconology