Freedom of Communication

American Library Association

Dorothy W. Curtiss

Freedom of Communication

Proceedings of the
First Conference on Intellectual Freedom
New York City, June 28-29, 1952

Freedom of Communication

Sponsored by the Committee on Intellectual Freedom
of the American Library Association

Edited by William Dix and Paul Bixler

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Chicago, 1954

Copyright 1954 by the American Library Association

Manufactured in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 54-6086

FOREWORD

Freedom of speech is not only freedom to speak but also freedom to listen, involves not only the right to express what one knows and believes, but also the right to seek out the facts, to learn the expressed opinions of others. One of the functions of librarians is to facilitate this flow of fact and opinion; the American library is a link in the vast network of communication channels through which a sovereign democratic people receives the intellectual nourishment so essential to the healthful exercise of its sovereignty.

The library faces both the past and the future. As the principal storehouse of the recorded fact and opinion of the past, the research library and archival collection is the principal source of our knowledge of how we, individually and collectively, got where we are today. If any despotic government desires to falsify history, to make black white, it must forbid access to libraries or pervert what is in them, as George Orwell has vividly imagined in 1984. At the same time, the school and college library and the public library, in helping disseminate the fact and opinion of the present, are among the major agencies in providing the intellectual raw material from which the popular decisions that shape history are made.

Thus librarians are concerned with intellectual freedom. It is their professional responsibility to see that their collections reflect, insofar as possible, all points of view. It is their duty not to use their libraries for the expression of their own opinions alone nor those of any other one group, but to see that their libraries provide amply for that freedom of inquiry which is recognized as the cornerstone of a democratic society. This concept is parallel to the concept of academic freedom, and like it is sometimes misunderstood. This freedom is not the freedom of the college professor or the librarian to do or say whatever he wants; it is not the freedom to propagandize or to indoctrinate. It is the freedom to explore impartially without hindrance whatever pathway seems to lead toward truth. The librarian's responsibility is to facilitate that exploration by helping keep those paths cleared.

In times like these, this responsibility which the librarian bears is a heavy one. The fear that the ruthless powers which oppose America will pour into these paths their own propaganda has led some Americans to advocate blocking the paths. Others, taking advantage of the uncertainty, have attempted to see that the paths to all but their own concept of truth are obstructed. A variety of attacks has been made upon libraries.

The American Library Association's Committee on Intellectual Freedom arranged this conference in an attempt to explore in a general way the implications of intellectual freedom for libraries today. We hope that it has stimulated consideration of a problem of importance not only to libraries but to the American people and that this volume of proceedings will lead to further reflections.

We wish to express our thanks to those who participated in the formal program; to the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which provided the meeting place; and to the Field Foundation, which made the conference possible.

William S. Dix, Chairman (1951-53)
A.L.A. Committee on Intellectual Freedom

Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

CONTENTS

Introduction. 1
Paul Bixler

THE LIBRARY AND FREE COMMUNICATION

Free Communication--an American Heritage 10
Julian Boyd
The Significance of Free Communication Today. . . . 19
Alan Barth
The Library's Responsibility in Free Communication 25
E. W. McDiarmid
Summary of Discussion. 34

THE PRESENT PROBLEM IN BOOK SELECTION

The Large Research Library 38
Verner W. Clapp
The Large Public Library 44
Ralph Munn
The Small Public Library 50
Jerome Cushman
The Problem--a British View. 55
Robert L. Collison
Summary of Discussion. 63

PRESSURES--WHERE FROM AND HOW?

Introduction. 70
David K. Berninghausen
Pressure Groups and Intellectual Freedom 73
Harwood L. Childs
A Statewide Expreience 89
John E. Smith
Summary of Discussion. 97

OUR COMMON STAKE IN FREE COMMUNICATION

Book Publishing 102
Donald S. Klopfer
The Press. 108
Lester Markel
Broadcasting 116
Merle Miller
Conference Summary 124
Alan Barth

Appendix A.-Library Bill of Rights 131
Appendix B.-Labeling Statement 133
Appendix C.-Selective Bibliography on Intellectual Freedom 135
John E. Smith

INTRODUCTION

For some time now we have been living in a twilight between war and peace--a twilight in which we seem to be without a number of advantages, or at least the certainties, of either condition. There has been a war in Korea, but we have none of that unity of action which usually accompanies military conflict. Over most of the world there is presumed to be peace, but nowhere is there any of the certainty or the calmness with which we associate a true peace. We seem to be in unknown territory--a kind of psychological no man's land--where nothing may be as it seems and where the ordinary signposts of everyday life are vague or difficult to make out. In this exigency we perhaps need not only caution in our advance but as much preparation for the uncertain and unknown as possible.

The commitments and responsibilities of the United States as a leading world power are recent, almost coinciding in time with our differences with the Soviet Union. For that reason, it may seem easier to recognize and attempt to explain the uncertainty and the occasional hysteria over international issues than it is over domestic issues. The concept of a limited war is patently unfamiliar to us. Our traditional isolationism plus the complexity of problems on the international front explain, if they do not excuse, our confusion of tongues as we seek to lead the world toward peace, or at least toward some form of stabilized tolerance.

Yet the confusion is quite as prevalent on the domestic front. And just where domestic issues reflect most plainly the international tensions--in the realm of national security and individual freedom--is our indecision the most marked. No issue in recent months, for example, has become more confused than that of free communication. How is one to speak freely if when he opens his mouth on a controversial issue he finds his motives and even his good faith called into question? And how is he to act if his own specific freedom to speak and that of his friends or associates is attacked in the name of American principle or of American freedom? We are not describing here a general or complete condition in American society. Yet questions of free communication have arisen often enough and in enough places--in the press, over the air, in the schoolroom and in the library--to warrant examination by those particularly concerned and responsible for that communication.

Background of the Conference

It was with such questions of free communication in mind that the Committee on Intellectual Freedom called its first conference. It was, of course, a conference primarily for librarians. In the preliminary planning, the Committee conceived of it as a series of working discussion groups composed of those most intimately concerned with problems of free communication. But it became clear that the need and interest among librarians were too great to limit attendance to intimate groups. And we recognized further that the library is not isolated, and that any worth-while exploration of its problems of free communication should be related to the larger principle of free communication, to the society which supports and lives by free communication, to present-day obstacles to free communication, and to other agencies which have a stake in its maintenance and its strengthening.

The conference was organized in four sessions, each designed as a symposium devoted to an important aspect of the subject. And though librarians predominated in the program, a number of nonlibrarians also were asked to address the meetings.

Two major types of efforts at censorship occur today, and since libraries are charged with responsibility for providing all manner and kinds of recorded knowledge, both of them can be a danger to the usefulness and even the existence of libraries.

1. Moral censorship aimed at the obscene and the sacrilegious. The urge to censorship on these grounds was a strong element in the two Gathings bills introduced in the Eighty-second Congress--one having to do with radio and television, and the other with books, magazines, and "comics." An example of alleged sacrilege was the film The Miracle, which on those grounds was at first denied a license for exhibition; more recently the denial of such license has been ruled unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. In libraries, efforts at censoring so-called "obscene" material may not so frequently take the form of outright censorship as of "control" through demands for restrictions on availability or for labeling.

2. Political censorship aimed at the subversive and politically unorthodox. Recently this type of effort has made up the majority of cases of censorship or attempted censorship in libraries. And though communism has not always been the sole object of the efforts, most of such efforts have been made in opposition to its name.

Let us quote here point six of the recommendations on labeling passed by the Council of the American Library Association in July, 1951:[1]

> Although we are all agreed that communism is a threat to the free world, if materials are labeled to pacify one group, there is no excuse for refusing to label any item in the library's collection. Because communism, fascism, or other authoritarianisms tend to suppress ideas and attempt to coerce individuals to conform to a specific ideology, American librarians must be opposed to such "isms." We are, then, anti-communist, but we are also opposed to any other group which aims at closing any path to knowledge.

We assume, furthermore, that libraries must not be made the tools of the Communist conspiracy or any other faction. For Communists or others to misuse their posts for the indoctrination of library users would be a violation of the spirit of the Library Bill of Rights. This, then, is the heart of the problem in these times: to present freely both fact and opinion from all points of view while maintaining the firm balance which will prevent our facilities from being abused by propagandists for any specific cause.

---

[1] The entire statement appears as Appendix B of this volume.

Pressures from different quarters have been brought to bear upon libraries to prevent the circulation of certain books, periodicals, and films. Librarians, while agreeing that the free communication of ideas is the very basis of their existence, have been uncertain how they should respond to these pressures. It was the hope of our committee that this conference would help to clarify the thinking of all of us, would develop common grounds on which we could all agree, would indicate the most effective kinds of action for us to follow, and would encourage productive relationships with other groups faced with similar problems.

The Program

As stated, sessions of the conference were conducted in the form of symposia. Well before June 28 participants were sent copies of a working paper giving the background of the conference and outlining the theme of each session.[2]

Papers were prepared by the several speakers before the conference, and we present them here as prepared with a minimum of correction and revision. The discussion following each of the first three sessions was recorded by stenotype. Reprinting the many verbal exchanges in full seemed unwise for a number of reasons: for one, the exchanges were frequently long, sometimes off the point, and sometimes unimportant--publishing in full would have wasted precious space; for another, the job of identifying every speaker and giving him a chance to "correct" his remarks would have seriously extended the present job. Instead, I have written a summary of each of the three discussions. These are not extended; in fact, to some they may seem too short. They simply identify the principal issues debated. Unfortunately absent are the personalities of the participants and the sharpness of an occasional challenge. But this method has allowed some strands of ideas to be pulled together which in a word-for-word transcript would have been separated or perhaps lost.

First Session: The Library and Free Communication

This session was devoted to historical background and to discussing the philosophy of the relationship between free communication and the library. We asked the speakers to discuss such questions as these:

How integral a part of American tradition is free communication?

What part has free communication played in the history of American institutions?

How relevant a relationship does free communication have to other freedoms in American life?

How significant is the unimpeded flow of ideas to the maintenance of democracy as we know it in this country?

Why is the free communication of ideas not only a privilege but a necessity?

What is the place of the library in maintaining free communication?

What has the citizen a right to expect of his library?

What is the responsibility of the library to the intellectual community which it serves?

Are there major differences in the nature of this responsibility among the various types of libraries?

Second Session: The Present Problem in Book Selection

In 1939 the Council of the American Library Association adopted the Library Bill of Rights. This policy statement was revised and reaffirmed in 1948, and in 1951 a footnote was added to make it clear that it covers not only reading materials but "all materials and media of communications used or collected by libraries." Specifically, the first two provisions of the Library Bill of Rights apply to the subject of this session: that library materials "should be chosen for values of interest, information and enlightenment of all the people"; and that "there should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times."[3]

---

[2] The greater part of the substance of this Introduction has been taken from the working paper.

It seems appropriate to remark here that the Committee on Intellectual Freedom considers no statement above criticism, including statements in the Library Bill of Rights. And although there may be no difference of opinion on these principles, as a practical matter there may be some variation in their application. In this session we asked such questions as the following:

What kinds of books must be selected to meet the conditions of free communication and of the first two provisions of the Library Bill of Rights?

What other criteria, within these conditions, may or should be used in selecting books?

Since selection implies rejection, what kinds of books can we reject without corrupting or nullifying our principles, in order to stay within our budget requirements?

In controversial areas, is it the library's responsibility to present a cross section of interpretation as well as factual material?

Can the small library apply the same criteria as the large, the public library the same as the research library?

Is the answer to the above question identical for all types of libraries--for example, school libraries?

Some of the problems to be considered here include more than the technical aspects of book selection. How do we handle the books once we have them? Is it within our principles to restrict the use of some of them? Can one justify putting the "hot" ones behind the desk and require borrowers to ask or sign for them? Labeling has been rejected, but how about the special shelf? There are perhaps more angles to "control" than have yet been investigated. (Yet should we discourage the invention of all such devices? In Peoria, Illinois, an indefensible demand for the labeling of films objectionable to one group in the community was satisfied in a sound, defensible way when public library films were offered for review to all local groups, and when the variety of their written critical remarks were then made available to all comers; this was in the tradition of the Book Review Digest and other library tools which make a variety of published opinion available in one place.)

And what, furthermore, about the policy on acceptance of gifts? Here is something in which practices are not at all uniform. Various interested groups, their plans rejected on grounds of censorship or labeling, may very well return more reasonably with gifts in their arms. What policies do we have to make the best and fairest use of such "cooperation"?

Third Session: Pressures--Where from and How?

"Censorship of books, urged or practiced by volunteer arbiters of morals or political opinion or by organizations that would establish a coercive concept of Americanism," says the third provision of the Library Bill of Rights, "must be challenged by libraries in maintenance of their responsibility to provide public information and enlightenment through the printed word." The third session was devoted to an examination of the source and of the nature of pressures leading toward censorship. Against the background of general propositions on the nature and functions of pressure groups, concrete situations were analyzed and discussed. This session was planned on the assumption that librarians might better maintain the free flow of knowledge and information if they had a clear understanding of the forces which obstruct this free flow. How--we may ask--are we to avoid, without compromising principles, issues which may lead to censorship? And if issues arise, how may we resolve them successfully? In other words, what can librarians do, in addition to their efforts as selectors of books and administrators of internal library policy, to preserve the public's right to examine all points of view and help to maintain free inquiry? Our committee hopes to see some suggestions for a future program of action emerge from this exploration.

---

[3] The Library Bill of Rights appears as Appendix A of this volume.

Fourth Session: Our Common Stake in Free Communication

In the fourth proposition of the Library Bill of Rights, "allied groups in the fields of science, education, and of book publishing" are suggested as groups with which libraries should join in seeking cooperation to resist all abridgment of freedom of expression and of communication. The fourth session was given over to statements from other groups concerned with free communication: the publishing industry, the press, and broadcasting. We hoped that each of these statements would indicate their common ground with libraries, the nature of the current problem as it affected their group, what was being done to combat the enemies of free communication, and areas where librarians might join with them in common action.

One of the high points of the conference was Alan Barth's summary which followed the fourth session in place of further discussion. Mr. Barth's words are given in full, and if one would like to gain a quick impression of the tone of the conference, one cannot do better than read what he had to say speaking from immediate, full knowledge of the conference proceedings. May I add that except for Mr. Barth's summary, given extemporaneously, all speeches were prepared beforehand, and except for minor editing are given here as they were prepared.

From this Introduction, one may see what we planned and how we tried to carry it out. From the body of the book one may gather how nearly our objectives were attained. For those who participated I think I can speak with authority in saying that the First Conference on Intellectual Freedom was one of the most stimulating experiences of our lives.

Paul Bixler, Secretary
A.L.A. Committee on Intellectual Freedom

Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio

THE LIBRARY AND FREE COMMUNICATION

WILLIAM DIX
Chairman

FREE COMMUNICATION--

AN AMERICAN HERITAGE

Julian Boyd

In a conference devoted to intellectual freedom, a subject which implies tolerance of dissent, I hope those hard-working and estimable gentlemen of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom will not think hard of me if I enter a mild criticism of the title assigned me. "Free Communication--an American Heritage" is a title that suffers from two defects. Like that over simplified definition of a horse, it is dangerous at both ends and uncomfortable in the middle. "Free Communication," besides suffering the defect of ambiguity, appears to me to be something substituted by sociology or some other young and terminology-happy profession for an ancient concept known to history under a very simple term. "American Heritage" is also ambiguous and drags after it a faint odor of chauvinism.

The library is the citadel of the free spirit. It is today imperiled. We are here to take counsel with each other concerning its defense. Let us therefore speak wisely if we can, but by all means let us speak plainly. The issue is too grave to permit euphemisms or ambiguities. We are here dealing with the age-old question of the right of the individual to think, to inquire, to know, to write, and to teach freely. We are concerned with the equally ancient question of the right of the state to curtail these individual liberties or to stifle them by compelling the acceptance of an official or authoritative or revealed version of truth. We would get no nearer our objective by avoiding the old-fashioned, blunt word

---

Julian Boyd was director of libraries, Princeton University, 1940-52, and previously, 1935-40, librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. He has edited numerous volumes of historical documents and papers, and is at present editing the monumental Papers of Thomas Jefferson.

"tyranny" for the one or the ennobling word "liberty" for the other. We are today talking about the same thing that Josiah Quincy, Jr., had in mind when he drew up his famous legacy: "To my son when he shall arrive to the age of fifteen years, Algernon Sidney's works, John Locke's works, Lord Bacon's works, Gordon's Tacitus, and Cato's Letters. May the spirit of liberty rest upon him!"

It will not have escaped your attention that Quincy's noble bequest was, first of all, a library. It was small, but it contained almost all that would be needed to provide a boy of fifteen with some of the great landmarks in the journey toward freedom and toward the maturing of a sense of rights and responsibilities. Quincy's bequest to his son also reminds us--and I think we need to be reminded of this in today's context of world affairs--that the spirit of liberty is not a peculiarly American heritage. It is a heritage of the human race and no doubt began ages before the first drawings were made on cave walls or the first symbols chiseled on stone. Not one of the authors named in Quincy's will was an American. We would malign the concept of liberty and reflect no honor upon the founders of our country by thinking of it as a peculiarly American ideal. Rather, it is universal. It did not grow out of nations or institutions. It originated in the inner recesses of the mind and spirit of man, and its birthplace is at once its domicile and its fortress. For those who really cherish free inquiry, the right of conscience, and the liberty to associate freely, it will not come as a shock to learn that there is no single concept underlying the American ideal as expressed in the Bill of Rights and in the Declaration of Independence that can properly be described as indigenous to this soil. All are derived from other lands and other ages, and we would make a mistake to limit their origin, as we so often tend to do, merely to the Hebraic-Hellenistic tradition of western culture.

But a nineteenth century orator declared that he could not consider one of the honored names in Quincy's cherished library--that of Algernon Sidney--as "other than an American name--American in all its associations, and American in all its influences." And it was with good reason that he took this view. Caroline Robbins, in an article in the William and

Mary Quarterly, 1947, described Sidney's Discourses Concerning Government as a "textbook of revolution" and showed how strong an influence that work exerted over Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and others of the Founding Fathers. The concept of inalienable rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as being derived from the law of nature and nature's God was phrased differently by Sidney from the immortal statement in the Declaration of Independence, but the concept, with all of its implications, was the same in both instances. It implied government by consent of the governed. It implied faith in the ability of the people to govern themselves according to principles of justice and reason. It implied tolerance of dissent. It implied belief in human progress through inquiry and through free dissemination of knowledge. It rejected the idea that some men were entitled, by divine authority or otherwise, to rule other men or tell them what to think or prescribe opinions and beliefs. It was neither original with Sidney nor with Thomas Jefferson: with both it was the affirmation of an ancient human urge.

But there was a difference between Sidney and Jefferson. When the judge summed up the evidence against Sidney at his trial in 1683, he declared: "This book contains all the malice and revenge and treason that mankind can be guilty of." Few save historians could today name the judge who presided at the trial of a man known and revered wherever intellectual freedom is cherished. But in these words from the bench Lord Jeffreys revealed himself as an unenviable symbol for the censor, the authoritarian, the tyrant, the enemy of books and of libraries in all ages. He stands at the bar of history not as judge but as culprit. In the long perspective of history the verdict is that he is an ignoble figure. No father urges his son to cherish the memory of what he did or said that day. His name is not gratefully inscribed upon libraries and colleges as a symbol of promise and destiny. For his verdict on the Discourses Concerning Government--and the similar verdicts of all of his prototypes, whether religious, political, social, racial, or economic, in all of the ages before or since--has been overruled in the hearts and memory of men by the power of Sidney's words and the nobility of his example. We revere his memory as one who declared: "Civil war in Macchiavel's account is a Desease but Tyranny is the Death of a state." And we soberly remember the other words Sidney wrote and handed to the executioner as he stepped upon the scaffold to surrender his life for the right to hold and express opinions contrary to all authority. "This," he declared, as a warning to all ages and never with more pertinence than to ours, "is an Age which makes truth pass for Treason."

The difference between Sidney and Jefferson lies not so much in their originality or in their beliefs but in the ages to which they belonged. In Sidney's century Jefferson's native colony of Virginia also had its prototype of Lord Jeffreys. "I thank God," declared Sir William Berkeley in 1671, knowing well that his words would be approved by those in authority in England, "I thank God we have not free schools nor printing; and I hope we shall not have these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience and heresy, and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them and libels against the government. God keep us from both."

But these hundred years brought everything that Berkeley had feared and more. They brought the overthrow of government by rebellion and an assertion of the right of the people to take such an extreme step when individual rights were contravened. They brought the establishment of a new nation based on the concept of the inherent and inalienable rights of the individual. They brought a declaration of the national ideal which its author declared "to be an expression of the American mind," its authority rested on the sense of the people and on such "elementary books of public right, as Aristotle, Cicero, Locke, Sidney, etc." They brought schools, libraries, and printing presses. They brought the disestablishment of a church sustained by public authority, and they brought a statement of the ideal of freedom of conscience in the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom. The preamble of that Act restated old beliefs and gave them the sanction of law: "That the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency, is a dangerous fallacy . . . and . . . that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human intervention disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."

This was the American answer to Jeffreys and Berkeley, the American vindication of Sidney's martyrdom. James Madison thought that this ringing affirmation of faith in the individual's capacity for government by discussion and debate had "in this country extinguished forever the ambitious hope of making laws for the human mind." He believed, and Jefferson asserted, but the Virginia legislature would not accept in the bill for religious freedom as originally drawn these axiomatic words: "that Almighty God hath created the mind free, and manifested his supreme will that free it shall remain by making it altogether insusceptible of restraint."

But this was not the end of attempts to restrict the human intellect, and the belief that it would be was no doubt the naive optimism that came from being alive in that blissful and promising dawn. In 1798 there were relatively mild legislative enactments curbing the right to criticize the government. The author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom declared these laws to be as palpably unconstitutional as if Congress had directed the people to bow down and worship a golden image. They were an abuse of right, and Jefferson declared them to be so. The people responded to his faith by bestowing upon him their highest office, and in his First Inaugural Jefferson voiced for all time the ultimate confidence and courage of one who truly believes in democracy: "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it." This was the most exalted expression of faith in the people ever voiced by an American president. It is, we are forced to reflect shamefully, an expression that no President of the United States could legally make today.

But the First Inaugural also showed the people that the sources of national power lay within themselves. "I know indeed," Jefferson declared, "that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this government is not strong enough. But . . . I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern." This, too, was not an original idea. Sidney himself had pointed out that free governments had demonstrated their capacity to draw forth better and abler men, that tyranny was the death of a state in the fears and cowardice induced by substituting force for loyalty. And Brissot de Warville asked in 1788: "Who is ignorant that it is to the freedom of debate and public discussion, that England owes the singular prosperity which, till lately, has followed her everywhere in commerce, in arts, in manufactures, as well abroad as at home . . . and it is the freedom of debate which has constantly saved her from ruin?" The proof of Jefferson's confidence in this government, which he declared then to be "the world's best hope," lies in a century and a half of unparalleled growth and power and in the defeat of authoritarian nation states in two great world wars in the present century. If "Tyranny is the death of a State," freedom is its very life.

The source of this power lies in our libraries. The handful of books bequeathed by Quincy to his son has become the world's greatest aggregation of books to be publicly owned and freely accessible to all of the people. Here is the original chain reaction infinitely more powerful than that resulting from nuclear fission. Here is the strength of democracy, the very center of discussion and debate, the stronghold of our faith. The library is also our best arsenal, and I think the time has come to make use of it.

Josiah Quincy made a prophecy as well as a legacy. "America [in the future]," he declared, "hath in store her Hampdens and Sidneys, patriots and heroes, who will form a band of brothers: men who have memories and feelings, courage and swords." In his own day I rather think he would have picked lawyers as the first defenders of rights and liberties. But in this twentieth century he would have to confess that the legal profession which once led a revolution to establish in this country the right of free discussion and debate has shamefully acquiesced in the betrayal of our liberties. There have been, to be sure, some splendid exceptions--Zechariah Chafee, Francis Biddle, William O. Douglas, John Raeburn Green, and others--who have kept the faith. But the official journal of the American Bar Association a year ago published as its leading article a total rejection of the premise underlying Jefferson's First Inaugural and denied that the constitutional guarantees extended to "the idea we hate," despite the great dissent by Justice Holmes.

In shining contrast to this we have the American Library Association with its publicly proclaimed Bill of Rights, and we have as well those who have shown the measure of their devotion to the ideal of their profession by sacrificing careers and means of livelihood rather than submit to the indignities and compromises forced upon them by a cruel and outrageous authoritarianism. These form the Hampdens and Sidneys, the band of brothers, that Quincy foresaw; they are the men and women who Jefferson knew would rush to the defense of the law as their own personal concern; they have "memories and feelings, courage and swords."

In the long view of history, the authoritarian of every species--religious, moral, political, or other--has always been defeated. The burners of books in Sapulpa, the deniers of a citizen's right of free inquiry in Peoria, have all the centuries of recorded history to show that they are on the losing side. The seed of their defeat is in their own lack of faith in the ability of the people to choose wisely. They may support such tyrannies of law as the McCarran Act--Sidney, and Jefferson as well, believed that an unjust law could not be legal--and they may label books in an effort to dissuade readers. But they are the true subversives. They are the real Un-Americans. They are the underminers of the nation's foundations. Had they adopted the McCarran Act, or suppressed the right of free inquiry at the beginning of American history, this nation could never have become "the world's best hope" or indeed any hope at all except for the faithless, the cynical, the cowardly, and the avaricious.

A letter appeared some days ago in the New York Times defending the censorship of textbooks. I abhor the conclusion reached, but I must agree with the definition of the issue: "This," declared the signers in

behalf of certain patriotic and educational organizations, ". . . is actually a battle of ideas involving the economic, social, and political philosophies, and therefore the life, of our Republic." I think this is true. Let us not adopt the methods of those whom we oppose by impugning their motives. We need not assume they are less loyal to the ideals of America than we. We need not conclude that because they would censor or ban or label books they are less devoted to the library's ideal than librarians are.

But this does not mean that we need refrain from naming the enemy or exposing the ignorant or defending the principle of free inquiry. We have had recourse lately to the great writings on freedom of dissent and the literature of nonconformity. Not since the American revolution have the principles of government been so widely discussed or so ably explored. Howard Mumford Jones's Primer of Intellectual Freedom is without question one book that should be in every American library. Civil Liberties Under Attack, by Commager, Gellhorn, Bok, Chafee, and others is another. Mr. Barth's The Loyalty of Free Men is still another. These should be the readily available arsenal of every librarian in every village and community in America. They present the truly crucial issue of our day, and the classic arguments in defense of the free mind and its essential relationship to our national survival.

But it is not enough merely to do this, or even to support the A.L.A. Committee on Intellectual Freedom which, in today's context, is our most important committee. Librarians have obligations to the present, but they are also custodians of a great past. They lie under a duty of honor to transmit to the future an unimpaired tradition of freedom of access to books. Every town and village librarian, resisting the community pressures that would subvert the ideal of the profession, is fighting our fight. Her defeat is our defeat, her victory ours. Her acquiescence diminishes our dignity as a profession, her denigration of the ideal our shame. This calls for resort to that old and truly indigenous American custom of organizing for mutual assistance. We have always used this device and by it we have achieved some of our greatest progress, even, at times, contrary to law.

This time-honored American right to associate freely is now itself being challenged legally in concepts unknown to American law until the last decade. But we must recognize that in unity there is strength. We need Committees of Safety perhaps even more than they were needed at the time of the American Revolution, for our liberties are in greater danger. There must be dedication and finally what Robert Oppenheimer has called the ultimate and the simple answer to fear--courage. We may not, like Sidney, be asked to give up our lives--or possibly in some not distant time we may--but we certainly are called upon to pledge our fortunes and our sacred honor. For Jefferson also had this word of encouragement and this word of warning to say to us on the great issue: "While the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind then and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement."

This is too great a promise, too rewarding a heritage, to be denied. No matter what the cost to us as individuals, we should gladly pay it for such an object. The bitterness of the struggle and the extent of the cost will be gauged from the fact that our great and incomparable heritage of free inquiry and of discussion and debate is most in danger from the friends within, not from the enemies without.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FREE COMMUNICATION TODAY

Alan Barth

I cannot help feeling that the company of librarians provides a somewhat rarefied atmosphere for a mere working newspaperman. But this is due, no doubt, to the fact that I have been guilty--as so many of us are these days--of thinking in stereotypes. I have been guilty, I suppose, of thinking of libraries as cloisters and of librarians as sheltered acolytes. A mere glance at the working paper prepared for this conference--or at the report of your Committee on Intellectual Freedom--is quite enough to dispel this misapprehension. It is plain that libraries and librarians are being granted no reprieve from the war that is now being waged against the freedom of the human mind. Indeed, it appears that they are under violent and dangerous attack.

This conference itself is evidence of the American Library Association's response to the challenge--evidence of the alertness of American librarians to the issues and the values that are involved. The contemporary assault upon libraries, like the contemporary assault upon universities, upon the press, upon free discussion, upon intellectual liberty in general, is an expression of the age-old assault of ignorance upon learning. It is, as Zechariah Chafee once called it, "a barbarian invasion."

I should have liked to begin a talk to so literate and intellectual a body as the American Library Association with an aphorism or a classical allusion. But the best that I can offer, I am afraid, is the solemn enunciation of a paradox which is also something of a platitude. We are living in a period in which the technical facilities for human communication are at an

---

Alan Barth is an editorial writer for the Washington Post and the author of The Loyalty of Free Men.

unprecedented peak of perfection; this is to say that you can now disseminate ideas farther and faster than ever before in the world's history. But we are also living in a period when the psychological barriers to communication are more numerous, more prevalent and more stubborn than they have ever been in the past; this is to say, in other words, that people are talking more and more in stereotypes and listening, if at all, only to what they want to hear.

I am thinking of the barriers to communication which arise out of international tension and distrust, and which, in turn, aggravate the tension and distrust which are their sources, thus feeding, as it were, upon themselves. And I am thinking even more particularly of the barriers to communication which are imposed in the name of patriotism and national security--and which operate to thwart the real national interest and to stifle the real sources of national strength.

So far as the international sphere is concerned, I fear that we have come very close indeed to a complete breakdown of communication with the whole of the Soviet world. It is an ominous breakdown, whatever its causes and wherever the blame for it may lie. For without communication, understanding is impossible. And, of course, as understanding diminishes, so do the chances of preserving peace. We have come, unhappily, to a stage at which virtually all communication with the Soviet Union is carried on at a formal diplomatic level. And, still more unhappily, the language of diplomacy appears to have been debased, for the most part, to the language of fishwives.

From the very beginning of the Russian revolution, the Communist dictators sought to insulate their people from all contact with the outside world. Travel by foreigners within the Soviet Union was severely restricted, when it was tolerated at all. Travel by Russians outside the Soviet Union was limited to a few trusted officials.

Here in the United States, we used to be extremely derisive about these Soviet idiosyncrasies. We poked a good deal of fun at the Iron Curtain that cut the USSR off from the free world. But that was before we saw the virtue of Soviet institutions and began to pay them the flattery of imitation. Now we inflexibly exclude from the United States, even as visitors, all aliens guilty of harboring subversive thoughts. And we forbid all but the politically pure and orthodox among our own citizens to leave these shores. We have developed a McCarran Curtain as impenetrable to communication in its way as the Iron Curtain itself.

The restraints which we have imposed upon the travel of American citizens are especially deserving of notice. For they are imposed with all the arbitrariness and authoritarianism of the police state. Passports, which have become an indispensable exit permit for any kind of travel overseas, are granted or denied at the absolute discretion of the Department of State. An applicant may be denied a passport without being given any statement of the reasons for the denial, without being accorded any kind of hearing and without having any recourse to a judicial review of the administrative decision. This is strange discipline, is it not, for citizens who like to boast that they live under a government of laws?

Just how arbitrary and capricious this official disregard for individual rights can become, on the pretext of protecting national interests, was interestingly demonstrated not long ago in the case of Owen Lattimore. Because a silly allegation concerning Mr. Lattimore was whispered to authorities by a professional informer, the whole of the country's customs apparatus was alerted to keep him from making a trip for which he had no passport and which he had never at any time contemplated. And, of course, a terrible and wanton injury was done to his reputation. The fraud and the hoax in this particular case have now, fortunately, been exposed. They never could have been perpetrated had the Department of State adhered even to the rudiments of due process of law in dealing with the rights of an American citizen. Lynch law is bad business not only because it flouts the community's established institutions; it is bad business also because it is all too likely to pick the wrong victim.

This short-cutting of the procedures which civilized men have evolved for the administration of justice is equally evident in purely domestic affairs--and sometimes produces equally disastrous results. You can observe it, for example, in the operation of the federal government's employee loyalty program which places reliance on the hearsay testimony (if it can be called that) of anonymous informants, denies an accused person any clear statement of the charges against him, deprives him of the right to confront and cross-examine his accusers, subjects him to multiple jeopardy and, by completely perverting the doctrine of reasonable doubt, places upon him the impossible burden of proving his innocence. Here is a system that ignores everything that men have ever learned about the safeguards necessary to disclose error and discover truth.

The effect of the government's loyalty program is to put a premium upon orthodoxy, and thus to create a barrier to the communication of all but orthodox ideas. Much the same thing may be said about the proliferation of test oaths of the very sort which our forefathers considered an abomination; about the attempts of vigilante groups to label library books, or to dictate the selection of them, or to censor the content of textbooks, or to criticize all current writing, not on its merits but exclusively in terms of the presumed political beliefs and associations of the writer. These are psychological impediments to communication because their whole purpose and effect is to penalize and prevent nonconformity. They constitute a kind of intellectual contraception.

Now all of these restraints on communication--all of these infringements of traditional individual rights--are justified by those who support them, no doubt quite sincerely, in the name of patriotism and national security. They are rooted, it seems to me, in two tragic fallacies, the most mischievous misconceptions of our time. One of these fallacies is the notion that there is some fundamental incompatibility between national security and individual rights. And the other is the belief that national unity is a product of uniformity.

As to the first, I think that the reverse is the truth. National security and individual rights, so far from being in conflict with each other, are, in point of fact, mutually indispensable. We do not achieve the one by sacrificing the other. We are not required to make a choice between them like the conventional choice between guns and butter. On the contrary, the civil liberties which distinguish free societies from the police states are affirmative sources of strength. They are an asset, not a liability, in the war against totalitarianism. And they are needed most--and most urgently--precisely in times of stress like the present.

The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States were not sentimentalists. They sought to create an enduring government and they insisted upon the adoption of a bill of rights for sound utilitarian reasons. They understood that free communication is a means toward the end of a strong and stable society. One of the essential aims of the First Amendment was to assure free communication. This was because its authors recognized that discussion is the best antidote to error, that criticism is a source of efficiency--in short, that the democratic process can operate only when the orderly exchange of ideas is uninhibited. Freedom of communication provides the self-regulating mechanism of democracy the lack of which is the fatal defect of dictatorships.

For my own part, I think it no overstatement to say that free communication affords the margin of superior fitness on which the democracies must depend for survival in their struggle against the totalitarians.

Now let me deal briefly with what I have suggested as the second major fallacy of our time, the idea that national unity grows out of uniformity. It does not. Paradoxically, it grows out of diversity--out of the resolution of conflict through free discussion. The men who wrote the Constitution understood that tolerance of diversity is the only way to gain real and enduring national unity. And they did what they could, therefore, to prevent the silencing of unpopular opinions by the easy device of labeling them treasonable or disloyal.

It may fairly be said--although the analogy should not be pressed too far--that a nation is in some respects like a family. It is held together by bonds of mutual trust and by a broad tolerance of diversity among its members. But these bonds are being dangerously unraveled in the United States today--by suspicion, by imputing disloyal motives to disagreement, in short, by a corruption of communication. Nothing could by more destructive of national unity. Doubt seems to have become the dominant characteristic of our time--doubt of our own institutions, doubt of the processes by which we have lived and grown to greatness as a nation, and doubt, finally, of each other.

The essential point of what I am trying to tell you was expressed--and better by a good deal than I know how to express it--by one of the great Americans of our time, Judge Learned Hand. Speaking extemporaneously at the American Law Institute a year ago, he said:

> My friends, our future is precarious . . . I like to hope--although I agree that we can have no certainty, still I like to hope--that we have a good chance, a splendid fighting chance and much assurance of victory; but on one condition: that we do not go to pieces internally. It is there, I think, that you and I may be able to help.
>
> Because, my friends, will you not agree that any society which begins to be doubtful of itself; in which one man looks at another and says, "He may be a traitor"; in which that spirit has disappeared which says, "I will not accept that, I will not believe that, I will demand proof . . . I will not say of my brother that he may be a traitor, but I will say, 'Produce what you have,' I will judge it fairly, and if he is, he shall pay the penalty, but I will not take it on rumor, I will not take it on hearsay . . . I will remember that what has brought us up from savagery is a loyalty to truth, and truth cannot emerge unless it is subjected to the utmost scrutiny";--will you not agree that a society which has lost sight of that cannot survive?

THE LIBRARY'S RESPONSIBILITY IN FREE COMMUNICATION

E. W. McDiarmid

I assume that my assignment is broad enough to include the library's objectives for service to its clientele as well as the library's responsibilities in the area of intellectual freedom. May I, then, use the first topic as a kind of introduction to the second.

I believe we would all agree that the library is an agency established by society to serve society's purposes. And hence our first step should be to try to discover what society expects of its libraries. What can we discover about intellectual freedom and responsibility from the library's history and background?

Library laws are not of much help. First, they speak almost universally of "free" libraries. But this clearly means available for use without charge or other restrictions. Second, they sometimes speak of "the greatest benefit to the greatest number." Third, they use the term "education" frequently in connection with all types of libraries. I do not need to emphasize that these points are not of much help in clarifying the library's responsibility in respect to free communication.

What can we learn from library history? Again, not much that will be of specific use to us. Mr. Jesse

---

E. W. McDiarmid was university librarian and director of the Division of Library Instruction at the University of Minnesota 1943-51; since then has been Dean of the College of Science, Literature and Arts at that University. He served as President of the American Library Association, 1948-49; was managing editor of College and Research Libraries, 1941-43; is the author of The Library Survey and, with John McDiarmid, of The Administration of the American Public Library.

Shera's study of the origins of the public library movement lists six causal factors:

1. Economic ability
2. Scholarship, historical research, and the urge for conservation
3. Local pride
4. Awareness of the need for universal educational opportunity
5. Growing demand for vocational training
6. The desire to save youth from the evils of an ill-spent leisure

These objectives seemed to loom pretty large in the minds of those responsible for the origin and development of the American public library, particularly in the middle of the nineteenth century. But they tell us very little about what the library's definition of intellectual freedom should be. Nor do they delimit clearly the library's responsibilities.

What about libraries today? As phrased in summary form by Robert D. Leigh, director of the Public Library Inquiry, the objectives of public libraries are:

1. To assemble, preserve and administer books and related educational materials in organized collections in order to promote, through guidance and stimulation, an enlightened citizenship and enriched personal lives
2. To serve the community as a general center of reliable information
3. To provide opportunity and encouragement for children, young people, men, and women to educate themselves continuously

Now all these statements define the broad goals of the public library, and in a general way they delimit its responsibilities. They clearly imply that the library has great responsibilities while at the same time exercising great freedom. That the two are inextricably interwoven is clear. Take, for instance, the phrase found so often in library laws, "greatest benefit for the largest number." Responsibility is clearly implied in the phrase "largest number." Freedom is equally clearly implied in the phrase "greatest benefit." Mr. Leigh's phrase, "to provide opportunity and encouragement," is meaningless unless the library has freedom. That it should help people continuously to educate themselves clearly indicates its responsibility as an agency of education. Yet none of these statements specifically define intellectual freedom and responsibility.

This leads me to my first point. Libraries should endeavor to make as clear as possible their definition of freedom and responsibility, and in arriving at such a definition they should realize they are society's agents and should take into account the heritage of American society as discussed by Dr. Boyd. I do not mean by this that libraries should conduct a plebiscite whenever any question of freedom or responsibility arises. If the library has any stature as an educational institution--and I believe it has great stature--it should be continuously in a position of leadership. And the profession has done well: the Library Bill of Rights, the Council statement on labeling, the statements of many library boards--all are evidences of responsible leadership on the part of librarianship. But there is more that needs to be done--witness this conference. Witness, too, the many instances of attempted violation of freedom. Until we have clear and accepted statements of policy and interpretation, instances of the same sort will continue. Such statements would not stop all attempts at violation, but I believe they would reduce them.

The second point I want to make is that there is no freedom without responsibility. The classic illustration concerns the subject of free speech. No one would claim that freedom of speech included the right of any person to stand up in a crowded theater and yell, "Fire!" Academic freedom does not give the professor the right to spread falsehood or misinformation in his classroom. The guarantees of freedom are not designed to aid the irresponsible. They are designed to protect the responsible person, even if he may be misguided or misinformed.

Freedom for libraries must, I think, be viewed in this same context. Freedom is not license without limitation. Libraries must have freedom because they have responsibilities that they must discharge to society. As long as they are, to the best of their ability, carrying out these responsibilities carefully, honestly and sincerely, they must have intellectual freedom.

What, then, are some of the library's responsibilities that are closely interwoven with intellectual freedom? What are its responsibilities to the community that has established it as an agency forever free for continuing education and information?

(1) In my opinion, the first responsibility of the library is to provide qualified personnel to carry out its objectives. If the library is going to perform its functions adequately--if in the performance of these functions it is to enjoy freedom--it must be staffed with competent people who not only understand those functions but carry on in the long tradition of freedom and responsibility which is so basic a part of American life. Unfortunately this is not so today. Miss Alice Bryan's study of The Public Librarian shows that there is much to be desired. For instance:

1. Only 58 per cent of professional librarians studied had graduated from an undergraduate college.
2. Only 40 per cent of professional librarians had completed a fifth college year of professional education.
3. The range of salary from the beginning to the end of the average professional library career was from less than $ 2000 to less than $ 4000.

These are only sample bits of evidence that could be multiplied many times over, but I am sure such documentation is not necessary for those who know and understand libraries. Conditions have been improving, as Miss Bryan points out, yet librarians today lack in far too many instances either the educational qualifications or the economic status that is necessary in a profession with as great educational responsibilities as librarianship. This means that intellectual freedom and responsibility are not always placed in the best hands. And, as you all know, library laws and library organizations place great responsibilities in the hands of librarians--they appoint staff, they define conditions of use, they select materials, and they spend the community's library funds. Clearly the library's responsibility to the community as well as the community's responsibility for good library services require competent, educated and properly paid library staff members.

While we are discussing library personnel we should not forget the library trustee, who in an overwhelming majority of public libraries occupies a very important position. Except in the smaller libraries, trustees are not intimately concerned with the day-to-day operation of the library but they are of crucial importance in defining goals, in obtaining and allocating funds and in determining, in broad outline at least, how those funds shall be spent. I think it is self-evident that with the authority and responsibility given in library law to library trustees, they are key people in defining the library's freedom and responsibility.

The second responsibility of the library is to promote the diffusion of understanding about the American heritage. The American Library Association's committee on the 75th anniversary celebration has done much in diffusing information about America's heritage, but this is a continuing responsibility that I believe libraries must keep constantly at the center of their objectives. Historically this was a prominent objective in the minds of those who established early American libraries. In those days, of course, it was made more necessary by virtue of the great waves of immigration that swept into this country in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Then the needs were for basic education in citizenship, acquiring the ability to read and write, knowledge of American government, some minimal grasp of American history--and the library made its significant contribution toward these objectives, which added up to "Americanization." (2)

Today, as Gerald Johnson points out in his book, This American People, America's form of democracy is a dangerous one. To enjoy the freedoms of democracy and exercise its responsibilities, Americans must be an alert and informed people--a condition of somewhat more crucial importance today than it ever was in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries. And in view of this fact libraries must dedicate themselves wholeheartedly to the diffusion of information and understanding about the American way of life. This must be a positive and active function, not a passive one.

The library's third responsibility is as a source of reliable information. Libraries I know would in nine cases out of ten endorse this principle heartily. And yet as I look at public libraries today I am convinced (3) that this principle is honored in theory but not in practice. I mean by this that libraries do not set as high standards for the selection of their materials as I believe they should. I suppose the most obvious area of dispute here concerns the quality of fiction which the library supplies. One extreme view says, in effect: buy the fiction people want regardless of its quality. The other extreme says: buy no fiction that does not meet high standards of literary or artistic quality. But it is in the area of nonfiction that definition of standards is most difficult. How can one be sure that a given book or pamphlet is reliable? I suppose that fundamentally we cannot solve this question until we have library personnel adequately prepared for the assumption of such grave responsibilities. But we cannot hide behind this limitation; we must, I believe, accept the library's responsibility and carry it out honestly, sincerely and forcefully.

How can we do so? How can we see that the library stands firmly as a source for reliable information? Let me suggest several criteria, and let me add parenthetically that they are nothing more than good principles of book selection which every good library school has taught for years:

1. Is the author honest and sincere in his presentation?
2. Is the book accurate and truthful in its facts?
3. Is the book a straightforward attempt to discuss a subject? Phrased negatively, does the book, while ostensibly attempting an honest presentation, actually border on dishonesty in its approach?
4. If a book purports to meet high standards of intellectual quality, does it actually do so?
5. If a book does not purport to examine its topic objectively, does it present the topic honestly?

If the answer to any of these questions is "no" I question whether the book has any place in the public library.[1] Intellectual freedom is not a justification for intellectual incompetence or dishonesty.

---

[1] I am, of course, using "public library" in the sense of "popular library." The collection of all types of material for research is an entirely different problem.

(4)

The fourth responsibility that libraries must face is the responsibility for the continuing education of children, young people and adults. This aspect of librarianship has been debated extensively and I have nothing very new to add to the discussion. But when we are talking about freedom and responsibility I think we need to keep in mind the library's educational objectives. For without this sort of purpose behind librarianship there would be no need for intellectual freedom and the library would have few intellectual responsibilities. Hence I hope I may be pardoned for re-emphasizing three points.

First, I believe libraries need to keep their educational objectives clearly to the forefront. Too often we tend to leave complete concern with education to schools and colleges, the library serving as a sort of supplementary source of material for those engaged in some organized form of education. This should not be so; the library must realize that its obligation for education demands an active, not a passive role.

Second, if libraries are to perform adequately this function of education they must be free--that is, they must have freedom to select the materials their clients need. Education as the library faces it is, even more than in schools and colleges, an individual matter. Each person using the library has his or her own educational problem and the library cannot in any way hope to meet these problems adequately unless it is free.

Third, if libraries are to accept their responsibility for education they must accept the responsibility for defining and delimiting the education they will provide. I know of no educational agency which offers to a person any kind of education he wants, though some perhaps come pretty close. Colleges, schools, institutes set up the areas in which they believe education to be important and invite people interested to use their facilities. So it must be with libraries--they must be willing to stand behind the materials they provide and offer only those resources that they believe to be educationally significant.

When we are considering the library's educational responsibilities we come to the most difficult aspect of freedom of communication. While few people would seriously quarrel with the proposition that the library must not make available false information, what about ideas that some people believe to be not only false but dangerous? Obviously no one can be certain that a new idea, or one diametrically opposed to principles commonly accepted, is dangerous or harmful. Nevertheless many people sincerely believe this--sometimes so deeply that they are unwilling for the idea to have any currency. Or take another kind of literature--that which advocates an idea most people would agree deserves a hearing but does it in such a partisan, irresponsible, even unethical way that it violates all standards of common decency. Should libraries have such literature?

The way in which one would answer such questions depends directly, I believe, upon one's faith in democracy and one's respect for the intellectual ability of people. Those who would limit the free interchange of ideas have little confidence in man's ability to distinguish between right and wrong, true and false, sound and unsound. Those who would place no limits or restrictions believe that man is a rational being and despite digressions and detours from the route to the good society eventually will find his way. Indeed, many ideas that an overwhelming majority of people felt to be false have turned out to be true. Hence, if we limit the free communication of some ideas we now believe to be wrong, we may in the long run be doing society great harm.

My own belief is that the library must have complete freedom in assembling and making available material on any and all ideas. As an educational agency it must, for the ultimate education of society, place in people's hands the partisan, the emotional, even the inflammatory. It should not be circumscribed by any limitations from without, though it should be guided by its own standards from within. To go back to the point made before, it must have freedom, but at the same time accept and discharge its responsibilities.

Now let me review the responsibilities of the public library. You remember I began by repeating the oft-quoted maxim that freedom and responsibility are closely intertwined. To be entitled to freedom the library must accept and fulfill these four responsibilities:

1. The responsibility for providing qualified personnel

2. The responsibility for promoting the diffusion of understanding about the American heritage
3. The responsibility for being a source of reliable information
4. The responsibility for the continuing education of children, young people and adults

Freedom of communication is a precious right; it is one that we must protect with all the wisdom and energy we can muster. We must see that falsehood, dishonesty, intellectual incompetence are not justified under the guise of freedom. We must see that libraries fulfill their responsibilities as well as exercise their freedoms. But most of all we must see that freedom of communication for libraries is adequately safeguarded so that libraries can take their proper place as educational agencies.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

First Session

In the short period of discussion from the floor following this session of the conference four points were brought out, two of them very briefly, two at greater length.

One participant mentioned the fact that in the public libraries built and financed by Andrew Carnegie over the United States a frequent feature was an auditorium; and from this fact one could logically infer that library buildings had been designed for the free discussion of ideas as well as to store reading materials.

Another discussant raised a question about the reliable information which Mr. McDiarmid had said it was the responsibility of the library to provide. Why, he asked, should the term "reliable" be inserted? Many a library could be criticized for not providing any information at all. Should not the library have on hand some of the publications of the Soviet government, and, say, some of the words of Stalin--and would a librarian want to be put in the position of contending that these materials were reliable? Mr. McDiarmid agreed with this point, and said that in his talk he had only been emphasizing the responsibility of the library to make available the more serious materials of all types which the research person and the student could use.

A third person made the point that in the recent history of the public library and in the findings of the Public Library Inquiry there was strong evidence to show that, in the past, exclusion of books or censorship had come more from within the library than from without. He contended that there had been, and perhaps there still was, a marked tendency among librarians to exclude or "unselect" certain books because the librarians didn't like certain ideas. He concluded that librarians should examine the censorship that lies within themselves as well as that which lies without,[1] and at

---

[1] The internal danger of avoiding the selection of certain books because they "may arouse controversy" was cited also during the discussion in the third session.

this point the transcript of the discussion recorded applause from the audience.

A fourth discussant raised the problem posed by the Smith Act, which, she contended, was "the most dangerous attack on the library profession." The Smith Act, she said, contained a clause which could be used against librarians; to be specific, it contained words proscribing the printing, publishing, circulating or display of printed material dealing with or advocating acts of violence. Since Mr. Boyd had been named as a person who had suggested the repeal of the Smith Act, he then commented as follows:

> I do not agree that the Smith Act is the most dangerous thing facing libraries. I do not think it will ever be employed to attack libraries in any way whatever. The Smith Act does promote a form of legislation, and the Communist Party in the United States has made every effort possible to enlist the opposition of librarians to it because the Communists themselves have become involved in it.
>
> It does, of course, potentially make each of us as librarians liable to criminal indictment if we knowingly distribute literature with the intent of overthrowing the government by violence. It will never be applied to curtail interlibrary loans, it will never be used to stop access to Marxian literature or any other form of literature in the United States. If the Communist Party thinks so, it doesn't know the United States or its people.
>
> We also have still on the books in Tennessee the statute that forbids our teaching the theory of evolution. Who pays any attention to it? The Smith Act may stay on the books but it will never curtail the right of libraries to use and freely disseminate books. To think otherwise implies strong disbelief in the sense of humor and the tolerance of the American people.[2]

---

[2] Mr. Boyd's opinion of the American people and the Smith Act was challenged at the following session by a member of the audience who contended that librarians were limited in their book selection when a publisher (Mr. Alexander Trachtenberg

---

of International Publishers) was put on trial under this act. It was pointed out that Mr. Trachtenberg was on trial not as a publisher but as an alleged member of the bureaucracy of the Communist Party of America working to overthrow the United States government by force and violence. On further dispute, a law librarian present contended that the significant words in the Smith Act were "with intent" in "whoever with intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any such government [meaning the United States government] prints, publishes or publicly displays any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the desirability or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government of the United States by force or violence by attempts to do so, is guilty of violating the law." In his opinion, the law would not hurt librarians even though it does contain the word "circulates," for "whenever a librarian is accused of violating this law, there won't be any freedom left."

THE PRESENT PROBLEM IN BOOK SELECTION

MILTON E. LORD

Chairman

THE LARGE RESEARCH LIBRARY

Verner W. Clapp

The question of book selection in relation to intellectual freedom may seem at the moment to be academic as respects the large research libraries. The right of those engaged in research to have access to all materials needed for its prosecution has not yet been challenged, so far as I know. Even in Nazi Germany, during the burning of the books, I believe it is true that research libraries were permitted to continue in possession of the works of which the public generally was deprived. But, just as even research libraries have in times past felt the censor's ban, so it is by no means inconceivable that, in a century which has relearned and improved upon the medieval arts of obscurantism which it was supposed were forgotten, attempts to expunge ideas by expunging their vehicles in research libraries may recur. After all, if you are prepared to kill an idea by suppressing it, why leave it around where people engaged in research can see it?

Furthermore, few great research libraries are exclusively research libraries. If they are university libraries they partake also of the educational function; if not, then they tend to have some of the attributes of the public library. So they are frequently vulnerable to censorship in these relations, even when they are protected in their purely research character.

How do research libraries select their materials? Obviously, with an eye to the research which they are committed to support. In the case of the great general research libraries the selection policies are never susceptible of simple statement, and very carefully worded pronouncements are usually worked out, the intention of which is to assure the procurement of the important materials in each field of interest and the rejection of only the less or least important. (Indeed, the greatest research libraries hate to admit that they neglect to acquire even the least important materials; as the published selection policy of one great library once put it, "We must have everything."[1]) Of course, the question is begged in the word "important"--does the acquisition of the "important" materials assure the presentation "of all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national and local," to use the words of the Library Bill of Rights? I doubt if the selection policies of the great research libraries are explicit on this point (and perhaps they should be); but there is no doubt that, in general, research libraries consider controversial material on social and political questions as among the more important materials in these fields. Leon Carnovsky, in his 1939 discussion of book selection at the University of Chicago Library Institute, felt that a librarian would be justified in withholding Father Coughlin's Social Justice or Mrs. Dilling's Red Network from his public in the interest of truth.[2] No matter how such a policy might be viewed by a library having responsibilities for adult or academic education, no research library with responsibilities in the social sciences could ever embrace it. Such works would be among the important materials which it feels obligated to acquire.

Why? Because the research library has complete (and perhaps naive) faith that it serves the cause of truth best by amassing the evidences; and its scale of importance is a scale of importance as evidence. The authors of the materials which it collects are the witnesses and often also the advocates; the library's users are the arbiters and judges; its own role is neuter. Leon Carnovsky, in the essay to which I have just referred, says that he most certainly does not subscribe to Lionel R. McColvin's dictum that "the library should have no opinions, no motives, no religion, no politics, no morals,"[3] but this dictum nevertheless

---

Verner W. Clapp is Chief Assistant Librarian, Library of Congress.

---

[1] College and Research Libraries, v.6, p.20.

[2] The Practice of Book Selection (Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1949), p.28.

[3] Ibid., p.34, citing McColvin's Libraries and the Public (London, Allen & Unwin, 1937), p.29.

much more closely describes the research library's attitude than does Carnovsky's recommendation for specific advocacy of particular truths.

The research library, then, in developing its selection policies, attempts to exercise the point of view of the arbiter, and to acquire what will be important to him as evidence. Frequently enough the research library has no expressed demand from users to go upon, but must make its decisions based on analogy and its own judgment; and though the errors of research libraries have been many, and the instances in which they have neglected to acquire the important evidence have been numerous, yet there are probably as many other instances in which they collected and held the evidence without any other encouragement or signified demand than that which their own judgments provided. In the pursuit of this policy they must be protected.

Though there has been, so far as I am aware, no concerted attack on research libraries for making available materials containing unpalatable ideas, yet probably every research library can report isolated instances of attempted pressure. Those which have come to my attention over a period of years fall into two classes: instances in which the suppression of material was requested by an organized group because the material contained views inimical to the aims of that group; and instances in which labeling or suppression was requested on the grounds of a generally anti-social character, e.g., as anti-Semitic or subversive. But these attempts have all quickly collapsed when it was demonstrated that it is impossible to censor in the interest of one group or one set of ideas without logically incurring the self-defeating necessity of censoring in the interest of all groups and all sets of ideas.

This is the proper answer in cases such as these, where conflicting interests are at issue within the whole group served by the research library; and the research library has been protected from severe pressure to date not only because of its research character, and not only because the extensiveness of its acquisitions do not call attention to its processes of selection and rejection as forcibly as do the comparatively meager acquisitions of the small library, but also because it has so far only had to face attempted pressure from minor special interests. What happens when pressure

from a major group appears? In that case the answer which has proved adequate for minor groups may not be sufficient, and the research library will have to rely upon more general principles. These must be the same general principles as are held by libraries generally, but they will still be reinforced by the research character of the collections.

Fundamentally, the issue of book selection rests upon one's view of the relationship between the librarian and his community. He is the expert selected by the community to conduct its library affairs, and the relationship is similar to that--say--of the sanitary engineer who has been appointed to supervise the community's water supply and sewage disposal. In the one case as in the other, the ordinary course of events will permit the expert to discharge the functions of his office without interference. But there may come a day when the water-supply man is a convinced fluoridationist while his community is emotionally and intransigently anti-fluoridationist. What then? The engineer can give his community fluorine, and get the sack; or he can resign; or he can compromise his professional principles for the time being, hoping to gain his point later as the result of education and the change of opinion; or he can merely give in for the sake of his job to what he considers an irrational display, on the grounds that, after all, it's their water and they can have it the way they want it. I am not sure that among these choices there is one which is obviously better than all the others, though there is certainly one which is obviously worse. In selecting from the others the engineer would have to consider what might be the best method, from the point of view of courage, of public relations and public education, of achieving the victory for his professional principle.

But suppose that the issue were at a higher level than the example I have given; suppose that what the community wanted for its water supply was something that the engineer held to be a matter affecting life or death. Then, it seems to me, he has no choice to palliate or compromise; he must abide by his principles or resign.

Return now to the librarian. Where may he compromise in matters of book selection, bowing to the demand of his community in the hope that a temporary irrationalism may be corrected, and where does book selection become a matter of vital principle? There is one criterion which is of some value for distinguishing between these two levels. When a group demand is positive, and is expressed in terms of its own need or interest, it is likely to fall into the first category; but when it is negative and is expressed in terms of withholding materials from other people on grounds beyond those generally recognized in book selection, such as obscenity, scurrility, etc., then it is very likely to fall into the second. It then becomes for the librarian a matter of life or death.

I referred, at the beginning of this paper, to the fact that in Nazi Germany, though book-purgings took certain literature from the hands of the public, the research libraries were allowed to retain the tainted volumes. No doubt many an anti-Nazi librarian and professor was consoled thereby. But this is the very symptom of which research libraries must beware. The moment they permit themselves to accept the doctrine that they are somehow exceptional, that their users constitute in some sense an elite, that while the general public cannot (for its own good) be freely trusted with ideas, yet a portion of the public which is somehow determined to be reliable may have access to the vehicles of dangerous ideas--that moment the nose of the camel will be under the tent, the same camel which, in a so-called "people's democracy," permits only card-bearing party members to have access to its national library, where, apparently, not even all of them have access to all of the books. The stake of the great research library in freedom of access is, therefore, identical with that of the smallest library in the country.

The research library, perhaps even more than others, has facilities for corrupting the flow of information. Its book selection is divided among experts, any one of whom may unnotedly be slanting his selection (and such situations have been suspected). Other opportunities for emphasis or obscuration occur after acquisition--in extent of cataloging or analysis, in annotation, inclusion or exclusion in bibliographies and special lists, accessibility in special collections, and so on. To be forewarned against the possibilities of misuse is to be forearmed; but there seem to be no real threats of misuse at the moment, while the threat of wholesale labeling appears to have expended itself.

In short, the very existence and the procedures of the great research libraries are based upon the premise of the right of free inquiry by the individual citizen; and neither the premise nor the institutions which are based upon it can be attacked without endangering the other.

THE LARGE PUBLIC LIBRARY

Ralph Munn

"There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view . . ." so says the Library Bill of Rights. We would have little interest today in discussing this trite statement, reflecting as it does nothing more than long established library policy and practice, if it were not for the Russian imperialist brand of communism as exemplified in the cold war. It is the threat of this force which gives importance to the bill, and urgency to our discussions.

Let us then discover the types of materials relating to Russia and communism which are involved:

1. There are the official expositions of communism as expressed by Marx and Engels, and developed by Lenin, Stalin and others. These are historic documents relating to the founding and development of ideas which are shaking the world. Unquestionably, they are proper source material for the public library.
2. Biographies of the founders and developers of communism should be collected just as they are in the fields of religion, education, science or any other world force.
3. Histories of Russia, including the Soviet era, and those written by Russians or written from their point of view, should be provided.
4. Factual explanations of the Soviet system of government by recognized writers of any country, including Russia, are clearly a proper library resource.
5. Such official Russian documents as are available, and unofficial yearbooks and statistical manuals are necessary reference sources.
6. Popular books covering the current scene present more problems, but the ordinary standards concerning the authority and objectivity of the author are the main guides in selection. Even the best of these books will bring some complaints from those people who object to the acknowledgement of any Soviet accomplishment; to write that the Soviets have made any advances in education, science or industry is treasonable to them. We must, of course, take a firm stand against these objectors.

Included in the current books are some items of disguised Russian propaganda. As citizens and librarians we should recognize that propaganda has become a vital weapon of warfare. Its purposes are to instill doubts, cause dissension and strife within a nation, and finally to undermine purpose and morale to such a degree that defense is no longer possible. Surely this knowledge places certain positive obligations upon the librarian. Among these obligations is that of attempting to identify items of disguised propaganda and eliminating them from the library's general collection. Written by people who may not be known to be Communist sympathizers, cleverly presented to avoid open adherence to the Communist line by subtly supporting it, these books are, of course, deliberately deceptive.[1]

I am not one of those librarians who strain to explain any act of censorship as a routine aspect of book selection. To my mind, however, the rejection of disguised propaganda is fully covered by one of the traditional tenets of selection--that a book shall be honest, that it shall be what it purports to be. Except for the occasional literary hoax, we do not knowingly select books which were written for the express purpose of deceiving our readers. Call it book selection or censorship, as you will, I believe it to be our duty to try to discover--and I know that we cannot catch all of it--and to eliminate disguised propaganda from the general collection. Some libraries may wish to form a special collection of these propaganda items; study of the technique of propaganda is, of course, important in itself.

Ralph Munn has been Director of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and of the Library School of the Carnegie Institute of Technology since 1928. He served as President of the American Library Association, 1939-40.

[1] A review by Edgar Ansel Mowrer in the March 15, 1952, issue of The Saturday Review (v.35, no.11, p.18) tells how to write a pro-Communist book without seeming to do so.

7. Finally we come to open propaganda, such as The Daily Worker, Masses and Mainstream, New World Review, and the books by Agnes Smedley, Anna Louise Strong, and other avowed Communists. Here there is no attempt at deception. The publication does not pretend to be one thing when it is in fact quite another. Those who use open propaganda know, or should know, its source and nature. Most of its users do so for a specific and fully legitimate purpose. Many items of open propaganda should, I am sure, be collected and preserved.

With the decision to try to identify and eliminate disguised propaganda from the general collection, there remains the problem of determining the treatment of the other groups of materials. Where and under what conditions shall they be shelved?

Most laws contain at least one vital word which is subject to varying interpretations. If this were not so, our attorneys would starve to death. So it is with the Library Bill of Rights where we find the word "provision"--to repeat: "There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view. . . ." What does "provision" mean?

There are three generally accepted ways in which a public library can make provision of materials. First, materials can be placed on open shelves in the reading rooms, or, in some of the newer buildings, in adjacent open stacks. Second, materials can be placed in storage stacks which are not open to the public but from which materials are available simply by filing an unsigned call slip in a completely impersonal and routine way. Third, by consigning materials to a restricted section from which they can be secured only by personal application to a librarian. If the library elects to collect Communist propaganda as such, it should either be placed in a restricted section, or--and here comes the naughty word--it should be labeled as propaganda. All of the other categories of materials which I have listed should, I think, be readily available on open shelves or in the stacks.

There is room, I am sure, for honest differences of opinion among well-meaning persons concerning the open display of books which can be regarded as having subversive features. My own thinking is strongly influenced by the fact that when we display a book we are inviting its use by people who have never heard of it. In the case of New World Review, for example, we are actually becoming part of the Russian propaganda machine if we display it; we are in effect, becoming a recruiting agent for Russia and communism. If placed in the stacks, this same material is readily available to any person who knows of the publication, or who uses the subject catalog. This, to my mind, is making an adequate provision of materials under the Library Bill of Rights.

Branch libraries are seldom equipped with storage stacks, and the only choice may lie between the reading room shelves and a restricted section, often the librarian's office. Because of the limited physical facilities of branch buildings, it is a long standing practice to eliminate certain items from their collections. Treatises on sex, novels not suited for general circulation, and small and expensive technical handbooks are examples. I would frankly include some of these propaganda items as unsuited to the limited facilities of a branch. Most of these materials are, of course, available to the branch user through the regular delivery service from Central. Here, again, I believe this to be an adequate provision. Also, I am sure that it is possible to select materials for the open shelves which do cover all sides of current questions, including the Russian viewpoint, without hidden or objectionable propaganda.

There are, then, some decisions which the librarian will make, or recommend to his board, which are based upon his own convictions. There are other decisions which may properly be influenced by the temper of the place and times.

The term "administrative feasibility" recently came to my attention and I wish to adopt it. It implies a full understanding of both the institution being administered and all of the conditions under which it must operate. Knowledge and judgment are its components.

My text is, then, that you and I must interpret and execute the Library Bill of Rights--the word "provision" especially--with some regard for administrative feasibility. Interpretations will differ, depending upon the prevailing opinion of the locality. Whether a book, or a category of books, is placed on the open shelves or in the book stack will depend somewhat upon this prevailing opinion. One of the prime factors in administrative feasibility is the determination of what the prevailing opinion actually is, always remembering that an embattled American Legion post or a reactionary newspaper may not reflect the opinion of the community as a whole.

Administrative feasibility must also be held in check by certain principles with which we will never compromise without a last-ditch fight. May I illustrate this point? Last month the Pittsburgh library issued a book list for our local World Affairs Forum. The very first entry under the heading "The Nature of the Aggressor," was The Communist Manifesto, put there at my direction. The sponsoring committee, of which I was a member, was a liberal group, but they objected strenuously, fearing that we would unnecessarily bring suspicion upon the forum. I agreed to reprint, omitting The Manifesto. My point is this: if I had been told that the library should not have The Communist Manifesto in its general collection I would have been compelled to fight. There is, though, a vast difference between having a book and advertising to secure readers for it. It is in the area of that difference that administrative feasibility plays a legitimate role.

May I draw another inference from that incident? Every military commander seeks to choose the time and place at which he will battle. We should do likewise, seeking to take our stand on issues which lend themselves to our defense. In this instance I had to admit that The Manifesto was in no way essential to the list. My defensive position was therefore weak.

Interpreting and executing the Library Bill of Rights in the light of administrative feasibility will, I know, be frowned upon by some librarians as a cautious, compromising policy based upon expediency and perhaps cowardice. It is nothing of the sort! Too many of the recent discussions concerning the public library and subversive literature have proceeded as though the library were a completely free agent, one which has in some way achieved full independence from its environment and which owes no obligation to any governmental or public policy or to public opinion. A more realistic approach is to recognize the basic fact that practically all public libraries are either an integral part of local government, or a quasi-public institution which the lawyers call an instrumentality of government.

One of the fundamental principles of democracy is that no government, or any part or instrumentality of it, can long survive if it gets too far away from prevailing public opinion. That is a truism. Parliaments and congresses, prime ministers and presidents have had to learn that fact. Quite naturally, it applies with equal force to public libraries and librarians. Our Constitution itself has been variously interpreted by the Supreme Court as conditions and the resulting public opinion have shifted.

So it is with the Library Bill of Rights. It expresses fundamental beliefs to which we fully subscribe and for which we will fight. It is, for example, fundamental that we provide The Communist Manifesto. But whether or not it be advertised in booklists, whether it be kept on open shelves or in the stacks, are not fundamental issues. You and I are administrators of governmental instrumentalities which are properly sensitive to public opinion. We may well be guided by administrative feasibility in deciding secondary questions such as these.

THE SMALL PUBLIC LIBRARY

Jerome Cushman

The line of demarcation between acceptability and non-acceptability of books for library use is becoming less and less clear. It is not that the principles of book selection have materially changed but rather that the irrationalities of the present period of social, economic and political upheaval are forcing different emphases upon its application. The problem is pointed up by the confusions and alarms raised by those who would "stereotype belief into persecution." Another factor, also symptomatic of our times, is unvarnished fear, the type that results in silence when active commitment is required. Librarians and their boards of trustees have become extra-sensitive to pressures both in and outside the community regarding books which are considered dangerous for reader consumption by individuals or groups.

The small public library has a special vulnerability to these pressures. Because of the personal and individual aspects of its service, due in great measure to the size of the city,[1] and the fact that the librarian is often more closely identified with the everyday workings of his institution, the small library finds itself in a more exposed position than the larger and more impersonal unit. This does not mean that there is any essential difference between the two libraries. We have our adult education programs, radio time, record collections and film forums. However, we have not, at least in our case, had the inclination to be caught up in the current rage for mechanization, architectureitis, or the overwhelming drive for new and different programming. It is more apparent in a small institution that our primary emphasis is on books. And so, for us, books remain the focal point in interpreting the services of our library to the community.

The first problem of book selection rests in the capabilities of the librarian himself. He must be intellectually attuned to an understanding of the heritage that has produced the Library Bill of Rights. Then he is able to face the problems posed in book selection with a firm foundation based upon a knowledge of the forces that move men in time and history.

We hear a great deal about the problems of library administration and not enough about the human values that books emphasize. The up-and-coming young librarian now specializes in personnel work, public administration or statistics. It is the other generation who paid attention to history, literature, philosophy or even the classics. But there is a correlation between intellectual endeavor and democracy. C. E. Robinson, speaking of ancient Greece, said, "An interest in intellectual problems had been awakened under the stimulus which democracy gave to free speech and free thought." The good doctor Rabelais had some sound advice for the younger generation of librarians when he said, "Therefore is it, that you must open the book and seriously consider the matter treated in it."

Formulation of criteria for book selection presents few difficulties. They are well known and are echoed in textbooks and staff manuals and by convention speakers. But when a well meaning group seeks to formulate the library collection in its own image of truth it seldom does good to cite the factors that influenced the decision for the purchase of the item. These critics are not interested in the virtues or faults of the books, but rather in what they think reading them will do to the unwary innocents who have not been forewarned. A librarian can run into trouble when he makes reviews the final criteria of book selection. Upon which review or reviews shall he depend? Shall his judgment of the book be based upon the numerical majority of reviews in favor of it? And what about the relative merit of reviews and reviewers? Is it a matter of which side of the fence the librarian is on, the liberal or conservative?

---

[1] The population of Salina is 26,000.

Jerome Cushman is librarian of the Salina (Kansas) Public Library. He has served as President of the Kansas Library Association, 1951-52, President of the Mountain Plains Library Association 1952-53, is currently a member of the Adult Education Board of the American Library Association.

These questions, if asked by an irate group, lead the librarian down an embarrassing blind alley. It can make him realize, if nothing else, that there are no absolutes in this business of book selection. Relying on authority is always a dangerous game because there is always someone who claims his authority has true validity. Reviews may serve the librarian as guide-posts toward mature decisions in book selection, but cannot take the place of his basic responsibility to understand the function of communication and man in a free society.

It is not selection but rejection that is the hub of this problem. Robert Leigh found that most librarians were liberal in regard to their book selection practices. While his report was not made in today's atmosphere of hypertension there is an indication that courage is not an unknown attribute among many of our colleagues. The librarian must meet the problem of rejecting books and still apply the principle of fairness to differing viewpoints. Here is how our library resolves this perplexity. If a book is rejected because it does not in our opinion fill a library need, we can be persuaded by a patron to either borrow or purchase the volume. We are not amenable to group pressure for the inclusion of books on our shelves which we do not feel belong, but we will allow them to purchase items for us which promulgates their particular brand of truth. Here is one concrete example. The report of the Commission on Freedom of the Press under the chairmanship of Robert H. Hutchins was purchased for the library. We did not stock Freedom and the Press, by Frank Hughes. However, we received two calls for the book and consequently purchased it. Thus due to patron requests we receive books that in our opinion do not add to the quality of our book collection. On the other hand, we are kept from the danger of the false assumption that our selections are always right and that we know what is best for the people. In other words, just as we cannot be influenced to ban books from our shelves, we can be influenced to place books upon them.

Every book in our library belongs on its regular shelf along with like books, unless there is an occasion for a special display. There are no books, in our opinion, that merit the special attention of being placed in the librarian's office or anywhere else that keeps

them from being readily accessible to the public. We did have to replace a snappy volume on photographic modeling a couple of times, but we did not let this irresistible interest in things artistic upset our basic policy. Labeling books holds no charm for us and we very gently refused an offer to help us tag our volumes. Nor can we agree with a colleague who places in selected earthy novels the following notice, "This book is placed in the library because of public demand and does not reflect the buying policy."

Gifts present only a mild problem. We receive and place alphabetically all periodical gifts. They are not shunted to one side but are arranged with our regular subscriptions. They are not kept for more than a year or so except those few in which the librarian takes a morbid interest. The adrenal outpourings of some of our leading superpatriotic publications help mightily to stimulate what otherwise promises to be a dull day. No responsibility is felt for unsolicited gift books received through the mail. Those not considered worthy of our collection are returned with a note of polite refusal. Further communications from the giver are unanswered. Mention has been made that we allow special interest groups to present gifts of books to the library. However, if one organization becomes too frequent a giver it is suggested to its officers that they limit the number of their contributions in fairness to others. We have had to use this padded club only once.

Before book selection policies are formed there are community considerations which a small public library might analyze. First and foremost, there must be a thorough understanding with the Board of Trustees resulting in their positive commitment to the Library Bill of Rights. This obviates, in the case of our library, the necessity for any other written set of book selection principles. The prestige and force of the library profession is behind the Library Bill of Rights and it avoids the danger entailed in too much spelling-out. Secondly, there are men and women in every community from a newspaper editor to a doctor's wife who may be depended upon to resist threats to a free public library. The librarian would do well to know these people so that their power can be added to the "stubborn ounces of weight" exerted by the library in any question of freedom from censorship.

We must be alert to the forces that would destroy the library's function as a free institution. Still we must not overestimate our importance. Many of the foundation-shaking battles that we wage with the forces of reaction hardly make a ripple in the consciousness of the community. By keeping perspective and realizing that it takes all kinds of Americans to make America we stand a better chance of being regarded as a bulwark, meriting the confidence of all facets of opinion. The library must be, as Caesar's wife, blameless before all. In implementing its book selection policies it must, according to Dr. Leigh, identify itself as the one institution that is "technically best suited to be a chief citadel of free communication." If a segment of the community seeks to abrogate this point of view then the library must resist every pressure exerted upon it.

The librarian need not be afraid. He has on his side the impetus of a powerful tradition that has helped shape the modern world and is still a dynamic force in the realm of ideas. This tradition, stemming from the Judaic-Christian values, encompasses man's questioning spirit, and will permit him to solve his own destiny. We need not fear the "one idea'd fanatics who want to make their petty standards the measure of our freedom." Ours is an era in which change has the inexorability of the tides. Man is expressing himself, and no authoritarian pattern, no status-quoism will prevent him from assuming responsibility for his future. It is for us librarians, conscious of our regard for man the individual, to keep open the lanes of free communication so that we can say with Archibald MacLeish, "The true test of freedom is in its use."

THE PROBLEM--A BRITISH VIEW

Robert L. Collison

"I deny not but that it is of greatest concernment in the church and commonwealth, to have a vigilant eye how books demean themselves as well as men; and thereafter to confine, imprison, and do sharpest justice on them as malefactors; for books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul was whose progeny they are; nay, they do preserve as in a vial the purest efficacy and extraction of that living intellect that bred them. I know they are as lively, and as vigorously productive, as those fabulous dragon's teeth: and being sown up and down, may chance to spring up armed men. And yet, on the other hand, unless wariness by used, as good almost kill a man as kill a good book: who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the image of God, as it were, in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious lifeblood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."

These words were written by one of our greatest writers just over three hundred years ago but, apart from some slight differences in the language in which they are couched, they clearly express the sentiments of any public-spirited man in Britain today. They express our beliefs and apprehensions; they not only defend our faith, but they attack what Milton rightly called "the greatest discouragement and affront that can be offered to learning and to learned men." Throughout these past three centuries scholars and writers in adversity have drawn comfort and renewed strength from such noble words in the Areopagitica as these: "For if we be sure we are in the right, and do not hold

---

Robert L. Collison is Reference Librarian of the City of Westminster Library, London, and the author of Bibliographies--Subject and National.

the truth guiltily, which becomes not, if we ourselves condemn not our own weak and frivolous teaching, and the people for an untaught and irreligious gadding rout, what can be more fair, than when a man judicious, learned, and of a conscience, for aught we know, as good as theirs that taught us what we know, shall not privily from house to house, which is more dangerous, but openly by writing, publish to the world what his opinion is, what his reasons, and wherefore that which is now thought cannot be sound?"

The practice of librarianship in Britain and the United States is similar in its fundamentals: with you, we believe that all subjects and shades of opinion should be represented in our libraries as far as possible, so that each man may with Dionysius Alexandrinus accept the advice: "Read any books whatever come to thy hands, for thou art sufficient both to judge aright, and to examine each matter." With you, we believe too that books should be chosen purely on their merits, without reference to their political or religious bias. Though we are all aware of the many differing opinions in our country on all manner of subjects, we do not fear "lest these divisions and subdivisions will undo us." In this our enemies may see our weakness, but we feel that these differences stem from a firm root, and that the sap which invigorates them is that same which has built and maintained our country through so many centuries. Especially do we feel that in times of stress and danger these differences of point of view should be allowed every freedom, from which we believe will be derived "a gallant bravery and well-grounded contempt" for our foes. This we are convinced is a better policy than any kind of restraint, for if "we are so timorous of ourselves and so suspicious of all men as to fear each book and the shaking of every leaf" we may earn a "tyranny over learning" where no man may "care to learn, or care to be more than worldly wise; for certainly in higher matters to be ignorant and slothful, to be a common steadfast dunce, will be the only pleasant life, and only in request."

Our method of judging the merits of each book is to read and compare its reviews in reputable journals, to consider its author's general reputation as a man and as a writer--especially in respect to his previous writings in the same field--and to take into account the publisher's reputation both in that field and in general. These are, of course, standards which are hard to define and depend much on the individual librarian's training and experience, but we should resent any kind of authoritarian guidance in this matter, for "truth and understanding are not such wares as to be monopolized and traded in by tickets, and statutes, and standards."

I should say also that further factors which have much influence on our choice of books are the local demands and interests which vary considerably even between neighboring towns, and between universities of similar standing. Indeed, a recent and promising scheme for cooperative cataloging between two libraries in adjacent areas was abandoned owing to the discovery that the differences in book selection in the two institutions were wider than had been thought possible.

In general, our books are chosen by the members of our library staffs, for in most libraries it is the custom to allot the reading of book reviews in a certain number of journals to each senior member. But, in addition, all worth-while suggestions made by our readers are considered with great sympathy, and in most cases the books are bought for them. The cases in which their requests are not granted are usually due to the fact that the suggestions do not conform to the standards I have outlined, or that they are too expensive for the budget of that particular library, or that they are in a physical form unsuitable for library use. Even so, each reader has the opportunity of appealing to the library committee, if he is not satisfied with the decision. In such event, the library committee calls for a report from the librarian and carefully considers the whole matter. This applies also to complaints about books already in stock, where they are considered by the reader to be objectionable either as a whole or in part. But these objections are usually on moral grounds, and not from political or religious scruples.

Before the war, occasional objections were raised (1) by Fascists concerning the nonprovision of Fascist material--more especially their periodicals, and (2) by anti-Fascists concerning the provision of such items as the shortened and bowdlerised version of Mein Kampf. In each case the individual librarian and library committee carefully inquired into the matter and came to a reasoned decision. There was certainly no complete uniformity in their judgments, for Britain is a small country with amazing variations in conditions and interests throughout its area, but I am sure that in the great majority of instances the decisions were good and just, and that the public was satisfied that the matter had had a fair trial. As you know, British practice in many affairs of government is not codified, and the people prefer to trust in government by conscience, and precedent, and common sense. And, furthermore, the British dislike censorship in any form, for they believe that it is not "to the common people less than a reproach; for if we be so jealous over them, as that we dare not trust them with an English pamphlet, what do we but censure them for a giddy, vicious and ungrounded people?"

In some libraries, the books which have been selected are submitted either before or after purchase to the library committee, or to a subcommittee appointed for that purpose, but this is a practice which is rapidly dying out, for our committees rightly feel that if their librarian is fit to be in charge of their libraries, he should be fit to be responsible to them for book selection and to be answerable to them for being as efficient in this most vital part of his work as in all the other duties of his office.

There has always been some suggestion of keeping books which are objectionable in a special place where the public may obtain them only on request. This we believe to be a vile practice, for either a book is worth having or it is not suitable at all. There can be no satisfactory compromise, for we know that while "a wise man, like a good refiner, can gather gold out of the drossiest volume . . .a fool will be a fool with the best book" and that "there is no reason that we should deprive a wise man of any advantage to his mission, while we seek to restrain from a fool that which being restrained will be no hindrance to his folly." From experience we know that to hide a book is to reduce its use; if, therefore, we have carefully selected a book in the first place, and if our judgment is confirmed, after deliberation, by the library committee, we see no reason why we should deliberately reduce its value to the community by restricting its reading in any way.

As for gifts, we have long been aware that any book given to a library needs just as much money and time spent on it--for cataloging, preparation, circulation, maintenance and eventual withdrawal--as for any book which is bought. Our policy, therefore, is to submit all gifts to the same tests which we use for selecting books for purchase; and, where direct propaganda is concerned, we feel that it is freely available to individual members of the public, on their own application to the publishers. This latter consideration naturally has particular bearing on all forms of periodicals issued for propaganda purposes.

Nor do we believe that there should be different principles for different types of libraries, or for the libraries serving different sizes of community. It is true that the purse of the small library is very restricted, and that the wide range of material within the reach of the larger libraries is probably beyond the small library's means. But our purely voluntary and nation-wide system of library cooperation is now so strong and well-knit that the reader in the smallest village is certain of obtaining most of the books he wants, even when they are not in any library in his particular region. Our desire is to secure as speedily and smoothly as possible for any reader any informative book which he requires without questioning his reasons for wanting it, for otherwise "what advantage is it to be a man over it is to be a boy at school?" Moreover, "we should be wary . . . what persecution we raise against the living labors of public men, how we spill that seasoned life of man preserved and stored up in books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom."

To the best of my ability I have interpreted current British practice to you as I truly believe it to be. Nevertheless, these words are, of course, mine alone, and in what follows it must be understood that I am expressing my own personal opinion. In the event that any attacks on book selection such as have been experienced in the United States in recent years were to take place in Britain, I feel confident that the following action would be taken:

1. As soon as the Library Association decided that such attacks were likely to become general, it would issue a warning to all librarians and library committees, outlining the forms of the attacks to date,

what action had been taken, and suggesting suitable courses of action.

2. The Library Association would lend full support to the librarian and the library committee of any library under attack. In the event of the dismissal of a librarian it would give aid--including legal aid--carrying the case to the highest court of appeal: from the double motive of supporting the librarian, and of making a test case which might deter other authorities from unduly taking similar action.

3. The Library Association would put newspapers and suitable periodicals clearly in the picture, and would ask their support--which I think it would undoubtedly get.

4. The Library Association would ask Members of Parliament interested in the library movement to ask questions on the matter in Parliament and would also seek the aid of the ministries most concerned with libraries.

And with respect to the action concerning the press, I know that the British press--apart from its most extreme elements--is whole-heartedly in favor of freedom of speech and opinion, and is always on the watch for the slightest infringements. Our press is well aware that an attack on our libraries, our schools, our universities, our scholars or our research workers will sooner or later be an attack on the press and on the nation as a whole. Our press has a long and painful history of winning and maintaining its freedom against attacks, some open and some so insidious that only its most zealous defenders have been able to recognize them for what they were. We look on the press as our friend, and have always found it to be ready and anxious to give us fair and impartial treatment in our problems. We are partners but not partisans in the informing of the nation.

In Britain we have a great regard for our experts, and when they are attacked we are inclined to ask what are the qualifications of those who attack. Moreover, we are quick to question the motives which lie behind

these attacks and, though we sometimes find them good though blind, we more often discover them to be malicious and partisan. In recent years we have seen also many attacks on books in the Third Reich and the Soviet Republics: are those places "one scruple the better, the honester, the wiser, the chaster, since all the inquisitional rigor that hath been executed on books?"

Ours is a small country: what happens today in Edinburgh will be debated tomorrow in London. Watch and guidance is therefore easier in our country than in the subcontinent which is the United States. But I believe that the principles of both our countries are fundamentally the same. The words I opened with are three hundred years old. About a quarter of a century ago, a Royal Commission appointed to study our libraries, wrote: "The principle underlying the library service is that it exists for the training of the good citizen. It must aim at providing all that printed literature can provide to develop his intellectual, moral, and spiritual capabilities. If, therefore, it begins with, and always includes, a service of newspapers, it is enabling him to form an opinion on public affairs--good or bad, according to the quality of the papers that he reads, but at any rate better than none: and by the variety of papers that it provides, it gives him the chance of not being the slave of one. By the provision of periodicals, it provides him with harmless recreation and disseminates knowledge in popular forms, and if the proportion of indifferent fiction is high, and actually demoralizing food is sometimes offered to the intellectual palate, it is the function of education to lead people to discriminate between the better and the worse, and to arrive at a higher standard. We have all gone through the stage of enjoying what we subsequently regard as rubbish; and a nation has to go through these stages as well as an individual. The remedy for the danger of a little knowledge is more knowledge."

Finally, in some of the darkest days of the war years, when the fate of Britain seemed dim indeed, L. R. McColvin, the current President of the Library Association, and a librarian under whom I have the honor to work, wrote:

> Libraries should be "free in every sense"--not only universally available regardless of a man's

resources, but free also in the sense that they offer sanctuary to all facets of opinion and all aspects of knowledge. It is just because the library could be, and has indeed been, used as a powerful propaganda weapon that all who value librarianship insist it shall not be so used. . . . Speaking for ourselves we certainly want democracy; we may believe that it is the only sound basis for the conduct of human affairs. But we do not want our libraries to support democracy as a positive creed in opposition to any other creed and we want libraries to produce citizens who will be qualified to choose wisely and freely whatever form of government they think best. We may not have the slightest doubt what their choice will be. That cannot affect our attitude as librarians. Therefore may we not prefer, as the crystallization of our faith, the words: "We library workers exist in our jobs to create whole personalities; that is, personalities balanced in body, mind and spirit--live and conscious individuals. . . . Inspired by this purpose libraries will materially help to reveal to every person his responsibility for service to his fellow men, which alone can be the basis of a new community."

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Second Session

A member of the audience immediately challenged the "nonpolitical and nonmoral position that the American Library Association takes" toward the selection of books. She said that in her work with children it was customary to point out the best in American tradition, although "naturally we had a lot of books on the shelves that have been criticized." If we are to take the nonpolitical, nonmoral attitude, she contended, "we would have to do away with the whole American Heritage program," for example. She then challenged Mr. Clapp to take a clear position on this point.

In behalf of the research library, Mr. Clapp replied, he would have to take the neutral attitude. But the position of the research library is "much easier on this point," he added, than that of the small public library. There was a "residual doubt" in his mind as to whether the library could in fact be completely neutral. He took his own lead from Mr. McColvin of Britain, and he asked that the issue be explored further by others.

The issue was not then explored further, but in a later difference of opinion over propaganda, Mr. Munn was asked if the propaganda that "comes from our side" (rather than from behind the Iron Curtain) wouldn't have "just as bad" an effect on human minds. Mr. Munn replied that the library is a "governmental instrumentality," and that in having books advocating American institutions, in subtle or other fashion, "we are quite all right." Rather obviously there was some difference of opinion in the assembly on this point, but discussion was brief and the issue was never clearly joined.

Labeling was broached as a problem, and inasmuch as Mr. Clapp had mentioned it in his prepared talk, he explained that Representative Velde from the congressional district which included Peoria, Illinois, had introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives authorizing the Librarian of Congress to draw up a list of subversive books in the Library of Congress, the list to be made available to librarians throughout the country for their guidance. Editorial reception of this idea, said Mr. Clapp, had been unfavorable, and the effort at wholesale labeling had collapsed.

Mr. Cushman asked Mr. Clapp what he meant when he termed a book "offensive." Mr. Clapp answered that political and social differences of opinion seemed to be the principal topic of discussion but that when he used the terms "obscene or scurrilous" he was thinking of material likely "to be susceptible of legal condemnation if brought to court." The point was not discussed further.

A number of questions were asked of Mr. Munn concerning "disguised propaganda." Who, for example, was to determine what was disguised propaganda? Mr. Munn pointed out that some years back most of the disguised propaganda came to libraries in the form of pamphlets "supposedly published by super-duper Americanism groups which deliberately adopted those names to throw us off the scent." As to current disguised propaganda, "all you can do is to get all the possible information from reviews, from committees, newspapers," discovering "who these people are and their connections as far as you can." The decision, he said, "will have to be made within the library, of course . . . presumably by a staff committee with the participation of the librarian."

"Good" propaganda, someone pointed out, could be supported with facts, "bad" propaganda could not be so supported; and the difficulty with propaganda from the Soviet Union was that one could not go behind the Iron Curtain to check on the facts. Mr. Munn commented that the problem presented by Russian propaganda was a difficult one. Admittedly we would make mistakes in handling it but he believed we had "the obligation to do the best we can."

Mr. Cushman commented that both the Communist party and the American Legion as well as other groups contend that they follow the highest principles of Americanism. We must not simply fall for terminology, he said; we can best put our own Americanism into practice by following out our professional principles of book selection.

From a member of the audience came the comment: Some people contend that it isn't the outright Communist books which are dangerous, but the subtle ones that wish to change things a little bit. These people believe the United World Federalists and some other groups are Communist because they are interested in world peace or housing or race relations, and the Communists "beat the same drum." Just how, he asked, can we differentiate between Communist propaganda and legitimate American criticism? No one answered that question. But another member of the audience commented on the negative aspect of the discussion. As a positive principle, he said, he would select books "which tend to promote integrity in the individual . . . and a democratic form of society."

At this point came an interjection from another member of the audience that "book selection is useless unless one can get the books," raising the question of interference by agencies of the federal government at the customs. Staff members of the Library of Congress replied that the problem was one, not just of books, but of all commercial traffic, and that in any case, a committee of the American Library Association other than the Intellectual Freedom Committee should be appealed to.

There was further disagreement with Mr. Munn over placing certain materials in restricted areas.

Mr. Munn: I want to make it very plain that the only type of literature which I said should be restricted is that type of literature which is written for propaganda reasons only, and that it should constitute a special collection which should be held for those who are especially interested, particularly those university classes which are making a special study of the techniques of propaganda itself . . .

Mr. Cushman: Mr. Munn, the National Association of Manufacturers also puts out what the A.F. of L. says is propaganda. Therein lies the crux of our situation, it seems to me.

From the audience came a question about the definition of propaganda.

Mr. Munn: I don't have a definition in mind. I think you know and I know what we have in mind, namely that sort of material which is written with something between the lines, the innuendo which makes it something which is not apparent on the surface, on the first reading--something that is put there deliberately in order to impress or deceive the reader. That's somewhere near it, isn't it?

Later in the discussion, a question was raised concerning Mr. Munn's term "administrative feasibility." Granted, said a member of the audience, that the community comes to a conclusion about a book or group of books contrary to that of the librarian, where is the librarian to draw the line as to what is administratively feasible and what is not? This question was not answered in the discussion, but it is worth noting that both Mr. Munn's prepared talk, in referring to the handling of the Communist Manifesto, and Mr. Clapp's prepared talk, in discussing the relation of the sanitary engineer to his community, had the problem in mind.

One of the sharpest exchanges of views in this session came over the problem of authority for book selection. One member of the audience "recognized" that "if there comes a conflict between the librarian and the community as a whole over book selection . . . then the librarian must justify his position and secure the confidence of the community or resign." But suppose, he added, that the conflict is "between himself and an individual who wants a particular volume simply because he has heard a great deal about it." To be specific, suppose the volume is USA Confidential. And suppose the librarian simply digs in his heels and says to this person: "I know more about this than you do. I am an expert. The community hired me. I have taken a course in library science. I have been reading ever since I was two and a half years old. I think I am better qualified than you. I won't buy the book because it is no good. If you ask why it is no good, it is no good because I say so." Is it reasonable for the librarian to say that, must he bring in all the reviews and spend an hour or two justifying himself--or if he takes neither attitude, what does he do?

Mr. Clapp, of whom the question was asked, said he appreciated the significance of the question, though not exactly the form in which it was presented. USA Confidential, he believed, could be rejected on a number of grounds, including that of scurrility, and he had no hesitation whatever in backing the librarian in his rejection.

Mention of USA Confidential called forth a number of responses, indicating that the book had been something of a national problem in book selection. One library rejected the book as "inflammatory, inaccurate and so on," but kept the reviews of it on file and when readers asked for the book, showed them the reviews. Chairman Milton Lord indicated it would have become a particularly annoying problem if presented to the library as a gift. Mr. Cushman said that his library had originally rejected the "crummy" book, but after five calls for it, one of them from the managing editor of the city's newspaper, he "to his shame" had purchased it. He had responded to "public" pressure, built up by the anti-New Deal tone of the book, but, he insisted, there were a "lot of very bad books" his library did not buy and did not feel under any obligation to buy.

A Massachusetts librarian said that the possibility of a stiff-necked librarian or trustee forcing his personal stamp upon book selection in the library had been forestalled by a library provision--established by a "smart old lawyer" trustee many years ago--which demanded that every book asked for must be purchased by the library or the individual be given a written statement from the library Board of Trustees as to the reason for rejection. On public demand this library bought the book--although the State Police had "told the booksellers not to sell the book"--and the library had no trouble about it, from the police or anyone else. This librarian concluded: "I think the whole thing is that we must be inclusive and not exclusive. When people ask for it, it doesn't cost much to include another book and you do protect some rights. You shouldn't throw anything out because somebody asks to have it excluded. You should always be willing to include a book."

But this did not satisfy all of those present. The person who had broached the problem commented: "We have been told that such a book won't change the mores of the community, and that it won't hurt to spend a couple more dollars for another book. . . . But it has to stop some place. You don't object to the doctor impressing his point of view upon you when he tells you that you are dangerously ill. You don't talk about his 'point of view.' Librarians should be expert or else they are not a profession."

There were murmurs of dissent, and it was on such a note that the session ended.[1]

---

[1] At the next session of the conference the previous point was broached again--that professional authority was sufficient reason to exclude the book. Mr. John E. Smith, a speaker at that session, responded that USA Confidential is a rare exception in book selection. It is a best seller; it is an extremely controversial book; it is "making news in the community and it is going to be in demand." For all these reasons, he said, "the library has a special obligation to provide it. I think there would be only one book in a decade about which you could say that."

PRESSURES--WHERE FROM AND HOW?

DAVID K. BERNINGHAUSEN

Chairman

INTRODUCTION

David K. Berninghausen

Last year, in the American sector of Berlin, a grey stone building was begun. Sixty feet high, it will face the Russian sector, a quarter of a mile away. Of simple design, the windows are framed with brass grilles. This will catch the light of the sun and reflect its rays toward the Russian sector. At night a similar effect is achieved by shining powerful beams of light from every window.

The architects who designed this building had an interesting assignment. It had to be aesthetically satisfactory. It had to be functional. And it had to symbolize the American concept of intellectual freedom. I believe it meets all the specifications.

In case you have not guessed, it is the Free American Library in Berlin, and it is our answer to Russian propaganda in Germany. It is a symbol of our faith in freedom and of our strength and our serenity. Word will get around the whole Soviet zone of Germany that in this library anyone is welcome, and that information on all sides of issues is freely available.

At first, it would be natural to the Germans, already saturated with Communist propaganda, to look with suspicion on a United States Information Library as merely an instrument for American propaganda. But the Germans will find that a public library--American style--includes all points of view, even books and magazines which criticize American policies. It is thus obvious to all that America does not fear free discussion and free inquiry. It is obvious to all that we believe in trying to solve our problems through the use

---

David K. Berninghausen is director of the library school of the University of Minnesota. He was Chairman of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association, 1948-50; committee secretary, 1951-52.

of our intelligence rather than by authoritarian force and thought control.[1]

In contrast, in January, 1952, the Soviets inaugurated a book-burning which aims to purge nine million books from shops, schools and libraries in the Soviet zone. Only officially approved reading material is permitted in this part of Germany.

Why do they do it? Why do they insist upon restricting what people shall read? Whenever anyone insists upon strict control of what books shall be available, drawing up lists of forbidden titles, we can be sure that there is fear that free men's minds will discover something that the censor would prefer to keep hidden. It is an expression of fear of men who have inquiring minds. It is an admission of weakness.

Today there are loud voices in America demanding that American libraries copy the methods of Germany and Russia, banning certain expressions of opinion. The American Library Association has taken a position in this. It is expressed in two policy statements, the Library Bill of Rights and the Labeling Resolution.

I wish to emphasize three points about our policies:

1. The Library Bill of Rights was not drawn up to protect librarians. Its purpose is to preserve the right of every citizen to read whatever he wishes, forming his own private judgments. Librarians are keepers of books for their patrons, not from them.

2. The responsibility of professional librarians is clear. As members of the American Library Association we are committed to resisting pressures to restrict the reading of American citizens, whether such pressures come from political, patriotic, religious, or any other groups.

3. These policies on intellectual freedom were not

---

[1] In July, 1953, perhaps it should be noted that Senator McCarthy's emissaries, Messrs. Cohn and Schine, have weakened the United States chances of convincing the Germans--or anyone else--that American libraries stock anything more than propaganda. Even so, the ideal United States Library abroad can still convince Germans that America respects freedom of mind if freedom of book selection for such libraries is preserved.

imposed upon the 20,000 librarians of the American Library Association by any central government, or by any other authority. They were drawn up by the Committee on Intellectual Freedom, the duly appointed body of A.L.A., then submitted to the A.L.A. Council for full discussion and debate. The committee has always held that no document is above criticism.

It is the committee's hope that American librarians can resist the pressures to adopt authoritarian methods of controlling libraries. If we in America copy totalitarian societies, rejecting free inquiry in our schools and libraries, we lend our influence on the side of the barbarian assault by ignorance upon learning. If we as librarians allow our institutions to become the tools of any authoritarian group, if we choose indoctrination over education, men everywhere will suffer. For the position of the United States in the world today is such that if we surrender our faith in freedom of thought, it may disappear from the globe.

Let us keep this in mind as we now consider how we can live with pressure groups which sometimes seek to impose their points of view as _the_ truth. Of course, as members ourselves of a pressure group, the American Library Association, we cannot simply reject the notion that pressure groups have a part to play in modern society. But what makes some of those aggressive groups so certain that they and they alone have the truth, the absolute truth? How are we to meet their challenge? This we would seek to know.

PRESSURE GROUPS AND INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

Harwood L. Childs

Libraries, in company with other public institutions, live in an environment of pressure groups; that is, in the midst of groups of people seeking to influence the attitudes, opinions, and behavior of others. These groups vary greatly in size, aims, methods, resources, and in their impact on society. There are powerful economic organizations such as federations of farmers, labor unions, trade associations, and chambers of commerce. There are medical societies, religious denominations, women's associations, veterans' organizations, patriotic societies, and others too numerous to mention. They function on the state and local as well as the national and international level. Their number is legion. They may be found anywhere and everywhere. Some have aims as broad as a political party platform. Others stress more specialized goals such as prison reform, the single tax, prohibition, civil service reform, and the like. Our community and national life is what it is largely because of the activities of these groups.

Pressure groups have been subjected to a great deal of criticism, so much in fact that the term itself often seems to have an evil connotation. Almost every aspect of group existence has been challenged at one time or another--for example, the group objectives, the methods used to exert influence, the lack of organizational democracy, the sources and extent of group power. In the face of so much criticism it is important to remember that pressure groups in general have arisen because they satisfy some social need, that they perform useful as well as objectionable functions, that they are an integral as well as an indispensable part of

---

Harwood L. Childs is Professor of Politics at Princeton University and an editor of _Public Opinion Quarterly_.

the community. If, from our personal point of view, the aims of some groups are pernicious; if they employ methods which are objectionable; if they are undemocratic; or if they seem to exert more influence than they should, care must be taken to keep the over-all pressure group picture in perspective. Shortcomings must not be allowed to hide services rendered; evils must not overshadow and obliterate the good.

What services do pressure groups render? Their role is to help the public generally and government officials particularly to formulate public policy. They perform many other functions, of course. But the principal reason for granting groups of people the right of association and freedom to express their opinions is the conviction that such freedom to advocate ideas, such competition for public support and governmental approval, are best calculated to insure an enlightened public opinion and wise public policy. The American theory of government rejects the authoritarian notion of government by dictators, philosopher guardians, aristocratic, oligarchic, or any other type of elite. It places its confidence in people, in their ability, based on native intelligence buttressed by education and information, to choose their principal governmental officials, to define the ends of public policy, and to assist their official representatives by advice and the free expression of opinions. Pressure groups make their greatest contribution to the democratic process by taking an active part in the great competitive arena of ideas, expressions of opinion, and, if you wish, propaganda. The more the participants the keener the intellectual competition, the greater the variety in points of view, the more cogent the arguments, the more abundant the evidence, the greater the likelihood that the public and their chosen representatives will formulate wise public policies.

This is the assumption. This is the hope. It should be remembered, however, that this theory makes several important suppositions. In the first place, it assumes that pressure group competition will be governed by rules to the effect that all points of view will have a fair chance of being heard, that the methods used for seeking support for these points of view will help rather than hinder wise decisions, and that, except for these limitations, the competition shall be the freest possible. In the second place, it assumes the necessity for widespread educational facilities to the end that the masses may be equipped to weigh different points of view and make more rather than less rational decisions. The success of the great democratic experiment in America rests quite as much on the competence of the masses as it does on the genius of its leaders. Those who advocate the restriction of educational facilities to the few with greater native abilities completely lose sight of the conditions necessary for the success of our political institutions. In the third place, the American theory of government assumes that the people will not be called upon to perform functions beyond their competence. There must be, according to the theory, a continual adjustment and readjustment of function to competence. As this competence increases, opportunities for greater participation in policy making should be made available.

Pressure groups at their best, therefore, perform vital functions. In the first place, they inform and educate the citizen. They help him arrive at wise decisions on questions of public policy. They define issues, state problems, explain alternatives, marshal evidence, correct misunderstandings, and help to focus the attention of their members upon matters of importance. In doing this they tend to raise the level of self-interest of the group. The larger the group, the more diverse its interests, and the higher the quality of its leadership, the broader its horizon is likely to be. The more vigorously the group participates in the market place of ideas the more informed the general public is likely to be.

In the second place, in their relations with other groups and with the government, pressure groups at their best perform valued services. They give advice and opinion regarding the needs and desires of the people they represent. Within their field of interest their specialized knowledge may be unmatched anywhere. In the process of representing the views of their constituencies, they screen out the frivolous, the irrelevant, the impractical, and present more coherent and better integrated programs. Perhaps one of their most important functions is that of translating the babel of individual hopes and ideas into some kind of program that public officials can appreciate.

Pressure groups aid democracy in many other ways. They often serve as channels through which the government communicates with its citizens. They are training schools for leaders, a function of great importance in the life of democracies. They pool human and material resources on behalf of worthwhile goals. They carry out programs of scholarly research; sometimes assist government in executing as well as formulating public policy; criticize and check government abuses and excesses; arbitrate disputes among their members; perform various kinds of welfare, financial, employment, and promotional functions for members. The list of functions and services is a long one.

In view of this long list of valuable services performed, what are the evils, if any, of pressure group activity? Why is their existence maligned? Why are they so passionately damned by leaders everywhere? Many claim, and this is perhaps the most frequent charge against them, that some groups exert more influence than they should. Labor leaders attempt to pin the label of "undue influence" on business groups, and business groups reply in kind. Little farmers attack big farmers with the same cudgel. The American Legion, the American Medical Association, the National Electric Light Association, the Anti-Saloon League, the Liberty League, groups of real estate men, the oleomargarine interests, the China lobby--in fact, most if not all of the more important pressure groups--have been subjected to this criticism at one time or another. Nearly everyone would agree that it is undesirable for groups to exert on government or on any other institution undue influence. But how much influence do they exert? And even more important, what is a fair amount of influence for a group to exert? Efforts to measure the influence of specific groups have not been too successful. To be sure, groups seldom hesitate to claim credit for such results as the passage of legislation, but the multiplicity of influences which combine to produce a specific effect such as the passage of a law are so confused and indeterminate that precise statements of cause and effect are often very difficult.

Even more difficult is the question of what influence a group should exert. Should it be in proportion to the size of the group, the quality of the membership, the excellence of group objectives, or what? Specifically, should a labor union with one million members have ten times the influence of an employer association with 100,000 members? Is the Red Cross, because of its aims, entitled to more influence than a national association of race track owners? Is the American Chemical Society, because of the intellectual attainments of its members, entitled to more influence than a federation of comic book publishers? In a sense these are academic questions, as all difficult questions usually are labeled. But they are also very practical and extremely important. Certainly we are in no position to say what that influence should be. The American theory of government tends to avoid a direct answer. Instead of assigning specific degrees of influence to different groups, it merely assumes that if they compete freely for public support according to prescribed rules of the game, then the truth--in the sense of the wisest view--will win out, regardless of the size, material resources, or other aspect of the group advocating the view. This is, of course, a very big assumption. Even in courts of law where much more attention has been given to devising rules that would ensure the victory of reason over emotion, other factors than the pure, intellectual merits of propositions now and then win out. In the court of public opinion very few rules to safeguard the nature of pressure group competition exist.

A second criticism of pressure groups alleges the employment of reprehensible tactics and strategies. The basic reason why pressure groups are a menace, according to some, is not the influence exerted by the group, but the way it seeks to obtain that influence. This allegation undoubtedly goes to the very heart of the pressure group problem. The American theory of government is definitely committed to the view that any and every group should have the right to propagate its ideas, to express its opinions freely, provided it does so in a way which does not do violence to the assumptions underlying the truth and market place theory. For example, so-called patriotic groups have every right to advocate the removal of Marxist or free love literature from library shelves. So long as they seek to present their views in a proper manner, they are performing a needed and desirable function in the democratic process. But what is a proper manner? When does socially desirable argument and persuasion become pernicious pressure?

It is not too difficult to give the answer in general terms. The difficulties arise in application. Since the primary objective of pressure group competition is to enlighten the public and assist public officials to arrive at wise policy decisions, methods which contribute to those ends are desirable; those which do not are a menace. In other words, propaganda and pressure methods which make it more difficult for the public and the government to decide wisely, which substitute threats for reason, which use promises of special favor in place of evidence, which deceive, distract, confuse, and otherwise defeat the purpose of pressure group competition are not proper according to democratic theory. Although there will be cases where it will be extremely difficult to decide whether the method is or is not pernicious, in the great majority of instances the decision will not be too difficult.

The community as a whole, in contrast to the particular pressure group, is not interested in the victory of any particular group at any cost. It is merely interested in seeing to it that success goes to the group with the wisest policies rather than with the most money or the fewest ethical qualms. Already many of the cruder forms of undesirable pressure such as outright bribery, libel, slander, and force have been outlawed. In certain sectors of the pressure group battle still further checks have been imposed by the government through corrupt practice acts, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and other agencies. Also, in some fields such as radio broadcasting, motion pictures, the press, and trade associations, efforts to curb undesirable practices have been made by private individuals and groups. The problem is to ensure the continuance of a competitive arena in which the rules of the game make it easier for appeals to the intellect, unselfish devotion to the public interest, and wisdom rather than foolishness to survive. It is a problem of raising the level of pressure group competition without infringing upon the freedom to advocate particular points of view. Ideas must be free; methods of advocating ideas must be consistent with the democratic thesis.

In addition to the charges that pressure groups exercise undue influence and employ reprehensible methods, numerous other criticisms have been expressed which cannot be discussed in detail. Some stress the selfishness of pressure groups, their preoccupation with their own narrow interests, their devotion to the "me too" principle. There are groups, of course, which are out to get what they can at any cost. Not only are they blind to the national interest, but they lack any sense of really enlightened self-interest. Some emphasize the undemocratic way in which particular groups are organized; the fact that they are really islands of authoritarianism within the larger democracy. Other evils frequently mentioned are the unrepresentative nature of many groups, notwithstanding the extravagant claims of group leaders; the way in which groups often interfere with and obstruct democratic processes; inequality of pressure group resources; the absence of group representation in many important areas, such as that of consumer interests; and the way in which pressure groups promote factionalism, weaken the functioning of the two-party system, and undermine national unity. The indictment is a long and challenging one.

At this point I should like to consider some of the suggestions for dealing with this pressure group problem. The framers of the Constitution were concerned with it, and in a sense the document itself represents their conception of how the problem of factions, how the evils of pressure groups could best be handled, as Madison so eloquently pointed out in the Federalist. Much of the legislation passed by both Congress and the state legislatures relates to group activities in one way or another, or affects the balance of power within the pressure group arena. Administrative changes and decrees often have the same effect. Hence, any really comprehensive consideration of efforts to deal with the problem would have to consider not only lobby legislation in the narrow sense of the term but also such fundamental legislative acts as the Sherman Anti-trust Act; tax legislation; laws setting up the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor; corrupt practice acts, election laws, and the National Industrial Recovery Act, to mention only a few. Therefore it is not surprising that much of the work of government is concerned with the broad problem of pressure groups. Too often, true perspective is lost and the problem is seen largely in terms of lobby legislation.

Practically all the states, and still more recently the federal government, have attempted to regulate lobbying by requiring registration, the filing of information forms and financial reports, and by an effort to outlaw certain lobbying practices. On the whole these laws have proved ineffective. This type of legislation deals with only a limited aspect of the whole problem. It cannot cope in any important way with many of the evils listed above. It depends primarily upon publicity to bring about a mitigation of evils through the ponderous and slowly working force of public opinion. If reliance is to be placed there, more attention must be given to the publicity problem as such. It is not enough to collect registration forms, financial reports, and information files, and then depend on the initiative of newspaper men to bring that information to the public. The government must assume more responsibility for publicizing what is going on. Moreover, it is essential that interests likely to be affected by some contemplated government action be warned so that all parties concerned will have a fair opportunity to be heard. Also, on the publicity side it would be helpful if some responsible agency could bring to public notice regularly and systematically information regarding the means various groups are using to manipulate public opinion. To be sure, Congressional investigations make exposures of this kind from time to time. But the impact is lost because of the spasmodic nature of these investigations, delays in publicizing the results, and the forbidding nature of ponderous tomes of committee hearings.

An entirely different approach is taken by those who feel that the remedy for many of the evils of pressure groups is to improve and strengthen the functioning of the legislative, administrative, and judicial branches of government. A strong government, so the argument runs, will be more or less immune to socially undesirable pressures, and can formulate and execute public policy without being unduly influenced by group pressures. Numerous suggestions have been made for strengthening Congress, some of which were incorporated in the Reorganization Act of 1946. They deal with the basis of Congressional representation, salaries, bill drafting, hearings, parliamentary procedure, the committee system, powers of the speaker, party discipline, and other problems. It is assumed that as the quality of membership rises, as procedures become more efficient, and as Congress as a whole becomes stronger, Congressmen can somehow rise above the influence of group pressures. This may be true up to a certain point, but it should be remembered that group pressures are of the very substance of politics, and it is improbable that politicians can ever be divorced from politics--that is, from the incessant conflicts of interest.

The arguments for strengthening the executive branch are similar in many respects to those for strengthening the legislative. A capable civil service, efficiently organized, competently led and staffed, with high morale and courage, would, so it is claimed, serve as a bulwark against the onslaughts of greedy self-interests. Certainly there is much to be said for improving and strengthening public administration.

Numerous other solutions of the pressure group problem have been proposed. Students of party politics have stressed the importance of strong political parties as forces capable of countering the undue influence of pressure groups. The Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association issued a report a few years ago supporting this proposition, and suggested ways of strengthening the two-party system. Since pressure groups are usually minority groups, so the argument goes, political parties, at least the major parties, are better able to represent the major public interest. By making them even stronger than they are today, it is argued, pressure group excesses will be curbed.

Following the first World War there was considerable interest in the possibility of mitigating the evils of pressure group activity by formalizing and institutionalizing the relations of government and group. Several European countries experimented with economic councils, one of the most outstanding examples occurring in Germany. Such agencies were designed to represent the various interests of the nation and formalize government and group relations, to channel pressure in a pre-established manner rather than to allow it to run wild, as it were. For various reasons too numerous to consider here these experiments did not prove very successful. In Italy the Fascists went ever further and made group interests the very foundation of their corporative governmental system. In other countries, interest in various forms of guild socialism, occupational representation, proportional representation, and pluralistic theories of the state reflected widespread appreciation of the importance of pressure groups and a desire to solve the problems their existence raised. In the United States, during the early years of the New Deal, an ambitious attempt was made to institutionalize pressure groups, particularly economic aggregations, in the ill-fated National Recovery Administration. This attempt to formalize a certain degree of self-government in industry was soon frustrated by the Supreme Court. It was the most sweeping effort to deal with the pressure group problem in the United States since the Convention of 1787. It failed, but the failure deserves much more study and analysis than it has hitherto received.

Other suggestions for improving the pressure group situation must be reviewed rather briefly. Some say that the remedy for its evils is more pressure groups, such as consumer organizations, in fields that are inadequately served at the present time. Government has done and can do much to further organizations in various fields. The stimulus to labor organizations under the New Deal and to the development of trade associations under earlier administrations are striking examples.

Another suggestion is that methods for informing the public as to what the public interest is should be improved. In the bedlam of competing special interests and propagandas, how is the humble citizen to know where the public interest lies? What means can be employed for weighing the multiplicity of proposals, for sifting truth from error? All too often the assumption that it is enough for the citizen to hear all points of view is contrary to fact. Dr. Gallup argues that one of the great services performed by the public opinion polls is that of underscoring the public interest in terms of majority opinion. Polls serve as a rod against which the extravagant claims of pressure groups can be measured. Others urge the government to do more to raise the banner of public interest through planning and research boards. Although no government agency can claim to be the final depository of the public interest, many government agencies are in a much better position to define that term than self-seeking private groups. Such official bodies as the National Resources Planning Board, the Temporary National Economic Committee, and the President's Board of Economic Advisers, to say nothing of such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and others have demonstrated the value of government efforts to define and underscore the nature of the public interest in particular situations. Without some general guidance the individual easily becomes confused, indifferent, and susceptible to exploitation.

Since many feel that one of the basic problems of pressure groups is to improve the methods employed for exerting pressure, a suggestion frequently made calls for the outlawing of unfair propaganda methods. Notwithstanding these curbs, some feel that the definition of pernicious methods of exerting pressure should be extended. The scope of the authority of the Federal Trade Commission might be enlarged, or an entirely new body established to hear complaints and adjudicate controversies having to do with methods of exerting pressure. The standards to apply seem clear, but their application is very difficult. How to control the methods of advocacy without infringing upon the constitutional rights of freedom of speech, press, and opinion will always be perplexing. Methods which are objectionable to the supreme court justice or the college professor may seem quite harmless to the housewife or the grocery clerk. Appeals to the emotions, repetition, use of slogans, card stacking--all the devices of the advertiser--may seem socially menacing to a few, but not to the many. Is it not too much to expect that the level of public discussion and pressure group propaganda can be kept at the level of a legal brief or an article in a scientific journal? Yet it should always be remembered that the justification for freedom of speech, opinion, information is that such freedom contributes to public enlightenment. There must, however, always be limits to freedom, and those limits are determined by the aims of freedom.

Since much pressure group activity stems from conflicts of interest, anything which tends to improve the machinery for resolving such conflicts will alleviate tensions and to that extent will ameliorate the pressure group situation--hence the many suggestions looking toward more effective procedures of negotiation and reconciliation of group interests. Other suggestions relate to the problem of oligarchy within groups and the need for broadening the basis of participation by the members of the group in policy making.

It must be evident that the pressure group problem goes to the very heart of the social, economic, and political problems of our times. Community life is essentially group life. The group struggle, and the balance of pressures resulting, determine to a large extent the nature of the social and even the material environment in which we live. So it is that there are some who insist that the solutions mentioned above are only trivial palliatives; that the basic problem is the distribution of pressure group resources. The solutions proposed range all the way from mild reforms in taxation and subsidies to various forms of socialism and communism. Where any considerable amount of dissatisfaction exists within any segment of the population, proposals of this sort multiply. The Great Depression of 1929 and the years following produced much talk of this kind, and the New Deal did produce very sizable shifts in pressure group resources. That more extreme measures were avoided was due in part to the resiliency of our political and economic system, which permitted rapid adjustments as exigencies arose. Economic, political, and social stability depend upon an established equilibrium of pressure group forces. The maintenance of that equilibrium is both a material and a psychological matter, a matter of material possessions and a matter of states of mind. The disturbance of either of these areas can easily precipitate radical solutions.

In what has gone before I have tried to define the role of pressure groups in our American system of government; to consider some of the more important evils which are said to be a consequence of the pressure group situations; and to review some of the suggested solutions to the pressure group problem that have been made. In any consideration of this matter it seems to me that the following points are basic:

1. Pressure groups are an integral and essential part of the American governmental system. They have definite functions to perform, and the problem is not to abolish or blindly attack such groups, but rather to find ways and means for helping them to function more effectively.

2. The basic function of pressure groups, at least from the point of view of the community at large, is to present different points of view reflecting the interests of their members, thereby helping public officials and private citizens to make wiser decisions.

3. The principal problem arising out of the pressure group situation today is how to raise the level of pressure group competition; how to improve methods of advocacy so that enlightenment rather than befuddlement will result; how to ensure that truth will survive in the market place, and that the more intelligent rather than the less intelligent views will prevail.

4. The solution is a difficult one. It is not as simple as some advocates of lobby regulation suppose. It need not await a world revolution and radical transformation of political and economic institutions as others demand. It can be helped along, I believe, in a number of ways:

   a. Strengthen the legislative and executive branches of government so that they can better cope with group pressures.
   b. Encourage more meaningful publicity of group activities.
   c. Encourage the formation of pressure groups in areas now lacking effective group representation.
   d. Offset the minority views with the views of the majority.
   e. Highlight official, government views regarding the public interest, especially those of expertly manned, nonpartisan general staff agencies and planning boards.
   f. Encourage efforts at self-regulation on the part of pressure groups that are seeking to curb pernicious practices.

g. Extend the jurisdiction of existing governmental agencies or establish new ones to hear complaints and publish findings regarding alleged unfair pressure group methods.
h. Provide for more effective enforcement of existing registration and lobbying laws.
i. Seek in every way possible to equalize the opportunities of groups regardless of size or resources to present their points of view.
j. Seek to improve the day-to-day relationships between groups and official agencies of government by systematizing and formalizing these relationships as much as possible. Care should be taken, however, to avoid any freezing of the existing balance of power. Flexibility and resiliency are necessary.

As I stated at the outset, libraries, along with legislatures, administrative agencies of government, political parties, business organizations, churches, families, and individuals, must expect to find themselves the targets of group pressures. The problem of how best to deal with these pressures is one that individuals as well as institutions must face. One significant aspect of the situation is the relation that exists between one's aims and the prevailing sentiment of the community. If the majority in a community strongly support intellectual freedom and enlightenment the task of the library in this area is not difficult. Another variable is the attitude of the community toward the institution itself. If the public is indifferent and apathetic, and displays little interest in the aims of the library, its task will be a hard one. Even in a situation where one or more vigorous pressure groups arise, bent on exploiting the library to their own ends of bigotry, the situation can be handled if the library has strong allies among the many other pressure groups in the area. The building up of such sympathetic, understanding, and cooperative allies is a must in the kind of situation just mentioned. Working through community leaders of opinion, not only in times of crisis but continually, helps to counter pressures that endanger the informational and educational objectives of the library. Often small minority groups make noises out of all proportion to their real importance, much less their social usefulness. Through public opinion polls and surveys by responsible leaders in the community the unrepresentative nature of these groups can be exposed.

The pressure group situation of the community library throws into clearer relief the pressure group situation throughout the country. Many of the same evils which are found on a national scale appear on a smaller scale locally--self-seeking, undue influence, undesirable methods, poor representation, obstructionism. Likewise, many of the remedies which have been proposed for dealing with the situation in the political arena may have pertinence for the local library. Lobby legislation suggests at once the possibility of identifying and publicizing information regarding the various groups in the community concerned with library matters, their policies and aims, their resources, and what they are doing to realize their goals. Such information and publicity might well have at the community level a very salutary effect on pressure groups seeking to influence library policy.

All that has been said about strengthening the government, especially its legislative and administrative branches, as a way of enabling the government to cope more effectively with pressure groups, may well have a local application. A strong library with capable leadership, a competent staff, high morale, and a position of high respect in the community can best withstand the onslaughts of pressure groups. Such strength cannot be built up in a day, but must be made the first order of business in communities at all times.

Similarly, encouraging the formation of additional pressure groups on behalf of important interests now unrepresented, improving techniques for informing the public regarding their stake in freedom of information, and formalizing to some extent relationships between library and pressure groups, all seem to be relevant to the local situation. It is quite possible that the experiments with advisory councils, minority representation, and self-government in industry have lessons of value for the library pressure group that have not as yet been fully exploited.

There is no quick, easy solution to the pressure group problem at any level. But there is no ground for pessimism. If there are a few groups at times which seek to obstruct the free flow of information and the democratic process, there are many which stand ready to increase that flow. It is inconceivable that the will of a minority here and there should for long prevail over that of the majority.

Bibliographic Note

For background information on the nature and scope of the pressure group problem see the following, in addition to the works listed in Appendix C under the heading "Public Opinion, Propaganda and Pressure Groups":

Blaisdell, D. C. "Economic Power and Political Pressures" (Temporary National Economic Committee, Monograph No. 26). Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1941.

Chase, Stuart. Democracy Under Pressure. N. Y., Twentieth Century Fund, 1945.

Childs, H. L. "Pressure Groups and Propaganda." Chapter 8 in E. B. Logan, ed., The American Political Scene. N. Y., Harper, 1936.

------ Labor and Capital in National Politics. Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Pr., 1930.

------, ed. Pressure Groups and Propaganda. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, v.179, May, 1935.

Crawford, K. G. Pressure Boys. N. Y., Messner, 1939.

Herring, E. P. Group Representation Before Congress. Washington, Brookings Institution, 1929.

McKean, O. D. Pressures on the Legislature of New Jersey. N. Y., Columbia Univ. Pr., 1938.

Schattschneider, E. E. Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff. N. Y., Prentice-Hall, 1935.

Truman, D. B. The Governmental Process. N. Y., Knopf, 1951.

Zeller, Belle. Pressure Politics in New York. N. Y., Prentice-Hall, 1937.

A STATEWIDE EXPERIENCE

John E. Smith

In California we have experienced many of the kinds of pressures in our schools and in our libraries which Professor Childs has described. Three nationally publicized California situations come first to mind.

In Pasadena, a leading educator was forced to resign under pressure after a vicious campaign of bigotry and vilification conducted by groups stirred up by Allan Zoll's National Council for American Education. Second, at the University of California the faculty and staff were troubled and divided by a special loyalty oath requirement imposed by the Board of Regents; although the oath requirement was finally rescinded, after another one was imposed on all state employees by the State Legislature. And thirdly, in California we had the Tenney Committee. According to Edward L. Barrett, a law professor at Berkeley and author of a study on the California Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, the Tenney Committee did much to alert the community to the dangers of communism, but did so at the cost of irremediable damage to innocent individuals and serious injury to native liberal groups.

Perhaps not as much national attention has been focused on some other California developments. In Los Angeles, for example, a Citizens' Committee on Education has investigated textbooks in the schools. Although there can be little disagreement with the statement of purpose of the committee or even the questionnaire being used to evaluate individual textbooks, many of us have been alarmed that the project is guided by Dr. V. Orval Watts, who is a vocal anti-United Nations advocate and who will perhaps define subversiveness to include all the forward-looking

---

John E. Smith is librarian of the Santa Barbara (California) Public Library and was a member of the A.L.A. Intellectual Freedom Committee at the time of this conference.

attempts at international cooperation which have emerged from UNESCO and other United Nations agencies.

As another example, several months ago the librarian of one of the campuses at the University of California was subpoenaed to appear before the State Legislative Committee on Education to explain what was alleged to have been a slanted exhibit on the subject of current attacks on public education.

What can we do about all this? How have libraries and librarians reacted to the pressures for official and unofficial orthodoxy and control of thought? Librarians have taken some important steps, and I hope that there will be some hard thinking and good discussion about how to increase our effectiveness in meeting pressures as they arise. I submit that programs such as this two-day conference contribute much toward clarification of the problems involved in the present cloudy intellectual atmosphere.

I want to tell you briefly about the circumstances of three cases which involved the Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the California Library Association. This committee was organized in 1940, a few months after a similar committee was appointed by the American Library Association. The first chairman of the California committee was Helen E. Haines, a great and vigorous library leader.

First, there is the story of the attempt to censor the Los Angeles County Library. The delegates to the California Library Association convention in Santa Barbara in 1948 were shocked to read an announcement that the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors was about to appoint a citizen's committee to screen the books in the county library in order to eliminate "those with a Communistic taint." The Committee on Intellectual Freedom quickly prepared a resolution for the convention, condemning the proposal as an abrogation of the Library Bill of Rights, a resolution which was passed unanimously. It was clear enough, however, that even a united and angry library world was hardly enough to convince a determined legislative body, and the Committee on Intellectual Freedom went into an intensive campaign to publicize the action of the board and to make clear the dangers. The committee fed all the ammunition it could gather to one of the friendly newspapers and kept as many community leaders informed of developments as we could. Many organizations memorialized the board: Parent-Teacher Association groups, the League of Women Voters, the American Civil Liberties Union, the local Democratic Committee, officers of the American Library Association and its Committee on Intellectual Freedom, and others. Librarians in the area and nationally were particularly vocal. This was the first instance in the United States, so far as I know, of proposed censorship imposed from an official, governing source; it was directly antithetical to the Library Bill of Rights.

Naturally, librarians were aroused. Newspapers of the area, even the conservative Los Angeles Times, came to the conclusion that the board would be ill advised to put its plan into effect. In the end, the Board of Supervisors, which incidentally had not been unanimous throughout its discussions, changed its mind about the censorship committee and dropped the whole matter.

Now what was behind all this? The Board of Supervisors was apparently acting out of pique. It was true that several members of the county library staff had refused to sign a disputed section of a new county loyalty oath, which listed the 132 organizations in the Tenney Committee index, and which asked county employees to check any with which they had any connection, direct or indirect. The Board of Supervisors may have been trying to punish the library staff for its show of resentment against this kind of loyalty oath, even though the constitutionality of the oath was very much in doubt at the time. Later the case was decided in favor of the County of Los Angeles and against the employees who questioned the legality of the oath requirement.[1]

I think it can fairly be stated that it was the action of librarians, within and outside the Committee on Intellectual Freedom, which was instrumental in arousing the newspapers and the community groups to action, so that the Board of Supervisors realized it had acted too hastily.

---

[1] Hirschman vs. County of Los Angeles, 39 Calif. (2d) 698, October 15, 1952.

Here is another story. In Los Angeles there is published a strident anti-Communist newsletter entitled Alert under the editorship of Norman Jacoby and Edward H. Gibbons. In its issue of June 14, 1951, Alert had the following to say about libraries in the course of a long section headed, "The Library Situation and What Can Be Done About It:"

> ALERT RECOMMENDS THAT: Civic leaders watch the policy of their libraries in the circulation and promotion of subversive publications.
>
> Check up on the balance between the promotion of pro-Communist and leftwing agitation material and the promotion of anti-Communist factual material.
>
> Check up on the ability and know-how of library staffs to spot pro-Communist material and to identify it as such.
>
> Check up on the records of authors and publishing houses.
>
> Check up also on the records and organization alliances of library staffs.
>
> You will be astounded at what you will find out. You also will be astounded at the defensive and antagonistic reaction that will be provoked in many library circles by even the most conservative approach to this problem.

One of the board members of the Burbank Public Library took the admonition seriously enough to invite editors Jacoby and Gibbons to talk to the library board in July. Mr. Jacoby said to a reporter later, "We told them we very frankly didn't believe books should be removed from library shelves. We told them that in screening books the Burbank library should have a very good reference library on Communism and the title page or index should be labeled so the reader would know what he was reading. The same for Fascist literature . . . ." Later in the same statement he added, "Perhaps it might be advisable to list beneath the author's name a notice to the effect that 'This book is written by a man with a long record in Communist organizations.'"

Now the labeling of library books had been discussed at length at the 1951 convention of the American Library Association in the report of its Committee on

Intellectual Freedom. The A.L.A. Council unanimously adopted a six-point recommendation against labeling library books. Summarized, the six points are as follows:

1. The establishment of criteria to judge publications as subversive is characteristic of totalitarian states, and brings with it injustice and ignorance. American librarians have a responsibility to take a stand against the establishment of such criteria in a democratic state.
2. Libraries do not advocate the ideas in their collections.
3. No one should have the responsibility of labeling publications. No sizable group could agree on what is subversive.
4. Labeling is a censor's tool in that it attempts to prejudice the reader.
5. Labeling violates the spirit of the Library Bill of Rights.
6. American librarians oppose any group which aims to close any path to knowledge. Although the profession is agreed that Communism is a threat to the free world, if we label materials to pacify one group, there is no excuse to refuse to label any item in the library's collection at any other group's suggestion.

The board of trustees at Burbank is composed of five members and functions in an advisory capacity to the Mayor. This board was interested enough in the proposals of Jacoby and Gibbons to pass a unanimous request that the City Council instruct the City Attorney to draft a resolution to the League of California Cities to approve the labeling of subversive and immoral books in California public libraries. The City Council voted unanimously on September 4, 1951, to do this.

Immediately labor union and citizen protests against library censorship and book-labeling were presented to the City Council. The Burbank Review, while failing to take an editorial position, gave prominent and fair presentation of the matter to its readers. In a nearby community, the Westwood Hills Press took a strong editorial position against all library censorship, printed the A.L.A. resolution against labeling, and carried interviews with prominent librarians and booksellers in the area who effectively pointed out the dangers of labeling. Two weeks later, on September 18, the Mayor called the Council into a special meeting to rescind its action and to consider another motion which would ask the League of California Cities to make a survey to see how California cities "resolve the problem of the infiltration of insidious propaganda, and other printed matter inimical to the American way of life, into their libraries . . . ."

Before the convention of the League of California Cities the annual meeting of the California Library Association was held in San Francisco. At this time the Committee on Intellectual Freedom reported on the Burbank matter and offered a resolution addressed to the League of California Cities which recapitulated the A.L.A. labeling resolution. This resolution was unanimously approved and the Chairman of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom was delegated to attend the League's convention. Contacts were made in advance also with various members of the League. The League of California Cities, which is a quasi-official organization of municipal officers, failed to take any action on the City of Burbank's resolution to survey the libraries of the state.

I have told two success stories in terms of the actions of the California Committee on Intellectual Freedom in cooperation with like-minded community groups. Pressures for censorship in Burbank and Los Angeles County came from outside the library--one from a zealous and commercial anti-Communist newsletter, and one from official anger on the part of a governing body.

There is another source of trouble for libraries stemming from within the profession, seemingly confused or uninformed attitudes toward those principles on which we are theoretically agreed. A third Los Angeles incident will illustrate: As the result of a single letter of criticism from an irate parent directed against the periodical the Nation, published in a Hollywood newspaper over a year ago, the Los Angeles schools removed both the Nation and the New Republic from the open shelves of high school and junior college libraries, making the two liberal journals available to students only when specifically requested. This was called a temporary measure to enable committees of teachers to examine the periodicals and submit a report concerning their propriety in school libraries. Several

months passed. Faculty committees, first at the junior college level and then at the high school level, recommended the return of the periodicals to the open shelves, and I am glad to say the recommendations were acted upon immediately in those libraries which subscribed. This was an instance in which the chief of the school libraries was so hypersensitive to criticism--or potential criticism--that she took the initiative in suppressive action.

I submit that librarians must not be fearful, cautious or even neutral about the rights of students and citizens generally to make free inquiry from a wide range of printed sources. The librarian ideally is a stout defender of this principle and ought to be so alert to the problems that no hesitation or shock ensues when the censor comes knocking at the library door. Are we working hard enough within the libraries to educate ourselves in these matters? Are we getting an adequate number of articles in library journals on intellectual freedom? Are we devoting staff meetings to the subject? Are we working toward the adoption of the Library Bill of Rights by trustees? These are things we can do and, I think, ought to do.

One final bit of Californiana. A large public library has decided not to add Mortimer and Lait's USA Confidential to its collection. No one will contest their right to this decision. To explain its decision however, the following announcement was made by the librarian: "It is against the library policy to buy books which are obviously written to trade on a taste for sensationalism, or strongly opinionated books when written in a violent, sensational and inflammatory manner. This book is such, filled with vicious, unsubstantiated accusations of the vilest kind." Now while I think that USA Confidential is an abomination, I also think that no library should put itself on record as excluding "strongly opinionated books when written in a violent, sensational, or inflammatory manner." Those are adjectives which we should avoid using, so that they don't come home to roost on books which are classic necessities on our shelves. We can think of many great books, after all, which are violent, inflammatory even, and opinionated in their time. There are other good arguments against buying USA Confidential. In the statement above the words "vicious and unsubstantiated accusations" may be quite enough to explain a library's unwillingness to purchase it. Personally, I think libraries ought to stock it. I think we can let the libel laws operate to protect individuals and organizations which are wronged. I believe that libraries must avoid denying reading materials which are in demand (working within the framework of established book selection criteria). But who can state positively what the effect of reading the Confidential series may be on the reading public? I have great faith in the judgment of the people of this country and little fear that lurid comics or trashy fiction or USA Confidential will corrupt us, as long as the channels of communication are kept free. I have great fear, on the other hand, that censorship, official or unofficial, would quickly corrupt us all.

We can probably agree that the pressures on libraries and schools, from external and internal sources, all emerge from the frightened atmosphere engendered by the postwar international situation. How much of this frightened atmosphere is traceable to actual jeopardy and how much is an irrational fear? How much is hysteria and how much grounded in reality? Whatever answer history brings, it is a question which stands outside the defense for freedom of communication. Insofar as we censor our books, discourage the publishers, enforce conformity in radio and television; insofar as we ignore the vigorous warnings handed us in the last two years by Francis Biddle, Harold Lasswell, Walter Gellhorn, Howard Mumford Jones, Alan Barth, Carey McWilliams, Roland Bainton, Merle Miller, George Stewart and many others, we have just that far acceded to the authoritarianism of the enemy and we have just that far compromised our democratic principles.

Francis Biddle put it this way: "The impulse to freedom is essentially tolerant, rational and mature. The form of fear tends to persecution, hatred and violence . . . . We tend too often to believe, particularly in times of panic, that our freedom to think as we please is endangered by the expression of opposing views, and that to protect the effectiveness of our own point of view, the others must be stifled."

We must find out how librarians can join more effectively with the educators, journalists, publishers, booksellers and other responsible agents in every community to work harder towards the tolerant, rational and mature aims of freedom.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Third Session

Mr. Childs was immediately asked if it was not proper for a majority within a community--say, a Catholic majority in a New England city--to impress its point of view upon the city's library board of trustees. He commented that he believed in majority rule, but that it was necessary to keep in mind the important distinction "between freedom in the expression of views and the means which are employed for propagating those views." The majority should not bring pressure to bear unfairly or in violation of democratic methods.

This is a difficult but important question, he added. You cannot tolerate too much domination by any special interest or group. The hope and expectation is that any majority may change as the result of changing interests and the interplay of the free market-place, and that those who are members of a certain minority today may become members of a majority tomorrow or that a present-day minority may win its place to a majority at some later time. "Any effort to infringe upon the integrity or freedom of expression of a minority is contrary to the democratic thesis."

Mr. Cushman commented that his own community was predominantly Protestant, but "I have absolutely no right, despite any pressure from . . . Protestant groups, to keep out of my library the O'Neill book; and if your community is predominantly Roman Catholic, you have no right to keep from the Protestants the Blanshard book."[1]

A member of the audience disagreed with the use of the term "free world" and the statement that "communism is a menace to the free world." Mr. Smith read the pertinent passage from the Labeling Statement: "Although we are all agreed that communism is a threat to the free world, if materials are labeled to pacify one group, there is no excuse for refusing to label any item in the library's collection." He said he agreed with the statement and pointed to the fact that it had been passed unanimously by the A.L.A. Council.

---

[1] The books referred to are J. M. O'Neills's Catholicism and American Freedom and Paul Blanshard's American Freedom and Catholic Power.

Mr. Dix noted that the A.L.A. Intellectual Freedom Committee spent much time and energy on individual cases of censorship and wondered if some larger, more effective approach might not be found for the problem. Was it possible, he wanted to know of Mr. Childs, for one pressure group to change the attitude of another pressure group? Was it reasonable to expect, for example, that the American Library Association might change the attitude of groups favoring censorship, or was it the history of pressure groups that their approaches and their attitudes do not change? Mr. Childs answered that one of the trends in the past two decades has been a shifting of the balance of power among pressure groups. It is, of course, the substance of the democratic thesis that "if all views are allowed to be propagated freely, the best will survive." He expressed the opinion that the American public was better able to deal with conflicts of pressure and propaganda than ever before, and that there is "every reason for hope that through the efforts of the A.L.A. and other associations the views of the A.L.A. will tend to prevail" over those taken by groups advocating censorship.

One of the pressure groups mentioned at this point was Pro-America. Chairman Berninghausen commented that the group had started as a Republican Women's group, but had lost its political character and become one of the several groups "attempting to destroy free public education in this country." The group, he added, had been active in Pasadena, Bartlesville and elsewhere.

In discussing the need to resist such groups the suggestion was made that the A.L.A. Intellectual Freedom Committee join with the American Academic Freedom Project[2] and other interested groups in propagating their point of view. Mr. Childs considered the suggestion excellent.

Mr. Collison referred to a feature story in that day's issue of the New York Times to the effect that "pressure groups are prodding the public schools to end their study of the United Nations." He asked Mr. Childs to suggest measures by which these pressure groups could be brought to see what harm they were doing in "such vulnerable areas as India and the Middle East." He wondered how pressure groups could be educated to realize the harmful effect they were having on international relations.

Mr. Childs said that of course there were all kinds of pressure groups and even all kinds of lunatic fringes, but he believed that the education of pressure groups lay not so much in trying directly to change their points of view as in trying to change their methods where those methods tend to "befuddle our minds," making it more difficult for us to reach intelligent decisions.

Mr. Collison, who feared that he was being misunderstood, explained further that "some countries overseas, notably India, are very sensitive to any suggestion that there should be any limit to freedom of discussion . . . in a country they now regard as their leader," and that Indians look askance at "crushing the discussion of the United Nations in a single American school."

Mr. Childs asked, in return, if there was any evidence that the methods used to "advocate less teaching . . . of United Nations materials are violating the democratic thesis in any way." He said that he was an enthusiastic supporter of the United Nations, but that others had a perfect right to oppose that organization. Perhaps, he added, "the problem is to explain to the people of India and other parts of the world just what we mean" by the democratic process. Chairman Berninghausen commented that perhaps the answer to Mr. Collison's expressed concern would be more effective promotion of United States Information Libraries abroad.

A member of the assembly questioned Mr. Childs concerning his proposal to strengthen the legislative and administrative efforts of government in order "to control these pressure groups." Wouldn't that, she wanted to know, be "a kind of censoring" that we want to get away from.

Mr. Childs said he wasn't thinking of strengthening the legislative and executive functions of government in

---

[2] The work of the American Academic Freedom Project at Columbia University was briefly described at this session of the conference by Leo Koutouzos, research member of the project.

the sense of giving them more control but rather in developing their "ability to deal independently with the various pressure groups." Some people, he thought, were "unduly disturbed . . . about government regulation"; we should distinguish very clearly between "regulation and control of ideas and opinions, and the regulation and control of the methods for propagating . . . ideas." He liked the illustration of the courtroom with its elaborate rules of procedure--a system set up not to interfere with freedom but to promote it. He thought we should "encourage government to make it easier for us to arrive at intelligent decisions." If you set up a Federal Trade Commission, he said, "or a propaganda commission or a pressure group commission to establish a high plane of competition so far as methods are concerned, you do run the danger that the control of the methods may ultimately result in some control of ideas. But that's a danger, it seems to me, that we have to face."

Another member of the assembly thought that pressure groups were not evenly matched, that some had more resources than others, and that the market was not exactly free. He suggested that the American Library Association support a program on a local as well as a national level so that "a local committeeman" could be sent into a situation "just as soon as the pressure begins to be felt." The A.L.A., he said, "is, in Professor Childs' thought, a counter-pressure group or a pressure group which is strong enough by its own impartiality to intercede and to help decide whether a pressure is legitimate, whether it is being brought by a body whose weight is not more apparent than it actually is."

Another member of the audience raised a number of questions, of which the only one which had not already been discussed in one manner or another was the problem of loyalty oaths. The discussant delivered her questions altogether to Mr. Smith in a bundle. He chose to comment only on loyalty oaths, which he briefly said were "oppressive" and opposed to freedom of thought. On this subject he urged the reading of Alan Barth's Loyalty of Free Men, and on that note the session was brought to a close.

OUR COMMON STAKE IN FREE COMMUNICATION

LUTHER EVANS

Chairman

BOOK PUBLISHING

Donald S. Klopfer

Ever since Gutenberg first used movable type to make the dissemination of ideas by the written word a practical matter, the authorities have been confronted by a grave problem. Both church and secular organizations have traditionally tried to suppress those ideas which they felt might be harmful to them. When the Bible was first printed, church leaders opposed its distribution to laymen. But the printer, who was at the same time the publisher and bookseller, bitterly fought this interference. History is replete with blasts against censorship, from Milton to our modern fighters for freedom of expression. In this struggle between freedom and suppression, one thing stands out above all else--dictators of all eras have established rigid censorship and have realized full well the danger to them of the free communication of ideas.

Freedom of speech is a concept of modern Western society. The Western world by constitutional guarantees or by the custom of centuries has made this freedom a cornerstone in its civilization. We must face the fact that only a small portion of the world understands this and tries to live by it. Most of the human beings on this planet do not know what we mean by freedom of speech and certainly do not accept this principle. Even the Indian government, which subscribes to many democratic ideals, insists on controls over the press. And this freedom, which was established by law after much fighting, is not God-given--constant vigilance is necessary to assure that this great principle remains a basic force in our society.

People are always sniping at it! We have the old cry of censorship on moral grounds. Well-meaning

---

Donald S. Klopfer is Secretary-Treasurer of Random House and is a Director and Vice-President of the American Book Publishers Council and Chairman of its Anti-Censorship Committee.

parents, civic organizations seeking to protect the young with best will in the world, P.T.A.'s, church organizations--all have their own ideas of what little Johnny should be exposed to in the book world. These are not vicious people. Most of them are well-meaning, but they are playing with dynamite. To save Johnny's morals they are asking us to give up our most cherished freedom and to accept an undeveloped twelve-year mind as the standard for all of us.

At a higher level, we see the spectacle of the Gathings Committee empowered to investigate television, radio, comics and books. I can hardly believe that an intelligent committee will do more than take a look at books and then decide that the dissemination of ideas in a free society is of the utmost importance.[1] I quote the Washington Post of May 12:

> One of his resolutions would establish a new select committee of nine members "to determine the extent to which current literature--books, magazines and comic books--containing immoral, obscene, or otherwise offensive matter, or placing improper emphasis on crime, violence, and corruption, are being made available to the people of the United States through the United States mails and otherwise." Here is an indubitably pious resolution embracing dangerously vague concepts. Who can say what constitutes "offensive matter" or precisely what degree of emphasis on crime, violence and corruption is "improper"? This investigation would be a threat to every publisher. It would amount, in effect, to a form of intimidation. Defective and sometimes sordid as the products of American printing presses may be, it is best to leave these products to the judgment of the public. There is no such thing as good censorship.

Whether we agree with those ideas or not, the obscenity laws already on the books take care of that phase of our problem. We should be mightily cheered by the Supreme Court decision in the Miracle case. The Book Publishers Council filed a brief amicus curiae on that case because we thought the principle was so important. Had sacrilege been allowed to become a ground for censorship it would have been dangerous to publish many works, particularly satires, and surely in that field what is sacrilegious to one group may not concern anyone else at all. We must keep the right to read what is pleasant or unpleasant, concurring or disagreeing. This is the keystone of a free society.

---

[1] The actual hearings of the Gathings Committee held later (in December, 1952) concentrated on paper-bound books, "girlie" magazines, and comics.

Then we face censorship on political grounds. The textbook publishers are constantly running into private reviews of their books with the object of making their texts conform to the particular orthodoxy of the reviewer. This is equally true in history, economics, science, religion. And great pressure is put on both school people and publishers to make them conform to this private group interest. We must fight this!

Reviewers and book review media are also under attack. We had the ludicrous statement made in the American Legion Monthly that the Times and Tribune book sections were so slanted in their reviews of the China situation that they must be Communist-infiltrated. This, of course, was never proved, but when the conservative New York press is scolded and pressured by a powerful group, we should sit up and take notice.

Why should we fight these censorship and suppression efforts, some of which are well meant, others evil? Times of crisis--and I fear that we are continually in such times--bring out fears of heresy and a blind clinging to orthodoxy and the traditional. These are the very times when it is necessary for a society to be receptive to new, challenging ideas, to re-examine fearlessly its own heritage and to discover the ways in which that heritage is being applied to meet the current situation.

Freedom is indeed dangerous. Free circulation of everyone's ideas means risks. But I am utterly convinced that far greater dangers to our whole way of life, to everything that we hold dear, arise from suppression of ideas. We need to be able to publish books on all sides of all problems, to sell them freely, to circulate them without fear of retaliation because we have offended someone's pet beliefs. All of this must be, of course, within the laws of our country, which afford protection against libel, slander and obscenity.

Publishers and other producers of media of communication are vitally concerned with the protection of their rights. But it is the citizen's right to read, to hear, to find out, to make his own decisions after a full review of all sides of any question that is even more important. In that sense, the rights of the individual publisher are socially valuable as a protection to the public.

I have great admiration for your Library Bill of Rights. I would like to see the book publishers adopt one of their own. I have asked one of our editors, Saxe Commins, to draw up a sample document which I, as an individual publisher, felt expressed our sentiments. This is in no way either a Book Publishers Council statement or an Anti-Censorship Committee statement. It is just one publisher's dream:

WE ARE PUBLISHERS AND WE ARE CITIZENS!

Our existence, professionally, depends upon the preservation of the constitutional guarantees of the freedom of the press.

Our survival, in the community, in the nation and in the world, is contingent upon our reliance on the letter and the spirit of the Bill of Rights as set forth in the First Amendment.

We are under attack.

The forces marshaled against us have been massed and repelled for five centuries, ever since the printed word first exercised its influence upon the mind of man.

Now a new and more insidious campaign of aggression has been launched against the freedom of the press. The modern weapons of coercion and intimidation, smear and innuendo, mere citation and charges of casual association are added to the armament of the forces of suppression. Their aim is to establish a dictatorship over the books our people should have available to them for their own judgment and decision.

As publishers and citizens we must face an old challenge in a new guise. To do so, openly and firmly, we set forth the principles on which we stand.

We believe that the propaganda aimed at achieving censorship of books can spread until it becomes a local, national and world catastrophe.

We believe in the right of men to differ in their opinions and conclusions.

We believe that the greatest possible variety of views and the widest possible range of interests should be represented in a publisher's list of books.

We believe that books have been and will remain the most effective market place for ideas, the meeting place for minds, where a free people can make their own choice among books of every kind and decide for themselves which serve truth and which falsehood.

We believe that it is the publisher's moral and civic duty to disseminate books which provide information on all sides of controversial questions.

We believe that restrictions on the freedom of selection among ideas can lead only to the destruction of democracy.

We believe that publishers, while free, should be responsive and responsible to the laws of their land.

We believe that an enlightened people can be trusted to discriminate between communism and democracy only if they can evaluate the principles and processes of both.

We believe that an informed people can distinguish between the meretricious and the valuable, between obscenity and decency, between banality and creative vigor.

We believe that the consequence of the current attack on independence of thought, nonconformity, liberalism and radicalism will be a wave of timidity, orthodoxy and regimentation in scholarship, in political effort, in science, in the humanities, in morals and in social behavior. To establish rigid standards of "safe and sane" books is to end up with a huge bonfire of all books.

We believe that able men will be driven from writing books altogether if they are intimidated into observing standards established by the enemies of free inquiry.

We believe, with Voltaire: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

We believe, with Thomas Jefferson, that "reason and free inquiry are the only effectual agents against error."

We believe, with John Milton: "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth is in the field, we do injuriously, by licensing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?"

We believe, as publishers and citizens, that freedom of the press is worth fighting for!

THE PRESS

Lester Markel

To me this conference seems a kind of family gathering--a coming together not of in-laws but of genuine blood relations. For we are all educators, we with our dailies, others with their weeklies or monthlies or annuals, you with your perennials--to wit, books. We are all proponents of the red, white and blue--the red ink, the white foolscap and the blue pencil.

Because you are the perennial persons, the guardians of the presumably ageless printings, I appear before you with a certain amount of awe. The fellow who prints words upon newsprint is likely, as I do, to look with reverence on those who handle the printed word bound and between covers--and this even though newsprint is now $ 126 a ton.

Yet I take a certain amount of consolation in the thought that even though the words "journalism" and "journalistic," which university and library folk sometimes employ to put us journalists in our places--even though these are offensive words, more often they are defensive words also. So-called "journalism," I have discovered, is not infrequently more penetrating and more lasting than a lot of the stuff that is advertised as literature. I have found, too, that often the word "scholarly" is camouflage for the word "dull" and that frequently something that is called "literary" is only "high-falutin'."

But enough of this friendly family feuding, let us be serious. There is a much more important link among us--we of the libraries, the universities, the press, the book business and the other groups whose concern is the printed word. We are all engaged--or should be engaged--in the task of educating the American public, some on a short term, some on a long term basis. And this task of educating the American people, of adding to their knowledge and information, of improving American public opinion is, I believe, the most important task that confronts the world today.

This is why. Men everywhere in the world look to us in America; our actions are the most watched, the most awaited actions in history. This is true of Moscow as well as Manchester, of Peiping as well as Paris. There may be dissent as to our course--and there may be reason in that dissent--but there is no doubt whatsoever about the importance and the impact of our decisions. Thus there rests upon us a grave responsibility to fulfill, wisely and courageously, the role to which history has assigned us. We may dislike that responsibility, we may try, through isolationism--direct or disguised--to evade it, but we cannot. We cannot escape our destiny.

We cannot fulfill that role, we cannot make right decisions, unless our judgments are sound. If they are unsound the results may be disastrous, for us as well as the rest of the world. Moreover, we cannot make sound judgments unless two fundamental conditions are met: first, our information must be good; second, we must be free to use that information freely. Let me repeat: the two great objectives, if we are to have a sound public opinion, are the acquisition of knowledge and the wise and unhampered use of that knowledge.

I am proposing to consider briefly whether these objectives are being realized; if they are not, why they are not; and, if they are not, what can be done to bring the realization closer.

Let us consider first, then, the state of our information. When I speak of "information" I include basic education as well as understanding of the immediate issues that confront us. The two, I am certain, cannot be separated. Unless a man knows how to think it will be futile to feed him facts; to do so will result only in bloating him and causing distress in others.

I do not think we should be at all complacent about the state of our information. Some of us hold that we are the best informed nation in the world. Even if that is true, it is not enough to meet the needs of the present

---

Lester Markel has been Sunday Editor of the New York Times since 1923. He has also been responsible in large part for the establishment of the International Press Institute, a body seeking improvement in the practice of journalism here and abroad as related to the conduct of international affairs.

time. But there are disturbing reports about the state of our information. For example, these: that three out of ten voters are unaware of almost every major program in foreign affairs; and only 25 out of 100 voters can be considered reasonably well-informed. Thus there is the danger that we shall proceed by emotion rather than by intelligence, by prejudice rather than by reason. Surely the old adage needs to be revised: what we don't know is sure to hurt us.

What, one asks, are the reasons for this failure of information? I think there is a failure of primary education, which is the concern of the school men; a failure of adult education, which is the concern of groups such as this; and a failure of the press. I leave you to confess your own sins. I shall confine myself to ours--which is enough of an assignment, I assure you.

Let us then consider the first of the two objectives, the acquisition of knowledge, and inquire into the reasons the press is not fulfilling--as I believe it must--its assignment of providing the information about current affairs without which sound judgements are almost impossible.

There is a lot of loose talk these days about freedom of the press, so much so that the phrase has lost a good deal of its impact. Yet the essential meaning is still there and the concept as it was laid down in the Bill of Rights grows more important daily. We must have "the right to print" and we must have "the right to know." But freedom from something is not enough; there must be also freedom for something. It is not enough that the press shall be free; it must also be responsible. The publisher and editor must look upon freedom of the press not as a grant but as a trust, not as a privilege but as a duty.

In the search for circulation and under the pressure of other mass media there has been a decided and unfortunate tendency to move into fields which are not the proper areas of journalism--a tendency to supply entertainment rather than information; we have too many mere papers today instead of newspapers. I am not saying that the newspaper of today is worse than the newspaper of--say--twenty-five years ago. I think there is, on the whole, a greater sense of responsibility. But that trend must move much faster and much further. What I am saying is that the press today is not good enough, on the whole, to meet the challenge of the times, to supply the great need for a sound opinion. The newspaper today is required to do a news job of greater penetration than any it has done before--a thorough job of interpretation, so that the reader will understand the complex questions with which he is confronted. It is required to do its job as objectively as human beings can.

The acid test of responsibility is the way the news is handled. The news must be given straight--the facts uncolored by bias. If the reader cannot be trusted to act intelligently upon those facts, then we might as well throw democracy overboard and plump for dictatorship.

There is another aspect of the newspaper task that is of prime importance. It derives out of this compelling fact: that even though we may not be one world ideologically we are surely one world physically. What happens in Pakistan brings an echo in Peoria; a stone cast into the Dead Sea will bring ripples in the lakes of Alberta and the Argentine; all the avenues of the world, all the village paths, all the country lanes are now main streets, each one reacting to the others and in turn reacting on them. No hamlet, no city, no nation can withdraw into itself; even though there are many who refuse to recognize it, isolationism is a thing of the past. In communication this is especially true. The press is so all-reporting that few censorships can keep facts hidden. The radio is so all-hearing that any shot anywhere is now echoed throughout the world.

One might expect, as a result of this, a great leap forward in understanding. Yet this has not happened. There are deep divisions among nations, there are cold wars, there are iron curtains and bamboo screens. There are prejudice and selfishness and fear. It seems almost as if the betterment of communication had led to a lessening of understanding.

International reporting could do a great deal to improve understanding, but it does not. We are getting too much sensational news, too much trivial news; we are not getting the interpretive news without which the reader gropes in an intellectual fog and generally gives up; we are not getting the perspective which is essential to straight thinking. As a result, even such closely related nations as Britain and the United States have distorted pictures of one another.

That is a basic task for the world's press-the improvement of the flow of the news among nations--so that they shall have accurate views of one another, and so through understanding learn tolerance and patience; and so eventually come to peace. That is the prime function of the International Press Institute.

You, too, can help in this effort for international understanding, through the correction of wrong impressions, through the dissemination of true information. It is a vital effort and I think it will be well rewarded.

We are much too likely, it seems to me, to assume the apathy of the reader. I do not believe, I shall never believe, that most people do not want to know. I do believe that if they have not informed themselves, if they do not know, it is because they have found the task of finding out too difficult. To help people to know is our first assignment. Without true information, as I have said, the pressing problem of public opinion cannot be solved. If that task is not being accomplished I think we should recognize that part of the fault is ours. In recent years, however, the task has been made much more difficult--and that is the reason for these meetings.

That brings us to the second condition for sound judgment--that we shall be free to use our knowledge, our information, freely. Let us be blunt about it. There are today definite threats to freedom of thought; there are pressures which affect even those whose records are beyond reproach; there is a black fear in the country brought about by the witch-hunters. The enemies of free thought have built up and now make use of certain myths. Among these myths there are five of particular concern.

There is, first, the myth of guilt by association. This is the birds-of-a-feather fallacy; we seem to forget that Americans are joiners and few of them look before they leap or sign up. One of our precious freedoms has been freedom of association. Prosecution of conspiracy is one thing--obviously plots have no place in a democratic system--but indictment for innocent participation is another. It is true that there have been many people who joined too freely and signed too easily, but surely they were not all fellow-travelers. All of us some time or other got on the wrong train.

Second, there is the myth of the liberal dupe. This is in large part the creation of the former Communists who must now whitewash themselves in public every morning to show that no trace of taint remains. Some of these even have the effrontery to condemn as doubtful risks those who, in the 1930's, when their critics were practicing members of the Communist party, were condemning Russia and all her adherents as dangerous totalitarians. This myth feeds on the belief that those farthest to the right are nearest right. It includes the myth of 110 percentism. Red, white, and blue is not enough--only patriotism in full technicolor will do. Sure, there have been gullible "liberals." Sure there was too ready an acceptance of Russia. But let us not call mistakes of judgment deep-dyed conspiracy.

Third, there is the myth of communism in government. The Hiss case gave this legend a vast impetus; there is no doubt that it was a disturbing revelation. But this was the case of a single man; this was no generation on trial. There were many, since disillusioned, who saw in Russia in the 1930's a possible path to Utopia. These were idealists, misguided idealists, but not traitors; they did not purloin documents from the State Department. Let us not get involved.

As for the present, most government employes are faithful and loyal, and to suggest that Washington is honeycombed with Communists is a false charge that gives aid and comfort to the Kremlin.

Fourth, there is the myth of wholesale logic. This is the belief that everything that is anti-Communist is good. This conviction leads to the acquisition of strange bedfellows. One need only point out that Hitler and Mussolini were foremost among the foes of communism to reveal the holes in the theory. The myth stretches further so that there are absurd charges, such as those of "premature anti-fascism," and there are vicious attacks on those who dare to express their concern over the excesses of so-called anti-communism.

Finally, there is the myth of international conspiracy. In a state of hysteria, one must, for comfort, find scapegoats, and one must, for false assurance of safety, search frantically under beds. It is consoling to believe that our troubles do not arise out of our own mistakes or defects but that they result from the machinations of others; to believe that there has been very dirty work at the crossroads, and if it had not been for that, we would not be in our present mess.

There is, for example, the Yalta myth--the belief that there was long-planned treachery among a handful of men. Few of those who cherish this myth have possession of any of the Yalta facts and would be astounded if they were told that among those present at Yalta was that catspaw of the Kremlin, Winston Spencer Churchill.

The result of this onslaught is evident everywhere. There has been dropped upon much public utterance and public thought a curtain which is constructed if not of iron then of such intimidation that it screens out a good deal of the kind of thinking that is essential to the solution of our present problems. It is a sort of intellectual virus, difficult to isolate, that paralyzes our moral sense and our basic judgments.

What then is to be done to combat these forces?

There was a time when I thought that this kind of assault should be allowed to pass unnoticed because it was really beneath the notice of decent men. I am convinced now that that is the wrong course. It should be recognized that the tactics we must oppose are not dissimilar from those employed formerly by Hitler, now by Stalin; namely, that through repetition a lie can win acceptance and falsehood can be made to appear in the guise of truth. Therefore, even at the cost of some personal sacrifice and even personal safety, the counterattack must be made.

It is important, though, that in the fight there shall be no blots upon our escutcheons. It seems to me, therefore, that these injunctions are in order:

We must not be intolerant. We must make certain that we do not condemn those on the other side or those we think are on the other side in the wholesale manner employed by the extremists. I should say that we should be intolerant only of one thing--intolerance.

We must be certain not to imitate the witch-hunters and fall into the same fallacies into which they fall. We must not applaud all that is anti-Communist. Merely because a man attacks a witch-hunter is not proof that he is on the side of the angels. There are, and have been, fellow-travelers who, even though it was through guile and not guilt, have been useful to the Communists.

We must be careful that we shall not be this kind of innocent at large.

We must not be fuzzy either in word or in action. We must beware of emotional approaches but follow as closely as we can the ideal of objectivity. We must be wary about giving our support or our signatures too easily to causes which we do not fully understand or which we have not carefully explored. We must be very watchful of our biases because prejudice can lead us into dreadful booby traps.

Above all, we must meet the attack courageously. We must fight fire with fire.

The success of the Communists--such success as they have had--has been in the fanatical nature of their appeal. They have held out hope to hopeless men; they have offered a haven to those who feel they do not belong; they have put out a kind of substitute for religion. This is a phony appeal, but a potent one, nevertheless. The same is true, in a way, of the fanatic anti-Communists. Many of them have applied in their campaigns the same type of total thinking and the same type of total method they once used when they were members of the Communist party. This is, too, a kind of fanaticism and a kind of substitute for religion. To offset both groups there is needed a united front of free men dedicated to intellectual liberty. I feel that the groups represented here could found that kind of association: to exchange ideas, to draw up programs of action, to make clear to the nation the importance of freedom of communication. Such an organization could be of enormous help in the present situation.

I repeat--these are the two essential things: first, true information; second, the freedom to use that information freely. The responsibility for achieving both objectives rests largely with groups such as this. It is a great challenge and a great opportunity.

BROADCASTING

Merle Miller

We are here today because we are under attack; we are here because we are in danger, all of us without exception. We are in danger because we believe in ideas. Ideas are, in fact, our reason for existence. In a world devoid of ideas, in a world where there is only one idea, we would be without meaning or purpose.

We do not believe that all ideas are created equal. We know better than that. We know that there are evil ideas and good ideas; we believe that we--that all people everywhere--can choose between good and evil, between right and wrong, between the just and the unjust. Our enemies do not believe that. We know that the Communists do not; we know that in the countries they control they imprison and maim and kill those who express unorthodox ideas--and sometimes those who are guilty only of thinking unorthodox thoughts or who might think so at some time in the future or, perhaps, did in the past. In the United States there are those, a maniacal fringe, who unceasingly conspire to introduce such a system here. They must be fought.

However, in the United States, too, there are those who under the guise of defending the American idea are destroying it. They do not understand the American idea, and, if they did, they would be opposed to it. It is about these men and women I want to talk this afternoon, and I want to confine my remarks to one area in which they have been active. I want to speak of their success in one of our basic industries, one of the most crucial areas in the field of free communications, radio and television.

The battle had an eerie beginning. Only one shot was fired. It was well-aimed, and it reached its target, a young actress named Jean Muir; and, at the same time, it succeeeded in frightening into submission a five-billion dollar industry. Nobody knows how many telephone calls there were that otherwise quiet afternoon in August, 1950. Some say there were twenty; others insist that there were two hundred. Compared to the more than a million persons who otherwise that night might have seen Miss Muir play the lead in a television program called "The Aldrich Family," there was only a handful.

As you know, Miss Muir was discharged; in the nearly two years since, she has appeared on only one radio and television program; she is not likely to appear soon again. Her career was ended because her name, as in The Mikado, was on a little list, was on a little list; and the three men who published the list insist that she never will be missed, she never will be missed. Neither, they declare, will the other one hundred and fifty radio writers, actors, singers, dancers, producers, directors and executives whose names are listed in a publication called Red Channels. They are named because at some time in the past, in the thirties or during the Second World War or after, they belonged to organizations now called subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, wrote a book that was chosen by the Book Find Club, composed a song which was praised by the Daily Worker, appeared at a rally in which members of the Communist Party were also on the program, opposed Jim Crow in baseball, sent a dollar to Loyalist Spain or a bundle to the Soviet Union in 1945. Some were surely Communists; some had been; some never had or would. Some were, as the three former members of the F.B.I. who issued Red Channels insist, "dupers"; others were "duped." No one knew the difference; no one could tell. The degree of their duplicity or muddle-headedness did not matter. Neither did their innocence of both. All of their careers were damaged, some permanently.

They had all become "controversial," and that is an unforgivable offense in an industry where the sale of a single box of Post Toasties is too often more important than the democratic principles.

There has never been another Jean Muir case. Now those named in Red Channels, denounced in the

---

Merle Miller is a newspaperman and novelist and most recently author of The Judges and the Judged, dealing with the broadcasting industry. At the time of this address he was a representative of the Authors Guild of the Authors League of America.

weekly newsletter *Counterattack*, chided in an American Legion publication, or protested against by anonymous telephone callers simply are not hired in the first place. Or, as the manager of a large network radio and television station in New Orleans told me recently, "If you have to drop anybody, you simply say you are making a change in the programming . . . These things can be handled very simply if management is alert.

"The whole matter," he added, "is strictly a problem for management."

I disagree; I think it is the problem of the American people. I think it is the special concern of all of us in this room today.

Is there a black list in the American radio and television industry? There most assuredly is. How does it work?

It works this way.

A few months before John Garfield's death his agent received a telephone call from the producer of one of the better dramatic shows on television.

"Who," the producer asked the agent, "have you got like John Garfield?"

"What do you mean, who've I got like Garfield!" the agent demanded. "I've got the boy himself. Why don't you use him?"

"I'm sorry," the producer said, "but we just can't, and you know why we can't."

The next week Dane Clark played the role which might have been John Garfield's. Dane Clark's name is not listed in *Red Channels*. John Garfield's is.

It works like this.

The distinguished playwright Arthur Miller was told by the producer of an hour-long radio drama, "We'd like to repeat some of those adaptations you did for us right after the war, but you're in *Red Channels*."

It works like this.

The late Canada Lee's name does not appear in what along Madison Avenue here in New York is known as "The Bible of Madison Avenue." However, according to Walter White, Executive Secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, just before Lee's death "a whispering campaign was circulated among broadcasting and advertising executives that Mr. Lee was 'too controversial' because he had appeared at benefits for organizations purportedly fighting race prejudice which subsequently had been placed on the Attorney General's subversive list.

"He told me," White went on, "of four lucrative television appearances which had been offered him, in each of which the sponsor told him that he would employ Mr. Lee after he had 'appeared on some other program.' But none had the courage to be first."

Lee, White continued, had wanted to dramatize his problem by buying a shoeshine box and setting it up in front of the Bijou Theater where the movie version of *Cry, the Beloved Country* was playing. Lee's performance had been highly praised by the critics; nevertheless, he was out of work. He proposed to place placards on the shoeshine box explaining the boycott against him.

"Now," White wrote, "I know I was wrong in dissuading him from his melodramatic plan."

It works like this.

Gilbert Gabriel, the eminent novelist and dramatic critic, was last summer scheduled to appear on a television quiz show. At the last moment, the engagement was canceled. When Gabriel asked the reason, he was reminded that he was then head of the anti-censorship committee of the Authors League of America.

"What difference does that make?" Gabriel asked.

"I'm afraid," he was told, "it makes you too controversial."

Who is responsible? A one-time trio of war-time appointees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, two of whom have, since the publication of *Red Channels*, resigned, a Connecticut housewife who attempted, with great success, to end the careers of musician Larry Adler and dancer Paul Draper, a rabbi without a temple, an official of the American Legion, and a small group of noisy zealots who altogether constitute, as *Fortune* magazine has said, only "a handful of busybodies."

But they have succeeded beyond what must surely have been their most ambitious dreams. They have succeeded because no one in the radio and television industry has spoken out against them; they have succeeded because there has been no discernible public outcry against their terrifying tactics. And with their success, the communists are not weakened; to the contrary, their cause has been strengthened. That distinguished scholar, Edward Crankshaw, has written, "I can think of only one way in which the Kremlin may still conquer us, and that without war. It is by so frightening us . . . that for fear of the enemy within we transform our own society imperceptibly into an apparatus of totalitarianism indistinguishable from the society of Soviet Russia--a system which may not be criticized . . . for fear of damaging national unity, the unity of the grave, a system in which the bully and the corrupt may not be denounced or the underdog uplifted because nobody will dare risk being called a Red."

Of course, as Alan Barth knows best, it was ridiculous to suppose that loyalty oaths would be confined to teachers; they are now required of lawyers; of doctors; yes, of dentists; in some cities, I am told, of chiropractors (but not yet of tree surgeons); of members of state legislatures, city councils, and county boards of supervisors; of chiefs of police and patrolmen. To date, I believe most firemen have escaped.

Naturally, the radio and television industry had to fall in line; there was even some reasonably spirited debate as to who had been first in line. Was it a station in Los Angeles, California, or one in San Bernadino? Both claim the nefarious distinction. The Los Angeles oath was required, and one woman refused to sign it. She was not, she said, a Communist; she was a registered Republican. However, she added, "I am not convinced that the use of dictatorial methods is a sane way to combat undesirable ideologies. Dictation is an admission that our democratic system cannot survive by democratic methods." Naturally, the woman had to go. "We do this regretfully," the station manager said, "but we have no choice . . . We must clear our skirts of any suspicion." The oath in San Bernadino was voluntary; it was administered by a judge of the state superior court, and, happily, every single employee of the station signed. As I have said, it was voluntary.

The Columbia Broadcasting System--a network which at one time represented the best and most liberal tradition in American broadcasting--requires of each of its employees what, in an apparent attempt to make its evil more palatable, is called not an oath but a loyalty statement. More than two thousand of the network have so stated; they have stated that they are not now nor have they ever been members of the Communist Party, that they are not now nor have they ever been Fascists, National Actionists, or supporters of Gerald L. K. Smith, nor have they belonged to any of the groups called "subversive" by the Attorney General. One executive signed, but a few days later he left the network. He was, he said, going into some other line of work. The other line of work has not yet materialized, although nearly two years have passed. One stenographer resigned rather than sign. She refused to let her name be publicized; she would not allow the Communists to defend her; she declined to become a martyr. With her, it was only a matter of conscience. The Columbia Braodcasting System was sorry, but the vice president who was responsible said, "We cannot make exceptions." A year or more later he changed his mind. When he asked for the resignation of a second executive who was then being attacked in the hate-ridden pages of the New York Journal-American, the executive pointed out, flinching only a little, that he had attested to his loyalty to the Columbia Broadcasting System and to the United States. However, the vice president said, "That doesn't mean a thing."

To date, the loyalty statement has not turned up a single Communist or Fascist; it never will. That was not its intention. Its intention was to ward off attack from a handful of neurotics, to buy a moment of peace from a sprinkling of psycopaths. In that it has also failed, as such shabby cowardice always does. Yet, despite black lists--and there are many, some public, some private--despite loyalty oaths, despite demeaning submission to the crackpots, despite its cavalier abandonment of the American idea, the radio and television industry is not free from attack; no more is it safe from sabotage.

If war comes, the name of the Soviet agent assigned to destroy the master control board at the National Broadcasting Company will not be discovered in Red Channels; he will not have been praised in the Daily Worker; he will not have belonged to a dozen or even one organization of allegedly pinkish hue. He will, in all probability, be found to have been a member of the National Association of Manufacturers and the extreme right wing of the Republican Party. Harry Gold's name would not have been listed in a publication like Red Channels; neither would those of the Rosenbergs, or Whittaker Chambers, or Alger Hiss.

Thus, by casting principle aside, the radio and television industry has not solved the problem; it has simply complicated it, and in so doing it has ruined the lives of many decent and loyal Americans. Yet the search for an answer continues; it has troubled some of the highest-priced brains in America. "I can't tell you," said the chairman of the board of directors of one of the major networks, "how many nights I've stayed awake trying to decide what to do. Nobody seems to have any clear ideas."

He was wrong, of course; a great many people know what to do, and some of them are within the industry. But they are frightened; they are afraid to speak. The answer is cool-headed courage; the answer is a return to the simple idea that no matter what their beliefs are or may have been men and women have a right to create their dramas, to sing their songs, to dance their dances, to produce and direct and, yes, to express their ideas, no matter how unpalatable.

A little more than a month ago a carpenter in Atlantic City, New Jersey, sent a letter to the President of the Columbia Broadcasting System with his solution. "All pressure groups are overrated," he stated. "Like pressure, they blow up, and the man on the street goes in the store and buys what he wants. When will you people learn this simple truth? Moreover, when will you learn that your programs will be listened to if they are worth listening to, no matter what?

"Why don't you and your sponsors hire anybody, no matter who he or she is just as long as he or she or they have the talent for the job?

"In the first place, it is legal, which means it is constitutional, and . . . it is democratic . . . and virtuous, too. The results? Well, . . . the first few days, there will be a lot of stupid talk, and then everybody on the other networks and his brother, including the sponsors too, will want to join your act . . . And, finally, it will be the finest thing that ever happened to this country since Columbus came over and started all the trouble."

To date, I am told, the letter has not been answered.

I hope it will be; I hope other letters will follow, thousands of them. I hope there will be letters from you who are here today. I know that you are not afraid to protest against evil; you have proved that. I hope you will contine to protest, courageously, directly, and without equivocation against all violators of freedom everywhere.

Unless you do, the Enemy will win, and win he must not.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Alan Barth

The Constitution of the United States, as I am sure you know, guarantees you against cruel and unusual punishment, but this, I am afraid, just goes to show how imperfect and uncertain this kind of paper protection can be. When you are up against conference managers of a tyrannical and dictatorial nature who choose to impose upon your patience, I am afraid that your constitutional rights aren't going to afford you any very great protection.

Here you have listened quietly and patiently to twelve separate and distinct papers in the last two days, and I am now leaving entirely out of the list the observations of the chairmen of the several sections, and I am leaving out of account too the observations that came from the floor. You have listened to a considerable amount of talk and you are now asked to listen to me tell you what you have heard.

Well, I ask for some measure of forbearance, and I shall endeavor in return to grant it by being reasonable in the consumption of your time. I was at a dinner sometime ago and was seated next to a member of the United States Supreme Court in this building of the Bar Association. He was to make the speech of the evening. Just before it was time for him to speak, he turned to me and asked if he could borrow my watch. Well, I took it off and gave it to him and he said, "It's not that I am going to look at it but it is such a comfort to the audience to know that I have one."

I don't know just how it is in your calling, but in mine every reader is an embryonic newspaper editor, and we publish every day for people who are convinced that they know how to do our job better than we do, and perhaps they are right. I have the uncomfortable feeling that there are in this room a considerable number who will feel, and perhaps correctly, that they could do this job of summarization better than it is going to be done; but I thought it might be useful to you if I brought to you the impressions of these two days

that came to the mind of an outsider, an amateur, a fellow not familiar with the peculiar and, I now know, difficult problems of your profession.

I am under some temptation as a newspaper man to start talking as a newspaper "lead" might talk about the area of controversy. There was some controversy here, and I am going to talk about it before I finish, but I think it would be more accurate, it would indeed be better reporting, if I talked first about the very large area of general agreement; about the consensus which emerged, it seems to me, from the discussion of these two days.

I have jotted down several points upon which I think those of you who have been in attendance reached if not universal agreement at any rate a very large measure of agreement.

It seems to me fair to say, because it was observed by several speakers--Mr. McDiarmid in the opening session, and Mr. Markel just a little while ago--that there is general agreement that freedom is kinfolk to responsibility and that the enjoyment of freedom is indistinguishably linked with a responsibility to use that freedom in the public interest, to use it responsibly and to use it with a sense of duty and obligation.

There seemed to be general agreement that freedom of communication is one of the essential elements of a free society; that it has for that society, utility; that it is something more than a luxury; that it is indeed a necessary and indispensable means to the end of a free life. And as a corollary to that there seemed to be universal, or at any rate very general, agreement that libraries are an essential element in the system of free communication which is an element of a free society.

I was particularly glad it was brought out, first of all, in the very eloquent paper that was read by Dr. Julian Boyd, the first paper of this conference. It was brought out that freedom is not a right of the librarian any more than it is a right of the newspaper editor or of the author so much as it is a right of the reader, a right of the public to have access to information, a right of the public to know.

Mr. Markel brought out the point again this afternoon. Mr. Collison in his, it seemed to me, delightful summary of the English approach to this problem made mention of it too. "Censorship," he said, "is a reproach to common people." I thought it an apt and illuminating way to state that point.

A fourth generalization on which, it seemed to me, there was almost universal agreement is that censorship is of itself a corrupting influence. There is indeed no such thing as good censorship; there is no such thing as wise censorship. Mr. Smith put it this way--I think I have the quote accurately although I had to take it down from hearing--"I have little fear that lurid comics or trashy fiction or USA Confidential will corrupt us, as long as the channels of communication are kept free. I have great fear, on the other hand, that censorship, official or unofficial, would quickly corrupt us all."

Mr. Klopfer put it with an equal eloquence: "Freedom is indeed dangerous. Free circulation of everyone's ideas means risks. But I am utterly convinced that far greater dangers to our whole way of life, to everything that we hold dear, arise from suppression of ideas."

Now when all of that has been acknowledged--and I do not think there is any conflict between what I have said and what I am about to say--there seems to be also general agreement among us that in the selection and in the operation of libraries, as in the operation of a newspaper, there must be selection, and selection poses a challenge.

Mr. McDiarmid made the point that libraries have need of more and better trained personnel. He made it in connection with a thesis that seemed to have general acceptance, that the inescapable part of library operation ought to be done by professional personnel, qualified people, not by outside pressure groups, not by self-appointed censors of any kind.

There is one concluding point which I think had general acceptance and it seems to me an extremely significant one. Mr. Berninghausen brought out this morning, when he was introducing the speakers on his panel, that the American faith in freedom, that the American adherence to the traditions which we are likely to think of as special, is not peculiarly American, it is an asset to us in our endeavors to provide leadership for the free world, and that relinquishment or abandonment of those ideals of freedom here can have a terrible impact upon the affairs of the world outside and upon our leadership of that world.

Now I come to an area in which there was an element of controversy. I want to try to state this controversy in proportion. I think that Mr. Munn of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh who touched it off yesterday afternoon will forgive me and will absolve me of any prejudice if I say that it seemed to me he was expressing here a minority point of view. He expressed it, I thought, with admirable moderation and good temper and the discussion that he touched off seemed to me to be admirably restrained and rational and illuminating.

Mr. Munn, as I understand it, was commenting on the Library Bill of Rights, and he said, "You and I must interpret and apply the Library Bill of Rights with some regard for administrative feasibility." The public library, he observed, is not independent of its environment; it is rather an integral part of local government and cannot get too far from or go too far in advance of local public opinion. It cannot get too far away from a prevailing opinion in the neighborhood which it serves.

Now I think that there was a good deal of agreement with that position. Mr Cushman, for example, said that "The library must be, like Caesar's wife, blameless before all." He said, too, that it must not battle quixotically, that it must make concessions to public opinion. But Mr. Munn then got specific. He was talking about the problem of how to handle Communist propaganda, and it is a wonderful commentary on the time in which we live that so much of the attention of this conference was focussed on Communist propaganda, which I must say it seems to me has had negligible effect for a quarter of a century on American opinion and which I must say seems to me to have little danger of subverting the faith of the American people in their own institutions.

However, Mr. Munn feels that although a library ought to make available to its readers the candid tools for the understanding of communism and of the Soviet Union, that it ought to include in its collections and make available to readers the honest works on Russia and communism. He thinks, nevertheless, that "It is our duty to discover and eliminate from library collections disguised propaganda."

He would go, as I understand it, to the extent of segregating that kind of book, that kind of material, putting it in a special place and making it available to readers only under special conditions. "When we display a book," he observed, "we are inviting its use by people who never before heard of it," and to that extent he fears that the display of books or other material which can be called "concealed Communist propaganda" serves as a recruitment for the Russian system and makes libraries agents of that approval.

The issue was sharply drawn when Mr. Munn stated that position. Mr. Cushman, for example, had this to say about it: "Every book on our shelves belongs in its proper place without segregation on account of qualities imputed to it." Mr. Collison noted that "special shelving or handling is a vile practice."

There were some pretty sharp protests from the floor. "Who decides what is concealed propaganda?" somebody asked. And the point was given illustration by another speaker from the floor, "What do you do about Agnes Smedley and Anna Louise Strong?" The list of writers about whom that question could be asked could readily be multiplied, it could be a very long list depending upon the degree of concealed propaganda. There was one speaker this morning who made it quite apparent that she would have a long list of books about the authors of which she would have genuinely, conscientiously held doubts.

Now I don't know myself--but I have no desire to dismiss the problem as negligible because I don't know the answer--I don't know myself how as conscientious librarians we are going to differentiate between books that are indeed concealed propaganda--books that are subversive--on the one hand, and books that honestly and sincerely advocate social change, books that advocate economic innovation, books that are severely critical of the administration in power, books that are directed at a change of established policy. Of course I suppose that there could be no question that at least one of the most important functions of the printed page is to provide the mechanism through which change, through which innovation can be advocated.

I think that as a detached and impartial reporter of this conference I ought to let the controversy go with what I have intended to be an evenhanded presentation of the two sides. It is a controversy about which I am sure at least of this, that there are no absolutes. It has to be worked out in terms of individual situations, in terms of individual and conscientious judgments about particular books, and perhaps no formula would serve satisfactorily to encompass or to solve the whole problem.

We heard this afternoon three extremely eloquent papers discussing not so much your special problem as the general problem of the atmosphere in which we are now living and working.

I thought that there was particular utility in the recitation which Mr. Markel gave us of the dangerous myths that are now assailing American minds: the myth of guilt by association; the myth which he called the myth of the liberal dupe; and the wonderful myth--and I am particularly grateful to him for elucidating it--that the farthest to the right are nearest right; the myth that the government is shot through with communism and that there is an international conspiracy dominating it.

I think that the whole of the problems which you have considered in this conference and which you will be discussing and working through in your daily operations can be better solved, better met if you will think of them with a recollection of the myths that Markel set forth.

He said, you know--and I took this down as a significant and interesting observation--that there is a black fear in the country that is brought about by the witch hunters. I think it worth while to ask ourselves, when we confront the variety, the multiplicity of pressures and pressure groups that were enumerated for us this morning by Professor Childs, whether much of that fear is generated by men who are deliberately setting about to create a panic.

"We are here," Merle Miller said, "because we are in great danger." I think that is so and I think that what brought all of you here to this Conference on Intellectual Freedom on a week end in advance of the meeting of your association was a sense that the country as well as your particular profession is in great danger. The danger arises from attacks that are essentially attacks upon ideas, attacks upon the right to hold ideas, attacks upon the diversity which has been, in my view, the genius of American society.

Mr. Dix opened the conference with the observation, "We are all of us naturally concerned with saving our own skins." Well, of course that is so. He went on to say, though, that we have less selfish concerns, less selfish and narrow motivations.

Mr. Boyd expressed it, it seemed to me, with special eloquence. "Librarians," he said, "are custodians of a great past." I think that is the special sense of responsibility which all of you ought to carry away with you, and that is the central responsibility of which you never ought to lose sight.

You will forgive me, I hope, since as a newspaper man I am not a reporter but an editorial writer, for an editorial observation in conclusion. I agree that the danger is very great, and I think that you as members of a profession need to close ranks, need to come together in the large area in which you have agreement, to resist what Professor Chafee called "a barbarian invasion," to resist the ground swell of know-nothingism which is attacking all ideas and which is attacking the central idea of American life, that men have a right to hold and to express ideas no matter how heterodox, no matter how unorthodox they may be.

You have more to save than your own skins. You are indeed custodians of a great past. You are in a peculiar sense the trustees of the nation's intellectual inheritance. When you seek to protect your own freedom against assaults that may be made upon it by the witch hunters, when you seek to protect your own profession from those attacks, you protect also the freedom of all Americans.

It seems to me that it is to the preservation of this freedom that you owe your first obligation, that the real and the essential loyalty of free men everywhere is a loyalty to the illimitable freedom of the human mind.

Appendix A

LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS

The Council of the American Library Association reaffirms its belief in the following basic policies which should govern the services of all libraries:

1. As a responsibility of library service, books and other reading matter selected should be chosen for values of interest, information and enlightenment of all the people of the community. In no case should any book be excluded because of the race or nationality, or the political or religious views of the writer.

2. There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national, and local; and books or other reading matter of sound factual authority should not be proscribed or removed from library shelves because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval.

3. Censorship of books, urged or practiced by volunteer arbiters of morals or political opinion or by organizations that would establish a coercive concept of Americanism, must be challenged by libraries in maintenance of their responsibility to provide public information and enlightenment through the printed word.

4. Libraries should enlist the cooperation of allied groups in the fields of science, of education, and of book publishing in resisting all abridgment of the free access to ideas and full freedom of expression that are the tradition and heritage of Americans.

5. As an institution of education for democratic living, the library should welcome the use of its meeting rooms for socially useful and cultural activities and discussion of current public questions. Such meeting

places should be available on equal terms to all groups in the community regardless of the beliefs and affiliations of their members.

By official action of the Council on February 3, 1951, the Library Bill of Rights shall be interpreted to apply to all materials and media of communication used or collected by libraries.

Appendix B

LABELING STATEMENT

In view of our own convictions and those of other practicing librarians whose counsel we sought, the Committee on Intellectual Freedom recommends to the A.L.A. Council the following policy with respect to labeling library materials:

Librarians should not use the technique of labeling as a means of predisposing readers against library materials for the following reasons:

1. Although totalitarian states find it easy and even proper, according to their ethics, to establish criteria for judging publications as "subversive," injustice and ignorance rather than justice and enlightenment result from such practices, and the American Library Association has a responsibility to take a stand against the establishment of such criteria in a democratic state.

2. Libraries do not advocate the ideas found in their collections. The presence of a magazine or book in a library does not indicate an endorsement of its contents by the library.

3. No one person should take the responsibility of labeling publications. No sizable group of persons would be likely to agree either on the types of material which should be labeled or the sources of information which should be regarded with suspicion. As a practical consideration, a librarian who labeled a book or magazine pro-communist might be sued for libel.

4. Labeling is an attempt to prejudice the reader, and as such, it is a censor's tool.

5. Labeling violates the spirit of the Library Bill of Rights.

6. Although we are all agreed that communism is a threat to the free world, if materials are labeled to pacify one group, there is no excuse for refusing to label any item in the library's collection. Because communism, fascism, or other authoritarianisms tend to suppress ideas and attempt to coerce individuals to conform to a specific ideology, American librarians must be opposed to such "isms." We are, then, anticommunist, but we are also opposed to any other group which aims at closing any path to knowledge.

(These recommendations were adopted by the A.L.A. Council on July 13, 1951.)

Appendix C

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

The following selection of books and pamphlets, confined to those published after World War II, is intended as an introduction to some of the problems surrounding the central idea of intellectual freedom. Titles have been chosen primarily to stimulate interest and to present a variety of viewpoints. This is by no means an exhaustive bibliography. The user is reminded in particular of the wealth of material to be found in current magazines, a great many of which can be found in any public library. The Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, under the heading "Intellectual Freedom" and related subjects, will quickly open many channels for the further study of these problems. --John E. Smith

THE CONCEPT OF LIBERTY, INCLUDING LIBERTY IN RELATION TO GOVERNMENT

Corwin, Edward Samuel. Liberty Against Government; the Rise, Flowering and Decline of a Famous Juridical Concept. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State Univ. Pr., 1948.

Cox, Ignatius Wiley. Liberty, Its Use and Abuse, Being the Principles of Ethics, Basic and Applied. 3d ed. N. Y., Fordham Univ. Pr., 1946.

Dos Passos, John. The Prospect before Us. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1950.

Jones, Howard Mumford, ed. Primer of Intellectual Freedom. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Pr., 1949.

Lauterbach, Albert T. Economic Security and Individual Freedom; Can we Have Both? Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1948.

Miller, John Chester. Crisis in Freedom, the Alien and Sedition Acts. Boston, Little, Brown, 1951.

Monaghan, Frank. Heritage of Freedom, the History and Significance of the Basic Documents of American Liberty. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Pr., 1947.

Polanyi, Michael. The Logic of Liberty, Reflections and Rejoinders. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1951.

Rosenfarb, Joseph. Freedom and the Administrative State. N.Y., Harper, 1948.

Schlesinger, Arthur Meier, Jr. The Vital Center, the Politics of Freedom. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin, 1949.

Steinberg, Julien, ed. Verdict of Three Decades; from the literature of individual revolt against Soviet communism, 1917-1950. N.Y., Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1950.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Freedom and Culture. N.Y., Columbia Univ. Pr., 1951.

U.S. Library of Congress. Legislative Reference Service. Communism in Action; a Documented Study and Analysis of Communism in Operation in the Soviet Union. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1946.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

Carr, Robert Kenneth. Federal Protection of Civil Rights, Quest for a Sword. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1948.

Chafee, Zechariah, ed. Documents on Fundamental Human Rights. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Pr., 1952. 2 vols.

Civil Liberties under Attack, by Henry Steele Commager and others. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 1951.

Civil Rights in the United States in 1951, a Balance Sheet of Group Relations. N.Y., American Jewish Congress and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1952.

Committee for Economic Development. National Security and Our Individual Freedom. N.Y., 1949.

Cushman, Robert Eugene. New Threats to American Freedoms. (Public affairs pamphlets, no. 143) N.Y., Public Affairs Committee, 1948.

De Huszar, George Bernard, comp. Equality in America; the Issue of Minority Rights. (Reference Shelf, v. 21, no. 3) N.Y., Wilson, 1949.

Foster, Arnold. The Trouble-makers, an Anti-Defamation League Report. N.Y., Doubleday, 1952.

Holcombe, Arthur Norman. Human Rights in the Modern World. N.Y., New York Univ. Pr., 1948.

Institute for Religious and Social Studies, Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Great Expressions of Human Rights, a Series of Addresses and Discussions, ed. by Robert Morrison MacIver. N.Y., Harper, 1950.

Jessop, Thomas Edmund. Freedom of the Individual in Society. Toronto, Ryerson Pr., 1948.

Lasswell, Harold Dwight. National Security and Individual Freedom. N.Y., McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Reppy, Alison. Civil Rights in the United States. N.Y., Central Book Co., 1951.

Rogge, Oetje John. Our Vanishing Civil Liberties. N.Y., Gaer Associates, 1949.

United Nations. General Assembly. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Rev. ed. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1951.

United Nations. Secretariat. Dept. of Public Information. These Rights and Freedoms. N.Y., Columbia Univ. Pr., 1950.

U.S. Dept. of State. Division of Library and Reference Service. Human Rights, a Selected Bibliography. (Bibliography no. 48) Washington, 1949.

FREE SPEECH AND FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Brucker, Herbert. Freedom of Information. N.Y., Macmillan, 1949.

Chafee, Zechariah. Thirty-five Years with Freedom of Speech. N.Y., Roger N. Baldwin Civil Liberties Foundation, 1952.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. Peoples Speaking to Peoples. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947.

Ernst, Morris Leopold. First Freedom. N.Y., Macmillan, 1946.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. Free Speech and Its Relation to Self-government. N.Y., Harper, 1948.

Summers, Robert Edward, comp. Federal Information Controls in Peace-time. (Reference shelf, v. 20, no. 6) N.Y., Wilson, 1949.

United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, Geneva, 1948. Delegation from the United States. Report of the United States Delegates, with Related Documents. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1948.

U.S. Library of Congress. European Affairs Division. Freedom of Information, a Selective Report on Recent Writing. Washington, 1949.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRIES

Commission on Freedom of the Press. American Radio, a Report on the Broadcasting Industry in the United States. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. Free and Responsible Press, a General Report on Mass Communication: Newspapers, Radio, Motion Pictures, Magazines and Books. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. Freedom of the Movies, a Report on Self-regulation. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. Freedom of the Press, a Framework of Principle. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947.

Commission on Freedom of the Press. Government and Mass Communications, a Report. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1947. 2 vols.

Field, Marshall. Freedom Is More Than a Word. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1945.

Gerald, James Edward. The Press and the Constitution, 1931-1947. Minneapolis, Univ. of Minnesota Pr., 1948.

Hughes, Frank L. Prejudice and the Press, a Restatement of the Principle of Freedom of the Press with Specific Reference to the Hutchins-Luce Commission. N.Y., Devin-Adair, 1950.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Bainton, Roland Herbert. The Travail of Religious Liberty, Nine Biographical Studies. Philadelphia, Westminster Pr., 1951.

Blanshard, Paul. *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. Boston, Beacon Pr., 1949.

Blau, Joseph Leon. *Cornerstones of Religious Freedom in America*. Boston, Beacon Pr., 1949.

Hutchinson, Paul. *The New Leviathan*. Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1946.

Northcott, William Cecil. *Religious Liberty*. N.Y., Macmillan, 1949.

Powers, Francis Joseph. *Religious Liberty and the Police Power of the State.* Washington, Catholic Univ. of America Pr., 1948.

LOYALTY AND SUBVERSION

Andrews, Bert. *Washington Witch Hunt*. N.Y., Random House, 1948.

Barrett, Edward L. *The Tenney Committee, Legislative Investigation of Subversive Activities in California*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1951.

Barth, Alan. *The Loyalty of Free Men*. N.Y., Viking, 1951.

Biddle, Francis Beverley. *The Fear of Freedom, a Discussion of the Contemporary Obsession of Anxiety and Fear in the United States, Its Historical Background and Present Expression, and Its Effect on National Security and on Free American Institutions*. N.Y., Doubleday, 1951.

Chamberlain, Lawrence Henry. *Loyalty and Legislative Action; a Survey of Activity by the New York State Legislature, 1919-1949*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1951.

Countryman, Vern. *Un-American Activities in the State of Washington; the Work of the Canwell Committee*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1951.

Gellhorn, Walter, ed. *The States and Subversion*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1952.

MacIver, Robert Morrison, editor. *Conflict of Loyalties*. N.Y., Harper, 1952.

McWilliams, Carey. *Witch Hunt, Revival of Heresy*. Boston, Little, Brown, 1951.

Ogden, August Raymond. *The Dies Committee; a Study of the Special House Committee for the Investigation of Un-American Activities, 1938-1944.* Washington, Catholic Univ. of America Pr., 1945.

U.S. President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty. *Report*. Washington, 1947.

Weyl, Nathaniel. *The Battle Against Disloyalty*. N.Y., Crowell, 1951.

SCIENCE, FREEDOM AND SECURITY

Bryson, Lyman. *Science and Freedom*. N.Y., Columbia Univ. Pr., 1947.

Gellhorn, Walter. *Security, Loyalty and Science*. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1950.

Polanyi, Michael. *Science, Faith and Society*. N.Y., Oxford Univ. Pr., 1946.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE ATTACKS ON EDUCATION

Buckley, William F. *God and Man at Yale, the Superstitions of Academic Freedom*. Chicago, Regnery, 1951.

Freedom and the University; the Responsibility of the University for the Maintenance of Freedom in the American Way of Life, by Edgar N. Johnson and others. Ithaca, Cornell Univ. Pr., 1950.

Hulburd, David. This Happened in Pasadena. N.Y., Macmillan, 1951.

Melby, Ernest Oscar. American Education Under Fire, the Story of the "Phony Three-R Fight." Chicago, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1951.

Reutter, E. Edmund. The School Administrator and Subversive Activities; a Study of the Administration of Restraints on Alleged Subversive Activities of Public School Personnel. N.Y., Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia Univ., 1951.

Stewart, George Rippey. Year of the Oath, the Fight for Academic Freedom at the University of California. N.Y., Doubleday, 1950.

Wagner, Charles Abraham. Harvard, Four Centuries and Freedoms. N.Y., Dutton, 1950.

Washington (State) University. Board of Regents. Communism and Academic Freedom; the Record of the Tenure Cases at the University of Washington, Including the Findings of the Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom and the President's Recommendations. Seattle, Univ. of Washington Pr., 1947.

PUBLIC OPINION, PROPAGANDA AND PRESSURE GROUPS

Berelson, Bernard, ed. Reader in Public Opinion and Communication. Glencoe, Ill., Free Pr., 1950.

Doob, Leonard William. Public Opinion and Propaganda. N.Y., Holt, 1948.

Ebersole, Luke Eugene. Church Lobbying in the Nation's Capital. N.Y., Macmillan, 1951.

Hummel, William Castle. The Analysis of Propaganda. N.Y., Sloane, 1949.

Key, Valdimer Orlando. Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups. N.Y., Crowell, 1947.

Lowenthal, Leo. Prophets of Deceit; a Study of the Techniques of the American Agitator. N.Y., Harper, 1949.

Schriftgiesser, Karl. The Lobbyists; the Art and Business of Influencing Law-makers. Boston, Little, Brown, 1951.

Smith, Bruce Lannes. Propaganda, Communication, and Public Opinion, a Comprehensive Reference Guide. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Pr., 1946.

Truman, David Bicknell. The Governmental Process; Political Interests and Public Opinion. N.Y., Knopf, 1951.