

Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association

Donald E. Strout, Editor

Vol. 6, No. 4

December, 1957

The Newsletter is published quarterly, subscription price \$2.00 per year. All subscriptions placed during 1957 start with the March issue and expire with the December issue. Address all correspondence on placement and payment of subscriptions to: Subscriptions Department, American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois. Address all other correspondence to: Editorial Office, 316 Library, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

TV, GRAY FLANNEL MENTALITY, AND THE OSTRICH

Throughout the year just past, the preoccupation of TV sponsors, network officials, producers, and script writers as well as program participants with avoiding "sensitive" areas, sidestepping controversy, and trying to offend no one and please everyone at the same time blanketed the industry with a kind of nightmarish fog of "Andy-ain't-mad-at-nobodiness". Programs, already mired in mediocrity, were further contoured to conformity and tailored to timidity. Well-known songs were rewritten, well known plays carefully "adapted", cartoon characters and events innocuized, movie sequences deleted, programs cancelled, and scripts revised, discarded outright, or "shelved".

Item: Network tampering with Stephen Foster's all-but-classic songs (Sept, 1957 Newsletter) set off a chain reaction of protest from Northern and Southern press alike. The networks involved (NBC and CBS), under pressure from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, announced that "any of Stephen Foster's songs which are state songs will go out over the air just as they were written" (AP release, Oct. 30). This half about-face was hailed by some as a victory; to the St. Petersburg, Fla., Independent (Nov. 5) it appeared "a little puzzling. . . just why the word 'darkie' is offensive when it is sung on a run-of-the-mill occasion but suddenly becomes inoffensive when it is uttered as a part of a state song."

Item: Marc Connelly's The Green Pastures, well received and warmly remembered on stage and screen, appeared on TV in late October, all prettied up in a brand new gray-flannel, offend-no-one version by Connelly himself. Sample transformations, replacements and deletions: De Lawd becomes The Lord, speaks grammatically, smokes no seegars, is no longer Liver Lips, but Preacher Man. No derbies. No celestial throne like a Negro lawyer's office in a Louisiana town. "A soft rural-type intonation" replaces the Negro dialect of Connelly's earlier script (which had been good enough for a Pulitzer Prize). New emphasis: "The timelessness of the story - the fable aspect rather than any specific place or period," according to a spokesman for the production. (Time, Oct. 21, p. 58)

Item: Walter Lantz, veteran cartoon producer and father of Woody Woodpecker, has found "taboo" signs hanging on the following subjects - even when appearing in animated cartoons - spitting grasshoppers, the kitten who said "I am an orphan with no mommy or poppy," three blind mice (but three mice pretending blindness were acceptable, however), characters speaking in foreign or racial dialects, a barefoot Mexican taking a siesta, and a cow's udder. Of the last-named Lantz observed, "Eliminating a cow's udder is just foolishness. It also is expensive. If I have to remove an udder from about 30 feet of film, it costs about \$6000." (Chicago News, Nov. 8)

Item: From the film clips of Time Limit shown on a nationally televised show, the following line was deleted: "My husband has been home for five months and six days and in all that time we have never been to bed together." Reason given by the network: "offensive to American taste." "Ridiculous," snapped producer-actor Widmark, "It's hard to accept the network's point of view when the channels are busy claiming that a happy marriage really depends on a special deodorant or a favorite tooth paste. . . Self-imposed censorship of the TV networks is an insult to the American people." (N. Y. Post, Oct. 22)

Item: A series of actual happenings involving individuals as disparate as a waitress and an industrial tycoon, where each went to extra effort to protect the rights of a fellow human being - and succeeded - were offered to TV program-makers. Producers liked them, but always "somebody" objected to them as "too strong" - despite the fact that in every instance, as Gilbert Seldes wrote (Saturday Review, Oct. 26), "The Bill of Rights was confirmed as an active ingredient in contemporary American life." Continued Seldes, "What, then, was 'too strong'? The one essential of drama: conflict. For the Bill of Rights to triumph it had to be challenged or violated . . . sometimes by authority. . . sometimes by groups or individuals - but every time Americans reasserted its validity. Yet the material could not be presented - on television." (Full account in Oct. 1957 Harper's)

Two other events, despite their immediate outcome, could only be regarded in the long run as contributing to the climate of fear already plaguing the industry.

Item: The New York Public Library withdrew its sponsorship of a program depicting the horrors of war, with the avowed intentions of avoiding participation in discussion of what it termed a "sensitive area" (recounted in full below). Despite this withdrawal, the program was presented as scheduled.

Item: "Robert Moses, chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Slum Clearance, refused to make a scheduled appearance on a television discussion program yesterday because the script was unfriendly" (N. Y. Times, Oct. 6). Mr. Moses had been invited to choose his fellow guests; he had been invited to submit questions he wanted asked; the script contained no suggestion as to the answers. The questions, on a subject long publicly debated, "were thorny; they dealt with three major areas of controversy: race, religion, and the relocation of poor people and small business." But, as Seldes (SR, Oct. 26) continued, "A representative of the City of New York not only refused to answer them, he refused to allow them to be asked in his presence - on television." Again to TV's credit (as in the case of the NYPL above), the show went on.

The TV industry as a whole could draw little encouragement from statements by the

Pope, the Catholic bishops of the U. S. , and a former government official - all reflecting the possibility of increased pressures from the outside.

Item: Said former chairman of the FCC McConnaughey before the Ohio Municipal League: "There has been a lot of inane prattle going on in Washington lately about regulating broadcasting. . . You will be helping not only your community but the broadcaster himself by doing away with the current motivation in Washington for the establishment of a federal censor of programming in one guise or another." (Dayton, O. , News, Sept. 20)

Item: The Papal encyclical ("Miranda prorsus") on radio and television (Sept. 1957 Newsletter), echoed in the 2400-word statement on censorship by the Catholic Bishops of the U. S. on Nov. 17, heralded a closer scrutiny by the Church of all broadcasting media and raised the prospect of subsequent ratings of programs as to acceptability through the establishment of national offices for TV and radio similar to those now operative for motion pictures and print.

Of these myriad moves toward censorship of TV programs from both within and outside the industry, columnist Jack Gould wrote (N. Y. Times, Sept. 22):

Anticipatory censorship - the subtle and silent exercise of fantastic caution merely to avoid even the possibility of a problem - is already a prevalent affliction in television. . . It is this omnipresent danger - the growing vacuity and innocuity of television - that always must be borne in mind by the perceptive Catholic, Protestant and Jew alike.

The truly large moral danger posed by television is not that an occasional program may make a slip in good taste or deviate from the individual viewer's tenets of morality. . . Rather the common concern of all should be that the home screen does not succumb to the infinitely greater immorality of cultural and intellectual sterility, to an emptiness of purpose which does nothing to buoy a viewer's mind, his spiritual faith or his awareness of the huge and complex issues which impinge on his life.

On another occasion early in the year, the ACLU pointed out (Chicago News, March 9):

Television stations cannot, ostrich-like, plunge their antennas into the sand whenever the winds of controversy blow.

Indeed, for that matter, neither can its vast audience, nor the myriad individuals and institutions like churches and libraries, large or small, in their varied (and often joint) role as sponsor, participant, and consumer of TV.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY - LION OR MOUSE?

Headlined the N. Y. Post editorially (Nov. 12): "Lights Out in the Library." Headlined the Des Moines Tribune editorially (Nov. 12): "He Calls This Freedom?" Headlined the N. Y. Times atop Jack Gould's column (Nov. 17): "Avoiding an Issue - Library's Withdrawal From TV Show War Seen as Shortsighted." Headlined the Saturday Review editorially (Nov. 23): "A 'Sensitive' Subject."

The occasion was the presentation on Sunday, Nov. 10, by CBS over its TV outlet

in New York, of a program called The Faces of War, produced under the auspices of the Metropolitan Educational TV Association, with dramatic readings from Homer, Euripides, Shakespeare, Whitman, Twain and the like to illustrate the horrors of war and the categorical imperative for modern man to rise above war in the interest of survival. Participants included James Jones, Norman Cousins, Margaret Mead, Mark Van Doren, and Earle Hyman. Up to the last moment, the New York Public Library was one of the sponsors (along with other educational groups).

Suddenly - without warning - on Nov. 9, the New York Public Library withdrew its support. NYPL Board president, Morris Hadley, was later quoted as ordering removal of a screen credit line "prepared for the NYPL" (N. Y. Times, Nov. 11) on the grounds that the show ran counter to a long-standing policy that "in sensitive areas it is wisest for the library not to take a position."

Commented Norman Cousins (SR, Nov. 23): "The word 'sensitive' is the new euphemism for 'controversial.' Actually, the program was no more 'sensitive' or 'controversial' than the Ten Commandments." Of the Library action, Cousins added: "It has acted more like a large soap company terrified by possible stockholder complaints than an institution which is supposed to serve as a headquarters for the free circulation of ideas."

Columnist Jack Gould (N. Y. Times, Nov. 17) found the decision "so contrary to the library's normally civilized behavior that the circumstances of the incident still remain rather baffling." In a more-in-sorrow-than-in-anger tone, Gould added: "Presumably by now the proud lions on the steps of the library have put their paws over their heads in abject chagrin. . . As one of the country's most treasured storehouses of the printed word, where the shelves are lined with controversial books of all types, the library cannot shed quickly its tradition of the circulation of ideas. Last week the library just became rattled; it will be forgiven."

Unfortunately, however, the issues raised for librarians by the NYPL's action cannot so easily be laid to rest. As the N. Y. Post (Nov. 12) observed:

To the enemies of liberty, a library in itself can be dangerous and controversial. For such an institution to believe it can remove itself from controversy by remaining above all mankind's battles is to reduce itself to absurdity.

This importance of libraries and their responsibility to act as instruments fostering controversy was voiced by Gould in these words:

A trustee of our culture, whether found in a library, broadcasting studio, or a classroom, has an obligation to give a hearing to countless opinions; whether he personally approves or disapproves of them is beside the point.

Cousins put his finger squarely upon the implications of the NYPL action for the library world at large when he wrote:

The American public library. . . has had to defend itself in recent years against outside pressures. Not enough people understood what a free public library is or does in a free society.

Now it develops that the concept of a free library is being jeopardized by the library itself. Indeed, a major public library, out of timidity and fear of controversy, has provoked a major controversy in which every library in the country and everyone connected with books must have deep concern.

Up until December 10, the NYPL declined to answer Mr. Cousins or to elaborate upon its reasons for withdrawing its sponsorship.

PEYTON PLACE BANNED

For a year Peyton Place went its best-selling way without benefit of censor. But on Sept. 24 the paperback edition of the Grace Metalious novel, which its jacket claims "lifts the lid off a respectable New England town," was published and within a month it had achieved the status of a "banned book."

On Oct. 24 the Roanoke, Va., World-News reported that Hampton police had banned the sale of "several magazines, several paperback books, and that dreary novel, Peyton Place." Said the World-News: "The sin of Peyton Place is not that it is smutty, but that it is a bore. . . The book merits what John Randolph once called a 'judicious neglect.'"

In Fort Wayne, Ind., the county prosecutor, after reading the book and deciding it was "obscene, lewd and indecent," asked dealers to stop selling copies "if they, too, found it obscene." The prosecutor's deputy said that "quite a demand had been created" by the removal of Peyton Place from the public library shelves there. (Indianapolis Times, Nov. 1)

Biggest fuss was stirred up in Rhode Island. On Oct. 24 the State Commission to Encourage Morality in Youth notified local police chiefs that the book was considered objectionable and not to be displayed or sold to persons under 18 years old. Booksellers throughout the state got busy "cooperating." Even libraries became involved. In Barrington, a patrolman went to the library and notified librarian Susan Demery that the book had to be removed, but patrons had already beaten him to it - both copies were out on loan. The chairman of the library board announced that no action would be taken concerning the book until "some sort of official communication was received." Later the police chief announced that the patrolman had erred in demanding the book's removal. The Providence Journal (Oct. 27) noted the "danger that the commission's zeal will lead to an assault upon the freedom of the state's public libraries," and said that although the patrolman's "action was disavowed, he demonstrated how widely an unchecked big stick can flail."

HOWL BAN LIFTED

San Francisco bookshop owner and publisher Ferlinghetti, on trial for having sold the allegedly obscene Howl and Other Poems by Allen Ginsberg (Sept. 1957 News-letter), was acquitted by Municipal Judge Clayton Horn, who found the book "cannot be held obscene unless it is entirely lacking in social importance" (ACLU News, Nov. 1957). Nine literary experts had testified as to the book's artistic merit (San Francisco News, Sept. 6).

Jam-packed with quoteworthy passages was Judge Horn's long (38-page) opinion. Sample: "There are a number of words used in Howl that are presently considered

coarse and vulgar in some circles of the community; in other circles such words are in every day use. . . The People state that it is not necessary to use such words and that others would be more palatable to good taste. The answer is that life is not encased in one formula whereby everyone acts the same or conforms to a particular pattern. . . Would there be any freedom of press or speech if one must reduce his vocabulary to vapid innocuous euphemism? "

THE LEGISLATIVE ROAD

The past year saw as many as 11 states enacting one or more new censorship laws to bolster already existing statutes. Texas, Pennsylvania, Florida, Missouri, North Carolina, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma joined the ranks of those states reported in the June 1957 Newsletter as having passed new measures. Already - although many legislatures do not convene again until 1959 - censorship advocates are busy laying the groundwork for more legislation, as in California, where, despite the fact that 4 censorship bills failed this year, a special subcommittee on pornography has announced a series of statewide hearings starting Nov. 25 and 26 (San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 12).

Perhaps the would-be censors of one state who think some other state has found the satisfactory answer would do well to take a look at the confused picture presented by the states trying to enforce their "model" laws. Usually the laws are vague in meaning, broad in scope, and dependent upon the individual interpretation of whoever is charged with the responsibility of enforcement. The legislative road to censorship - like another well-known road - is paved with good intentions, but the traffic signals and caution blinkers either fail to work or are missing entirely. The subsequent chaos either brings about an encroachment on individual freedom never intended by the well-meaning lawmakers (and the opponents of censorship are unhappy), or the law enforcing agencies, charged with the responsibility but not given the legal authority, are unable to enforce the law (and the proponents of censorship are unhappy). The easy answer: another unworkable statute to clutter up the books, despite the recent experiences of states like Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and North Carolina, where similar newly enacted statutes are proving unworkable.

Oklahoma: When Oklahoma's 3-man literature commission, created in 1957 to censor "objectionable" publications, set about to study the extent of its powers, it found that all it could do was: (1) receive evidence of obscene literature sales from citizens; (2) hold hearings it could not compel anyone to attend or testify before; (3) send the evidence to the county attorney and "recommend" that he prosecute (which any private citizen could already do). But the commission had no money to hold hearings, to buy magazines for investigation, or even to notify county attorneys of violations. The legislature had failed to make any appropriation and the attorney general, a member of the commission, ruled that the situation was not such as would permit use of the governor's emergency fund.

For several months, the commission's one power - to act as a clearing house for citizen complaints - proved empty because it received no complaints; finally in September two letters arrived. One wanted three magazines banned: Time for printing the painting "September Morn," National Geographic for pictures of unclad natives, and Good Housekeeping for the "nasty pictures of women." The other letter expressed the general hope that "sexy literature" could be eliminated from the newstands. (Okl. City Times, July 9 and 25, Sept. 20)

The Oklahoma City Oklahoman (July 14) summed up the enactment well: "Unless all signs fail the new literature commission is a legislative stillbirth."

Rhode Island: The General Assembly in 1956 established the Commission to Encourage Morality in Youth and defined its task as twofold: to "educate" the public about indecent publications and to "investigate and recommend the prosecution of all violations" of state laws on obscene literature. This year the Assembly appropriated about \$13,000 for expenses; the commission promptly went to work. In July the commission discharged its first responsibility by announcing "a statewide program of education on what might be called positive living for youth." The second responsibility - that of "investigating and recommending" - the commission discharged by sending out a blacklist of publications to magazine distributors and police departments across the state (with a promise of additional future lists) and a statement that "in cases of non-compliance with the recommendation the attorney general will initiate prosecution." (Providence Bulletin, July 23) Some local police refused to comply but others were not only quick to act on the proscribed magazines but also suggested other publications they thought the commission should ban.

The Rhode Island press was shocked but not silent. Said the Providence Journal (July 25): "The laws of this state reserve to the courts the power to decide what is obscene"; and asked, "Will the people of this state long endure the operation of any group of men which pretends to the powers of police, jury and judge?" The attorney general announced that the commission had erred in threatening automatic prosecution of any dealer failing to obey commission orders. But despite widespread criticism, there seems to be no letting up in the commission's activity (cf. the report on Peyton Place above).

North Carolina: Last June the General Assembly passed an anti-obscenity law including a "model" definition of obscenity as drawn up by the American Law Institute. The lawmakers gave the 100 sheriffs of the state the responsibility of enforcing the law. In October the N. C. Sheriffs Association issued a blacklist of 20 comics (nearly all of which had been approved by the Comics Code Authority) and 31 miscellaneous periodicals. Immediately some sheriffs went to work obtaining the "cooperation" of distributors and dealers in removing the banned publications. But many sheriffs, though quick to deplore some of the magazines, were wary of taking on the role of censor. Said Sampson County's sheriff: "I feel that it is the responsibility of parents to decide just which books their children should read. I am not an authority on the subject and I don't intend to act like one" (Wilmington Star, Oct. 13). The Wake County sheriff's statement, "I hesitate to trust my judgment on deciding what is fit to read and what isn't. . . I'm just not that brilliant," prompted the Winston-Salem Twin City Sentinel (Oct. 24) to comment: "[The sheriff] has displayed an abundance of common sense and possibly far more brilliance than those law enforcement officers who would presume to know what the public should read or what effect reading matter has on the life of an individual." On the reluctance of the sheriffs to become "one-man censor boards," the Elizabeth City Advance (Nov. 8) observed: "The General Assembly should have known such an idea would not work. Perhaps the legislators wanted it that way. No doubt they felt that in approving the bill they had done their part."

THE PUBLIC'S "RIGHT TO KNOW"

In addition to new "right-to-know" legislation in Vermont and North Dakota (June

1957 Newsletter), two other states passed similar laws and others are pushing for such legislation. One of Pennsylvania's two "right-to-know" laws opens to the public the records of public agencies; the other prohibits closed-door sessions of public officials, school boards, and other agencies on matters of public concern. A similar law passed in Tennessee through the efforts of the state press association is known as the Freedom of Information Law. New York and New Jersey newspaper associations are urging the passage of similar legislation, although they expect strong opposition by lawyers in the state senates. As one editor said: "Lawyers in general have had anti-newspaper feelings for many years - a sort of in-born belligerence" (Perth Amboy, N. J., News, Sept. 13).

CATHOLIC "CENSORSHIP" STATEMENT

Asserting that "freedom of the press is a basic right to be safeguarded and respected," that "freedom of expression is not an absolute freedom," that "liberty has a moral dimension," and that "morally, the Church can and does exercise what is called censorship," the Catholic Bishops of the U. S. on Nov. 17 issued a lengthy (2400-word) official statement entitled "Censorship." Net effect of the statement appeared threefold: (1) to re-affirm the Church's stand as an agent of censorship; (2) to endorse the recent Papal encyclical (Sept. 1957 Newsletter) envisaging an extension of the Church's watchful care from printed materials and movies to the areas of radio and television; and incidentally (3) to provide an answer to the earlier widely circulated ACLU statement, openly critical of NODL methods, reported in the June 1957 Newsletter.

Of Church and State: Noting the traditional "principle of minimal restraint" reflected in court decisions, i. e., the "reluctance of the State through its laws to curb and curtail human freedom," the bishops added: "Between the legally punishable and the morally good, there exists a wide gap. . . It must be recognized that civil legislation by itself does not constitute an adequate standard of morality. "

Of the NODL and the NLD: An understanding of the above shortcoming in civil legislation, continued the statement, "moved the Bishops of the United States to set up agencies to work in the field - for motion pictures, the National Legion of Decency; for printed publications, the National Office for Decent Literature. . . Through these agencies we voice our concern over conditions which, tolerated, merit expression of public indignation. But we assert that our activities as carried out by these organizations cannot justly be termed an attempt to exercise censorship. . . The evaluations of these agencies have been a guide to our Catholic people. At the same time, they have enlisted the support of many others who share our concern. "

Of radio and television: Reflecting the Papal admonition to extend Catholic watchfulness to the newer media, the bishops observed: "Far from curtailing the work of these agencies [NODL and NLD] we must have them continue. Nor can we fail to be watchful over the fields of radio and television. Meanwhile, our existing agencies must be prepared to meet a continuing evil with an unremitting effort. "

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Virginia committee exceeds authority, moves against school libraries: "I suggest that your committee stay out of Arlington County Schools," bluntly stated a telegram on Oct. 7 from Delegate C. Harrison Mann of Arlington to Delegate James M.

Thompson, chairman of Virginia's Committee on Law Reform and Racial Activity (Washington Post & Times Herald, Oct. 13). The protest grew out of a claim that Thompson and his committee had overstepped its authority in requesting (only one month before its final report to the Governor was due) from secondary schools in Northern Virginia detailed lists of school library reference books as well as textbooks on social studies, history, civics, and government. Private citizens and organizations joined legislators and school officials in protesting the committee's actions.

Nevertheless, when Thompson's committee made its report to the Governor on Nov. 11, it announced it would recommend to the General Assembly in January that a further study be made of "subversive" school textbooks and library materials by "some appropriate agency of the State government" (Washington Star, Nov. 11).

The teenager: Since 1940, the Purdue University Opinion Panel has been conducting a survey of 2500 teenagers (9th to 12th grades) from a variety of national backgrounds, religions, and family income brackets across the country. The conclusions were published last summer in a book called The American Teenager (Bobbs Merrill, 3.75), by H. H. Remmers and D. H. Radler.

Sample American teenager beliefs:

- 60% approve of censorship of books, movies, television, and radio.
- 50% think most people incapable of deciding for themselves what's right and what's wrong.
- 41% believe we could do without freedom of the press.
- 39% think visiting foreigners should be denied the right to criticize the United States.
- 34% favor prohibiting some people from making public speeches.
- 26% approve of search and seizure without a warrant.

More on "Huck": The hornet's nest of controversy stirred up by the failure of New York educators to renew contracts with publishers of the classic "Huck Finn" and their alleged "dropping" of it as required reading in elementary schools (Sept. 1957 Newsletter) continued to buzz across the land. North, East, South, and West, newspapers angrily protested it as an act of censorship, despite repeated denials from all parties involved. General tenor of the remarks: - whether spelled "nigger" or "Nigger", Nigger Jim is the hero, not the heel, of the book; far less admirable, in effect, are various and sundry "whites" portrayed in the book.

SILVER LINING

Good reading emphasized in Atlanta: Proclamation of "Better Literature Week" by Atlanta's mayor highlighted the PTA council's positive approach toward the problem of what young Atlantans read. Commending the Council's wise approach to this problem and observing that such a program "will be more effective than boards of censors and literary commissions," the Atlanta Constitution (Oct, 17) said: "The positive approach. . . means good books and magazines in the home. It means extra effort on the part of the parent to see that the child learns where the public library is and how to use it. It means, too, a school library, well-stocked and easily available to children."

San Francisco police will go slow: "Censorship is a delicate matter. . . and requires the use of delicate judgment," declared the president of the San Francisco Police Commission after the Howl trial, and announced that police would limit censorship activities to "out-and-out pornography." Continued the commissioner: "Henceforth, we're going to make a distinction and use our heads before proceeding with precipitate arrests." (San Francisco Examiner, Oct. 11)

Sense vs. censorship: "I do not say that censorship of a book should never happen, but as yet I have not seen a novel worthy of such dire action," wrote the Rev. Howard C. Olsen, a member of the Rhode Island Commission to Encourage Morality in Youth, in the November 8 issue of The Rhode Island Churchman. The Episcopal priest explained that he had not voted to blacklist Peyton Place because he did not believe it morally dangerous to youth since "the novel does not glorify sin, it simply exposes it." (Providence Journal, Nov. 9)

WHAT NEXT?

Little late: Erskine Caldwell's God's Little Acre was published in 1933. Almost 25 years and 7,000,000 copies later, the Georgia Literature Commission has recommended prosecution for any sales of the book (Atlanta Constitution, Sept. 25).

"Sequel to sex" sells best: The Salem, Ore., Capital Journal (Sept. 18) points out that the best-selling best-seller of all paperback books is not a sex book but "the sequel to sex" - Dr. Benjamin Spook's Child and Baby Care.

Come now--which? "America is a very moral nation and will not stand for salacity in general doses" - Judge Bok (SR, Feb. 13, 1954). "The American people are more preoccupied with sex and more frightened of it than any others. We're just an obscene people" - Philip Wylie (Miami, Fla., News, June 25).

SUBMIT YOUR CANDIDATE FOR A LIBERTY AND JUSTICE BOOK AWARD

Have you read a 1957 book that you consider "tops" in:

- (1) Contemporary problems and affairs (non-fiction)
- (2) History and biography (non-fiction)
- (3) Imaginative literature (fiction, poetry, drama)

- a book that deals with freedom of speech; social, religious, and cultural tolerance; the Bill of Rights; totalitarian threats to liberties; aspects of censorship?

Then write to: Robert B. Downs, Chairman, Intellectual Freedom Committee, University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Illinois, and give the author, title, and publisher of the book, so that the judges for the Second ALA Liberty and Justice Book Awards can consider it for one of the \$5000 awards for each category. Deadline: March 1, 1958.

A folder describing the Awards accompanies this issue.