

Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association

Donald E. Strout, Editor

Vol. 8, No. 2

June, 1959

The Newsletter is published quarterly, subscription price \$2.00 per year. All subscriptions placed during 1959 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.

POSTAL POWER TO BAN

Never a stranger to headlines, the Post Office made quite a few in the months just past. It was under attack by the ACLU and others for its continued policy of screening foreign publications (and often harrasing their recipients). It, in turn, was attacking the courts for the encouragement their decisions on obscenity had given to "mail order merchants in filth," and was claiming that the postal power to ban had been hobbled by these same decisions. No hobbling of power was evident, however, in the Post Office's action to ban from the mails such diverse items as a postcard reproduction of a painting, a couple of magazines, and a new edition of an English classic.

Postal procedure on foreign publications faces court tests: Confronting the Post Office is a series of court cases which the ACLU promises to introduce in Illinois, New York, California, and Washington to test the validity of the postal procedure of impounding published matter from certain foreign countries which it considers "political propaganda" and releasing it to the addressee only upon signed declaration that government-set conditions of its receipt and use are met. ACLU's Illinois division has already instigated court action to "challenge the Post Office's practice of confiscating as foreign political propaganda millions of pieces of mail" and to end what it terms this massive and unauthorized censorship. Plaintiff in the Illinois case is Mrs. Helen M. Hughes, managing editor of the American Journal of Sociology, to whom the Post Office refused to deliver two Czech magazines unless she signed forms stating that she had "subscribed to, ordered, or desired" the magazines and that they were "not for dissemination." (N. Y. Times, Apr. 23) (For other similar experiences involving foreign mail, see June 1957 Newsletter, p. 1; Sept. 1958 Newsletter, p. 9.)

Whole postal procedure derives its shaky authority from the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 and from an Attorney General's opinion in 1940, relating to the required registration of foreign agents inside and outside the U. S., and the penalties (including confiscation of mail) for failure to do so. The American Bar

Association's suggestion to regularize this procedure by statute has been assailed by ACLU's national office on the grounds that it would be "unenforceable except on a selective and discriminatory basis" and would "give broad censorship powers ... to the Postmaster General." (N. Y. Times, Apr. 19)

The Baltimore Sun (May 8) sees hope in the litigation being instituted by ACLU: "An obvious political censorship is involved. At the same time, it may well be within Congress' power to police any use of the United States mails by foreign enemies. Here again, in brief, two large principles collide and the ACLU, as so often, performs a service in asking the courts to straighten things out."

Postmaster General attacks "liberal" court decisions: Postal power to ban is limited by "leading court decisions which obviously are more liberal in their definition of obscenity than are the views of many thousands of patrons of the postal service," in the words of the Postmaster General, testifying before a House Post Office subcommittee. These same decisions, he claimed, have enabled "defiant barons of obscenity" operating out of "virtual sanctuaries" in New York and Los Angeles, to distribute their wares through the mails. Armed with massive figures ("\$500-million-a-year business," "15 tons of films, slides, photographs, and trashy literature seized in 3 raids in 10 days in New York"), the Postmaster General (like FBI's Hoover) found it easy to establish a connection between the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency and the "ruthless mail order merchants in filth" who "are violating the homes of the nation in defiance of the national Government." (N. Y. Times, N. Y. News, Scranton, Pa., Times, Apr. 24)

Post Office continues to exercise power to ban: Limited though the Postmaster thought its powers were, the Post Office continued to bar from the mails, by action or default, an assortment of items it considered objectionable.

Most unusual postal action was the ruling that advertising postcards showing Goya's painting The Naked Maja are obscene and non-mailable. Postal examiner Duvall saw fit to prepare a 19-page decision wherein he observed that the postcard "cannot be considered a masterpiece... In sum, it is simply a color picture of a nude woman." Since, "generally speaking, we live in a clothed civilization," the examiner felt a nude woman would strike an average person as indecent. (N. Y. Times, May 6)

Two magazines - Men's Digest, Big Table - were declared non-mailable by the Post Office, whose ruling (and subsequent hearing) on the first-named moved PW's columnist Harriet Pilpel to examine the Post Office procedures on obscenity at some length (Publishers' Weekly, May 25). The P. O. found Big Table, a new literary quarterly, "obscene and filthy," chiefly for two articles by Beatnik Kerouac ("Old Angel Midnight") and William Burroughs ("Ten Episodes from Naked Lunch"). Big Table's contents - and its editors, too - had been destined originally to be those of Chicago Review's Winter '59 issue, but the contents were suppressed by University officials and the editors resigned, as reported in the March Newsletter. As postal procedure provides, Big Table will get a later hearing. (PW, June 8)

Quick to impose a ban, the Post Office showed no such speed in lifting it, even when judged wrong by the courts. In early 1958, a postal ban on two nudist magazines - Sunshine and Health and Sun Magazine - was unanimously reversed by the U. S. Supreme Court (March 1958 Newsletter). Three days later, their publisher

filed requests with the Post Office for 2nd-class mailing permits. Over a year later, the publisher, still seeking the 2nd-class permits (which would cut his mailing costs by about \$275 a month), took the issue back to the courts. (Washington Post and Times-Herald, Apr. 24)

That the new unexpurgated Grove Press edition of Lady Chatterley's Lover ("may well be one of the greatest contributions in history to the freedom of the press" - Antiquarian Bookman, Apr. 20) would run into trouble at the Post Office was expected by almost everyone. The Post Office lived up to expectations.

"LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER" - THE BOOK AND THE FILM

The book: The 31 years of the Lawrence classic had been storm-studded and turbulent. The author's third (and most descriptive) version, printed in Italy in 1928, had been promptly (in 1929) banned by U. S. Customs. Vice suppressors in New York had seized 400 copies of the Dial-published first version in 1944. The book had been bowdlerized, expurgated, abridged; in its unexpurgated form, it had been pirated, peddled, smuggled, sold. Then, on March 18, Grove Press announced it would publish on May 4, for the first time in either the U. S. or England, the third version - complete, authorized, unexpurgated. Things moved fast:

May 4: Grove publishes third version, as announced.

May 6: Use of mails denied Grove by Post Office; 164 copies of book impounded (some had already been delivered); hearing set for May 14; Grove announces continued delivery by truck, air freight, express.

Early May: Book chosen as May selection by Readers Subscription Book Club; 20,000 circulars to members impounded by P. O.

May 14: Nine hour postal hearing; Grove, Readers Subscription defendants; experts Cowley and Kazin testify; ruling due May 26.

May 28: Postal judicial officer cites 30-year Customs and P. O. bans on previous unexpurgated editions, passes book to Postmaster General for final decision on mailability; Grove seeks suspension of May 6 postal ban, pending P. G. 's final decision, continues to deliver book via non-mail channels, promises legal support for any bookseller, if needed.

June 11: Postmaster General finds book "obscene and filthy," bars it (along with Readers Subscription circulars advertising it) from the mails, thus upholding and extending indefinitely May 6 postal action; Grove promises legal action leading to Supreme Court if necessary.

This was how things stood at mid-June with Lawrence's classic tale of an English noblewoman's affair with her husband's gamekeeper. (N. Y. Times, March 19, May 7, May 15, June 12; Time, May 4; Publishers' Weekly, May 18, May 25, June 8, June 22). Like some Greek tragedy whose outcome was known to every observer from the moment the players appeared on the stage, the case of L. C. L. vs. the U. S. P. O. had moved swiftly - and inexorably - to its inevitable and foregone conclusion. The next step would be up to the courts.

Commented the N. Y. Times (June 16): "There could hardly be a poorer occasion for the Postmaster General to exercise his power than that of Lady Chatterley's Lover. Whatever one thinks of the D. H. Lawrence novel - and the critics on the whole think well of it - it is a serious literary work with an established reputation. Censorship by the Post Office is perhaps most justifiable when it is intended to

keep offensive material from persons who have not asked for it . . . But no one will be involuntarily exposed to Lady Chatterley's Lover and a book club is limited to its subscribers. As long as the book is sold freely in cities all over the country, the Post Office is protecting no one by a foolish gesture that must in the end be upset by the courts. "

The film: It was, as one observer put it, "D. H. Lawrence week in Washington. " While the Postmaster General and his aides were eying the book, the U. S. Supreme Court justices were eying the film. Objects of their concern: the banning of the film in New York State, along with the system under which it was banned. On June 29, evidencing a latitude of view not evident in the Postmaster General's office, they ruled: (1) the New York ban on the film was improper (unanimous); (2) the New York State system of film licensing was unconstitutional (4 dissenting). (N. Y. Times, Apr. 24; Chicago Daily News, June 29). Whatever difficulties New York Staters might have getting L. C. L. through the mails, their chances of seeing L. C. L. on the screen, the way things were going, were probably pretty good.

STATE SCOREBOARD

Anti-obscenity legislation: "To protect the youth of the State and the Nation, " according to sponsoring lawmakers and supporting organizations and individuals, was the sole intent of nearly all anti-obscenity measures before state legislatures - even though the bills themselves often made no reference to those they were supposed to protect. Legislators were confronted with proposals to extend or toughen present statutes (Minnesota, Oklahoma, California, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Illinois), to replace invalidated laws (Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington), or to enact the state's first censorship law (New Mexico).

Minnesota's TV viewers would be reduced not to watching "teen-age fare" but "completely childish stuff" under a proposed ban on television and radio dramatizations unfit for "children of a tender age" between 7 a. m. and 9 p. m. The bill would impose state censorship on television and radio stations, books, newspapers and magazines in order to protect young people under 18 from reports of "criminal news, police reports, accounts of criminal deeds, or pictures or stories of deeds of bloodshed, lust or crime. " (Minneapolis Tribune, March 23) Another bill would include billboards and movies in the list of media banned from depicting "obscene or indecent" matter (Minneapolis Star, March 11).

When the 1957 Oklahoma legislature set up a commission for the control of "comic books . . . not uplifting or beneficial to the education, welfare and character-building of the children of Oklahoma" along with "any literature offensive to chastity or modesty, " the commission - finding itself stymied by no power to obtain evidence and no money to operate with - advised offended citizens to make any complaints to their county attorney by using an old law on the books since before statehood. Nothing dismayed, the present legislature hoped to spark the commission with a bill that would give it subpoena powers, delete exemption formerly given to newspapers and state and federal publications, and add exemption to reading matter used in recognized religious, scientific or educational institutions (Oklahoma City Times, Apr. 16).

Out of five "anti-smut" bills in California, the major one, calling for tighter controls and tougher penalties, was expected to die in committee (Sacramento Union,

May 7). Sponsor of the bills, chairman of a subcommittee on pornographic literature (March 1958 Newsletter), claimed that 75% of a \$500,000,000 a year business in "sexy and girly" magazines in California is supported by youngsters under 18 years of age (Fresno Bee, March 17, 26). Two Pennsylvania bills would grant more power to local authorities. One proposal would require dealers of publications containing "graphic reproductions of the female form, unrelated to science, art or scientific study" to submit monthly reports to the county sheriff, each report to be accompanied by a \$1 fee to pay for a copy of the publication in question. If the sheriff deemed the publication obscene, he would take action against the publisher. The other measure would empower sheriffs to seize and destroy all material deemed lewd or obscene and would authorize local governments to seek injunctions against persons dealing in such material. (Harrisburg News, Apr. 9)

No sooner had Oregon's 1864 obscenity statute been declared unconstitutional in its first court test (Eugene Register-Guard, March 2) than a new one was up for consideration. The proposed law, carefully and reasonably conceived in line with recent court decisions, provides for judging obscenity "by applying contemporary standards of the community ... with reference to ordinary adults," such standards to be determined by a jury in the trial of each case, and for a defendant to show that a work under attack has artistic, literary, scientific or educational merit (Portland Oregonian, March 19). In Rhode Island, where four out of the state's six distributors "cooperate" by not handling publications labeled obscene by the Commission to Encourage Morality in Youth, a new law struck out the phrase "manifestly tending to the corruption of the morals of youth" from basic section of previous law, recently held invalid because of the phrase. New law also gave the attorney general authority to obtain an injunction against alleged violators whenever complaint is made to him under oath. (Providence Journal, May 23)

New Mexico's all-inclusive "pornography" bill, called by columnist Will Harrison "a sloppy bill ... [with] distinguished sponsors and powerful church backing" (Santa Fe New Mexican, March 4), won unanimous House approval. The original bill, strongly opposed by New Mexico librarians, had been amended to meet some of the objections. However, the New Mexican (March 11) still saw the bill as a "threat ... against New Mexico libraries"; and the Albuquerque Journal (March 11) called the measure "a far-reaching censorship bill which would affect not only libraries but art galleries and artists as well as newspapers, magazines, motion pictures and television."

Postscripts on legislation reported in March Newsletter: Maryland's controversial obscene literature bill was signed into law (Baltimore News-Post, March 24). Washington's horror comic and obscene literature bill, with amendment excluding libraries, went into effect June 11 (Yakima Republic, June 15). The librarian-protested Illinois bill aimed at shielding persons under 18 from objectionable literature died in committee.

Textbook legislation: Attempts to ban textbooks for their subversive or un-American teachings met defeat in four states (Florida, Illinois, North Carolina, Missouri).

Florida's bill would have applied not only to textbooks but also to reference books or other printed material used in either public schools or institutions of higher

learning. Prohibited would have been all books written by present or former Communists or by present or former members "of any organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, the un-American Activities Committee of the Congress or any other congressional or state legislative committee." Also prohibited would have been all books that presented "Communism, Socialism, One World Government, World Citizenship, or any other similar ideology as superior to the American system of constitutional government, American Citizenship and free enterprise." (House Bill 477, Senate Bill 247) Bill was killed by House committee on public schools (Tampa Tribune, May 22).

Defeated in Illinois was an American Legion sponsored measure providing for the state superintendent of public instruction to set up a local committee to check any textbook "antagonistic to or incompatible with the ideals and principles of the American constitutional form of government," if the school board or 30 citizens of a school district so requested (Champaign News-Gazette, June 11, July 1).

In North Carolina, a proposal to put laymen on the state textbook commission to seek out books with "social overtones in subjects dealing with social studies" was defeated in the House education committee (Greensboro Record, May 28).

Missouri legislators were troubled by subversion of another sort in today's textbooks. A bill to ban textbooks that teach evolution from all Missouri schools was reportedly killed in committee after one of the sponsors said he didn't think such books were being used at present and added that he felt the intent of the bill is "about 100 per cent enforced now" (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 4).

CRITICISM, PRESSURES CONFRONT TEXTBOOK PUBLISHERS

"Frankly, I cannot recall a time during the 14 years I have been identified with the industry when there was more reason for concern about the recurring attacks on the product," Grant H. Brown, American Book Company president, told the American Textbook Publishers Institute in New York on April 29 (Publishers' Weekly, May 25). Mr. Brown's concern was well-founded. Post-Sputnik repercussions, aimed at American education generally, had found target in teacher and textbook alike. A spate of doubtless well-meaning (though all-but-irrational) bills had been introduced into State legislatures, their content far outrunning their intent, to outlaw textbooks (and even reference and general books) because of content or authorship.

In other quarters, too, textbooks were under attack. A college professor had lapsed into the history texts, charging "brainwashing" in the public schools (March Newsletter). He had been shortly joined by another college prof who levelled off with a blast from an angle of just about exactly 180°: "The primary fault of our texts, however, is not that they contain biases but that they contain nothing at all. The worst they can do to a student is not to brainwash him but to leave his brain as blank as it was before, with no sensitivities offended and no prejudices altered." Then, just for good measure, that second critic had tossed this one out: "Textbooks are the tailfins of our academic system, exaggerated in size and devoid of honest purpose." (from "Homogenized History," by George Rudisill, Jr., writing in The Nation, May 9)

And then there had been that matter of "integration in illustrations" - which might,

after all, prove to be the industry's biggest headache of all, both economic and ideological. New York's school superintendent Theobald, acting for the city's Board of Superintendents as a whole, in a form letter to about 100 textbook publishers, had requested them to "take further steps towards introducing representations of non-white individuals in illustrations in textbooks... in view of our school system's large, varied student population and in view of our commitment to a policy and program of integration." (N. Y. Times, Apr. 16) A later account in the Times (Apr. 19) signed by Gene Currivan, quoting several publishers' reactions, was sympathetic, but observed significantly that "all textbooks, except when specifically ordered by an individual state, are prepared for a national and not a regional audience." In a curious twist, the New York Amsterdam News headlined its April 17 account "South Tells Us What to Use in Books," apparently on the basis of a remark by a McGraw-Hill spokesman: "I would be reluctant to rush into publishing pictures showing Negroes and Whites mixing socially because I know to begin with they will not sell in many Southern states." The account also represented Supt. Theobald as requesting the removal of anti-Negro remarks from textbooks. Elsewhere in the U. S., there were evidences of unfavorable reaction from the press. Chattanooga's News-Free Press (Apr. 17) was typical: "Brainwashing ... these books are no place for interracial propaganda, subtle or otherwise."

Yes, what with Sputniks, and history teaching, and the legislatures, and integrated illustrations, and one thing and another, the "second most important influence on education," as American Book's Brown cannily characterized the textbook trade, had good cause for concern.

MOVIES AND THE CENSORS

"People who have the notion that the censoring of movies is on the wane would do well to read their newspapers ... Then they might see that the forces for censorship and legal restraints on the 'free speech' prerogatives of motion pictures are far from ready to give up their ghosts," recently wrote N. Y. Times film critic Bosley Crowther (Feb. 8). But much film censoring never reaches the newspapers. Although the Supreme Court ruling on June 29 that New York's state censor board was unconstitutional would seem to forecast an early end to the remaining three in Maryland, Kansas, and Virginia, innumerable local boards will probably continue as active as ever. Both local and state boards rarely ban a film in entirety but tend to limit their disapproval to "cutting" offensive scenes - an even more vicious form of censorship, because so often unpublicized and unknown. Discernible, too, are trends toward extending censor board powers to television (despite self-imposed regulation by the industry) and toward labeling films as suitable for certain age groups (although a court decision recently invalidated a local ordinance permitting such labeling). Since U. S. court decisions have struck down about all bases for prohibiting a film except obscenity, most censors in this country are usually careful to cite the obscenity criterion, no matter what the real reason may be, in justifying their actions. On the other hand, U. S. films abroad are more apt to run into open and official censorship for any number of reasons other than obscenity.

Banning: Fort Worth Censor Board's ban of the Brigitte Bardot movie And God Created Woman was upheld by a Federal judge, who ruled that organizations set up to censor on the basis of obscenity are legal. A movie firm had sued the board

when the picture was banned following the firm's refusal to cut five scenes. (N. Y. Times, Feb. 11)

Cutting: Although New York's state censor board did not ban a film during the year ending March, 1959 (as against 4 banned the previous year), 53 films were cut (as against 38 the previous year). Most of the deletions were ordered for foreign films. New York's law provides several reasons other than obscenity for censoring a film - such as, inciting to crime, sacrilege, indecency, immorality, inhumanity or corruption of morals. While such criteria are often invoked, they are usually cited along with obscenity. (N. Y. Times, Apr. 15) Constitutionality of New York State's whole film licensing system has been struck down by the June 29 ruling of the U. S. Supreme Court (see account of Lady Chatterley's Lover above).

Labeling: A city ordinance permitting censors to tag motion pictures "adults only" was ruled unconstitutional by a Federal judge. Ruling had been sought by Paramount after the censors had limited its film Desire Under the Elms to adult viewers. In the words of the judge: "A picture is either obscene or it is not." (Chicago Daily Tribune, March 25)

Film showings on TV: Kansas television stations should submit their films to be examined and approved by Kansas Board of Review, according to a ruling of the State Attorney General. The state law also gives the board authority to grant permits for showing films for educational, charitable, and religious purposes. The Kansas City Times (Apr. 20) pointed out the manifest impossibility "for three censors to review tens of thousands of educational films ... plus the aging television spectaculars that keep people up late at night" and concluded: "Perhaps an all-out enforcement effort will be needed to show the impractical nature of the law."

U. S. films and film-makers abroad: Drastic cuts in the final scenes of I Want to Live were ordered by the British Board of Censors. Reason: an execution is not suitable material for entertainment. Observed the British News-Chronicle: "The film is not meant to entertain... Of course, many people would go to see it in a morbid spirit but that is not a reason for cutting it. Sadists could get plenty of satisfaction from 'King Lear' but no serious person suggests that the scene when Gloucester's eyes are torn out should be banned from the stage because some people enjoy it." (N. Y. Times, Apr. 26)

Shooting of a U. S. film on location in Havana went on under the watchful eye of a Cuban Government representative, on hand to see that nothing disparaging to the revolutionary government appeared in the film. The movie, Our Man in Havana, based on the Graham Greene novel, is a light comedy set in Havana before the Castro revolution. In five days of shooting, 39 changes were made in the script at the insistence of the Cuban representative. (N. Y. Times, Apr. 16)

AND ALSO

"Tropic of Cancer" ruled admissible to U. S. - for some people: The decision of Customs to allow sociologist Foreman to bring in a copy of Henry Miller's long-banned (since 1931) work applied again the Palmieri-pronounced "who sees it" standard for judging obscenity (N. Y. Times, March 20). Customs' reasons: (1) literary recognition given work over the years, (2) importer a "person of responsibility, not bringing the book in to satisfy a commercial or prurient interest," in the N. Y. Times words.

Children's book attacked in Alabama: From any point of view, the furor over that wedding of a black and white rabbit was all-but-ludicrous right down the line, from the Alabama legislator who wanted it burned (as integration propaganda) to the Alabama state librarian who removed it from the open collection (it being budget time and all) to the author who stoutly protested innocence of any overtones of integration. It could have been funny - except that it wasn't; it was simply unfortunate for all concerned - except possibly the author who found his book suddenly very much in the limelight (Time, Life, June 1; N. Y. Times, May 24; PW, June 8; numerous other news accounts). The book: Garth Williams' The Rabbits' Wedding, written for children, ages 3-7. Perhaps Publishers' Weekly (June 8) summed it all up best: "Alabama's rabbit stew... a jarring note at a time when in the South integration in public libraries is reported [N. Y. Times, May 24] to be progressing with some measure of deliberate speed."

Good news: The West Hartford (Conn.) School Board ordered Mr. Roberts returned to school library's shelves after parental protest had caused its removal. Board said it was "valuable" for studying modern drama (N. Y. Times, May 1)... The Hermosa Beach (Calif.) City Council unanimously rejected a proposal to form a decent literature commission to police the newsstands for obscene material (Los Angeles Times, Apr. 26).

Briefly noted: "Censorship and Lady Chatterley's Lover" was title of half-hour May 24 radio program presented by Evergreen Review (according to N. Y. Times adv., May 22) ... New York City's Fed. of Womens Clubs adopted resolution condemning "obscenity and pornography" in print (mags), film (mp and mp advertising) and on the air (TV), urged self-regulatory codes or, if necessary, more control via legislation at all levels of government (N. Y. Times, May 2) ... Les Miserables has been taken off the Roman Catholic index of banned books (N. Y. Times, Apr. 25) ... British Customs seized Paris-purchased copy of Lolita upon owner's arrival at London airport (N. Y. Times, May 5), pronouncing it "obscene" ... American press may not be giving public all the information it needs, conceded 4 out of the 5 panelists on one of CBS' TV series The Great Challenge (N. Y. Times, Apr. 6) ... Three Californians were indicted in Detroit by the Post Office, on charges of promoting "filth through the mails," acting under the new federal statute (Sept. 1958 Newsletter) permitting prosecution at point of delivery (N. Y. Times, May 20).

Continued from the March Newsletter: The Lolita picketing incident at the Long Beach P. L. was subsequently revealed as somebody's weird idea of a publicity gag - for a movie to be made 2 years hence (letter from Ed Castagna, March 25, with clipping from San Diego Union, Feb. 14) ... The Swimming Hole, which was already banned in two Southern states, was branded "pro-integrationist" by a State Board of Education member in a third (Georgia), and removed from at least one public library in the state (Macon), according to the Macon News, March 19 ... In an editorial "Labor's Captive Children," the Boston Herald (March 27) reported the School Committee's latest attempt to placate labor: the suggestion that labor leaders from the printing trades sit in on all textbook-selecting sessions, to make certain no texts are chosen from a publisher out of favor with labor.

YOU MIGHT LIKE TO READ...

Ciardi, John: "The Book Burners and Sweet Sixteen." Saturday Review, June 27, 1959, pp. 22+.

Brilliant and biting indictment of the way of the censor. Chief targets of Ciardi's criticism: the Post Office and Univ. of Chicago's Chancellor Kimpton for their roles in banning and suppressing the work of new writers. Occasion: the University's suppression of the Winter 1959 issue of Chicago Review (March Newsletter) and the Post Office's ban on the same material, published as vol. 1, no. 1 of new literary mag Big Table (reported elsewhere in this issue). Sample Ciardisms: (of the Post Office) "And why don't you just go on about the business of getting my mail to me on time, gentlemen?"; (of censorship) "All censorship is a disaster that begins in ignorance and seeks to culminate in demagoguery."

Downs, Robert B.: "Censorship." In the American Library Annual and Book Trade Almanac, 1959. N. Y., Bowker, 1959, pp. 91-92.

Readable resumé of censorship happenings in 1958 by former CIF chairman, based on work of the CIF, events reported in the Newsletter, and the activities of related groups like ABPC and ACLU.

Winick, Charles: Taste and the Censor in Television. N. Y., Fund for the Republic, 1959.

This 33-page "Occasional Paper," readable and carefully documented, was issued in connection with the Fund's study of "the basic issues underlying a free society." Prepared with the help of the networks, which made records and other data available, and of numerous organizations, this informative and timely paper presents its findings in sections entitled "The Climate," "The Controversial Content," "Music and Film on TV," "The Impact of Advertising on Content," "The Industry," "The Audience." Single copies available gratis from the Fund's office, 60 E. 42nd St., N. Y., 17. [Ed. note: Well worth your 4-cent stamp - the examples he gives, especially under "Music," are fantastic!]

Boyle, Robert, S. J.: "Teaching 'Dirty' Books in College." America, Dec. 13, 1958, pp. 337-339.

A disciplined and powerful plea to liberal-arts colleges not to exclude contemporary writers from undergraduate reading on the grounds that they are obscene or conducive to evil. Calling Joyce, Greene, Faulkner, Williams, Salinger, and Hemingway "literary artists," and likening them, in the contemporary sense, to Dante, Shakespeare, Swift, and Johnson in the classic sense, the author observes "it is important that our students see our own time through the eyes of our competent artists" and expresses the view that "the contemplation of powerful literary expression of visions of reality is a necessary component of liberal education."

Horchler, Richard: "Literature and Morality." Commonweal, Feb. 27, 1959, pp. 559-561.

Commonweal's associate editor presents a stimulating analysis of the "immensely complicated and subtle" relationship between literature (as a form of art) and morality. Sample quotes: "Rather than enemies, of course, morality and literature are inseparable allies. Nevertheless, for this alliance to be productive, a moralist who turns to the judgment of literature must be as competent a student of art as he is of morality." "When the 'data' of the art work - characters, situations, problems - are disentangled from the total experience for the purpose of

moral scrutiny, they are in danger of being judged without the esthetic context which gives them meaning. This is a caution the enthusiastic moralist is likely to forget "

Wall, Patrick M. and Hemper, Wm. J.: "Extralegal Censorship of Literature." New York University Law Review, Nov. 1958, pp. 989-1026.

Compiled from sources like CIF's Newsletter and ABPC's Censorship Bulletin, printed reports of ACLU and court cases, along with personal interviews and correspondence, this report's particular interest to librarians attaches to its appendices, wherein are listed: "Publications Disapproved for Youth by the NODL" and "Objectionable Magazines" (October 1958); "Communities in Which Reading Material Available to the Public Has Been or Is Determined to Some Extent by Public Officials" (documented); "Partial List of Pocket Books [sic] Banned by the Police in Detroit, Mich., 1950 to 1955" (280 titles).

American Jewish Congress: Bombings and Hate Sheets. N. Y., The Congress, 1958.

A timely 22-page pamphlet treating a topic much in the news. Available from Stephen Wise Congress House, 15 E. 84th St., N. Y. 28.

Comics Magazine Assoc. of America: Facts About the Comic Code. N. Y., The Association, n. d. (24 p., paper)

Contains the text of the Code, an account of the Comics Code Authority, its workings and its relations with the industry, with a discussion of self-regulation vs. censorship legislation. Informative and helpful statement of the industry's viewpoint. Available from the Association, 300 Fourth Ave., N. Y. 17.

WHAT NEXT?

On the effects of teaching evolution: "You can teach a juvenile that he came up from an animal and he's going to act like one. We shouldn't teach them that they came up from a ground squirrel or a tadpole" - a Missouri legislator. (St. Louis Post-Dispatch)

Postal panacea: The campaign of the Post Office to clear the mails of pornographic material will do more than anything else to curb juvenile delinquency, according to Postmaster General Summerfield, addressing Republican Women's Conference in Washington. (N. Y. Times)

Classification comprehensive: Among the contents of an Ohio bill ostensibly designed to clarify obscenity were paragraphs banning the sale, advertising, manufacture, or possession of anything that would prevent conception, and providing penalties for advising anyone on the use of contraceptives. Bill's title - "Obscene Literature and Related Matters." (Cleveland Press)