



newsletter

## ON INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

PUBLISHED BY THE INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, MARTHA BOAZ, DEAN, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE, CHAIRMAN, EDITED BY LEROY CHARLES MERRITT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP, BERKELEY.

VOL. XIII

NOVEMBER, 1964

No. 6

### CURRENT TENDENCIES IN BOURGEOIS LIBRARY SCIENCE\*

One of the major problems put before scientific workers by the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the exposure of the reactionary essence of current bourgeois ideology in all its manifestations.

Although in recent years Soviet library scholars were more actively at work in this direction, many profoundly fallacious conceptions of bourgeois library science have escaped the fire of our criticism. That is why the theoretical conference on "Basic tendencies in the development of library science in current bourgeois society," organized by the State Lenin Library, evoked such great interest among the scientific workers of the libraries of Moscow and Leningrad. Nearly 400 librarians, scientific workers and teachers of library disciplines participated in the work of the conference.

Principle attention was given to American library science. And that is understandable; the USA occupies a leading position in the capitalist world in the level of its library science work, as well as in the quantity of its published specialized literature.

Library work is one of the forms of ideological work and, as with all sections of ideological activity, it cannot stand outside the ideological struggle, outside the class struggle. Bourgeois—and above all American—library science proclaims as its basic slogan an imaginary "freedom to read" which is non-existent in capitalist society.

The defenders of this slogan, the freedom to read, consciously or unconsciously pass in silence over the kinds of literature available to the reader under capitalist conditions. Neither the classics of world literature, nor contemporary realists, nor the books of progressive writers comprise the book market of the USA and other capitalist countries. The ordinary reader there is overwhelmed by a turgid stream of anticommunist, anti-scientific, pornographic publications.

That is why in actuality the principle of "freedom to read" in capitalist countries serves above all as a cover for the dissemination of politically reactionary literature which in one form or another promotes the propaganda of capitalist ideology. And that is the reason why this principle is so extensively utilized and propagandized in the library work of capitalist countries. Applied variously in the different sections of library practice, this principle gives a definite political bent to the entire system of library work in bourgeois states.

\*B. Pétrov, *Sovremennye Tendentsii Burzhuznogo Bibliotekovedeniia*, *Bibliotekar* No. 7 (July 1964) 55-58. Translated by Rudolf Lednický, University of California Library.

"Freedom to read" means that in the acquisition of library material, comics, detective stories, "horror novels," anticommunist libels, racist fabrications, open and half-concealed pornography, all that which is thrust upon the reader by deafening advertisements with the aid of press, radio and television, must be widely represented in the libraries' book collections. In questions of cataloging, classification and recommendatory bibliography, the principle of "freedom to read" means that tendentious selection, imaginary-objective headings in catalogs and indexes, and deliberately compiled annotations put before the reader the same reactionary literature propagandizing antisoviet and anticommunist ideas, religion, philosophic idealism, and, at times, even a poorly concealed obscurantism (there even exists in some applied classification schemes in the West the heading of "occult sciences"). "Freedom to read" in terms of library service leads to a situation where the reader is left alone with the book collections consisting significantly (or in greater part) of that same politically reactionary or antihumanistic literature. "Freedom to read" as understood in its bourgeois sense means the complete rejection of the pedagogical element in the librarian's work and, from here, it is not far to the theory of the total disappearance of libraries in the future, to projects of the substitution of books and librarians by electronics, to theories transforming the living and curious reader into a consumer of dry, codified information, which is, as it were, called upon to replace in its entirety a full-blooded literature.

The practical results flowing from the application of such a profoundly fallacious basic principle of bourgeois library science is evident even to some portion of the librarians in the USA and other capitalistic countries. These librarians, while maintaining the positions of bourgeois ideology, evince a sincere anxiety about the fate of library work in their countries.

The disclosure of the falsity and insolvency of the slogan "freedom to read" under capitalist conditions is essential for a proper understanding of the present condition of library work in capitalist countries and of some trends in the development of bourgeois library science.

The first three reports presented by N. I. Tiulina, M. I. Gorbunov and B. P. Kanevskii (State Lenin Library) were devoted basically to the disclosure of the false and insolvent principles of an abstract "freedom to read" and the librarian's "non-interference" in the reader's selection of literature, which are enunciated by bourgeois library science.

Please turn to page 82

## A Dangerous Man

*Issues of Freedom in American Libraries*, by Everett T. Moore. Chicago, ALA, 1964. 80 p. \$1.75.

This is the quiet man's reply to the idiot's shouting.

On the face of it, the author is a harmless reporter, sometimes a librarian. From 1960 to 1963 he churned out essays for the "Intellectual Freedom" department of the *ALA Bulletin*. Reprinted here, they are divided into four handy sections. The reader is given a multi-dimensional view of the super patriot, the language Mr. Clean, the child protector, and the save-our-library from the Negro advocate. Understandably enough for the period covered, two-thirds are polemics about who carries the biggest flag and Henry Miller's old-fashioned approach to instinct drives. Themes differ but variations are on consequences for libraries and librarians.

Research indicates that at least one reviewer thought Mr. Moore "a human being like the rest of us." (*LJ*, September 1, 1964, p. 3134). An understandable error. His singularly unexcited analysis is the skeletal framework most librarians understand, and, if Fiske is to be believed, appreciate. He examines the censor's gyrations with mathematical exactness. "Our study of their ways should be unceasing," he comments. This is in tune with an important section of the profession, but what is not said also should have warned the reviewer that Mr. Moore is a bit different. He fails to call for a committee.

Because of his very intellectualism his essays reach another level, that of satirical objectivity. He demonstrates a remarkable literary skill in disguising this sapient structure. In a word, Mr. Moore is a dangerous man, so much so that by the end of this series the perceptive reader will recognize in him the ideal organizer of street riots. He may not be able to exorcise the censor, but he will engineer any practical plan to burn him at the stake.

The author is a revolutionary in the best tradition whose notions of freedom are tied up with action. Such titles as "Raising Hell with the Legionnaires," and "The Innocent Librarians," do not require a course in applied linguistics to appreciate the irony, humor, and downright anger. Although he may not be prepared to disown those librarians who employ every alibi to avoid controversy, the tongue in cheek frequently becomes more obviously directed.

Mr. Moore in these essays comes out firmly against censorship. Anyone thirsting for traditional excuses had best turn elsewhere. Seen as a contribution in the unending good fight, it will be clear that this is a book every self-respecting librarian should purchase for patron and personal reading—Bill Katz, University of Kentucky.

### Censorship Kills OR

The Tenth Anniversary issue of *The Paris Review*, dated Winter-Spring, 1964, carried an advertisement for *Olympia* which drew the attention of a reader in August. His air mail subscription order was returned forthwith by air mail with the typewritten note that *Olympia* had suspended publication because of censorship.

## Nassau-Suffolk School Library Assn. Intellectual Freedom Resolution

*Whereas:* The library profession affirms its responsibility for the selection of books and materials in the honored tradition of democracy in education and education for democracy,

*And whereas:* The public library represents the market place of ideas where citizens may come freely to find the materials they seek,

*And whereas:* The school library embodies the same purpose by providing materials that will sustain, implement, and enrich the program of the school toward the basic goal of education—the development of a free, reasoning, understanding, and compassionate individual,

Be it resolved that the Nassau-Suffolk School Library Association endorse the principle of freedom to read—the first freedom written into our Constitution and incorporated in the Library Bill of Rights and reaffirmed in the School Library Bill of Rights.

And be it further resolved that the Nassau-Suffolk School Library Association repudiate any censorship of library materials.

And be it further resolved that the Nassau-Suffolk School Library Association strongly recommend that each school district adopt a written book selection policy, with a definite procedure for handling complaints through use of a printed form to be forwarded to a faculty materials evaluation committee, which includes the librarian, for consideration and decision.

And be it further resolved that the Nassau-Suffolk School Library Association initiate a Long Island Intellectual Freedom Committee with representatives from the following organizations:

- Nassau County Library Association
- Suffolk County Library Association
- Nassau-Suffolk Classroom Teachers Association
- Long Island Council of NCTE
- Long Island Council for the Social Studies
- Long Island School Boards Association
- Nassau County Association of Chief School Administrators
- Suffolk County Council of Superintendents
- New York State Association of Secondary School Principals, Districts 1 and 17
- New York State Teachers Association, Long Island Section
- Long Island Council, AF of T
- ACLU local chapters
- New York State Citizens Committee for the Public Schools
- PTA Councils
- New York State Congress of Parents and Teachers

and that it be the purpose of the Long Island Intellectual Freedom Committee to 1) lend professional aid and advice when requested in situations where intellectual freedom has been endangered in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, and 2) support and encourage the proper execution of sound book selection policies.

(Adopted by the N-S SLA on 1 October, 1964. For further information write David Cohen, Librarian of the Plainview, Long Island, High School, who is chairman of the Freedom to Read Committee and Second VP of the N-S SLA.)

## The Right to Read . . . What Does It Mean?

### *The Right to Read Means:*

A belief that others have the right to decide what is best for them to read . . . the same as *you* have for yourself.

A willingness to be a responsible citizen by acting within the existing framework of the law to obtain redress for material which is objectionable to you.

Looking at your community to see if it is offering adequate facilities to encourage the unfettered and inquiring mind.

Working to make the community more mindful of the value of good reading habits and facilities.

Supporting freedom of the press and access to ideas and information.

Recognizing that the quick, easy answer may discard liberty for the sake of safety and create graver problems.

Understanding and appreciating the meaning of freedom of expression.

Defending the cherished principles of our democracy.

### *The Right to Read Does NOT Mean:*

The proliferation of obscenity in the community.

Indifference to the problems of youth.—New Jersey Committee for the Right to Read, as quoted from *AB*, 7-14 September.

## "Lady Chatterly" Held To Be Obscene in India

The Supreme Court of India has upheld the decision of the Bombay High Court that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is obscene. The Bombay court had convicted and imposed a fine on Ranji Udeshi for being in possession of the book for purposes of sale, and he was appealing against this decision.

The judgment is given in the *Times Law Report* in the issue of August 20th. Mr. Justice Hidayatullah said that it was argued for the appellant that the fundamental right of freedom of expression was being violated, and, alternatively, that the Hicklin test of 1868, which had been adopted by the Indian courts, was out of date—if it were modified to suit the requirements of present-day society, the novel would not be considered obscene.

In the opinion of the court, the judge said, the test to be adopted was that obscenity without a preponderating social purpose or profit could not have the constitutional protection of free speech and expression. Obscenity meant the treatment of sex in a manner appealing to the carnal side of human nature or having that tendency. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, the portions dealing with sex were not a legitimate embroidery but were the only attraction to the common man; viewed separately and in the setting of the whole book they passed the permissible limits judged by the standards of the community, and there was no social gain which could be said to preponderate.—*The Bookseller*, 22 August.

November, 1964

## Statements of Purpose

Recently events in several North Jersey communities indicated the need for the existence of a Right to Read Committee. This need was evidenced by:

1. Attempts at prior censorship.
2. A lack of understanding of the meaning of freedom of expression.

Already functioning in many communities are Decent Literature Committees. The effect and degree of damage to freedom of the press cannot yet be assessed. However, no known organization in the community to protect and insure the right to read exists presently.\*

### *Purpose*

To support the untrammelled and unfettered dissemination and availability of all reading material in accordance with the principles of a free press in a free society.

To promote strict adherence to fundamental due process of law where individual conscience requires redress on material considered objectionable.

The Right to Read Committee endeavors to carry out its stated purpose by:

- A. Acting in an advisory capacity for the formation of local groups in sympathy with these aims.
- B. Promoting Community open forum conferences to afford and encourage a wide range of inquiry and expression.

C. Presenting community education programs. (Visual aids, qualified speakers representing libraries, law, sociology, psychology, philosophy, etc.)

D. Appraising and assessing of the needs of community facilities and promoting the growth and development of public reading facilities.

E. Legal testing of the right of any private citizens' group to ban books for the general public.—New Jersey Committee for the Right to Read, Box 250, Caldwell, N.J. 07006.

\*Will someone please page the NJLA IFC?

## It's an Idea!

15 September 1964

To the Editor:

I noticed that you might like more subscribers for your *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*.

We subscribe for each Library Board Member and for the City Manager and City Council Library Commissioners. One of the Board Members, Mr. Philip Reifel, commented on the September 1964 issue, "Where do you get this from? It's the best thing yet. I liked the articles and the editorial. You should send a copy to the City Manager." The other Board Members appreciate the *Newsletter* also and it has done much for this Library to help combat the censorship pressure we are constantly confronted with. I particularly like your September editorial.

If some 7,000 public libraries were to get 6 subscriptions each, you would have real good circulation and would do much to combat censorship.

Sincerely,  
James R. Housel, Librarian  
Ontario City Library  
Ontario, California

75

# Library Censors Irk Youngsters

By ALLEN WOLPER

SADDLE BROOK—Should high school students be subjected to censorship when they seek to borrow a book from their local library? This question has been tossed around from one part of the country to the other, and this township is no exception. But here the situation has resulted in a double standard on literary value.

The local library pursues a censorship policy it feels must be taken to monitor students not mature enough to handle volumes which include descriptive passages on sexual behavior. The high school on the other hand, feels that literary pursuit is to be encouraged and lends out many books which the library bans.

This is how it works: A student goes into the library, catches a glimpse of a certain book, and asks for it. He or she is told that a parental note of approval must be gotten before the book can be borrowed.

The youngster, unwilling to go home and become involved with explanations to parents, goes to the high school, claiming censorship. If the book is not out, then it can be borrowed here without any fuss at all.

To add to the confusion, the National Council of Teachers of English publishes an annual list of books it considers "important reading by students." On this list may be the book in question.

Many students don't even bother to go to the high school. They head straight for the Hackensack Library or some other town where the scored volume can be read.

It was reported that a young girl last week went to the local library to borrow a copy of a piece of literature which has been labeled both as a brilliant spoof on pornography and a book that is "just plain filthy."

The girl, despite the fact that she was capable of deriving the true meaning of the author, ran straight to the high school to protest. She said she did not want to go home for a note. As librarian Mrs. Marie Sponaes puts it; the library has been thrust into its current corner because of the attitude of the township parents.

Mrs. Sponaes says that the parents don't discuss many books at home and therefore don't know much about the current crop of best sellers, be they controversial or not. The note is one way of communicating with them.

The parents to whom Mrs. Sponaes has spoken feel that she should be the judge of what the children take out. She agrees and in fact, says that her policy and that of her staff, Mrs. Eva Brown and Mrs. Barbara Wilson, will be to give out one book to one child, while withholding it from someone else they feel will not benefit from reading it.

The library also differentiates between the terms "controversial" and "pornographic." The former might be borrowed without any trouble at all, while the latter is the one which would require a note.

The censorship problem, of course, has been with this area for many years. In some parts of Bergen County, for example, books by Ernest Hemingway, a classic American writer, are not even on the bookshelf.

Mrs. Sponaes, however, orders any book requested by adult residents, no matter how controversial. It seems, however, that a more uniform method of judgment might be arrived at in dealing with teen-agers.

Alvin Yhlen, president of the library, has said publicly that censorship is needed for teen-agers. All that this has created, however, is a fierce desire by the rebuked child to get the book somewhere else.

But since the high school has many of the books which the library refused to lend without a parental approval slip, this means that an uneven educational road is being laid out for the youngsters in the township. It would seem that some meeting between the library officials and some representative of the high school would be in order so that a consistent policy can be created.—Passaic, N.J., *Herald-News*, 24 August.

## A Sensible (?) Solution

Norman H. Lowenthal and James M. Hoffman, who have played prominent roles in the controversy centering on activities of the Decent Literature Committee and the Right to Read Committee in Cedar Grove (New Jersey) this week proposed a "sensible solution" to end differences between the two groups and said a summit meeting to discuss the topic appears imminent.

Their proposal reads as follows:

Provision I, Article I. The groups consenting to this agreement are the Cedar Grove Decent Literature Committee and the Cedar Grove Right to Read Committee.

Article 2. As used in the provisions of this agreement, an "adult" shall be defined as any person who is either a sophomore in high school or has attained the age of 16 years. A child shall be defined as any person who is not an adult.

Article 3. The list of publications referred to in the provisions of this agreement shall be the National Office of Decent Literature list of "Publications Disapproved for Youth," with revisions according to Provision three of this agreement.

Provision II, Article 1. No program shall be undertaken which would attempt to influence a merchant to reject any publication for sale or display, or whose effect would be to impede the display or sale to adults of publications the merchant has previously accepted for display and sale. Any and all provisions of this agreement found to be in contradiction to or inconsistent with this one shall be declared void.

Article 2. No prohibition of any attempts to influence a merchant to accept publications for sale or display shall be enacted by the consenting groups.

Article 3. No child shall be permitted to purchase any publication appearing on the revised NODL list without the personal permission of a parent or guardian.

Article 4. The basis for determining the age status of a customer and the means by which parental permission is to be presented shall be left to the discretion of the merchant.

Article 5. Magazines in the merchant's stock appearing on the revised NODL list will be displayed in full view, but in such a manner as to be available for purchase or examination only upon request to the merchant. Such requests will be honored only if made by an adult or a child with permission of a parent or guardian.

Article 6. Listed books in the merchant's stock will be displayed without special designation, in the same manner and in the same place as books not appearing on the List.

## Problems of Literary Censorship

10 weeks \$25

An opportunity to discuss, in an academic atmosphere, the relationship of pornography, cultural awareness, and the public welfare. Readings include *Catcher in the Rye*, *The Scarlet Letter*, and others suggested by the group.

The instructor is *Richard E. Quaintance, Ph.D.*

Thursdays, beginning Oct. 1, 8:00-10:00 p.m.

Above course is co-sponsored by Oakland University and The Community House, and is being given this fall at The Community House in Birmingham, Michigan.

Provision III, Article 1. For the purpose of recourse under the provisions of this agreement, an Appeals Committee shall be formed.

Article 2. The Appeals Committee shall consist of 15 members. Two of the members shall be selected by each of the consenting groups. The Cedar Grove Public Library shall be requested to supply from its staff as many members, not to exceed five, as wish to serve. The complement of the committee shall consist of educators in the Cedar Grove Public School System, selected by the Cedar Grove Education Association, one of whom shall be the school system's psychologist, should he be willing to serve.

Article 2a. If the approval of the Cedar Grove Education Association for Provision III, Article 2 is not secured, the complement of the Appeals Committee shall consist of responsible members of the community, selected and approved by all four of the Committee members who are also members of the consenting groups.

Article 3. The Appeals Committee shall have the prerogative to remove from the NODL list the titles of those publications which it believes may be sold and displayed, without restriction, to all persons regardless of age. The following shall be the procedure for the removal of a title from the list:

Any title may be proposed for discussion by the Appeals Committee by any three members of the Committee.

Following discussion, any publication shall be removed from the NODL list by a majority vote of those Committee members who have thoroughly read the publication.

Article 4. The Appeals Committee is urged to use this prerogative with judicious care, drawing on the advice of qualified citizens of the community, especially clergymen. If found desirable, these clergymen may form themselves into a standing advisory board.

Article 5. Any claims or complaints of breaches of this agreement by any member of either of the consenting groups shall be brought before the Appeals Committee. A majority decision of the Appeals Committee in these claims shall be binding on both groups consenting to this agreement.

The Appeals Committee, however, shall have no jurisdiction over, and may exert no pressure upon any merchant, but shall concern itself solely with the functions and actions of the Decent Literature Committee and the Right to Read Committee.

Provision IV. Both Groups participating in this agreement affirm their support of the following program to provide better reading and better reading habits for the community:

1. Use of the local paperback bookmobile.
2. Encouragement of wider support and use of the public library.
3. Making existing book clubs for children more available for family use.
4. Encouraging parents to build up good reading habits in their children by providing better books in the home.

Provision V, Article 1. No pressure shall be used in implementing the Decent Literature Program or in implementing this compromise. No merchant who refuses to cooperate shall be made to look antisocial by either group, either directly or by implication.

No aspersions shall be cast upon the character of cooperating merchants by either group, either directly or by implication. Cooperation with the program outlined herein shall be made completely voluntary on the part of the merchant.

Article 2. The display of certificates of cooperation shall be discontinued. No list of cooperating or non-cooperating merchants shall be made available to anyone.

Article 3. Monthly inspections of stores will be conducted only at the request of the merchant.

Article 4. Any merchant who acts according to the provisions of this agreement shall be considered cooperating. However, no reprisals will be brought by either group against any merchant who uses the list by refusing to sell or display books on it. Likewise, no reprisals will be brought against any merchant who, in good conscience, chooses not to use the list at all.

Article 5. The consenting parties will neither encourage their sympathizers to inform their merchants of their preference in regard to the program they will follow, nor will they discourage them from this practice.

Article 6. A copy of this agreement will be presented to all merchants in Cedar Grove, and made available to any person interested in obtaining a copy.—Quoted in full, without accompanying comment, from the *Verona-Cedar Grove Times*, 17 September, 1964.

## Library Integration Attempt Leads to Arrests in Louisiana

Eleven Negroes were arrested in Monroe, Louisiana, and four more in adjoining West Monroe when they attempted on July 20 to desegregate three branches of the Ouachita Parish Public Library. The Negroes were charged with disturbing the peace or trespassing, and were held under bond. There were, said the *New York Times*, "no disturbances."

The Negroes attempted to get library membership cards. When they were turned down they sat at tables in the branch libraries. They were told to leave, but said they would not until their cards were issued, the local police said.

Richard Haley, director of the Southern office of the Congress on Racial Equality, described the arrests as a "complete illegality."—*LJ*, August.

### Osborne Censored in London (Sort of)

John Osborne disclosed in New York that his new play, "A Patriot for Me," had been banned in London by the Lord Chamberlain because parts of the drama were considered "liable to corrupt."

The British playwright said he could not revise the play to the Lord Chamberlain's satisfaction because it would require "cutting out whole scenes."

Osborne did not express any anxiety about getting the play done in London. By temporarily converting the Royal Court Theater into a club, memberships could be sold instead of regular tickets and the Lord Chamberlain would be powerless to interfere.—S. F. *Chronicle*, 18 September.

### Librarian No Expert

*Another Country* by James Baldwin may now be legally sold in New Orleans. The copies in the New Orleans Public Library, removed by the City Attorney in June 1963, were restored to circulation five minutes after the Librarian heard the news.

It started this way. In June 1963 telephone callers to the New Orleans Police Department complained about the obscenity of *Another Country*. The office of the City Attorney put the book dealers in New Orleans on notice to cease selling the book. All did except the Doubleday Book Shop. Paul Rossiter, Manager, and George DeVille, Assistant Manager, were arrested and indicted under a State obscenity statute for selling an obscene book. The District Attorney refused to prosecute. A few days later, the men were re-arrested and accused under a local obscenity Ordinance.

Mr. Wood Brown, while technically representing the arrested men, was retained by Dial Press, Dell Books, and Doubleday & Company. Mr. Brown, primarily a civil law attorney, had not had occasion to practice in a Municipal Court for over thirty-five years.

Despite several efforts by the defense, the case was not called until May 1964. Four University Professors, two from Tulane University, one from Loyola University of the South, and one from Louisiana State University of Baton Rouge, testified in behalf of the book. The Head Librarian of the New Orleans Public Library was on the stand ready to testify in the book's behalf. Before he could answer the question put to him by the defense attorney, "Do you think this book is obscene?" the opposing attorney objected and indicated that since the Librarian was not a Professor of Literature, he was not qualified to testify concerning the merits or demerits of the book. The defense attorney's protestations about the Librarian's final responsibility for book selection in a large public library, Library School and Literature Degree were to no avail. The Judge allowed the objection and an astonished—and chastened Librarian left the stand.

Final testimony did not occur until September 1, 1964. The decision came ten days later, indicating that the City had failed to make its case that the book was obscene. The issue of the book's obscenity or non-obscenity was not decided by the Judge.

The fact that up to now *Another Country* has not been legally questioned any place in the United States,

only bears out the fact that New Orleans lives up to its public relations boast of being "America's Most Interesting City." While freedom to read in New Orleans is indeed heady wine, it must not be forgotten that *Another Country* by James Baldwin was a victim of official de facto censorship in our City from June 1963 to September 1964.—Jerome Cushman.

### Library Board's Policy on Censorship

*The Library Board of New South Wales at its meeting on the 4th June, 1964, adopted the following statement on Censorship.*

In the opinion of the Library Board of New South Wales:

(1) Censorship of books is a function that should properly be exercised by the authorities legally constituted for that purpose. Powers of censorship are vested in both State and Federal authorities.

(2) The function of a library service is to provide information through books and related material, insofar as its resources allow, on all aspects of human experience and activity.

(3) One of the most important purposes of a public library is to extend the range of ideas that are considered, discussed and debated, and to make available books and other published materials on all aspects of science technology, social problems and controversial issues which may be dealt with in works of fiction as well as non-fiction.

(4) A publication that has not been subject to legal prohibition should not be excluded from a library on moral, political, racial or religious grounds *alone*, whatever pressure may be brought to bear by individuals or groups.

(5) Whether individuals or groups think that present censorship laws and regulations are good or bad, is in this context irrelevant.

(6) There are laws dealing with obscene and indecent publications. There is no place in our society for extra-legal efforts to coerce the taste of others and to confine adults to reading matter considered suitable for children and adolescents.

(7) In a free society, freedom of access to information and ideas through books is a fundamental need and right; no individual or group has the right to take the law into its own hands and impose its own concepts of politics or morality upon other members of society.

(8) Individuals and groups should not seek to impose upon others, private standards of their own which differ from the standards established and sanctioned by law. Self-appointed arbiters of public morals have no right to assume that they should determine what is good and what is bad for their fellow citizens.

(9) Councils and then Librarians do not necessarily support every idea or presentation contained in the books that they make available. Nevertheless, if they set up their own political, moral, aesthetic or religious views as the *sole* criterion for determining what books they acquire, then they may be acting contrary to the public interest. Book selection should not become a disguised form of censorship.—*Australian Library Journal*, June.

## Farhat Challenges Supreme Court

LANSING (AP)—Ingham County (Michigan) Prosecutor Leo Farhat filed suit on 8 September to remove Henry Miller's controversial books, *Tropic of Cancer* and *Tropic of Capricorn* from public circulation.

In a suit filed in Ingham County Circuit Court, Farhat charged that both books violate the state's obscenity statutes. He named the York News Co., a distributor, and the Paramount News Agency, a book store, as defendants. Both started selling the books Sept. 2, he said, after voluntarily withholding their sale for two years.

He said the decision to sell the books apparently stemmed from the U.S. Supreme Court's finding that "Cancer" was "not obscene." The high court has not ruled on the other book.

Farhat said the ruling failed to state the issue clearly "and merely continued the generalities and lack of agreement of prior decisions of the Supreme Court."

Benjamin Schwendener, defense attorney, said he would ask dismissal of the suit. The Supreme Court decision and those of several states clarified the law as much as possible, he said, and answered the question of obscenity.

## "Candy" Denied

Booksellers may have been wondering what has happened to the New York *Times* advertisements for "Candy" (*Putnam*), which has been on the *Times* best seller list for the past three months. The answer is that while the book is not barred from the editorial pages (there was a story on a movie version in the Sunday, August 9, issue), the advertising department will no longer accept ads for the book. Walter Minton, president of Putnam, told *PY* that about a month ago, in the middle of running a schedule of ads—with the message "Have You Read 'Candy', the Novel That's Becoming as Famous as 'Lolita?'"—the firm was notified that the *Times* would no longer accept ads for the book. Shortly thereafter, although in an apparently unrelated action, the *Chicago Tribune* also refused to accept further "Candy" ads. Mr. Minton said that he had heard from a highly placed officer of the *Times* that the reason they had decided to stop the ads was that the *Times* hierarchy had found the book "filthy, disgusting and obscene."

A spokesman for the New York *Times* advertising acceptance department told *PW* that the decision not to accept further "Candy" ads had been made despite the fact that the paper's policy is to judge ads on content, rather than on a book itself. "While we usually do not read books," he said, "in the case of 'Candy' we did read it and found it to be smutty to the degree that we didn't want it advertised in our pages." There are now 100,000 copies of "Candy" in print, but Mr. Minton said that the cessation of advertising in the *Times* had caused some drop in sales. A *Life* feature on the book and its authors, Terry Southern and Mason Hoffenberg, is scheduled for August 21, and news of this will probably boost sales once more. Mr. Minton also said, rather cryptically, "We think that readers in New York and Chicago will soon be hearing from 'Candy' directly."—*PW*, 17 August.

November, 1964

## Unitarian Pastor Speaks Up

The ILLINOIS Supreme Court on 29 September threw out the conviction of a Chicago man for selling obscene books. "It is difficult to comprehend how this court could hold the books here involved to be obscene, while TROPIC OF CANCER is held not to be obscene," said the Court in a *per curiam* opinion. The Court held that Charles Kimmel, bookseller at 72 W. Van Buren, was improperly convicted by a Chicago Municipal Court jury and wrongly fined \$200 each for the sale of these two titles: *Campus Mistress* and *Born to be Made*. *Chicago Tribune's* 30 September headline: "Ruling Blocks Obscenity War."

Suffolk Superior Court Judge Donald M. Macauley on 4 September ruled Fanny Hill to be obscene and without literary merit in Boston, and by effect in all of MASSACHUSETTS. Ruling was the result of the 27 May move of Attorney General Edward W. Brooke to have the novel declared obscene. After reading the book four times, Judge Macauley wrote a 20-page ruling, including these words: "its evident purpose is to sexually arouse its reader and keep them aroused." The judge said that in considering its impact on average persons he found the book is "hard core pornography appealing to the prurient interests."

The PENNSYLVANIA Department of Justice on 18 August turned down a Westmoreland County judge's request for a legal opinion of whether a number of confiscated "girlie" magazines and "night stand" pocket-books could be considered obscene. DA Richard E. McCormick quoted a department spokesman as saying the attorney general's office "has no legal right" to hand down an opinion on the confiscated material.

One small voice has now been heard in opposition to the Memphis, TENNESSEE, drive against alleged newsstand obscenity in the course of a sermon on 20 September by First Unitarian Church minister James Madison Barr: "I am opposed to censorship or decency committees—even if made up as our new one here in Memphis is of a majority of clergymen. They stand as a threat to the right to read." The sermon was reported by the *Commercial Appeal's* religious editor Elinor Kelley on 21 September. Meanwhile there appears to be dissension from within: Police are accusing the mayor of getting the headlines while the police do the work.

### Activities Limited

The Chairman of the Intellectual Freedom Committee appointed two other members to the committee—Mrs. Anne Boatner, Southwestern-at-Memphis, and Mrs. Mozelle Commons, Memphis State University. Since this committee serves principally as the watchdog for violations of intellectual freedom its activities are somewhat limited. No violations were called to the attention of the committee during 1963-64 and, therefore, no action was taken.

Larry Earl Bone, Chairman  
Intellectual Freedom Committee  
Tennessee Library Association

## NCLA IFC Supports Evergreen Review

September 23, 1964

To the Editor:

I know that you have heard the good news from other sources, but I feel dutybound to report that Grove Press won a court victory in the *Evergreen Review* case.

Our Committee was quite proud and happy over the result. The statement which we issued was well-publicised in the local newspapers, and I submitted an affidavit supporting the *Evergreen Review* which was used by Grove Press as evidence in the court case. I believe that this was quite an unusual step for a local library association to take. The publisher was quite surprised that we entered the court fight despite the fact that our libraries were not directly involved in the matter.

We were pleased locally to read District Attorney Cahn's statement in the Long Island papers to the effect that he was withdrawing from the censorship field after this episode, since he felt that the courts and the laws did not offer much support for his censorship activities.

We are presently attempting to sign-up all libraries in Nassau County as subscribers to your very necessary and important publication.

Sincerely yours,  
Joseph Covino, Chairman  
Committee on Intellectual Freedom  
Nassau County Library Association

## Thought Control for Alabama?

A proposal that the writing and printing of Alabama's school textbooks be restricted to Alabamians would be too ridiculous for comment except that the state's House of Representatives voted funds to look into just such a plan.

Surely House members must have been in too much of a hurry to get home after the special session to give it much thought or else they figured such a proposal was too preposterous to be seriously considered.

Alabama scholarship is not to be denied. Our campuses are graced by several eminent authors whose volumes adorn library shelves in schools and colleges across the country.

The thought, however, of erecting barriers separating Alabama from the ideas and talents and knowledge of the rest of the nation's great storehouse of scholarship, of retreating — for whatever the reason — behind walls of narrow-minded provincialism and fear — of whatever mental ghosts and ghoulies — is repulsive.

The proposal carries with it the implication that Alabama minds may not be capable of weighing a book of non-Alabama origin, accepting its merits and rejecting its faults.

It carries, in fact, too many implications of thought control and other unworthy factors to deserve the serious, reasoned and responsible consideration of Alabama's legislators.—Anniston *Star*, 3 September.

## Freedom of Opinion

That overworked word "controversial" could be applied to Professor John K. Galbraith of Harvard who has been chosen as speaker at the dedication of the new Salt Lake City Public Library on October 30. For Professor Galbraith is a man who is not afraid to take a stand and express his opinions with vigor.

But what is wrong with that in a country where free and open discussion of issues—controversy, in short—is an accepted way of life?

Mayor J. Bracken Lee objects to the Library Board's invitation to Professor Galbraith, calling him "a man with such liberal leanings." The mayor also threatens to boycott the library rites unless the board withdraws the invitation.

Mayor Lee is entitled to his opinion. He is perfectly free to stay away from the dedication. He has the privilege of being "controversial" himself.

We believe that the Library Board should stand by its decision. First, because Professor Galbraith is an economist and writer of international reputation and a diplomat who served the United States with distinction as ambassador to India. Second, and more important, because a library, where censorship of books cannot be tolerated, should not become involved in what amounts to attempted censorship of ideas.

Professor Galbraith has never made any secret of his liberalism. His views are firmly on the record. His career is an open book. And while one may disagree with his economic writings or his theories of government, there is nothing even remotely subversive in them. The professor is a Democrat, but Mayor Lee's objections could apply to more than a few members of recent national administrations, whether Democratic or Republican.

The Library Board was fortunate in obtaining an American of Professor Galbraith's stature for the dedication rites.—Salt Lake City *Tribune*, 25 September.

(The library board that same day reaffirmed its invitation to Galbraith in a 90-second meeting, and Mayor Lee said he would be at the dedication, "unless something unforeseen comes up.")

## Teacher Quits over Book Ban

EDGERTON, WIS.—Edgerton's Board of Education Tuesday night accepted the resignation of a teacher who quit because he said he was ordered not to use George Orwell's novel, *1984*, in his psychology class.

The teacher, Robert Nordlander, said he was "sick and tired of working in an atmosphere where some unknown element of public opinion seems to be the primary concern of the local school administrators."

School Superintendent Kenneth Williams recommended acceptance of Nordlander's resignation. He said Nordlander violated board policy by distributing copies of the novel and instructing students to bring money to pay for them without first getting the approval of the principal.

Nordlander, who did not speak at the board meeting, referred in a statement to a 1963 "book battle" which resulted in the removal of one novel from a required reading list.—Rockford, Ill. *Register-Republic*, 23 September.



## "Brave New World" Pre-visited

A Prince Georges County, Virginia, high school teacher who says he was fired for asking his students to read *Brave New World*, wants his job back and \$100,000 for loss of earnings. In a suit filed in Baltimore Federal District Court, psychology teacher Ray E. Parker said he was told in March, 1963 that his contract would not be renewed, shortly after a parent complained about the book.

Parker said in his suit that he had been employed as a teacher at Northwestern High School since June, 1962. On March 15, 1963, he was called to the principal's office and told about the parent's complaint, he said. On March 26, he again was summoned and told that his contract would not be renewed because of the complaint, Parker charged. In addition to reinstatement, the suit against the State and the County School Board also asks:

- For a hearing at which Parker would be informed of charges against him and be given a right to present evidence in his defense.

- That the School Board be enjoined from "issuing information to prospective employers derogatory to the plaintiff."—*Washington Post*, 19 August.

## Don't Take Any Guff From a Self-Appointed Censor

*QUESTION: The other day we had a telephone call from a man who identified himself as a member of the John Birch Society. He said that he had spent time browsing in our bookstore and had noticed a great many "subversive" books on our shelves. When I asked him what books he referred to, he named "Das Kapital" by Marx, "Inside Russia" by John Gunther and a book on Lenin by Robert Payne. He also mentioned a book by Nabokov, Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago" (in the Modern Library) and a Russian-English dictionary. He went on to say that if we did not remove these and all other "un-America" books from view, his society would organize a boycott of our store. Ever since that call, we have been worried frantic. We have not removed any of the books as yet, but we are scared about what to say when he calls again. We try to cooperate with all the organizations of the community and to give offense to none. In fact, we lean over backwards to please everybody. What do you think we should do?*

*ANSWER: Don't take any guff from this crackpot, and stop trying to please everybody. If you give in to this benighted character, there'll be other self-appointed censors who will badger, threaten and cajole, especially when they discover that you want to "give offense to none." Don't truckle to any of them, or you won't be able to call your store your own. Tell this fellow, if he calls again, not to bother you any more. If he comes into the store and makes himself obnoxious, ask him to leave. If he refuses, call the police. Don't try to reason with him or compromise—you'll get nowhere. Let him know in no uncertain terms that you couldn't care less whether his society boycotts your store or not. To be on the proscribed list of such an organization might well turn out to be a citation of honor in the community.—Charles B. Anderson of Anderson's Bookshop in Larchmont, New York.—P.W., 10 August.*

November, 1964

## No Librarian?

Two hundred persons attended the Westfield-Mountainside, New Jersey, Area B'nai B'rith panel discussion on "Pornography: Is There a Way to Control It?" on 23 September. The answer did not come clear in the *Elizabeth Journal* report of the meeting, but these panelists said these things:

Essex County detective Arthur Magnusson and the Westfield CDL's John P. Walsh cited J. E. Hoover's statement that a large percentage of sexual crimes are connected with pornography. ACLU's Arthur Shara spoke of the dangers of a citizen's group working outside of legal remedies. "No known free society gives power to one group of people to suppress something of another group of people."

Harold Flanders, of the New Jersey Committee for the Right to Read, said that if someone feels something is pornographic, he should take it to the courts. He added that society should encourage good reading habits and conduct research to help solve the dilemma of today's youth.

One resident, who said she was a parent and teacher, said she preferred her child to see a publication on a newsstand rather than lose her constitutional right. She asked what redress is available to an unorganized group which opposes removal of books and magazines.

No librarian is reported to have said anything.

## No Slight Intended

28 September 1964

To the Editor:

As you know, we in Wisconsin are much interested in intellectual freedom. The *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* published by the ALA Committee is helpful, and we are pleased that you noted in the September 1964 issue our material on the subject

We believe, however, that the next to the last paragraph on the first page of the September issue of the *Newsletter* is misleading. It reads:

Mr. Josey first raised a question about the propriety of the Grolier Award for an excellent National Library Week program being given to a state association which is not an ALA chapter.

The winner of the Grolier Award of \$1000 was the Wisconsin Library Association, which is a chapter of the American Library Association of many years standing. Perhaps a notation of this could be published in the next *Newsletter*.

Sincerely yours,  
(Miss) Beryl E. Hoyt  
President

(The Editor pleads guilty of not listening too well. The July-August *ALA Bulletin* reports that Mr. Josey's protest concerned the Mississippi Library Association having received honorable mention in the NLW contest. Our apologies to WLA, and our thanks to Miss Hoyt.)

81

## Correction

Contrary to the information found in the press and reported on page 58 of the September issue, counsel for Henry Haldeman in his appeal of his conviction on an obscenity charge for selling 8 little blue books is Stanley Fleishman, of Los Angeles. Appeal was scheduled for the tenth circuit U.S. Court of Appeals in Denver in September. The ACLU appeared as amicus curiae.

## Bourgeois (Cont.)

The opening report of the conference by N. I. Tiulina was titled "Current American library science on the role of the public library." American bourgeois library scholars stubbornly defend an imaginary apoliticalness and objectivity in the activity of public libraries in their country; they popularize this myth, and on this same basis theoretically justify various forms of propaganda of bourgeois ideology among librarians of many other countries. Forgotten is the statement made in the 19th Century by the famous American library scholar Melville Dewey, that the goal of the public library is to provide "the best reading for the greatest number of people at the lowest cost." Now, the idea disseminated is that the library is only a place to unite a book to a reader, any book to any reader. But with the prevalence of anticommunist and esthetically inferior literature on the bookmarket of the USA, it is clear with what kind of book a reader in the library "is united." American bourgeois library science in its determination of problems of the public libraries, is going backward even from its own ideas at the end of the 19th Century, actually orienting libraries to the dissemination of inferior reading matter, reactionary writings, militaristic literature, and doing all this in the name of an imaginary "freedom to read."

A. M. Gorbunov devoted his report to a criticism of bourgeois ideas in the sphere of guiding reading in belles lettres which, as is well known, is the most in demand.

Stimulating the interest of the readers in belles lettres of a definite tendency is an important means of ideological influence. Does the professed bourgeois library science of "non-interference" of the library actually give the reader the possibility of getting into his hands esthetically and ideologically valuable artistic works? Far from it. An enormous number of factors influences his choice, among them the character of published literature, the composition of the library collections, the system of advertising new books in the press, on radio and television, and the level of training of the reader himself. In capitalist countries his attention inescapably is directed to reactionary literature and the librarian by his position of "non-interference" aids its pernicious influence on the reader.

Bourgeois ideologists through their propagation of individualism further the alienation of people and to this end in the final summation are directed the theories and practice of bourgeois library science in the sphere of reader guidance. Such was the conclusion of A. M. Gorbunov.

B. P. Kanevskii in his report "Libraries of the USA and Censorship" demonstrated the failure of the state-

ment about the apoliticalness of libraries in capitalist conditions. The question of censorship profoundly disturbs American librarians. The USA has established control through government agencies for literature coming from socialist countries, and interference by local authorities in the acquisition of materials by public and school libraries has become more frequent. However, it is ultra-reactionary organizations of the type of the "John Birch Society" and "Daughters of the American Revolution" which manifest the greatest activity in establishing a non-legal censorship.

Notwithstanding that a majority of American librarians oppose censorship attacks, at times displaying genuine courage, their position on this question is, at the least, inconsistent, since they themselves to a marked degree share the anticommunist prejudices which appear as the basis of the ultra-right organizations' censorship activities. A stubborn defence of the principle of "absolute freedom to read" frequently leads American librarians into the camp of defenders of antisoviet, anticommunist and pornographic literature, which in the USA is opposed by society as a whole. In the opinion of the speaker the struggle over the question of censorship is an important political lesson for American librarians.

The speakers emphasized that in contrast to American library science which, under cover of the principles of "apoliticalness" and an imaginary "freedom to read," actually cloaks a propaganda of bourgeois ideology, Soviet librarians openly acknowledge the party nature of library work and subordinate all their work to the noble task of molding advanced, communist ideas among the readers.

The report by A. IA. Kushul was devoted to the question of the functions and meaning of library catalogs to which great attention is given in the works of American library scholars. She was able to cite rich factual material, convincingly demonstrating that the overwhelming majority of them value the role of the catalog only as a means to find needed publications on the library shelves. The pedagogical aspect of the catalogs, their role as advisors and consultants to the reader is rejected by bourgeois library science in the name of all the principles of "non-interference." More than that, in American publications one encounters attacks on the "tendentiousness" of catalogs in the libraries of the USSR and other socialist countries. Meanwhile, the catalogs of American libraries enter and offer readers only such literature as defends bourgeois ideology and the bourgeois view of life. This is promoted not only by the content of the catalogs but also by their internal organization, headings and subheadings. A. IA. Kushul also showed the failure of attempts of American library scholars to declare catalogs unnecessary, replacing them by various types of specialized bibliographies. The result of such a belittling of the catalog's role became in the words of one American specialist "the intellectual bankruptcy of the catalog."

Soviet librarians consider the catalog as not only an important means of service, but also as an effective method of educating readers, an important tool aiding him in the selection of literature. Enjoying first class bibliographies, we do not set them against the library catalog. Both bibliographic tools and catalogs are used in Soviet libraries in the readers' interests.

Z. N. Ambartsumian (of the library faculty of the Moscow Institute of Culture) dwelt on the problem of classification, one of the more acute theoretical problems of library work and bibliography. The speaker convincingly showed that with all the apparent differences in current classification schemes used in the libraries and bibliographic publications of capitalistic countries, they, at times graphically, sometimes more obscurely, demonstrated the narrowmindedness of the bourgeois world outlook and philosophical idealism of their authors. They do not place the ties existing in the real world as a base for their structures; instead they use the relationship of phenomena in man's consciousness. Some of the bourgeois theoreticians, particularly the English library scholar, J. Faraday, take positions of double-dye agnosticism. Philosophical idealism, agnosticism lead to the creation of schemes in which the nucleus itself, the fundamental series of divisions, is based on an arbitrary, antiscientific classification of science. This pertains even to the basic series of decimal classification.

Citing examples of theoretical structures by authors of a series of current classification schemes (Bliss, Ranganathan), Z. N. Ambartsumian demonstrated the impossibility of creating a genuine scientific scheme on the basis of idealistic philosophical conceptions or by means of a mechanical transferral of the biological principles of evolution to human society. Analyzing the classification schemes of some bourgeois library scholars Z. N. Ambartsumian revealed how the principles of "non-party activity" and "objectivity" enunciated by them, in practice, mask an anticommunist and anti-soviet attitude in distinct headings and propagate religion and superstition. In connection with this, he remarked that in the technique of constructing classification schemes these authors had amassed great experience worthy of attentive study.

Great interest was aroused among the participants of the conference by the report "The library of the future in the light of bourgeois library literature" by the docent of the Moscow State University Department of Scientific Information, R. S. Giliarevskii. In the opinion of the lecturer, library work at the present time is at a turning point in its development. The furious growth of printed works poses a number of serious problems before libraries, since the traditional forms of library service do not ensure scholars the possibility of becoming acquainted quickly with new facts and ideas. This problem confronts the librarians of many countries and we are interested in knowing how it is viewed in the economically and technically developed countries of the West. The exhibit organized by the American Library Association at the 1962 World Fair at Seattle with the extremely pretentious title of "Library 21" was an additional stimulus to the evaluation of this theme of the foreign library press.

Two trends were revealed. Adherents of one course affirm that the library of the future is the automated library without librarians or books. In it, factual information printed by electronic devices will be handed to those in need of it (I may add, that people making use of the services of such an automat can scarcely be called readers). The American librarian, M. Griffin, stated that even the "book itself will not be preserved

in its traditional form." The adherents of the other school, admitting that mechanization and automation introduce much that is new, picture the library of the future as a synthesis of the traditional current new methods of work

R. S. Giliarevskii disclosed the reactionary essence of the outwardly radical ideas about the disappearance of contemporary libraries. He acknowledged the importance of utilizing new modes of preserving printed texts and facts (micro-editions, electronic storage devices), but he emphasized that it is precisely the traditional form of the book which corresponds to man's abilities to acquire knowledge with the help of the printed word. The library of the future will not be electronic machines without librarians, without books and, in fact, without readers, but it will be a library directed by highly qualified librarians armed with all the latest technology for the swift search of necessary work and the swift transformation of them from microform or electronic tapes into a form convenient for the reader (in all likelihood, precisely in the form of a book). Not the transformation of the librarian into a mechanic-supervisor, but the all and every conceivable raising of the ideological level of the librarian's activity, his transformation into a still more effective helper and educator of readers, armed with the technology of tomorrow; that is the library of the future. In R. Giliarevskii's conception, such a library will occupy its proper, honored position in communist society. To this end it is necessary now for Soviet library scholars to work tenaciously for the resolution of the many problems springing up before contemporary library work.

The concluding report "Soviet library work in the interpretation of the bourgeois press" was given by B. N. Bachaldin (GPNTB).<sup>\*</sup> Noting that more and more material about Soviet library work and bibliography is appearing in the press of the capitalist countries (during 1956-63 by approximate count over 180 articles and notes and about 60 reviews), he analyzed their theme and character in detail. A number of authors, maintaining the attitudes of bourgeois library science, honestly strove to investigate Soviet reality. They noted with admiration the tremendous love of the Soviet people for the book, the great network of libraries, the generous acquisitions to their collections, the close contact of the librarian with the readers, the elements of teaching in their activity, and the broad scope of abstracting and bibliographic work. There is a grain of truth in some of the critical remarks. They point out the lack of mechanization in Soviet libraries or, at times, the lack of a high artistic level in their design. At the same time the speaker emphasized that a lack of understanding and a negative attitude to the principle of party activity which is paramount in the work of Soviet librarians was characteristic of the overwhelming majority of bourgeois library scholars. Some of the articles revealed the open enmity, conditioned by a pathological anticommunism, of their authors.

The interest of librarians of capitalist countries in Soviet library work testifies to the growth of the influence of socialist culture. Soviet library scholars must not only carefully watch the library press of capitalist countries and opportunely unmask attempts at falsi-

<sup>\*</sup>Gosudarstvennaia pblchnaia nauchno-tekhnikheskaia biblioteka (state public scientific-technological library).

fication, but they must also create well written works which may carry the truth about Soviet libraries to our foreign colleagues.

In our opinion, this task is of special importance, since the librarians of the developing states of Asia, Africa, Latin America express great interest in the organization of library work and bibliography in the Soviet Union and are intensely interested in studying our experiment in cultural construction.

One must also keep in mind that the political views of librarians of capitalist countries are extremely varied. One must remember Lenin's words about the presence of two cultures in the national culture of each people living in the conditions of an exploiting order. Even though in the majority of incidents the voices of the defenders of reactionary ideas clearly resound and are dominant in bourgeois library science still, side by side but much more weakly and less noticeably, one can still observe democratic trends in the library science of capitalist countries. The manifestation of a progressive line is not an easy matter in bourgeois library science but it is necessary, because without it, it is impossible to correctly understand the actual situation.

As a whole the reports were given a positive appraisal. At the same time the participants made a number of essential critical remarks. It was noted that the content of some speakers' reports was weakened in so far as they did not subject to exposure the extremely reactionary tendencies existing in the library science of the German Federated Republic. The activity of the Catholic Church in the field of library work was not touched upon in our criticism. In some reports there was a lack of theoretical conclusions, organization of material; and the library literature of the socialist countries was not utilized. Some of the participants expressed a desire that in the future conferences of this kind be set up on some specific theme, that a history of foreign library work be fostered.

In his concluding words O. S. Chubar'ian (State Lenin Library) noted that the successful work of the conference had been possible only because of the combined efforts of the libraries and cultural institutes of Moscow and Leningrad. Summing up the results of this interesting conference, it can be said that, notwithstanding some specific limitations, it was as a whole a noteworthy expression of the activity of Soviet library scholars. The conference showed that Soviet librarians are actively achieving the fulfillment of the decisions of the June Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union even in such a complex and responsible sphere as the criticism of bourgeois theories of library work.

The *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* is published bi-monthly by the American Library Association at 48 Arlington Avenue, Kensington, California, the address to which all editorial communications should be sent. Address all correspondence concerning subscriptions (\$3.00 per year) to Subscription Department, American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.

## Current Bibliography

"ALA Go Home!" *Library Journal*, XIC (15 October, 1964), 4128.

Appel, Benjamin. "Me and the Texas Loyalty Oath." *Publishers' Weekly*, CLXXXVI (7 September 1964), 2830.

Bray, J. J. "Censorship." *Australian Library Journal*, XIII (June, 1964), 60-70.

Brophy, Brigid. "An Open Letter to the Director of Public Prosecutions." *Books and Bookmen*, IX (August, 1964), 11-12.

Cook, Bruce. "Candy Comes to Chicago." *The Nation*, CIC (14 September, 1964), 125-126.

"Durham, 1964—The A.A.L. and Censorship." *The Assistant Librarian*, LVII (July, 1964), 113-117.

Ellis, Elmo. "The Right to be Heard: Free Men and Free Thought in a Changing World." *The South-eastern Librarian*, XIV (Summer, 1964), 89-96.

Embree, Raymond. "What to Do Until the Censor Comes." *OLA Bulletin*, XXXIV (July, 1964), 24-26.

Franklin, Robert D. "A Game of Chicken." *Library Journal*, XIC (15 October, 1964), 3918-19.

Gaines, Ervin J. "The Fear of Freedom." *ALA Bulletin*, LVIII (October, 1964), 767-68.

Gaines, Ervin J. "Sunshine on the Vigilant." *ALA Bulletin*, LVIII (September, 1964), 675-676.

Haheys, J. E. "Declaratory Relief in Obscenity Proceedings." *California Librarian*, XXV (July, 1964), 177-180.

Haines, Fred. "City of Angeles vs. Scorpio Rising." *The Nation*, CIC (14 September, 1964), 123-125.

Lindsay, John V. "Censorship Feeds on Complacency." *Library Journal*, XIC (15 October, 1964), 3909-3912.

"Lords Pass Obscenity Bill." *The Bookseller*, (1 August, 1964), 970-974.

May, Frederick. "The Concupiscence of the Oppressor." *Australian Library Journal*, XIII (June, 1964), 73-84.

Moore, Everett T. "Open to All—Except the Censor." *California Librarian*, XXV (July, 1964), 153-160, 183-184.

"More on Censorship." Letters from William A. Gaynor and Bradford Harrison III. *ALA Bulletin*, LVIII (October, 1964), 752-53.

Newman, M. W. "The Smut Hunters." *Chicago Daily News*. Series of articles: August 31, p. 1; Sept. 1, p. 1; Sept. 2, p. 1; Sept. 3, p. 22; Sept. 4, p. 1; Sept. 5, p. 9; Sept. 7, p. 8; Sept. 8, p. 12; Sept. 9, p. 41; Sept. 10, p. 52.

Pierson, Robert M. "'Objectionable' Literature: Some False Synonymies." *Library Journal*, XIC (15 October, 1964), 3920-23.

"A Policy for the Library Association of Australia?" *Australian Library Journal*, XIII (June, 1964), 55-57.

Sachs, Ed. "I Want Candy." *Focus Midwest*, III (No. 3, 1964), 11-13, 23-24.

"Should Schoolmen Serve as Censors?" By Max Rafferty and Thomas Braden. *Nation's Schools*, LXXIII (September, 1964), 62-64.