



IFC ALA

on Intellectual freedom

Edited by LEROY CHARLES MERRITT, *Dean, University of Oregon School of Librarianship*

VOL. XVIII • May, 1969 • No. 3

Four Thoughts

1.

My allegiance to intellectual freedom is derived from three personal opinions: that no one is entitled to tell me what to read and what not to read; that if I choose not to read something, the resulting ignorance is of my own making, and not imposed from the outside; that for me nothing is "evil" in this world, except what I so determine through my individual sense of values.

The above principles are constantly violated, and the prospects for the future are not too bright. Some people do feel that they have a right to curb other peoples' reading; some people are under the impression that ignorance is bliss; finally, some people have a weird sense of values which they more-over want to impose upon others!

2.

Librarians who take intellectual freedom seriously should by all means be backed up. If they have to resign from their jobs, then A.L.A., other library organizations, and even library schools, should substantially help them in finding decent positions. If necessary, cash should be provided on a temporary basis to tide them over. If this has not been done yet, a fund should be set aside by A.L.A. for this purpose, to be handled by the Intellectual Freedom Committee.

Libraries whose policy-making bodies commit them to censorship, should be so identified, and after due process, state and federal monies should be withheld from them. They should first, of course, be given every chance to mend their ways.

3.

As long as man exists, there probably will be censorship. The battle may never end. In the meantime, it is incumbent upon librarians to take a good, honest look at themselves: are they perhaps the worst censors? Are they using the threats of patrons' complaints as rationalizations? Are they imposing their own puritan sex standards upon their readers?

I remember a conversation I had a few years ago with Mr. Castagna, the present chairman of A.L.A.'s Intellectual Freedom Committee. He claimed at the time that selection and censorship were two different things. I was a

little dubious then, and I am still now. Of course, to some extent he was quite correct. In selecting, we do exclude. We have just so much money at our disposal, and we have to consider quality and demand in making decisions. Unfortunately it is all too easy to censor through selection, and plenty of librarians "select" in this manner.

4.

When a person, child or adult, suffers mental agonies because he feels guilty over some perfectly normal sexuals thought or experience, he might conceivably have been spared this unnecessary torment, had a librarian not hidden his sex education manuals (assuming he even has any). When an unwanted child is born, his parents might have been spared the financial and emotional agonies which may follow, had a librarian not hidden his sex education manuals (assuming he even has any). When a borrower doesn't get a chance to read a fine book like "Portnoy's Complaint," he might have been provided a real artistic experience, had a librarian not decided that "the book is no good, because I don't like it!"

— JOSEPH RUEF, *Director*, Glen Rock Library,
Glen Rock, New Jersey, and *Chairman*,
NJLA Intellectual Freedom Committee

Intellectual Freedom in Atlantic City

"Freedom to Read: A Battlefield Report," is the theme of a three-part program sponsored by the American Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee, in conjunction with ALA's 88th Annual Conference to be held in Atlantic City the week of June 22. The programs will take place on Monday and Wednesday mornings, June 23 and 25 from 8 a.m. until 12 noon.

The first session, covering legislation and being held Monday, June 23, from 8 a.m. until 10 a.m., will be keynoted by Charles Rembar, author of *The End of Obscenity* (Random House, 1968). Mr. Rembar, a lawyer, defended the public's right to read D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterly's Lover*, Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, and John Cleland's *Fanny Hill*, the latter before the United States Supreme Court. His speech will focus on major pieces of national legislation and decisions of the Supreme Court (including, but not limited to, obscenity) which affect intellectual freedom guaranteed by the First Amendment, and which, therefore, may create a climate limiting freedom of access to materials and ideas. A symposium-panel, moderated by Peter Jennison, Executive Director of the National Book Committee, and composed of an educator, a publisher, a librarian and a citizen, will react to Mr. Rembar's talk. Discussion among the panel members and with the audience will follow.

The Monday morning program will continue from 10 a.m. - 12 noon with a presentation of the results of a study concerning the legality and feasibility of developing a support fund for librarians who are fired or forced to resign in defense of intellectual freedom. Suggestions for establishing a program of action to be used in regard to institutions violating the spirit of the Library Bill of Rights also will be presented. The report is the follow-up of a directive given to the Intellectual Freedom Committee by the ALA Council at the 1968 Annual Conference. Entitled "The Feasibility and Legality of Promoting and Defending the Library Bill of Rights," the report will be discussed by its authors, Mr. Eli Oboler and Mr. Edwin Jackson.

Following the report, representatives from groups having similar programs of action will relate their experiences with such. Included will be representatives from the National Education Association, the American Association of University Professors, and the insurance industry. Questions from the audience will be entertained.

Using a modified workshop format, Wednesday's session, entitled "The Censor Knocks" will answer the questions: "How does one react when the censor stands in front of him? What are the tactics currently being used by would-be censors? What charges are being leveled?"

Persons who have recently been involved in confrontations will share their experiences through brief formal papers, through role-playing, and through open discussion.

Intellectual Freedom Exhibit

The Intellectual Freedom Committee and the Office for Intellectual Freedom is sponsoring an exhibit in Booth 819, on the Boardwalk Level of the Convention Hall. The display consists of materials from the polemic fringes of political thought. These publications, while legitimate, are only occasionally found in libraries. Among others, writings are included from the left of center, right of center, the peace movement, the civil rights movement, and the underground press.

Mr. William D. North, ALA's legal counsel will be at the booth on Idea Day, Wednesday, June 25, to discuss aspects of intellectual freedom and its attendant problems. While Mr. North cannot provide a defense for specific problems, he can indicate the legality of actions that you may consider undertaking in defending intellectual freedom. What rules of law are applicable in a particular censorship incident, and how can these rules be utilized? Mr. North will be available to discuss these and other questions.

During all exhibit hours, members of state Intellectual Freedom Committees and ALA staff will be available to answer questions, discuss problems, and provide information and literature.

Missouri Library Commission Flunks the IF Test

The State Library Commission Thursday called involvement of the State Library in the "free speech" at the University of Missouri a "display of indiscretion" and censured State Librarian Charles O'Halloran.

After a total of 10 hours devoted to involvement of the Library, the Commission issued a statement which read in part:

"The incidents at the University of Missouri involving student conduct, which precipitated the current issue, were extraneous to the functions of the State Library as defined by statute. The letter to the press by a member of the library staff, sent with the approval of the State Librarian, which injected the State Library into the matter was a display of indiscretion."

At Thursday's first meeting, according to the statement, O'Halloran told the Commission, "The intrusion of the State Library into a matter completely the concern and responsibility of the administration of the University of Missouri was rash, impetuous, and impertinent."

The statement issued after another five-hour meeting Thursday said, "The Commission agrees in general with Mr. O'Halloran's statement and we recognize this statement as an admission of error in judgment on his part. In consideration of the five years of outstanding service which he has given to the Missouri State Library, the Commission does not feel that a single error of judgment justifies further censure."

Apparently the Commission plans no action against Mrs. Joan Bodger, the employe who wrote the letter triggering the involvement. Dr. Ralph H. Parker, Librarian at the University of Missouri who is a member of the Commission, explained that the Commission can hire or fire a State Librarian who hires his own staff. Parker said dismissals must be handled the same way.

Mrs. Bodger's letter, written on official stationery and signed over her title as a consultant in the Children's Services Division of the Library, protested "suppression" of an edition of an underground student newspaper at MU and "the arrest of several" students, members of Students for a Democratic Society, who distributed the publication.

Mrs. Bodger's letter also said she would have placed a copy of the underground paper on display in the State Library Children's Book Examination Center, which she directs.

According to the statement, O'Halloran told the Commission:

"It was never, and is not now our intent that any such publication, even if it were completely unoffensive, be openly displayed if by display means actively and consciously promoting it in such a way that any-

one coming to the library must see it. Our intent, with this and many other publications of every sort, would be that the publication be owned by the library.

"In great measure children would find the State Library, as a whole, not appropriate to their needs and children are systematically encouraged by the library staff to use a public library or a school library with programs and book collections designed for them. Therefore, any publications owned by the State Library and needed for legitimate research or reference needs of adults would be stored and made available in such a way that a child would simply not be exposed to anything potentially harmful to him."

The position taken by O'Halloran before the Commission represented a slight "retreat" from earlier positions. Earlier he said the publication would not be "stored" but would be in an area of the library frequented by young persons. However, he said there would be no barrier to prevent young persons from access where it was planned to display such publications.

The final paragraph of the statement read:

"The Commission feels there are further matters to be considered arising out of the present controversy. Further study will be given and action taken in due course."

Dr. Parker and Mrs. Jerome Duggan, who heads the Commission, said the final paragraph in no way meant that the dismissal of any employe was still under consideration.

Parker said the final paragraph in the statement meant that rules and regulations governing O'Halloran might need revision to prevent a similar incident from recurring.—Jefferson City *Capital News*, 21 March.

The Jefferson City *Post-Tribune* ran long editorials on 3 March and 19 March seeking the dismissal of Mr. O'Halloran and Mrs. Bodger. On 20 March the cry was taken up by the Capital City Women's Club. On 4 April the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* reported that 35 "angry mothers, carrying mops, blooms and placards," picketed the St. Charles County Library's O'Fallon branch while Mrs. Bodger talked to a training class for area library employes.

On 8 April, the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* reported that Mrs. Bodger had resigned on Monday, 7 April, giving 30 days' notice. On Tuesday, 2 April, she was informed that she had been dismissed by the State Library Commission.

As we go to press, neither the ALA nor the MLA intellectual freedom committees have raised their voices in support of their beleaguered colleagues.

This Is No. 3

And the March issue was No. 2. If our printer calls this No. 4 when we're not looking, don't you believe him.

Fiske Revisited

I

An adolescent going into a Cuyahoga County Public Library to learn about sex is more likely to be given *Valley of the Dolls* or *The Arrangement* than an authoritative book on sex education.

This is just one of the findings of an eight-month study of censorship in the Cuyahoga County Public Library in preparation for a Master's thesis at Kent State University library school.

At least 22 of the 25 head librarians of CCPL interviewed last spring said they had on their shelves both of the above novels, which they rated from average to poor. But nine admitted having restricted shelves in their libraries, and most of those shelves contained sex education and hygiene books.

This points up the nature of censorship in CCPL. It exists unofficially and contrary to official policy. It is arbitrary and highly personalized. The number of restricted shelves, the incidents of book removal, and absence of some books and types of books were all indicative of the gap between principle and practice in book selection.

Only one librarian openly advocated censorship, but many others indicated by action, by their comments and by an uneasiness with the subject that they approved of some form of censorship in practice if not in theory.

The librarians were found to be intent on preserving the status quo and were wary lest they be accused of being too conservative or too liberal. None had ever coped with a major crisis in censorship, but most had been involved in minor skirmishes. Yet their main fear seemed to be public opinion. They were reluctant to buy some books because the public would complain and yet they had never received any serious complaints from the public. In most instances the librarians were willing to have highly erotic fiction on their shelves because of public demand but were reluctant to put sex hygiene, marriage manuals and the like on the open shelves.

Weakness of the book selection policy then in effect can be seen in the head book selector's admission that he had no means of enforcing the policy or keeping shelves open. Herein lies the weakness of CCPL. It tends to make the liberal, anti-censorship book selection policy a statement with no force and the fact that many librarians tend to ignore it, renders it meaningless.

The study also revealed a need for better education and better informed librarians. Some of those interviewed are disappointingly ill-informed and poorly read. Greater public awareness of the purpose of libraries—to serve *all* the people—and the system's policies—to bend to no special pressures—are concomitant goals.

The public library, encouraging and aiding the free exchange of ideas, is one of the cornerstones of a free society. To chip away at that foundation with a chisel of censorship is to threaten the entire structure which it helps support.

Too many librarians were on the far end of the generation gap, with an average age of 49, some 30 years older than the majority of library users. Too many of these librarians still think of libraries as murky vaults to deposit books rather than incubators for thought. Too many cling blindly to some ill-conceived "tradition" at the expense of serving *all* the people by becoming truly involved in the community.—*Cuyahoga Currents*, March.

—JOY F. BLOOMFIELD
Garfield Heights Library

II

Browsing through the book shelves at any of Lorain County's seven public library systems is a little like seeing Raquel Welch in a floor-length sack dress.

Some of the more provocative features are kept out of sight.

Books on sex education, marriage manuals, and, in some county libraries, novels that may be considered "objectionable" by some readers, are stacked on a shelf in the back room. While all library books are listed in the card catalogue, a reader may have to see the librarian to get what he wants.

The reasons for libraries' back-shelf policy range from the desire to protect young readers from material which is judged beyond their comprehension, or "suggestive," to the fear that some volumes would be stolen from open shelves.

But in every Lorain County Library, there are books the reader must ask for.

The back-shelf policy is really back-shelf diplomacy, according to librarians. Most professionals figure that readers who want to read a particular book will find it, and that those library users who might object to the same book won't object if they don't see it.

Librarian Donald J. Sager said the back shelf at Elvira Public Library is home for about 50 volumes, ranging from the *Kinsey Report* to a guide to raising earthworms.

Few novels are deemed suggestive or controversial enough to be kept off the open shelf, and most of the reading in the back room deals with sex education or specialized subject matter.

The back shelf does hold some novels, however, including such publicized best-sellers as Gore Vidal's *Myra Breckenridge*, a free-wheeling sex satire, and *Valley of the Dolls* by Jacqueline Susann.

Sager, 30, said the books on wrestling, karate and tropical fish are often stolen when put on the open shelf, and are kept in the back to prevent their loss.

With almost 100,000 volumes, Elyria's public library is about two-thirds the size of Lorain Public Library's main branch. Librarian Richard Willson, 35, said the Lorain library also has a back shelf for several books, including sex education, marriage manuals and cake decorating.

No novels are kept from the open shelf in Lorain, but that may be more indicative of the library's general buying policy than of their judgment on individual books.

Willson said he feels the Lorain library is more conservative than the Elyria library, and instead of buying novels that might end up on the back shelf, the Lorain library often doesn't buy them at all.

By way of comparison, neither *Myra Breckenridge* or John Updike's *Couples* is available in Lorain, but both are part of Elyria's collection.

Willson said he felt *Couples* "was not a book for us."

Readers over the age of 14 are issued adult cards at all county libraries, and are thus entitled to check out any book, record or film available. No county library reports any difficulty with the back-shelf policy for books on sex education, marriage or "frank novels," and all insist that readers can always get what they want.

The differences in what is available at county libraries are often pronounced, however. What is viewed as a valuable addition to the library collection in one of the country's seven systems may be called trash at another.

The Avon Lake Public Library, for example, is recognized as having a slightly more liberal book-buying policy than others in the county. Among the 36,500 volumes there, readers can find the sex-spoof *Candy*, which was scorned as pornographic by other libraries.

On the other hand, librarian Mrs. Doris Sunderland said the library declined to add *Myra Breckenridge* to its shelves because the staff considered it "literary pornography."

In addition to books on sex education and improving marriages, Avon Lake's back shelf holds Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, James Baldwin's *Another Country*, and *Candy*. Places on the shelf, said Mrs. Sunderland, are reserved for books which may draw an outcry from the library's more narrow-minded patrons.

No county librarian admits to censorship, but all recognize that the economics of buying books screens out some and accepts others. In 1968 librarians could choose from 28,000 new books published in this country alone.

Most librarians said they buy "what is right for us," and try to avoid controversy over any particular book by moving it to the back if there is any possibility of reader objection.

Eileen Thornton, librarian for both the public and college collections in Oberlin, said she often shelves a book in the back room to save it from being stolen rath-

er than for censorship. She said the library has "a broad selection policy."

In the Grafton Public Library, Mrs. Dorothy Snedaker said the library bought *Myra Breckenridge* and *Couples* in response to readers' requests, and put them on a back shelf.

"I believe people should read anything they want to read," said Mrs. Snedaker, who is in charge of the 19,000 volumes there.

Throughout the county, books that end up out of the library patron's sight get there as a result of readers' objections or the desire of the librarians to avoid the chance of controversy. But in many cases, the reader who relies on browsing the open shelves won't see all of what is available.

In Elyria, for example, the books kept in the back are listed in the card catalogue, but the cards don't indicate where the books are shelved. The reader has to know enough to ask for them, said one librarian.

"The people who want to read these books usually find them," said another county librarian. "We don't try to keep any secrets about what we have."

Complaints from library users that books are "trashy" or pornographic are rare, according to Lorain County librarians. But when complaints are heard, the common solution is the shelf in the back room.

"It is not an entirely satisfactory policy," said one librarian, "but since everyone will never agree on what is good reading and what isn't, the policy will undoubtedly continue."—Elyria, Ohio *Chronicle-Telegram*, 16 March.

Three Nuns Fired

NEW YORK (AP)—A Roman Catholic parochial school on Staten Island has dismissed its principal and two other nuns accused of teaching "evolution vs creation" and not adhering to Church doctrine about devils, angels and sin.

The dismissals were first reported Sunday by the Staten Island *Advance*.

One of the nuns termed the charges "distortions and misunderstandings."

The dispute reflected widespread, current tension in the Roman Catholic church over old and newer styles of teaching theological concepts.

Action removing the three nuns was taken by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. John J. Cleary, pastor of St. Mary of the Assumption parish, after complaints against them were printed in the parish bulletin.

He declined comment, referring newsmen to the district superintendent of Catholic schools, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph T. Riordan, who said the friction resulted from "differences in approach."—Santa Ana *Register*, 7 January.

Intellectual Freedom: A Resolution

WHEREAS in a free society the principle of intellectual liberty stands among the fundamental and essential truths that sustain the republic, and

WHEREAS academic freedom includes both freedom in teaching and freedom in learning, and

WHEREAS both the student and the educator have certain rights and privileges in the common search for truth, and

WHEREAS both the student and the educator are entitled to an educational climate in which a free movement of ideas can exist, within the limits of the law, and

WHEREAS the recent decision of the Orange County Board of Education to remove several books, among them *Hiroshima*, *Sigmund Freud*, and two technical books, from a purchase list considered for use at Rio Contiguo School, and

WHEREAS such removal was clearly a reflection of personal political views of the Orange County Board of Education, with little apparent consideration given to the literary and historical significance of the books, and

WHEREAS such removal constitutes outright censorship and a resultant denial of the intellectual liberties upon which a free society must rest, and

WHEREAS such books were removed without their having been read, and without benefit of professional judgment,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Librarians of the University of California at Irvine hereby go on record in direct opposition to this unwarranted and deplorable affront to academic freedom in our public-supported schools, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Librarians of the University of California at Irvine request that greater emphasis be given to literary, social, and historical significance than to personal political viewpoints when considering books for possible inclusion in school libraries, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Librarians of the University of California at Irvine suggest that books be read *before* being rejected as inappropriate, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Librarians of the University of California at Irvine request that John Hersey's *Hiroshima*, in addition to the above-mentioned books, be reconsidered for inclusion in the library of the Rio Contiguo School, and

BE IT RESOLVED that the Librarians of the University of California at Irvine recommend that especial care be taken so that further instances of such censorship might be avoided, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to each of the following parties: Superior Judge Bruce W. Sumner; Dr. Dale E.

Rallison; A. E. Arnold; Clay Mitchell; the *Daily Pilot*; the *Santa Ana Register*; the *Los Angeles Times*, Orange County Edition; the *Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram*; and LeRoy C. Merritt, Editor, *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*.

Passed unanimously, 5 February, 1969.

— PIETER DEKKERS, *President*
L. U. C. I.

— DON L. HIXON, *Vice-President*
L. U. C. I.

Pro and Contra

PLAYBOY: My suggestion is that you subscribe to *Playboy* magazine. Over the years I have found that it is superior to several of the magazines which you now carry in editorial comment, fiction writers and stories, non-fiction articles (written by some of the world's more renowned people).

ANSWER: Sorry, we have yet to find an academic justification of *Playboy* that will satisfy our own collective consciences. It is not indexed; it is not much cited, in a manner that would make it useful for college papers. Its interviews with the "renowned" (read: fashionable?) are amusing, but not enough to carry conviction. It is highly available elsewhere and locally. As a girly magazine, it doesn't even have the justification of *Redbook*, *Seventeen*, *Yachting*, which we also don't take, although they *are* indexed in the *Reader's Guide*.

PLAYBOY: Odd that a magazine with so little—as you insinuated—educational value would be assigned reading in an English course (and rightly so) on this campus. (Mrs. Webb, of the English Department, assigned readings from the December 1968 issue of *Playboy* for her English class.) I suggest that you reconsider your ruling. (Also, in regards to your remarks on *Redbook* et al. I heartily agree. *Playboy* has printed an interesting series on that area entitled "The Pious Pornographers." Might I recommend it for your reading?)

ANSWER: I humbly suggest that if an instructor thinks *Playboy* a necessary acquisition for the Library, he follow regular channels and, by memo, request the Library to purchase a subscription. This is the manner in which most new periodicals are added. The Library stands on its judgment in the last posting.

PLAYBOY ONCE AGAIN: What's wrong with *Playboy*? No need? I've been getting assignments for three weeks in English Comp. on *Playboy* articles. What's the use of a suggestion box if you discard them all.

ANSWER: As far as subscribing to *Playboy* is concerned, we feel we gave our deliberately considered answer in the last posting. As for the remark about discarding suggestions, it is uncalled for. The only questions we do not answer are those on irresolvable problems, such as the maintenance of room temperature, and those written in obscene or abusive language.—*The (University of Idaho Library) Bookmark*, March.

Unions' Stand on Richmond Library

I

The Public Employees Union promised yesterday to try to keep Richmond from hiring a new city librarian to replace John Forsman, who has resigned in a censorship battle.

The city's Public Library Commission, responding to right-wing groups concerned over "pornographic and left-wing" material, ordered Forsman to ban two periodicals from the library last October—*The Berkeley Barb* and *Avant Garde*.

Library commissioners claimed this was in line with a policy against "pornography" and "sensationalism" appearing in the library.

Forsman, who had fought the ban, repeatedly asked the commission at least to provide objective definitions of "pornography" and "sensationalism" so he could be guided in selecting future library materials.

But the commission refused, and Forsman, the Richmond city librarian for four years, submitted his resignation, effective April 1.

If the Public Employees Union has anything to say about it, however, the commission won't be able to find a replacement.

The executive board of the union's Local 1675 voted to urge professional librarians, some of whom belong to the union, to steer clear of Richmond until the Library Commission abandons its "undemocratic interference" in the selection of library materials.

Union Business Manager Henry Clarke said Local 1675 will circulate statements to librarians throughout the country. As a first step, it is putting an advertisement in the *Library Journal*, the national professional organ of librarians.

The commission, charged Clarke, "completely caved in to the pressure of special interest groups, and left its professional librarians virtually without support . . . It dispensed with the professional judgment of a trained librarian regarding the selection of library materials."

He called the commission action "a threat to both professional standards of our members and to the public's right to have a public library that meets the needs of all."—*San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 March.

II

WHEREAS the Library Bill of Rights states that "Libraries should provide books and other materials presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times; no library materials should be proscribed or removed from libraries because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval"; and

WHEREAS the Richmond Library Commission has banned from the Richmond Library two publications representing unorthodox political and social viewpoints,

thus bowing to pressure from ultra-right special interest groups; and

WHEREAS the Richmond Library Commission has repeatedly declined to provide objective definitions of "pornography" and "sensationalism," thus leaving their professional librarians without support and subject to arbitrary whim and pressure from persons seeking to use the library for their own political ends;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the University Federation of Librarians, AFT 1795, U.C. Berkeley, supports the Contra Costa County Employees Union, AFSCME Local 1675 in urging professional librarians not to seek employment in the Richmond Public Library until such a time as it shall be made explicitly clear by the Library Commission that library materials will not be excluded because of the social, political, or religious views of the authors, that objective criteria, such as defined in state and federal law, shall govern decisions on what is pornographic or obscene, and that the professional judgment of trained librarians will be upheld in selecting library materials.—11 March, 1969.

What Shall They Read?

March 5, 1969

To the Editor:

What Shall They Read?, the documentary long-play recording of the August 26, 1968, Richmond (Calif.) City Council meeting concerning the Richmond Library censorship battle, is now available for purchase from KPFA Radio, 2207 Shattuck, Berkeley, Calif. It sells for \$5. While the record and its liner notes stand alone as an unusually interesting and educational example of what librarians may expect in such a battle, we feel that some additional comments will further clarify the issues.

1. *Never, ever*, from the time they came into the Richmond Library until they were removed, were the *Berkeley Barb* and *Avant Garde* in the children's room of the library. The children's room is in a different part of the building than the adult room, where the periodicals were shelved, and is far removed from the adult room. Age limit for use of the adult room is 8th grade and up, in conformity with the Contra Costa County library system regulations.

2. While Mr. Forsman's expletive to Mrs. Klock was impolite and ill-advised, it was spontaneously prompted when she invited him to attend a John Birch Society meeting "to see how nice they are." Certainly none of us involved in defending the library has any knowledge whatsoever of "threatening" telephone calls.

3. The *Berkeley Barb* belongs in the library, especially a large public library in the Bay Area such as Richmond, because it reports news of the new left and radical student community which is not reported in the "establishment" press. Whether we agree with these political viewpoints or not, they affect our lives and the

society in which we live, and we have a clear obligation to see that they are represented in the library collection. Conversely, the radical right viewpoint should be represented in the library collection, if that minority exists in the community, and the Richmond Library does have representative materials for this viewpoint.

4. The significance of this meeting is that Mrs. Klock took the issue directly to the City Council, bypassing the librarian and the Library Commission. We felt it would be to the detriment of the library and a free book selection policy for the City Council to determine the issue. The city code clearly stated that such matters should be determined by the Library Commission. Therefore, at the end of the recording when the Council voted to continue the issue, it appeared to be a defeat for intellectual freedom in the Richmond Library—we had hoped they would vote to simply turn the matter back to the Library Commission, as they had voted on August 12, the date on which Mrs. Klock first took the issue to the City Council. At this time we had every confidence in the Library Commission, which had stated publicly several times, after the El Cerrito Library was attacked in May, that they would defend the book selection policy and the library from censorship. However, in November the Library Commission voted 3-2 to remove the *Berkeley Barb* and *Avant Garde* on the grounds of the word "sensationalism" in the book selection statement.

5. It was clear even in August that Councilman Vargas was looking at the library issue as a good "decency, law and order" issue on which to campaign for re-election to the City Council in April, 1969. After the *Berkeley Barb* was no longer an issue, he continued to attack many aspects of the library operation, such as why does the library buy British books, what is the fine system, etc. He even went to far as to ask library staff to send anonymous letters about their complaints, if any, about the library, thus opening the door for anyone so inclined to write and say he was a library employee and thus to criticize Mr. Forsman. Mrs. Strindberg has now filed for election to the City Council, and a "people's mandate" for a clean, conservative library has been mentioned recently.

6. Mr. Forsman has now asked the Richmond Library Commission to rewrite the book selection policy, removing the word "sensationalism" and substituting that state and federal law shall determine what is pornographic and obscene. Should the Commission decide to make this change, it will make the criteria legal and rational, rather than subjective and possibly punitive and censorious.

7. Mr. Forsman resigned in January and will leave the Richmond Library in April. An ultra-right attack on the El Cerrito Library has been renewed.

Sincerely — LAUREL BURLEY
California Library Association
Intellectual Freedom Committee

NLA Opposes New Obscenity Statute

I

Public hearing on AB70, legislation to prohibit sale and exhibition of obscene material to minors brought forth opposition from the Nevada Library Association.

Harold G. Morehouse, president, said his group, the American Library Association and most librarians in general have "a dislike for any law or proposed law restricting access to books or magazines."

It is "not the concern of the state to tell us what our children may or may not purchase at the bookstore," but it is the concern of parents and teachers "to lead our children into the world of books without the distraction of a temptingly forbidden category of materials proscribed by law," Morehouse said.

Noting that there is no proven casual relationship between exposure to obscenity and any kind of activity, Robert Armstrong, special collector of material for the university Reno campus asked the judiciary committee to defer action on the bill until the president's commission report on obscenity and its effect had been published.

Armstrong called the bill a start on chopping up of freedom and said children must have an opportunity to exercise a choice. "They can't do this if they are forbidden by law," he said.

"Parents should not abrogate their prerogative of teaching responsibility and choice is the essence of responsibility," Armstrong continued.—*Reno Gazette*, 12 February.

II

Members of the Nevada Library Association have been reading too many books recently. The fine print has affected their reason.

They don't even want to protect our children from obscenity and blatant material displayed on newsstands for only one reason—to appeal to the prurient desires of juveniles.

How else can you accept the statement of President Harold Morehouse, who objected to a bill before the Legislature to prohibit the sale and exhibition of obscene material to minors.

Morehouse said his group, the American Library Association, "and most librarians in general have a dislike for any laws or proposed law restricting access to books or magazines.

"It is not the concern of the state to tell us what our children may or may not purchase at the book store. It is the concern of parents, teachers and librarians to lead our children into the world of books without the distraction of a temptingly forbidden category of materials proscribed by law."

Morehouse misses the point. He lives too much in cloistered halls and hideaway libraries.

Our children, in many cases, are not being lead into "a world of books." They are being trapped into a world of salacious literature, filth, sex, sadism, pornography, incest, torture and lust.

It is not happening in the libraries either, but right on the newsstands of the community. You can see it openly and so can your children.

The sadism, the women in chains being burned or tortured, the naked beauties in wanton poses, homosexuality and indecency in all its salacious forms is paraded in magazines, cartoon books and picture books.

Morehouse may not consider this a danger and may not want to do a blessed thing to screen our children from such filth, but most of us feel differently.

Let's hope the Legislature also does.—Las Vegas Sun, 14 February.

Censorship Bills

Of interest and concern to librarians are the two bills on obscenity which have been introduced in the state legislature. Both *Senate Bill 30*, introduced by Senator Sam Guess, and *House Bill 10*, introduced by Representatives Richardson and Kuehnle, would penalize and prohibit the publication, sale, and distribution of materials judged obscene. Both bills are rather specific in defining what is considered obscene and would include magazines, books, films, etc. The Washington Library Association, the State Library, and the Trustees of the King County Library System have declared themselves against the bills and all such forms of censorship. Many librarians, although agreeing in principle on the necessity of restraining obscene materials, would feel that the difficulty of enforcing such laws and the impossibility of interpreting what is obscene, even though the bills give specific definitions, would create great problems for libraries. Many current best-selling novels would be on library shelves against the law. Philosophically and professionally most librarians would subscribe wholeheartedly to the Library Bill of Rights with its emphasis on the freedom to read. The usual standards of careful book selection by professionals should suffice. Morality is difficult to legislate.—*Comstock Nuggets*: Bulletin of the Spokane Public Library Staff Association, 1 March, 1969.

Box Score

New obscenity statutes have been passed by the following jurisdictions:

Milwaukee County, Wis. 11 March.

Charlotte, N.C. 25 March

Tennessee 26 March

Reluctant Librarians

It's open season on smut at the Minnesota State Capitol again, and this time some new—if somewhat half-hearted—allies have joined the fray.

The new backers of anti-pornography legislation include many of the institutions and groups that opposed it two years ago, when a bill was passed by the House but allowed to die a quiet death in the Senate.

Among them are the Minnesota Library Association, the Minnesota Newspaper Association, the Minneapolis public schools, the Minneapolis Institute of Art and the Walker Art Center.

"It isn't that we're so gung-ho for any bill," explained Ervin Gaines, director of the Minneapolis public library, last week. "It's just that if there's going to be one, we want one we can live with."

The bill this group is backing in preference to a more stringent approach will be sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Kenneth Wolfe, St. Louis Park Conservative.

The stronger plan is incorporated in a pair of measures introduced in the House by Rep. C. A. Johnson, Mankato Conservative.

Johnson's bill provides that it is a defense against prosecution to prove that the alleged offense was committed by such an institution or by its employee in discharging his duties. But charges could be filed, and the burden of the defense would be on the accused.

"We felt that 'defense' was not a strong enough word," Gaines explained.

The group he was a part of, he said, wanted to prevent charges from being filed in the first place, so it proposed legislation clearly exempting educational and cultural institutions and their employees from prosecution. That's the bill Wolfe is sponsoring—*Minneapolis Tribune*, 16 February.

"Target Smut" Too Smutty

At first, it seemed that a screening of the film *Target Smut* would be an ideal way to help stamp out pornography. But the film, produced by Citizens for Decent Literature, is simply too smutty to show, some critics say. The film, highly critical of court decisions permitting showing of several questionable movies, includes clips from some of the offending films. The Citizens for Youth Protection, a Minneapolis-St. Paul organization, reported in a recent newsletter that *Target Smut* is "too obscene for showing to the general public." The newsletter added that members of the organization previewing the film were shocked. Mayor Thomas Byrne canceled a showing for city officials and reporters after a citizen complained that "dirty movies were going to be shown in the council chambers."—*National Observer*, 3 March.

Anchorage Principal Makes a Point

More than 400 persons packed the Mears Junior High School auditorium Monday night as the school's principal, Larry Pollock, defended its literature and teaching methods against a neo-Birchite attack, delivered by Mrs. Opel Van Kommer, a Mears parent and vice president of the local Parent-Teacher Association.

The meeting had been called last Tuesday after Pollock suggested to the 12-member PTA board that sniping attacks against himself and the school instructional program be brought into the open. Major Oliver H. Entwistle, president of the state PTA, served as moderator of the session.

Mrs. Van Kommer claimed the teaching methods adopted reflected the theory of John Dewey, whom she described as a "Fabian Socialist and or a Marxist." She complained that the system had retreated from the teaching of "absolutes."

The big target, however, was the magazine, *Scope*, a publication of National Scholastic, Inc., which is on file at all high school libraries in the Anchorage area. She claimed the magazine provided, "Questions, questions, questions, but no answers."

Mrs. Van Kommer found objections to the Soviet publication, *Soviet Life*, which has been cleared by the State Department for distribution in this country. She claimed it only showed the bright side of communism and might thus influence "our idealistic children."

Pollock, a former Iowa state Republican legislator, spoke softly but emphatically in reply. He dealt with the charges in order.

On the subject of absolutes, Pollock noted that Mears had 1,200 students and almost 2,000 parents. "I'd like to know how many absolutes there are that 3,200 people can agree upon," he said.

Noting that *Scope* is available in schools throughout the state and nation, he said, "I can take the McGuffie Reader or the Bible and teach something wrong, or even dirty. This is why we need and have good teachers."

Describing most of the *Scope* material attacked as important in evaluating youthful attitudes, he drew lengthy applause for his defense of the Martin Luther King literature; "Was King a Communist? Possibly. Probably not. I just wonder how many of you people could have been patient for 100 years . . . how many could have been patient for one day or one week when you wanted something that is rightfully yours."

Pollock noted that in addition to *Soviet Life*, the Mears Library subscribed to *Time*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* and other periodicals representing "every hue of political opinion."

Pollock continued: "We're not trying to brainwash these kids . . . We hope we are preparing them to make intelligent choices, not choices based upon ill-informed opinion or one opinion . . . If you undermine this then you're playing into Communist hands much more than we ever will by letting them read *Soviet Life* . . ."

Pollock said he recalled seeing newspaper pictures as a kid of the Nazi burning books. "If you want to be part of a one-party society, go ahead and burn your books," he said, "but count me out."

He received a standing ovation.—Anchorage Daily News, 11 March.

Karate is a No-No

I

The library has been really concerned for some years as to the advisability of stocking books on Karate (an unarmed form of Japanese self-defense and/or mayhem). Many requests have been and continue to be made at Central and all of the branches for instructions in the art. At one time the library did buy a book on the subject, all copies of which have either worn out or disappeared.

It was deemed advisable to get an expert opinion on the subject. Mr. Mark Koukal, Chief instructor of Judo at the Fresno YMCA, and his colleague in the department, Mr. Frank Wolverton were consulted by library staff. Both men agreed that a Karate book, used without a competent instructor, could result in serious injury to an amateur.

Therefore, the library will buy no more books on the subject, as a protection for our patrons, and such books will not be available through interlibrary loan.

If your patrons ask for Karate information, please explain why we do not have and will not borrow books on the subject, or clip this article to show them.—Fresno County Free Library *Intercom*, 21 February.

II

March 5, 1969

Mrs. Alice F. Reilly
Fresno County Library
2420 Mariposa St.
Fresno, California 93721

The censorship of books on Karate in the Fresno County Library has been called to my attention by members of the Intellectual Freedom Committee of CLA.

I think that your decision to open the door to the protection of patrons from books is regrettable. Books, surely, must be protected from damage or loss by patrons, but the reverse can only be called censorship.

Will you next remove all formularies which explain the manufacture of poisons and explosives? What about books on electronics or home electrical repairs?

The dangers inherent in amateur karate differ only in degree from the dangers which exist in any other active sport conducted without the supervision of a competent instructor.

I believe that you have made an error and hope that you will reconsider.

— DAVID W. BRUNTON
Executive Director, CLA

III

March 11, 1969

Mr. David W. Brunton
Executive Director
California Library Association

I have received your astonishing communication regarding Fresno's decision not to continue purchasing how-to-do-it books on Karate. I hardly feel that this is an area that should be of concern to the Intellectual Freedom Committee, but this may be a matter of opinion.

Since you have concerned yourself with this, however, I wish to point out to you and to the IF Committee that the decision was made by the Fresno County Free Library Book Selection Committee on the basis of recommendations made to librarians on the Committee by instructors at the Fresno YMCA gymnasium. In the instructors' experience boys trying out advanced techniques pictured and described in Karate text books, without benefit of demonstration of those techniques by competent instructors or without earlier instruction in elementary techniques, have either been injured themselves or have inflicted unintentional injury to others. The Fresno book committee accepted the recommendations of the instructors as they have accepted recommendations regarding books from instructors in other fields or from members of the medical or legal professions when, in their judgment, they do not themselves have sufficient knowledge of a specific subject to make a wise decision on inclusion of books in our collection.

Responsible book selection is one of the duties entrusted to professional librarians. I believe that my staff made a responsible decision based on information received from experts in the field.

We will continue to exercise our professional responsibility in the area of book selection as we will continue to uphold the principles of the ALA Bill of Rights. We see no conflict.

We recently purchased multiple copies of *Karate's History and Traditions*, by Bruce Haines, among other thousands of titles selected for use by our patrons. Other thousands of titles were not selected for one reason or another. Is all book selection to be equated with censorship? Is Common Sense, like God, dead? The moral of Thurber's "The Bear Who Let It Alone" (copy enclosed) seems to me to be applicable in some cases to the IFC.

— (MRS.) ALICE P. REILLY

Peaceful Protest OK in Schools

WASHINGTON (AP)—The Supreme Court told public school officials Monday that they cannot prevent pupils from peacefully advocating at their schools causes which may be unpopular with the officials.

The court held 7 to 2 that unless officials can show that a pupil's remarks, demonstration or protest are hurting others or interfering with orderly classroom procedure he is as free as an adult to speak up.

"In our system," wrote Justice Abe Fortas for the majority, "state-operated schools may not be enclaves of totalitarianism. School officials do not possess absolute authority over their students.

"Students in schools as well as out of school are 'persons' under our Constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the state must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the states."

The decision undercut school officials in Des Moines, Iowa, who had ruled three teen-agers could not wear black armbands at school in protest of the Vietnam war.

Justices Hugo L. Black and John Marshall Harlan dissented.

Black, speaking from the bench as the decision was announced declared: "I have always had the idea that the schools were to educate children and not children to educate teachers; but that seems to be an out-of-date concept."

Harlan, in a terse dissent, found no evidence of bad faith by officials in ruling out the armbands.—Portland *Oregonian*, 25 February.

Pickets Close Store

LOWELL—A legion of pickets, made up mostly of students led by elected officials, priests, ministers, nuns and a few parents, successfully closed a Gorham street book store yesterday in a march leaders claimed was designed to drive pornography out of Lowell.

Pickets, numbering an estimated 400 at one point, marched for nearly 10 hours in front of the Tower News, 99 Gorham St.

Leading marchers along a route that started at city hall and continued over downtown streets to the Gorham street store operated by Paul Dunigan of Pine Street, Lowell were City Councilors Ellen A. Sampson, John E. Cox and Armand W. LeMay, Rev. Arthur Obin, and William Moriarty of the city's anti-pornography commission.

Also taking part from time to time were School Committeemen William C. Collins and Thomas Sullivan.

The pickets staged an almost silent vigil in front of the store in which an allegedly pornographic magazine was purchased by a 17-year-old boy last week.—Lowell *Sun*, 22 November.

Censorship in Rhodesia . . .

Mr. Burke recalled that a talk on the policy and work of the recently appointed Censorship Board by Mr. J. R. McLaren, its Chairman, at the Mashonaland Branch annual general meeting at the end of January, had helped to clear the air on this subject. He went on to explain the division of the Board's duties between various committees, and noted that he himself had been co-opted to the Books Committee, with the aim of providing liaison between the Committee and librarians. The Chairman of the Books Committee, Mr. N. M. Campbell, a member of the Association who was present at this afternoon's meeting, said that while the Board and its Committees were still feeling their way, the Act did lay down various clearly stated grounds for the banning of books. Exemptions from bannings could, however, be made in favor of individuals or institutions, and libraries could in this way obtain permission to have books which were otherwise banned. The Books Committee was anxious that books so exempted should be made available only for serious study, but he stressed his own feeling that as much discretion as possible should be left to the individual librarian in carrying out the terms of any exemptions made. Books exempted should not be displayed on open shelves, but should be kept in reserve, for study only on the library premises. This threw an added responsibility onto the librarian, but not, he felt, a new one. He hoped that it would be accepted.

In reply to questions on the desirability of lending out such books if they were required for lengthy study, Mr. Burke pointed out that this would mean they were out of the librarian's control. Mr. Foggin added that in any case possession of obscene books by unauthorized persons would in itself break the law. The exemption granted to the librarian could not, he thought, be held to pass on to the borrower. Mrs. D. M. Thorpe (Salisbury Polytechnic) questioned the position of the librarian who unwittingly had on his shelves a banned book. Mr. Burke advised that the titles of books banned by the Board were listed in the *Government Gazette*, but agreed that not all librarians saw this and suggested that some other machinery for advising them of the banning of books was needed. Mr. Campbell commented that the Books Committee would make available to any librarian, on request, a list of books banned. Responding to a comment by Mr. Tarica that it appeared the onus of assessing the serious nature of a student's request for a banned book was to be thrown on the librarian, Mr. Campbell expressed the view that librarians were reliable custodians of this responsibility. The good faith of the librarian would be accepted. Dr. Aschenborn suggested that a letter from a supervising professor or lecturer supporting a student's request to see a banned book might be a useful safeguard.

After discussion on the blanket banning of all editions of a book, both Mr. Campbell and Mr. Foggin advised that this problem was very much in the Board's minds. In response to Mr. Burns' comment that the New Zealand Obscene Publications Tribunal took the view that paperback editions were more widely available and more easily accessible to children, Mr. Campbell suggested that this might be taken to imply the giving of one law to the poor and another to the rich. Mr. Foggin agreed that if a price criterion were to be applied it would sometimes be difficult to know where to set the dividing line.

Discussion closed with an invitation from the chair to members to indicate whether the responsibility for the handling of banned books was acceptable. A favorable response brought from Mr. Campbell an expression of appreciation and the offer of the Books Committee's co-operation with librarians.—*The Rhodesian Librarian*, January.

. . . Irks Berman

What I find especially tragic—and indefensible—in this is not the *fact* of book-banning (that's a commonplace on every continent), but rather the librarians' gutless submission to it. No outcry. No objection, however mild. Not even a whimper.

Instead of denouncing censorship as a form of mind-murder, an outrage against civilized life and values, they earnestly discuss—like good, insensitive technocrats and faithful *apparachniks* anywhere—how to implement it most effectively.

Should the time come for bonfires, the Rhodesia Library Association—if asked—will no doubt patriotically supply all the needed kerosene. Matches. And books. Just another professional service.

— SANFORD BERMAN
University of Zambia

5 Years and \$75,000

Convicted publisher Marvin Miller, owner of Collectors Publications, today faces five years in federal prison and a \$75,000 fine for violating federal obscenity laws.

Miller's firm, Covina Publishing Co., which did business as Collectors Publications, also was fined \$15,000 by Federal Judge Manuel L. Real.

Miller and his company were convicted of mailing and shipping 2700 copies of one book and 2500 copies of another, each of which the jury found to be obscene.

Miller and his company also were convicted of mailing advertisements giving information where to obtain other alleged pornography, according to U.S. Attorney W. Matt Byrne.—Los Angeles *Herald Examiner*, 4 February.

Sex Ed. Film Curbed

Severe public criticism has caused school officials in Richmond to halt regular classroom use of the controversial sex education film, *Time of Your Life*.

D. E. Widel, superintendent of the Richmond Unified School District, said elementary schools would be free to show the film on a voluntary basis at noon or before or after school.

Public and personal attacks against the film, originated by the educational television station, KQED, have been increasing. Parent groups in West Contra Costa County condemned the series as a "Communist-socialist conspiracy to undermine family life" and said it was "obscene."

Dr. Robert Griffin, assistant superintendent of the Richmond school district, said principals of the 10 elementary schools where the film had been in use agreed the TV series was beginning to take up too much time because of the attacks. Principals said they were "on the phone with objectors all day long" and added they were concerned lest individual teachers and administrators become targets of the attacks.—Vallejo, Cal. *Times Herald*, 22 November.

Supreme Court Moves Ahead

WASHINGTON (AP)—The Supreme Court guaranteed Americans Monday the right to read dirty books or look at dirty movies in the privacy of their homes.

"A state has no business telling a man, sitting alone in his own house what books he may read or what films he may watch," said Justice Thurgood Marshall for the court.

The ruling, an important extension of freedom of thought, forbids states to make mere possession of obscene material a crime—but leaves them free to restrict public distribution.

Marshall said an Atlanta bachelor, Robert Eli Stanley, sentenced to a year in prison because he had three "stag films at home, was "asserting the right to read or observe what he pleases—the right to satisfy his intellectual and emotional needs in the privacy of his own home.

"Whatever may be the justification for other statutes regulating obscenity," Marshall said, "we do not think they reach into the privacy of one's own home."

Chief Justice Earl Warren, Justices William O. Douglas, John Marshall Harlan and Abe Fortas joined Marshall's opinion. Justice Hugo L. Black concurred separately.

The three remaining Justices, Potter Stewart, William J. Brennan, Jr., and Byron R. White said they would have upset the conviction of the Atlantan because officers used a search warrant issued for other reasons—to look for gambling material—to seize the films.

The Georgia obscenity law, now invalid, was based on the theory that the state should protect individuals and society from literature and films that could spawn antisocial conduct.

Marshall said: "We are not certain that this argument amounts to anything more than the assertion that the state has the right to control the moral content of a person's thought.

"To some," he added, "this may be a noble purpose, but it is wholly inconsistent with the philosophy of the First Amendment."

Besides, he said, for the majority, there appears to be little proof that exposure to obscenity leads to deviant sexual behavior or to crimes of sexual violence.—Portland *Oregonian*, 8 April.

Possession No Crime

The Indiana law that prohibits possession of pornography even when there is no intent to sell it was ruled unconstitutional Monday by three federal judges. The judges said the Indiana obscenity law is basically all right, except for that portion dealing with possession of smut, after a hearing in Hammond on an obscenity case.

The panel of three judges also ruled that the underground newspaper, *Kaleidoscope*, is not obscene.—Chicago *Tribune*, 5 March.

Libraries Opted Out

The Phoenix City Council adopted an all-inclusive antipornography ordinance, making it punishable by law to "sell or loan for monetary consideration" any "harmful materials" to juveniles.

"Harmful materials" include "any picture, drawing, sculpture, motion picture film or similar visual representation or image of a person or portion of the human body which depicts nudity, sexual conduct, sexual excitement or sado-masochistic abuse . . ."

The ordinance extends also to "any book, pamphlet, magazine, printed matter, however reproduced, or sound recording which contains any matter . . ."

Hitting at theaters, the ordinance holds that "it shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to exhibit for a monetary consideration to a juvenile an admission ticket or pass or knowingly to admit a juvenile for a monetary consideration to premises whereon there is exhibited a motion picture, show or other presentation which in whole or in part depicts . . ."

The ordinance makes any violation of it punishable by a fine of not more than \$300 or not more than three months in city jail or both.—Phoenix *Gazette*, 4 February.

Judges Rule Nude Photos Not Obscene

SAN FRANCISCO (AP)—Nudity is not obscene if no sexual activity is shown, says the California Supreme Court.

The court, in a unanimous decision, reversed the conviction of Larry D. Pinchot, a San Francisco bookstore operator. He had been fined \$332 on a municipal court conviction of distributing and possessing obscene material.

Two police inspectors, who arrested him three years ago, testified his store window displayed pictures of unclothed young women in a variety of poses.

The state Supreme Court held that "after a careful scrutiny of the obscenity decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, we hold that the representation of the nude human body in a nonsexual context had not violated the penal code."—Eugene *Register Guard*, 30 December.

Censorship in Washington

It is disquieting that passages raising questions about interracial and interfaith marriages have been officially razored out of an 11th grade health textbook used in the Washington, D.C., public schools. The reasons for this may seem plausible; some may even find them laudable. All the same, this is censorship, and it goes against the grain.

It goes against the grain all the more because this is not censorship on grounds of taste, but censorship of ideas. School officials have concluded that certain views expressed in the book—*Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living*, by Judson and Mary E. Landis—should not be conveyed to high school juniors.

And what are these dangerous ideas? Here is a part of one of the passages deleted: "Most people would not wish to marry outside of their racial group whether or not it was legal. They have observed that interracial marriages involve serious problems." And so they often do. Does that warrant banning the idea? How can one justify shielding young people from this truth—that, as the book says, "acceptance into the community may be difficult or impossible for the marriage partners and their children to obtain?"

Another excised passage runs as follows: "Jewish-gentile marriages face many of the difficulties that we have discussed in Protestant-Catholic marriages. Again, conflicts may arise over the religious training of the children." And again, this is true: conflicts may arise, often do, in interfaith marriages. But what is gained by seeking to assure, through the most questionable means

of overt censorship, that students will not be exposed to this bit of reality?

The rationale of Washington school officials seems to be summed up in remarks by the superintendent's executive assistant, Charles S. Lofton, who said of his superior: "He's simply looking out for the welfare of students in the community. And the type of community we live in is more explosive than it was 10 years ago."

What the Washington school officials seem to fear, in short, is that leaving the excised passages might have touched off violent disagreement with the ideas expressed. Their fears may to some extent be justified. But since when has it become the function of the schools to insulate students from controversial ideas? That runs wholly counter to what education is all about.—Fremont, Ohio, *News-Messenger*, 20 February.

"Sister George" Obscene in Boston, But Show Goes On

The "biggest in Boston of any film currently running" became even bigger yesterday, through a judicial hangup and attachment of a "banned in Boston" label.

Boston municipal Court Chief Justice Elijah Adlow, in effect applied the business-booming-ban by ruling *The Killing of Sister George* an obscene movie.

Simultaneously he sentenced the manager of the Cheri I Theater to six months in jail and a \$1000 fine for showing it. That's where the hangup developed.

Cheri I manager Joseph Sasso of Shore Dr., Peabody, through his lawyers, indicated he would appeal. Judge Adlow released him in \$1000 bail.

The appeal to Suffolk Superior Court continues a restraining order, issued last week by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, prohibiting Boston police from seizing the controversial film.

That order, handed down by Justice Jacob J. Spiegel, remains in force until the matter is adjudicated. The appeal is part of the adjudication process.—Boston *Globe*, 12 March.

Oregon Moves Ahead

The membership of the Oregon Library Association, in annual conference in Salem in April adopted a strong statement of policy for its Intellectual Freedom Committee, empowering the Committee to act for the Association in all matters relating to censorship and intellectual freedom. Other state associations please copy and report to the *Newsletter*.

“Censored” Jones Play Staged at Eastern High

Three teachers at Eastern High School yesterday presented to their students a version of the LeRoi Jones play, *The Toilet*, without four-letter words or vernacular after school Principal William Saunders refused to endorse the use of Jones' play in uncut form in the classroom.

“LeRoi Jones' play is a work of art,” protested the teachers, Paul Aaron, Larry Kirkman and Tuck Amory. “Every word is chosen for its dramatic effectiveness. The play would be destroyed by eliminating the so-called dirty words.”

Relenting, at least temporarily, to Saunders' wishes, the teachers conducted an experiment in which a censored version of the black militant's play was read aloud and then discussed by students.—*Washington Star*, 15 February.

The Fuentes Incident

One sure way to tarnish the United States is for some bureaucrat to decide that a writer, painter or other artist is an “undesirable alien” because of his work or beliefs. Politicizing literature is a common practice for authoritarian governments; it should not become one for this country.

Yet a silly charade occurred last month in the case of Carlos Fuentes, who has had several novels published in the United States and is one of Mexico's outstanding writers. En route to Mexico on a passenger ship, he was denied permission to land in Puerto Rico and his transit card was torn up. The Justice Department has confirmed that he was listed as “undesirable” and barred by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

When the Congress of International Poets, Essayists and Novelists (PEN) was held in New York in 1966, the State Department at first attempted to bar Mr. Fuentes but then was embarrassed into granting a visa. The Mexican author did participate; New York and the Republic did not fall.

The basic problem is that the immigration law on exclusion is a vestige of the restrictive era of the nineteen fifties. Aliens who are teachers and writers are particularly singled out for advocacy and affiliations that are considered repugnant; almost anyone can be barred for past or present Communist or totalitarian affiliations. Congress ought to re-examine and eliminate these purposeless restrictions, which make the United States ridiculous rather than secure. Literary imprimaturs by the Immigration Service or any other Government body are alien to the United States itself.—*New York Times*, 5 March.

Mother Goose Withdrawn

NEW YORK, April 3—The Xerox Corp. has withdrawn 3000 reprints of an 1895 English edition of “Mother Goose's Nursery Rhymes and Fairy Tales,” after a complaint that it contained anti-Jewish and anti-Negro material.

The decision was announced yesterday by the American Jewish Congress, which had made the complaint that two of the 217 classic nursery rhymes and their illustrations used racist stereotypes.

The organization received letters of apology from Thomas D. Anglim, Xerox's manager of public relations, and from Arnold Zohn, president of Arno Press, Inc., copublisher of the series called “Legacy Library Facsimile,” of which the book is part.

Within hours after the American Jewish Congress had publicized its complaint on the two rhymes—“Ol Mother Goose” and “The 10 Little Niggers”—and Xerox's decision to recall the book, the action drew a variety of troubled comments.

Officers of other Jewish civil rights agencies privately expressed dismay over the AJC action.

An officer of the Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith, who asked not to be identified, declared: “We've stopped worrying about the classics years ago. There are more pressing issues these days.”

Some representatives of the publishing community questioned the decision to withdraw the book for its implications on freedom of expression.

Edward E. Booher, president of the American Book Publishers Council, Inc., and chairman of McGraw-Hill, Inc., said “The whole thing seems silly and not a very wise precedent.”—*St. Louis Post Dispatch*, 3 April.

No Satisfactory Definition

TUCSON, Feb. 17 (AP)—Chief Justice Earl Warren has told University of Arizona law students that pornography was the most difficult area in which the Court has been involved during his tenure.

He said that two constitutional principles, the right of freedom of expression and the right of the nation to preserve itself in a decent society, were clashing, creating an extremely unsatisfactory condition.

Justice Warren said that no definition of obscenity had been written that was satisfactory to everyone. He said he thought the framers of the Constitution believed freedom of expression to be the right of people to speak out against their Government, not the right of anyone to say anything he pleased at any time.—*New York Times*, 23 February.

NOW

is the time to subscribe to the *Newsletter* at present under-cost price of \$3.00 per year. Beginning 1 September, 1969, the price will be \$5.00. The time to subscribe at \$3.00 is NOW. Send orders to Subscription Department, ALA, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 60611.

'Huck Finn' Banned From Reading List

MIAMI, FLA.(AP) — *Huckleberry Finn*, the Mark Twain classic, has been dropped from the required reading list at Miami Dade Junior College—a victim of Black Power.

Ambrose Gardner, a school official, said Negro students complained that they were embarrassed by the novel of 19th century life on the Mississippi River and its satirical look at prejudice and discrimination. Gardner said the book appears to create an emotional block for black students that inhibits learning.

In his preface, Twain, who died in 1910, wrote: "Persons attempting to find a motive in this narrative will be prosecuted; persons attempting to find a moral in it will be banished; persons attempting to find a plot in it will be shot. By order of the author."—*Philadelphia Bulletin*, 15 January.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bendix, Dorothy. "Teaching the Concept of Intellectual Freedom: The State of the Art." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (March, 1969), 351-362.

Boles, Alan. "Upstarts in the Ivy." *The Nation*, CCVIII (7 April, 1969), 429-432.

Brien, Alan, "New York pornography: I am still curious (blue)," *New Statesman*, LXXVII (28 March, 1969), 444.

Brignolo, Donald E. "The Censor Always Rings Twice." *Missouri Press News*, XXXVII (March, 1969), 6-7.

The *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* is published bi-monthly by the American Library Association at the University of Oregon School of Librarianship in Eugene, the address to which all editorial communications should be sent. Address all changes of address and correspondence concerning subscriptions (\$3.00 per year) to Subscription Department, American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

"The Censorship Bugaboo." *Newsweek*, LXXIII (31 March, 1969), 90-91.

"College papers face obscenity charges, censorship threats," *The chronicle of higher education*, III, (9 December, 1968), p. 1, 6.

Cottle, Thomas J. "The Wellesley Incident: A Case of Obscenity." *Saturday Review*, LII (15 March, 1969), 67-68, 75-77.

de Camp, L. Sprague. "The End of the Monkey War." *Scientific American*, CCXX (February, 1969), 15-21.

Dixon, John W. "Art and Pornography." *Theology Today*, XXV (January, 1969), 474-77.

Ferguson, Paul R. "A Judicial Farce." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, XLIII (March, 1969), 653-656.

Gore, Daniel. "A skirmish with the Censors." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (February, 1969), 193-203.

Hodges, Parker. "Censorship: What Of It?" *Cavalier*, XIX (March, 1969), 28-29, 74-76.

"How to Deal with Four-Letter Words." *Time*, XCIII (7 March, 1969), 63.

Humphries, Charles W. "The Banning of a Book in British Columbia." *BC Studies*, I (Winter, 1968-69), 1-12.

Krug, Judith F. "Intellectual Freedom." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (March, 1969), 320-321.

"Minuet Over Censorship." *Time*, XCIII (4 April, 1969), 76.

Moore, Everett T. "Broadening Concerns for Intellectual Freedom." *Library Quarterly*, XXXVIII (October, 1938), 309-314.

Moscone, George R. "Freedom and the Pressures of Censorship." *California Librarian*, XXX (January, 1969), 23-27.

Romm, Ethel Grodzins. "'*-*-*' Is No Longer a Dirty Word." *Esquire*, LXXI (April, 1969), 135, 136, 202, 208-211.

"Sex and the Arts: Explosive Scene." *Newsweek*, LXXIII (14 April, 1969), 67-70.

"Sex, Shock and Sensuality." *Life*, LXVI (4 April, 1969), 22-35.

Shuman, R. Baird. "Making the World Safe for What?" *Illinois Schools Journal*, XLVIII (Fall, 1968), 145-54. Also in *Education Digest*, XXXIV (December, 1968), 36-38.

Watkins, Alan. "A slight case of obscenity," *New Statesman*, LXXVII (14 February, 1969), 210.