



on Intellectual freedom

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

VOL. XVIII • July, 1969 • No. 4

A Call for Action

If librarians are expected to support the principles of intellectual freedom, their professional organization has an equal responsibility to extend its full support to them. The American Library Association has not done this. This was the judgment of Ervin Gaines, chairman of the Intellectual Freedom Committee (ALA), in his report to the 1967 ALA convention. So far as I know, ALA has not taken any significant action since that time to assume that responsibility. I do not know what provisions the various state library organizations have made to deal with censorship. But it seems clear that these organizations should be ready to provide immediate aid to librarians in local communities when the latter call on them. And ALA should be available for further help if such help is needed.

Such assistance is only possible if ready funds are available. Trade unions set aside regular amounts of their budgets as a strike fund. Corporations also provide for emergency expenses in their annual budgets. ALA and state library associations should be equally far-seeing and make provision in their budgets to set aside funds to defend their members when the censors attack.

Beyond offering financial aid and advice to local librarians, ALA and state associations must be prepared to bring additional pressure to bear on a community library board found, after proper investigation, to be permitting censorship of library materials. The state association should be empowered to place an offending library under ban. This would entail publishing the name of the library in the official state library association publication, refusing the library the use of the association's job referral service, and declining to accept classified ads from the library in the association's publications. When such measures had been taken, the state association would notify ALA who would publish this information in the national Bulletin. ALA would similarly refuse classified advertising from libraries under the ban.

As an additional measure, the state library association would officially notify the state librarian of the name of the library under ban. At the same time, it might also strongly recommend that the state librarian defer action on any application for LSCA or other federal funds, if the library has an application pending, until such time as the ban was lifted. (Whether a library has a right to receive federal funds while it denies to patrons the freedom to read raises an interesting constitutional issue.)

If the librarian is to be any match for the censors, these are the kinds of defenses that must be available. Knowing he can expect this kind of help

from state and national library association, a librarian will not flinch so readily when faced with the censors. And by the same token, censors will be chary about going into action when they understand they will have to oppose not only the librarian on the scene, but also the state and perhaps even the national professional library associations as well.

Our Library Bill of Rights will be a travesty if we do not provide it with a stout defense complete with sanctions that have some zap in them. Protection of the freedom to read rests in large measure in our hands. Whether we stand firm in protecting that freedom will determine ultimately whether we are professionals or just practitioners.

— Elmer S. Newman
Cleveland State University Library

'Portnoy's Complaint' a Pain

The librarian's complaint is that a book like *Portnoy's Complaint* a current best seller, raises the aggravating question of censorship, taste and service — all at once.

Portnoy's Complaint, written by Philip Roth, a New York boy who was graduated from Weequahic High School, has had a runaway success.

It also has posed runaway problems. It is considered one of the frankest expositions of sexual manifestations in recent literature and is being talked about and giggled about in almost every circle where books are read.

Such books raise serious questions for local libraries.

Are the librarians and trustees supposed to determine what their members should read and should not? Or rather, should they be responsible for what publishers produce.

Portnoy's Complaint talks about the sexual drive in explicit language and is considered more obscene than pornographic.

But another book, *Couples*, by John Updike, has been on the shelves of local libraries and has been a highly popular item. There have been no complaints.

In the minds of some, *Couples*, which deals with wife-swapping, a topic of hard pornography, may be even more censor-prone than *Portnoy's Complaint*. Yet because of the elegant language used by Updike, one of the most popular writers in the *New Yorker* magazine stable, it has received little criticism.

A talk with librarians in the area indicates, however, that the rising tide of magazines and books that deal openly with sex has toughened the public mind toward the subject. Consequently there are new complaints.

Certainly there are no such cases as that of Lyndhurst Library where Thomas Wolfe's *Look Homeward Angel* was ordered off the shelves by an angry trustee over 30 years ago.

In Lyndhurst, where there are 35,000 to 40,000 books on the shelves, Miss Edith Jennings, the librarian, said

she ordered a copy of *Portnoy's Complaint* after two women requested it.

Miss Jennings did not purchase *Couples*.

"For that matter," she said, "we did not buy a copy of *Myra Breckenridge* either. There were very few requests for them."

Lyndhurst readers are more interested in non-fiction, said Miss Jennings.

"Our non-fiction outdraws fiction two to one," said Miss Jennings.

Miss Jennings has been director of the library since the 1950's.

In Long Island recently there was a furor over a book called *Call Me Brick*. The library refused to put it on the shelves and there was a rumpus. In this area such a book would not cause trouble because it is a paper cover production only—and the libraries by and large don't bother with books unless they are hard cover.

"If a book isn't considered important enough for hard covers we don't consider it important enough for our shelves," was the way one librarian put it.

In Kearny Library Mrs. Laura Ingalls, the librarian, said that *Couples* was one of the most popular books on her shelves last year. In Kearny, when requests pile up a second volume is ordered — as happened in the case of *Couples*.

In Kearny all books on the best seller lists are ordered unless they are too expensive. Those designed for the adult mind are kept for adults.

Mrs. Ingalls pointed out that books on the best seller lists usually are those with sex emphasis. She said she doesn't enjoy such literature but that the library is a public institution and has to be operated as such.

As the librarians sadly note books don't need good reviews to get on the best seller lists. One of the wildest demands in recent years was for *Valley of the Dolls*, a book that was condemned by most reviewers.

In Rutherford *Couples* has been popular but not nearly as much as *Valley of the Dolls*. There were 35 requests for it. There were 18 for *Portnoy's Complaint* and an even dozen for *Couples*. This shows that *Valley of the Dolls* is still running well ahead of the other 64,000 books there.

In East Rutherford, where there are 16,000 books, *Couples* is popular. It is kept on a closed shelf reserved for adults.

Thank You

The first Robert B. Downs award for outstanding contribution to the cause of intellectual freedom in libraries was presented at the University of Illinois Library School Alumni Association dinner in Atlantic City on 25 June by Director Herbert Goldhor to the editor of the Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom.

In Carlstadt there are 14,000 books and Miss Theresa Hasler, the librarian, said *Portnoy's Complaint* is on order but has not yet been delivered. When it arrives the book will be made available to adults. Nobody has asked for *Couples* and Miss Hasler does not think it will be ordered.

In North Arlington Gerard Hickey, presiding over 20,000 books, has had *Couples* on the shelves since September 28 and the book has had only moderate popularity. Four or five others are more popular. *Portnoy's Complaint* is not on the shelves and but a single request for the book has been made.

There is no "closed shelf" in North Arlington.

"I believe the public can be trusted to make up its own mind," said Hickey. —Lyndhurst, N.J. *Commercial Leader*, 3 April.

Says People Should Read Obscene Book

Portnoy's Complaint, a book which was aptly described by Frank Getlein, art critic for the *Evening Star*, as "60 per cent masturbation and 40 per cent Jewish mother" has been approved for use by the Montgomery County Library.

In fact the library bought 73 copies to assure good distribution, and reports some branches have waiting lists of over 100.

According to a spokesman for the library, "the book is worthwhile as a literary work. In fact," she said, "the reviews have been largely favorable and people should be urged to read all of it."

Apparently the three employees of the library who read the book and recommended its purchase were not offended.

However, it does offend Jewish mothers, and those who object to the portrayal of man as "nothing more than a psychotic and a masturbating animal."

There are those who do not approve literature written in the language of the gutter as having any redeeming qualities.

Among those are the Jewish and Catholic Book Stores, in Wheaton who do not stock the novel. Brentano's also does not endorse the book.

In other County book stores, it is among the best sellers.

Portnoy's Complaint is considered by the County Library as adult fare and is not available to juveniles.

However, at age 14, juveniles are issued adult cards, and most of those on the waiting list are high school students.

When asked if she thought that masturbation was a proper subject to popularize about the County with taxpayer money, the spokesman for the library replied that "it is after all a fact of life."

When it was pointed out that the action of the library was to arbitrarily establish a base, which unless challenged by the community, would set the standard of accepted values of obscenity and community morals, which could at some later time be used in court to defend greater obscenity, the spokesman declined to answer, and recommended that complaints be addressed to Mr. George Moreland, Director of Libraries, Montgomery County Library, 6400 Democracy Boulevard, Bethesda 20034. —Bethesda-Chevy Chase *Tribune*, 25 April.

Obscene Books

If the spokesman for the Library could give me one good decent reason to read *Portnoy's Complaint*, I could give her reasons ad infinitum why no one should read it except those by self admission that are "nothing more than a psychotic and a masturbating animal."

I protest vigorously that taxpayers' money is spent on this rotten trash that is supposed to have literary value. All these pseudo free speech advocates are trying to say is that the abnormal is normal and they would have us believe that everyone walking the streets is a masturbator, a pervert and one who can only use barnyard language.

But let them persist long enough and the abnormal will become the rule and not the exception to it. "As a man thinketh, so is he" was never truer.

I'm ashamed of our guidance. It is the older generation who gives this kind of nourishment to a young mind.

Yes, high school students have young minds and yet are more receptive to ideals than at any other time in their lives — ideals of fairness, decency, courage and service.

A generation gap — that's for sure. Our generation, with its bleeding hearts, our educators who foster anarchy over old dirty minds that turn out lewd movies, our writers who are only concerned with lust — stand up and take a bow. Hand out adult cards to 14-year-olds to advance their ideological life!

Perhaps we'll have another tax boost in Montgomery County to help supply the libraries with this book. There are many facts of life, but man was made a little higher than the animals. He was supposed to have discernment. My vote goes to the animals.

A MOTHER

As a librarian in a county school library, and as a citizen of Montgomery county, I object to the headline concerning the book, *Portnoy's Complaint*. The headline for the article read "Says People Should Read Obscene Book."

When reading the article, I gathered that this is not what the spokesman from the Montgomery County Libraries said at all. The spokesman said that "the re-

views have been largely favorable and people should be urged to read all of it."

By this, I am sure the spokesman meant that the reader should read the entire book before making a judgment of it concerning its obscenity, and not read just portions of it. This is all too often the case of people censoring books — they read only portions of the book, often out of context, and do not read the entire work before making their decision.

I feel that the choice of headline for this article was misleading and sarcastic and did not at all contribute to the fair representation I feel a newspaper should present. I personally have not read the book, so would not wish to state my opinion concerning it until I have done so.

(MRS.) MARY JANE COX
515 New York Avenue
Takoma Park, Md.

— Bethesda-Chevy Chase *Tribune*, 2 May

Obscenity in Library Books

The courts have been very broad in defining obscenity in light of community morals. Regardless of how offensive a book may be to some, if it has "redeeming literary value" it is judged permissible for public distribution.

Last week we published an article on *Portnoy's Complaint*, a book which the Director of Adult Services of the County Library said should be read in its entirety to get the flavor of its "redeeming literary and social values."

Sensitive, cultured people would be shocked by this book, which is pretty sordid and replete with the baser facts of life. Culturally, it offers little to inspire the reader.

The Public Library should abandon its eagerness to provide the public with books which are best sellers because they have been publicized by controversy labeling them obscene. Perhaps it is time to better scrutinize the budget which seems to provide money for such expenditures. —Bethesda-Chevy Chase *Tribune*, 2 May.

Box Score

New obscenity legislation has been passed by the following jurisdictions:

Sioux City, Iowa, 14 April, 1969.
Kankakee, Illinois, 7 April, 1969.
Baltimore, Maryland, 12 May, 1969.
Appleton, Wisconsin, 19 April, 1969.
Thibodaux, Louisiana, 29 April, 1969.
New York State, 23 May, 1969.
South Bend, Indiana, 25 March, 1969.

Portnoy, et al

The Henrico County Library Board of Trustees on 7 May approved a policy statement regarding selection and distribution of adult books, including those which are considered controversial.

At issue are the county's six copies of Phillip Roth's book *Portnoy's Complaint*. The book has been widely acclaimed, but also contains controversial language.

The statement adopted is patterned after policies of Baltimore's Pratt Library and the Brooklyn Public Library. The statement leaves selection of controversial books to the discretion of the library director.

Under the Henrico policy, two staff members would review "questionable material" before placing it in the libraries for distribution. If the book has been favorably reviewed prior to acquisition by the system, it is likely to be distributed, officials say.

A policy statement regarding acquisition of children's books which concern sex education may be drawn up later. —Richmond *News Leader*, 8 May.

Principal Sees the Greater Difficulty

The board of trustees of school district 139 (Vallivue) voted to appoint a committee to "screen" periodicals and books before placement in the school library. Bruce Bartlett, board member, was directed to work with the administration in selecting patrons and officials for the committee.

The question of proper reading materials for high school students was raised recently after a controversy over a book an English student chose to read and depict in a display poster.

Mrs. Warren Tolmie, librarian, told the board that it is difficult for her to decide what materials to put into circulation. She displayed three popular magazines which she said contained pictures of questionable value to high school students. In addition, she questioned some of the books listed in guidelines published by the National Association of School Libraries and the State Department of Education. Authors such as Hemingway, Faulkner, Steinbeck and Mitchner are recommended reading for college-bound students, she pointed out, "but where do we draw the line?"

Ernie Knee, high school principal, said no complaints had as yet been made by parents, "but we may have to have a screening committee to protect the district."

Knee said he was "very skeptical and concerned about the people who would serve on this committee," noting that "we certainly don't want special political interest groups represented." —Caldwell, Idaho, *News-Tribune*, 11 March.

Parents of Better Students Ban Books

DALLAS, Ore. (AP) — Two books — *Nigger* and *A Patch of Blue* — have been banned from the supplemental reading list at Academy Junior High School here.

Copies of *Nigger*, a novel written by comedian Dick Gregory, were in the possession of students in one teacher's social studies class.

"A group of better students was asked to take the book home for an opinion from their parents," school Supt. Ray Klappenbach said Thursday.

"The book," he said, "is not part of my required class reading. Book reports are not required and the students' grades are not affected in any way if he or she reads the book."

Klappenbach said he banned the books after parents who asked about them expressed objections to their use.

Nigger is an autobiography in which Gregory tells of his life and his problems with racial prejudice.

A Patch of Blue, written by Elizabeth Kata, involves a Negro's relationship with a blind white girl. A motion picture was based on the novel.

Gregory's book "uses a number of four-letter words," said Klappenbach. "Many of the parents who were asked for an opinion on the book said it was not good reading for an eighth-grade student."

A Patch of Blue and *Nigger* were among five books on the supplemental reading list. Students could read them for their sociological and literary value, but they were not required to. —Portland *Oregonian*, 16 May.

Authors' Objections Fail to Halt Staging of Shows in Africa

JOHANNESBURG, Feb. 17—The Supreme Court Copyright Tribunal today granted the Johannesburg Operatic and Dramatic Society permission to stage three American musical hits even though the authors objected to their being presented to racially segregated audiences.

The ruling by Justice Oscar Galgut in Pretoria, which invoked the "piracy clause," allowed the society to stage *West Side Story*, *Fiddler on the Roof* and *Man of La Mancha*. Objecting to the move were Music Theater International, the William Morris Agency and Elisabeth Marton. They handle the foreign rights for these musicals.

The judge ruled that the Johannesburg society was competent to produce plays of highest professional standard. They had financial backing and were able to pay necessary royalties, he said.—New York *Times*, 18 February.

'Curious' Not a Nuisance in Philly

U.S. District Judge Thomas A. Masterson told the city on Tuesday it could not close the controversial Swedish movie, *I Am Curious (Yellow)*, as a public nuisance.

But the judge, who saw the film, made no ruling on the No. 1 question: Is *Curious* legally obscene?

The immediate effect of the decision was to give *Curious* more time to continue its sensational box office success at Cinema 19 where it enters its fifth week on Wednesday. —Philadelphia *Inquirer*, 21 May.

Free Speech for Fear-Mongers, Too

The Mount Pleasant American Legion post agreed to let Edgar C. Bundy, general chairman of the right-wing Church League of America, use its hall for a meeting—then revoked this permission.

Donald E. Johnson of West Branch, a former national commander of the Legion who was a candidate for the Republican nomination for governor last year, praised the Mount Pleasant post for this action. He said, "Nothing in the American concept of freedom demands that we provide a forum to those who spew their venom and filth and advocate a policy completely alien to our position of freedom and liberty."

Bundy's scare tactics about the internal Communist threat and his innuendos about organizations and individuals are offensive to us, too. Bundy, who has served on the Legion's national convention committee on Americanism, is himself in favor of restricting speech in order to prevent "radical" views from being heard. Some Americanism! For example, he said it was "irresponsible" of the American Association of University Professors to declare that students should be allowed to invite and hear speakers of their own choosing and that university control of campus facilities should not be used as a device of censorship.

Nevertheless, we think the Mount Pleasant Legion post made a mistake in turning down Bundy. We agree with Mrs. Louise Noun, chairman of the Iowa Civil Liberties Union, that if the post has a policy of letting speakers use the hall, it should not deny the right of someone to speak because it disagrees with him.

The Civil Liberties Union, one of Bundy's favorite targets, believes in "freedom for the thought you hate." It is constantly defending the free speech rights of Communists and leftwing radicals against such groups as Bundy's. But it is equally vigilant in defending the right of such as Bundy to be heard.

As Mrs. Noun said, "Freedom of speech is indivisible. Either we all have it or we are all in jeopardy of losing it."—Des Moines *Register*, 24 March.

Bad Review Makes Book

FARMINGDALE—The recent complaint by a resident that a library book is obscene and should be removed has increased public demand for the book so much that it is now on the reserved list, the Farmingdale Public Library director said yesterday.

Library Director Orrin B. Dow said the new demand was ironic because the book, *Call Me Brick*, published in 1967 by Grove Press, had been marked to be discarded soon because of previously low public interest. He said that about 5,000 books are discarded by the library each year.

Attorney Robert F. Smith of 17 Lincoln St., Farmingdale, appeared last week at the library board's meeting to ask that the book, which he said he found on the shelves, be withdrawn. The book, by Munroe Howard, describes the adventures of a teenage girl, including several sexual incidents. "Now I wish I'd simply returned the book and kept my mouth shut," Smith said after learning of the effect of the publicity. "But I still feel the book should be withdrawn."

The book issue comes two months before the election for one seat on the five-man board, which now is divided 3-2 against former John Birch Society member Carl E. Gorton and his ally on the board, Warren W. Altman. Smith, however, denied that he is a Birch Society member or a possible candidate for the board.

Dow assembled his top staff members yesterday to decide what to do about Smith's complaint. At Dow's request last week, all had read it, several sharing a paperback edition because one of the library's two hardcover copies is checked out and the other has been missing for a long time.

"I ordered it because I felt there would be public demand for it," senior librarian Robert Culbertson said, "but I believe from a literary viewpoint it has no lasting value."

"I felt it was not a good book, a trashy literature sort of thing, but I feel we should have this in the library if there are people who want to read this type of thing," said Mrs. Thomas Torrance, chief of processing.

In addition to "many" requests at the library, Mrs. Michael Verasco, who runs the bookmobile operation, said that the bookmobile returned yesterday with two reservations for *Call Me Brick*. The main and branch libraries had not yet counted their reservation.—*Garden City Newsday*, 27 February.

Back File

Microfilm edition of the *Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom*, Volumes 1-16 (1962-1965) is now available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan at \$8.50.

Poem Issue Roils New Mexico U.

The University of New Mexico is in turmoil over a classroom discussion of a poem.

Legislators, many of whom called the poem "filthy," called for an investigation of the university. They demanded that the teaching assistant who used it in class be fired immediately. Much of the public, including parents of some college students, demanded that university administrators "clean up" the campus.

The response of much of the student body and faculty was outrage — not at the poem but at what they see as an attempted infringement on the autonomy of the university and the right of an instructor to teach what he wants.

A number of other teaching assistants in the English department distributed copies of the same poem so as to be implicated along with the teaching assistant, Lionel Williams, and a colleague who sat in on some classes, Ken Pollack.

The chairman of the English department, Dr. Joseph Frank, and the head of the freshman English division, Dr. Roy Pickett, were suspended from their administrative duties when they refused to appoint a replacement instructor for Mr. Williams.

The president of the university, Dr. Ferrel Heady, was caught in a cross fire between the campus and the public.

Dr. Heady raised the ire of students and faculty by suspending both Messrs. Williams and Pollack, pending a hearing. Calling this an infringement on academic freedom and a violation of due process, many students threatened a boycott of classes and even possible disruption of the campus.

Mass meetings sprang up almost every afternoon and night, most featuring readings of the controversial poem by students and professors. One meeting went on late into the night and culminated in Dr. Heady's being roused from his bed at 2:30 a.m. to be presented with four demands by the group, the Ad Hoc Committee for a Free University.

The demands included a call for reinstatement of Messrs. Williams and Pollack, recognition that "there is no pornography in a free academic community," that Dr. Heady either "support a free academic community or resign as president," and that the student union building shall belong to the students "and always be open to them."

Copies Circulate

Another demand for reinstatement came at a meeting of about one-third of the university's faculty members and graduate teaching assistants.

Meanwhile, copies of the poem began to appear all over Albuquerque at meetings of civic clubs, the Chamber of Commerce, even women's organizations.

At issue was *Love Lust Poem* by Lenore Kandel, which made liberal use of four-letter words.

Mr. Williams, a graduate student and teaching assistant for a freshman English class, distributed copies of the poem to his class and, along with Mr. Pollack, a fellow teaching assistant, discussed the poem with the freshmen students.

Apparently none of the students objected. But the 1969 State Legislature was in session in Santa Fe at the time. Somehow, State Sen. Harold Runnels (D) of Lovington, chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, learned of the incident and received a copy of the poem.

It was not long before everyone in the capital had his own copy of the poem. —Carol W. Cagle in *Christian Science Monitor*, 1 May.

Man Bites Dog!

SIoux CITY, Iowa—The City Council here Monday rejected a proposed “obscenity ordinance” designed to protect children younger than 18 from exposure to “obscene” literature, films, drawings and photographs.

The proposed ordinance, modeled after a controversial New York statute which was upheld last April by the U.S. Supreme Court, was defeated by a 3-1 vote. One councilman abstained from voting.

The proposed ordinance would have provided a \$100 fine or a 30-day jail sentence for anyone who knowingly sold or permitted the showing of “obscene” materials to children younger than 18. Robert Clem, city attorney, said the councilmen rejected the ordinance “because they apparently felt it was a form of censorship in which they shouldn’t be involved.”—Des Moines Register, 11 March.

“Free Press” Sale Draws 6 Months

BETHESDA—A Montgomery County People’s Court judge ordered today that J. Brinton Dillingham, 25, serve six months in the county jail for distributing the Washington *Free Press*, an underground newspaper alleged to be obscene.

Judge J. Willard Nalls, Jr., who heard the case without a jury, set bail at \$5,000 pending appeal by Dillingham’s lawyer, Joseph F. Forer, of the American Civil Liberties Union.

When the judge set the bail, Mr. Forer exclaimed, “I’ve known capital cases where the bail was not that high.”—Baltimore Sun, 8 April.

Ardsley School Censorship

The Ardsley Board of Education Monday night adopted a policy of censoring student publications. As written, the policy would do credit to the most bureaucratic mossback anywhere to be found, if we assume its good intentions; it will bring relief to every communist-hunting reactionary in Ardsley, if it’s intended as a repressive measure.

Whatever the intentions, the censorship policy is not only immoral and educationally wrong, but won’t even work. Far from preventing or repressing student dissent, it’s more likely to provoke it. In the end, if it’s not drastically modified and revised, it will destroy everything the board has been trying to accomplish in creating good relationships between students on the one hand, and the board, administration, faculty and the community at large on the other. —Hastings on Hudson News Weekly, 27 March.

Criterion: Filth

ORFORDVILLE — J. D. Salinger’s *Catcher in the Rye* came under fire when the board of education for Joint School District number four met Tuesday night. Over 20 parents appeared at the meeting to object to several pieces of literature not required for Parkview’s high school students.

One mother brought the Salinger book and a book of short stories which she considered objectionable and said her son told her they were on the school’s recommended reading list.

Principal Edward Connors replied that the book is recommended by the American Library Association but is not on Parkview’s list of recommended reading and only six of the nine short stories in question were used for classroom discussion.

One mother objected to the *Romeo and Juliet* film attended by students. Another mother said after she read Shakespeare she considered he “was a dirty old man” and added “I’ll have the last say on what books my children read and what movies they see.”

Connors said he had substituted for several books this year including John Steinbeck’s *Of Mice and Men* and went on to say that 90 percent of the required reading list is the same as it has been for several years.

It was agreed to set up a committee of parents to work with teachers on the required reading list. Parents will judge their books not on their literary value but on what they consider “filth.” —Beloit, Wis. News, 27 March.

On the other hand, the Parchmont Board of Education, Parchmont, Michigan, on 7 April refused to ban *Catcher in the Rye*.

Mrs. Bodger Resigns

First, let me make it clear that my act of writing a letter protesting the censorship of the *Free Press* was not an impetuous one. Neither do I regret that act. The administrators at the University of Missouri precipitated my professional decision to act by their overt actions. It was they who made me ask, Whose side are you on in this war against the young? I decided that when the roll is called up yonder, Children's Services, State Library of Missouri, should be there.

Almost everything I read professionally about young people and children today points to the same overwhelming conclusion: for the first time in history we have the ability to destroy life on earth or to maim and disfigure it beyond redemption. All over the world children and young people are protesting. They are not only trying to save their lives, but to save life. Nothing these young protestors do or say is as obscene as the death of body and spirit we seek to impose through war, pollution, population explosion, dehumanization and The Bomb.

I am not saying that we should give in unquestioningly to the students' demands. We must establish limits, we must afford a feed back as to where we stand. But this does not mean calling in the police to suppress a student newspaper. Nor does it mean arresting students for distributing a newspaper, nor a printer for printing one. Can't we learn to *listen* effectively?

Young people have stopped listening to us because we do not listen to them. Moreover, they no longer trust us to tell the truth, often with good reason. We should learn to speak to feeling and to express our own feelings. We should learn to distinguish the difference between how we "should" feel and how we *do* feel, and learn to communicate the latter. We should be training ourselves and our young not to be afraid of the judicious expression of anger, our own or theirs.

In my letter I pleaded for a chance to set up a display (a shelf? a rack? a table? a locked cabinet? who cares?) where teachers, librarians, ministers, youth leaders and — yes — students, could avail themselves of the historically important, student-produced newspapers that are proliferating throughout this country. Especially, I wished to have a copy of a paper produced just thirty miles away from the State Library by students at the State University. There is a good argument that if we can listen to what these young people are trying to express we might be able to save some campus real estate. I would hope to save more than that.

There are people who say, not without reason, that we should ignore the four letter words in the *Free Press* and concentrate on the straight news and features. Now, let us ask ourselves. Did we pay attention

when those four letter words were not used? Did we give serious consideration, on front pages and in editorials, to what these young people had to say about making the world safe for themselves and their children's children? We reacted neither positively nor negatively. Their words dribbled into quicksand.

I can sympathize with the frustration this must elicit. Barely a week before the censorship of the students' *Free Press* I was asked to speak on a panel on censorship at the University. I sat with others on a platform in the Student Union, serving as a hired expert invited to speak at an administration-approved conference. I did not know then that we were only play-acting. My ideas were acknowledged and recorded on tape and television. My speech was quoted approvingly in the *Missourian*, the official campus newspaper. The import of what I said at that meeting was much the same as what I wrote later in my letter to the *Tribune*.

What happened? My professional opinion, distilled from knowledge, research and experience, was bought and paid for by the State, then carefully filed away. I might as well have saved my breath to cool my porridge. My words had no effect. A few days later, in that same Student Union, everything I had said was negated by the actions of the University and town police.

I waited a week before I wrote to the *Tribune*. To wait longer or to ignore the situation would have been by way of making the Eichman decision: do your job and shut up. My job is communication with the young. The *Columbia Tribune* published my letter without comment. Other newspapers called for my dismissal.

"Mrs. Bodger," one of the reporters asked me, "What is your reaction when you look at the cartoon on the front page of the *Free Press*?" He did not print my reply, so I will repeat it here: "My reaction is to deplore rape and to spring to the side of Liberty and Justice."

I cannot work for an institution that will do less. The Commission has tied the hands of the State Library and forced the State Librarian to "suggest" that I refrain from my normal duties. Therefore, as of this date, I give thirty days notice of my resignation from my post as Consultant to Children's Services of the State Library of Missouri.

MLA IFC Makes a Point

When the Minnesota Intellectual Freedom Committee for 1968-69 had its first meeting only the chairman and the two ex-officio members had participated in the lobbying against the censorship bills in the 1967 session of the Minnesota Legislature. Two of these three agreed with the State Librarian, Mr. Hannis Smith, that the only reason our efforts appeared successful two years ago were lack of time (there were just too many bills before the Senate to get to the censorship bill before ad-

journalment), professional organizations had introduced some logical and important questions that showed a need for reconsideration by the Senate, and these professional organizations had been able to achieve an on-the-spot cohesiveness that gave the appearance of planned solidity.

Word had been coming in before October from varied sources that the "extreme right" was all set to push for an anti-pornography bill based on the N.Y. 484 H. The committee felt consultation would be wise before the 1969 Session of the Legislature, with the organizations which had shown interest and concern previously. The Minnesota Newspaper Association, the Minneapolis School Board, the Minnesota Education Association, the State PTA, the Minnesota Federation of Teachers, the Minneapolis Institute of Art, the Walker Art Center, the Minnesota Council of Churches, and the Minnesota chapter of the National Council of Teachers of English were invited to join the MLA-IFC for discussion on how the problem should be met. At the first meeting of representatives from most of these groups it was apparent to all that public feeling to control the sale of pornographic material so it would not be available to minors had reached a much higher pitch than before, and advice had been strongly given from legal sources and several legislators that the best way to fight a "bad" bill was with a "better" bill. Since the U.S. Supreme Court had given the "green-light" to the N.Y. 484H-type law, we set about to write into that law protection against harassment for those in professional organizations who use nudity and deal with other areas defined in that law in a legitimate manner. The Minnesota Newspaper Association was having its legal counsel draw a law and their representative was kind enough to take our suggestions so it would be possible to incorporate them, then all the groups represented could back one bill. First of all, a statement of purpose that put into the bill the "spirit" or intention of the law, since many times the "letter" of the law allows abuse. This was then spelled out in the body of the bill by a section stating the "exemptions." Exempted are schools, churches, museums, medical clinics and physicians, hospitals, public libraries, governmental agencies or quasi-governmental sponsored organizations, and persons acting in their capacity as employees or agents of such organizations. Schools do sell books, libraries often sell old copies or discarded editions, museums have shops where they sell nude pictures that many in the "extreme right" and the Birch Society would consider "harmful to minors." Churches and clinics have family-planning pamphlets and books that they loan or sell for a small fee to teen-agers in trouble. Plays, movies, puppet shows are shown in schools, libraries, and museums where a small fee is charged and "on the premises is exhibited an image of a person or portion of the human body which depicts nudity, etc." (Even the Venus de Milo.) It was very apparent to the

educators that the foes of sex-education in the public schools would use the wording of this type of legislation to attack text-books and other materials used by the schools. *Probably* no professional person would be prosecuted without the "exemptions," but the question of harassment under this law is a very real possibility. The idea for "exemptions" occurred upon reading Richard Kuh's book *Foolish Fingleaves?* In this book he mentions a section for "defenses," and it just seemed logical that if such "defenses" were allowable why not eliminate the *need* for such "defenses" and make them "exemptions"! It would take much less time of the district attorney, librarian, teacher or other employee who could be accused of providing material that could be construed as "harmful to a minor" by any member of the "lunatic fringe" or one super-sensitive to God's image! Unfavorable publicity, hysterical charges from the emotionally unstable, and sensational mass meetings would be checked, too.

The chairman of the MLA Legislative Committee, Mr. Ervin Gaines, found able sponsors for the bill in both houses, and the final law was passed in both houses.

As one of those who lobbied for the "exemptions," we feel the situation was not exaggerated to us before the Session. The "right" was well organized; there was a strongly organized attempt to fight for the bills without "exemptions." We did not dare to miss a hearing. The Citizens for Youth Protection, and the John Birch Society were the best organized opponents to our efforts. Also, the group opposing sex-education spoke against "exemptions." The Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion accepted our "exemptions" in the final hearing before the House of Representatives.

There was a sentiment that the MLA should not back *any kind* of a censorship bill. However, in the 1950's the MLA did back the so-called "McClure Bill," so a precedent had been established for our actions at this time when the conditions on the censorship front are "up-tight" all over! The MLA Trustee Section sent letters to all legislators supporting our efforts, and members of MLA responded from outstate as well as from the Twin City Area, contacting their legislators individually. The MLA-IFC and the Legislative Committee owes them a debt of gratitude. Needless to say, this followed the Library Association's tradition and was a joint operation with other professional groups and we feel resulted in a law that will prove to be protection for those dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge in all areas. However, until the next on-slaught by the self-appointed censors "the vigilantes for freedom to read" will keep contact and try to be prepared!

— Mrs. Elizabeth Lee Simmons

Chairman—IFC, Minn. Library Assn.

Feedback

Dear Sir:

In the May issue of NOIF, the attitude of Mrs. Alice P. Reilly, Fresno County Library, towards the letter she received from Mr. David W. Brunton should give us pause. Clearly not all librarians subscribe to the notion of intellectual freedom and one wonders whether IF committees do indeed reflect the thinking of state associations as a whole. I have found strong supporters of Colorado's anti-pornography bills within the library profession and I sometimes wonder if my voice is not that of a minority group within the Colorado Library Association.

Sincerely,
HARRY J. MOONEY, JR.
Chairman, IF Committee
Colorado Library Association

WLA Hears Fletcher

The battle against censorship waged by the Arcadia and Vallejo, Calif. public libraries was described by Homer Fletcher to Wyoming librarians at a luncheon Friday in the Ramada Inn.

At the Wyoming Library Association convention, Fletcher, now librarian of the Vallejo Public Library and formerly librarian of the Arcadia Public Library, told of the methods used to try to ban books from the libraries and how the censors were defeated.

In Vallejo last fall a similar controversy broke out over a book entitled *Hippie Papers*, said Fletcher. One day he received notice that the female mayor's committee on decency was to meet to protest the expenditure of taxpayers' money for "filthy books" for the library.

Fletcher said she received a complaint from parents of a teen-ager who borrowed the book from the young adult shelf in the library.

Fletcher said the library board of trustees immediately announced a meeting and supported the library. The library put on an anti-censorship campaign and received support from labor unions, the local newspaper and in many letters.

"It is important to be prepared," Fletcher told the librarians and "to keep your sense of humor."

"When you get in this type of situation, you can't sit back and wait. Get support immediately," emphasized Fletcher. He suggested that the first argument against censorship be based on an individual's right to read because "intellectual freedom" is often over people's heads.

He noted that censors are "self defeating" because when they attack a book, it gets publicity and more people than ever want to read it. —Casper *Star Tribune*, 27 April.

Hiding from Reality Dangerous

Pope Paul, a man of vast intellectual integrity, apparently feels some compulsion to cast himself in the role of the king who waded out into the surf and commanded the waves to stand still.

Even while echoes of protest regarding his disapproval of contraceptives are still heard around the world, the Pontiff has issued an appeal to communications media, asking that they adopt some system of self-censorship over information and subjects "that can damage the family in its existence, its stability and its happiness."

Every editor worth his salt feels compelled to exercise some control over the material he publishes, using his sense of values as a guideline. But we have often wondered whether the printed word — or the power of the press — shapes the social structure or merely reflects it.

If the latter is true, then the press has a definite obligation to serve as a mirror in order that the community may gauge its own drift and direction.

Too severe a censorship is an act of dishonesty. It is the same as saying that all is well because we refuse to see and report what is bad. And beneath this palliative approach the evil festers and eventually infects those who were unaware of its existence and are unprepared to cope with it.

There is much to be said for an honest confrontation. If a six-year-old child does something wrong, it is dangerous to humor that child for the sake of appeasement. The far more healthy approach is to express disapproval in rational terms.

So it is with discussing social mores. It is better to get these disputes into the open where they may be seen, understood and judged. In this manner social pressures are formed which tend to shape conformity.

An individual with a mental disturbance usually knows something is wrong. And it is a disservice to that person to refuse to recognize the illness or to suggest that it will go away if we don't talk about it. This is a profound dishonesty which only deepens the psychosis.

So it is with social ills. Unless they are faced frankly and discussed openly, the threat to the family structure is even more exaggerated. Ignorance rarely wins an argument.

Pope Paul's intentions are all to the good. But his solutions are out of tune with the world situation today where higher levels of education and various types of communication media make censorship virtually impossible. The logical alternative is to keep communication channels as open as possible in order that a healthy debate may ensue and, hopefully, the higher sense of values will prevail. —Tampa *Times*, 15 May.

Book Store Licensing Unconstitutional

Mayor White yesterday vetoed the proposed ordinance calling for city licensing of Boston book stores that label and sell materials marked "for adults only."

White's message rejecting the measure as constitutionally defective came on the last day before it would automatically have gone into operation as a city ordinance without his signature.

His veto message and a letter from Corporation Counsel Herbert P. Gleason ruling it an unconstitutional infringement on book dealers will be sent to the City Council Monday. It is expected to reach the show-down vote on sustaining the veto at the following meeting, June 2. —*Boston Traveler*, 17 May.

Fiske Revisited

A "restrictive shelf" policy on non-fiction books dealing with sex does exist in the Cleveland Public Library.

The *Press* found that out of hundreds of books on sex listed in the card catalog, only 40 or so were available on the open shelves in the Religion and Philosophy room where most of the clinical works are kept.

If you're looking for *A Marriage Doctor Speaks Her Mind About Sex*, by Rebecca Liswood, or *Sex and the Adult Woman*, by Ellen Birchall, you won't find them. The clinical, and presumably adult, volumes on sex are either in the closed stacks or locked up in a big metal cabinet.

Why? "This is an open shelf library," says Mrs. Verelia Farmer, assistant to the director of the Main Library. "And you must remember that while these books are geared to adults, children and teen agers can come into the open shelves. Their parents might not like their children coming home with books on sex."

If you want a copy of *Sex in Marriage*, by Dr. Dorothy Baruch and Dr. Hyman Miller, the librarian will go and get it for you. If you want a reference book, such as *Sex in Development*, by Carney Landis, you will have to leave your library card at the desk until you return the book.

Said Mrs. Farmer, "Our policy is to buy all sex books, and we're not restrictive, but most of these are taken off the main stacks."

"One reason is that we don't have enough shelf space. And then we feel that certain books for certain reasons would be better shelved in the stacks, and kept out of general circulation."

Mrs. Farmer said that the display of books about sex in the branch libraries is up to the discretion of the head librarian, but that "I should think the same policy would hold true for the branches." —*Cleveland Press*, 27 March.

Nixon Couldn't Wait

for the report and recommendations of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography appointed by President Johnson and scheduled to report in January, 1970. On 2 May he asked Congress for new laws "to combat a flood of smut mail which he termed 'unsolicited, unwanted and deeply offensive to those who receive it.'"

Nixon said the attorney general and the postmaster general will shortly submit to Congress three detailed proposals for legislation which would:

— "Make it a federal crime to use the mails or other facilities of commerce to deliver to anyone under 18 years of age material dealing with a sexual subject in a matter unsuitable for young people."

— "Make it a federal crime to use the mails, or other facilities of commerce, for the commercial exploitation of a prurient interest in sex through advertising."

— "Extend the existing law to enable a citizen to protect his home from any intrusion of sex-oriented advertising, regardless of whether or not a citizen has ever received such mailing." —*Portland Oregonian*, 3 May.

Ban the Daughter, Not the Book

A library book has been mailed to Dean Meredith, St. Paul civic buildings commissioner, whose job includes supervising the city's public libraries.

The book was sent him by Mrs. Robert E. Lundgren, 467 E. Arlington Ave., St. Paul, who considers the book obscene.

Mrs. Lundgren, a housewife, first complained to Daniel Klas, assistant city attorney, that her 14-year-old daughter had obtained a copy of *Babyhip* by Patricia Welles after having been on a waiting list for a year.

Then she wrote letters to all the city councilmen declaring, "This book is obscene and not fit for the entertainment of minors. Why should our public libraries put filth out at the taxpayers' expense as a form of entertainment?"

Meredith complained that Mrs. Lundgren did not talk to him before sending her letters and asked, "Who's going to be the censor? Is she? Is the city attorney going to read all the books in the library?"

He referred the matter to J. Archer Eggen, library director, who said he considers the book "frank and sensational" but not obscene. If Mrs. Lundgren wishes, he says, he will ban her daughter from the adult sections of the libraries.

But Mrs. Lundgren isn't through. She has checked copies of the book out of two other branch libraries and, although one is overdue, she said she isn't worried about returning them. She also plans to circulate a petition asking for the removal of the book. —*Minneapolis Star*, 1 May.

Wis. Supreme Court Lifts Ban of Underground Paper

In a 6-to-1 split decision, the State Supreme Court today ruled that village officials of Whitefish Bay had acted unconstitutionally in preventing the circulation of the controversial underground newspaper *Kaleidoscope* in the village.

The majority decision, written by Justice Bruce Beilfuss, upheld a ruling by Milwaukee County Circuit Judge Robert W. Landry that restrained Whitefish Bay officials from continuing to ban the sale of the newspaper.

Beilfuss said that the village used an ordinance dealing with transient merchants to prevent the circulation of the paper. This ordinance, the justice said, was designed reasonably to regulate sales and distributions, but the manner in which it was used by the village amounted to "censorship."

The majority decision held that if the village wants to stop circulation of *Kaleidoscope* it would have to do so through the obscenity statutes, not an ordinance dealing with peddlers' licenses.

"Upon the basis of the established law we must hold the ordinance in question as applied in this instance does result in censorship and prior restraint without constitutionally decreed safeguards," Justice Beilfuss' opinion said. —Madison *Capital Times*, 9 May.

Beetle Songs Not Obscene

NEWARK, N.J. (UPI)—A Beatle album with nude pictures of John Lennon and his girlfriend on the cover has been banned in New Jersey as a "naked spectacle" intended to promote sales to teen-agers.

Superior Court Judge Nelson K. Mintz decreed the ban yesterday on the strength of a record dealer's testimony that he refused to show the "Two Virgins" album to teen-age girls because he thought they were more interested in seeing Lennon nude than in hearing the record.

Witnesses for the defense testified that the fore-and-aft pictures of the Beatle and his Japanese girlfriend, Yoko Ono, reflected a "theme of innocence."

Mintz said the songs in the album are not obscene, but that the cover is "offensive to the community standards." He ordered the Tetragrammaton Company of Los Angeles and Bestway Products, Inc., of Mountainside, N.J., distributors of the record and defendants in the case, to surrender their stocks of the album to the sheriffs of Union and Essex counties.

The companies said they will appeal.—Washington *Star*, 12 February.

Pornographic Photos Legal In Denmark

COPENHAGEN (AP) — The Danish parliament has approved a bill legalizing the sale of pornographic pictures.

It took just two minutes Friday for the Parliament to approve the government sponsored measure by a 112-25 vote. Four legislators abstained.

Although nobody has taken much notice, it has been illegal in Denmark either to sell or display pictorial pornography. But police powers have been loosely enforced and hundreds of kiosks and shops with names like "Sex-O-Rama" and "Porno-Time" have flourished on Copenhagen's main shopping streets.

The government said police would retain power to act when pornographic window displays overstep some unspecified marks. This was greeted skeptically by opponents of the bill, who contended that current window displays could hardly be more sexually explicit. The law takes effect July 1.

"We have now become the first Western country to free pictorial pornography," complained Conservative legislator O. Vestergaard Poulsen, a main opponent of the bill.

Justice Minister Knud Thestrup, a Conservative also, expressed the rival view that governments should not attempt to censor the reading matter of adults.

"Moreover," he said, "when pornographic pictures are free, I expect their incidence will become much less." —Portland *Oregonian*, 1 June.

Supermarket Censorship

Officials of a chain of supermarkets in a Southwestern state have taken upon themselves the thorny task of deciding, on an issue-to-issue basis, what magazines shall be sold in their stores. This came to public attention when, in two successive weeks, issues of *Life* and *Newsweek* were kept off the shelves.

There is nothing unusual about stores deciding which magazines to make available to their customers. Indeed, it is a necessary exercise of judgment; there would not be room, on the average array of magazine shelves, for a fraction of the weekly and monthly publications available.

Nor can one take issue with the stated rationale of the aforementioned supermarket officials. One of them said the chain is "not trying to tell adults what they should read or not read" but is merely "deciding the kind of magazine that will be available for children to leaf through while their mothers shop in our stores." Who could take issue with so wholesome a purpose as that?

Misgivings arise, all the same. Their nature can be indicated by noting that the issues of *Life* and *Newsweek* barred from the store shelves carried, in each instance, articles about the wave of sexual permissiveness — nudity in movies and on stage, uninhibited language and subject matter in literature, and so on — that is found in the United States today. Ostensibly the magazines were banned because the articles were illustrated with photographs including some of unclothed people.

Both *Newsweek* and *Life* are established, reputable publications which are found in millions of American homes each week. In the judgment of their editors, the subject of those articles merits serious coverage. In their judgment, pictures accompanying the articles were within permissible bounds of taste. So what we have here is a contest of judgment — the judgment of the editors of *Life* and *Newsweek* as to what is in good taste matched against the judgment of storekeepers. It is not censorship, legally speaking, but it does smell rather like censorship. —Westerly, R.I., *Sun*, 24 April.

Two Fined for Showing 'Inga'

STAUNTON — A downtown theater manager drew a maximum fine and a projectionist a minimum fine in the 4th regional juvenile court here yesterday on convictions of violating a city obscenity ordinance — making available to minors indecent materials.

Fined \$500 and costs were Frank K. Shaffer, 68, manager of the Dixie Theater. Edgar G. Wiseman, 66, a relief projectionist, was fined \$10 and costs.

The charges against the defendants grew out of a raid at the Dixie Theater about 10:45 p.m. April 18.

The movie shown that night was a feature-length, Swedish-made film, *Inga*, starring Swedish actress Maria Liljedahl.

Whether or not the film was obscene for adult viewing was not an issue in the case. —Richmond *Times Dispatch*, 8 May.

Rock County Librarians Unite

Area librarians have united against would-be censors of books.

The Association of Beloit Librarians joined with the Association of Janesville Librarians at the Janesville Public Library this week and unanimously adopted a resolution defending the freedom to read.

Gary Lenox, president of the Janesville association, said this was an appropriate time for librarians to affirm verbally their united stand against censors, who seem to abound this spring. April 20-26 is National Library Week.

In their first joint meeting, the associations noted that in recent weeks attempts have been made in Wisconsin to ban such prize winning books as MacKinley Kantor's *Andersonville* and J. D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*.

Members said that any roster of works unsuitable for school use begins to read like a "random sampling from a 'Who's Who of distinguished literary figures.' Here is a partial list: Plato, Chaucer, Faulkner, Hemingway, Mark Twain, Thomas Mann, and many others."

Censorship can leave American students with an inadequate grasp of the values and ideals of their culture. Writers are often the chief spokesmen of a culture, Lenox said. —Beloit *News*, 17 April.

May 'Motive' in Question

NASHVILLE — Charging "clearly obscene" language, the head of the United Methodist higher education unit here has "postponed" the May issue of *Motive* magazine, a publication aimed primarily at campuses.

The Rev. Myron Wicke's allegation that some words in the issue breach the "canons of good taste" was countered by the retiring editor, the Rev. B. J. Stiles, who said the "charges would be amusing if the situation were not so absurd."

The action of Dr. Wicke, who ordered the issue held at the Methodist Publishing House, followed a flurry of complaints about a March-April special magazine in the local community and from some Methodist leaders. He did not know when the copies might be released. —Washington *Post*, 31 May.

Right to Bar Obscene Mail Upheld

LOS ANGELES, May 9 (UPI) — A three-judge Federal panel has upheld the constitutionality of a 1968 law allowing persons to halt the mailing of advertisements for obscene material to their homes, U.S. District Attorney Matt Byrne disclosed today.

It was the first court test of the law that gives the citizen sole discretion to determine what he considers obscenity. Passed by Congress in December, 1967, it became effective April 15, 1968.

The law had been challenged by 15 individuals in a suit filed last September seeking to enjoin the Post Office Department and the U.S. Attorney General from enforcing it. They contended the statute was unconstitutional because it violates freedom of speech.

The ruling was handed down April 30 by a panel made up of U.S. Circuit Judge Shirley M. Hufstедler and U.S. District Court Judges Charles H. Carr and Manuel L. Real. —Washington *Post*, 9 May.

So All Alone!

Under consideration in the Colorado legislature are three bills designed to control the distribution of pornography. All of them are patterned, to some extent, after the New York law, as have been so many others which have been adopted by state and local governments since April, 1968. It seems inevitable at this point that one of these bills will ultimately require an executive decision. Should such a law be passed it will probably be reported in *The Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom* with customary impatience.

More distressing, perhaps, than the mere passage of these laws are the reasons why they pass, and rather than pout we might well examine those reasons along with the actions, if any, taken by the profession to counter the tide.

These bills usually pass because the groups behind them are well organized, fully knowledgeable, extremely articulate, adequately financed, and hard working. They seek and obtain advice, counsel, and support from professional persons in law enforcement, psychology, medicine, and education. They ally themselves with other organized groups of similar persuasion and they solicit the endorsement of any group in search of a cause. They accept every invitation to participate in open discussions, and they provide speakers for any group that requests one. Most significantly, they initiate discussions with legislators long before the legislature convenes, and they follow through with dogged determination until the final votes are cast. Their campaigns are conducted openly, logically, and with an almost military precision.

Against this kind of coordinated, disciplined, spirited, and singularly directed march, librarians seem particularly ineffective. Possibly such ineffectiveness stems from the nature of librarians as a whole, the concepts of the institutions for which they work, the general conservatism of library governing bodies, and the spate of professional problems and issues which cause librarians to fractionalize their energies. In any event, all of these serve to prevent the profession from amplifying its opposition to a level audible to legislators.

As a case in point, consider the Colorado experience where the only counter measures have been those voiced by the Intellectual Freedom Committee. No library in the state, be it public, academic, or special, has yet made a statement to the press. No library board has adopted, and publicized, a point of view, either for the measures or against them, nor has any library board sought information from the Intellectual Freedom Committee. No trustee or member of a friends group spoke on behalf of libraries at the public hearings held in the statehouse, hearings which members of the Intellectual Freedom Committee, being, for the most part, public servants on public payrolls during working hours, could

not, in all conscience, have attended. One friends organization did endorse a statement by the Colorado Booksellers Association (NOIF, March 1969, p. 26) but it has yet to reply to the scathing criticism it subsequently received in the press for its stand.

Local newspapers have carried no letters to the editor signed by a librarian, a library board, or a friends organization. While it cannot be positively stated that no librarian has communicated with his congressman, it is seriously doubted that many have. No librarians attended any of the nine public meetings at which this member of the Intellectual Freedom Committee has so far spoken, including one evening meeting which was held in a public library. Other members of the Committee have observed a similar lack of interest.

This groundswell of indifference clearly indicates the prevailing attitude of librarians and library trustees towards the legislative process. They seem, for the most part, completely apathetic, content to let the more vocal forces in the community influence congress and to learn to live within the laws it passes. Thus, when laws are enacted which inhibit library operation, as this one in Colorado most assuredly will, and there is as little opposition from the profession as has been heard here, then libraries fully deserve the restrictions imposed upon them.

The final puzzling question is whether Intellectual Freedom Committees should address their attention to combatting legislation, or whether they should confine their activities to the investigation of specific instances of library censorship within the state. It is only in the latter role that the committees can reasonably expect active and vocal support from within the profession. When a committee takes on the former task, it may well find itself alone.

—HARRY J. MOONEY, JR., *Chairman*
CLA Intellectual Freedom Committee

Paging COOP

Burning ice: the moral and emotion effects of reading.

By Lorang, Sister Mary Corde. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968. 303p. 7.95.

The author holds a Ph.D. in psychology from Catholic University of America. Her present work stems from her dissertation, published in 1945 as *The Effect of Reading on Moral Conduct and Emotional Experience*, her persistent interest in the effect of reading on behavior, and her belief that there is "mounting evidence of the effect of reading together with increasing unconcern for the damage pornography is doing." Her data were obtained from a four-page questionnaire, condensed from the one used in her dissertation, designed to determine if young adults of the '60's would "answer as their parents did in the '40's," and reprinted in the book.

The author sent the earlier questionnaire to U.S. high school students in all four years; the later one, because of increased school enrollments and her desire to obtain wide geographic coverage, she sent only to juniors and seniors. She reports that many principals, superintendents, teachers, and parents resisted the use of the questionnaire in their schools, a reaction she had not received in 1944. As a consequence, she added Catholic English-speaking schools in Hawaii, the Philippines, Africa, and Guatemala to the American public and Catholic high schools circulated. She describes her 1967 population as omitting "few social and economic factors." She did not employ a random sample, or control for such factors as IQ or age.

The questionnaire attempted to obtain a report from the students regarding their perceived effect on themselves of reading books and magazines. It solicited the names of three books each student had read and the year read, and the names of illustrated magazines each saw regularly and saw occasionally. The students were then asked to name those books having a good effect on them and those having a bad effect. Additional questions requested information about characters liked best, least, and why, and such yes-no answers as "did you ever try to act like a character in a magazine," "did any book ever arouse your emotions," "did the reading of books ever start you thinking of bad things," etc., with opportunity in some cases to state why or how. Then the students were asked to state whether reading material or illustrations had ever made them experience one of 18 listed emotions ranging from "joyful" to "wanting to kill enemies." In these questions, they were asked to state whether a book, magazine, or illustration aroused the emotion and to give the name of the book or magazine if remembered.

Thirty five hundred questionnaires were distributed; 3206 were returned. The names of cited books and magazines were listed from the responses (4200 titles) and given to judges for rating. Originally there were 12 judges, identified only as "four librarians, a high school counselor, a college professor with an English major, a young adult in the first year of college, two young adults in their senior high school year, two career women from Tanzania, and one college student from the Philippines." The panel did not know all the books and magazines; the author was forced ultimately to use "some forty people, all experts in their line" to fill in the gaps. The National Office for Decent Literature mailed her ratings for "girlie books and objectionable magazines" as well as their 1966 and 1967 booklets of recommended reading material for young adults. It is not clear how this information was used by the judges.

In the 1944 study apparently the judges were charged with classifying all the titles as *Fit* or *Unfit* for young adults. The contemporary judges "preferred and used" a four-way classification. The categories were *Fit* (can

be read by all high school students to advantage for enjoyment, personal improvement, educational value), *Mature* (suited to the "advanced student"), *Adult* (content and style too adult to be of interest to even mature high school students, very long books, books that move too slowly, "sexual sins may be detailed but still a part of the story, even though the story itself is sketchy"), *Unfit* (of "no true value even to adults, cheap or downright pornographic, display sexual sins, deviations, lewd pictures, torture, etc., to incite prurient interests").

Examples of books classified *Adult* are *The Great Gatsby*, *Daisy Miller*, *Darkness at Noon*, and *Age of Innocence*. Examples of books classified *Unfit* are *Peyton Place*, *Tropic of Capricorn*, *Candy*, *DeSade*, and *Justice*. The author wished to use Pearson's tetrachoric formula as she did in her dissertation; hence she combined the first two categories and the last two categories. In the earlier study, with the aid of four independent judges to assist in making objective interpretations of students' responses, coefficient correlations of .95 to .99 were obtained between books and magazines judged *Unfit* and cited as arousing bad effects by the students. Similar correlations prevailed for "good" and *Fit*. In the recent study, the average correlation was .764 for books and .886 for magazines. In the case of books, two schools' low correlations brought the average down markedly. The author concludes that "we do have evidence that reading effects and affects behavior for good or evil. The effect may result in socially acceptable behavior or anti-social behavior." She specifically concludes (1) young people of 1967 are reading a wide range of books, (2) from 2.6%-31% of the books they read are judged unfit for them, (3) rural young people mentioned significantly fewer unfit books than any other group used, (4) the number of books mentioned per student has increased 1400% since the 1944 study, magazines 288%, (5) the paperback explosion seems to be the main factor in the increase in book reading. The last conclusion appears to be derived from data outside that of the study.

The book has many tables of data from the present study, and several that compare the findings of the two studies. Perhaps half the book consists of selections of the student responses to the open-ended questions, with no statistical indication of how representative of the total response the selected responses are. The author states that her purpose in including direct quotations from the students was to attest to the causal aspect of the statistical correlation. The reviewer was pleased to note that at least some students asked what "bad" and "good" effects are. A list of the titles mentioned by the students is included, with the judges' rating and the percentage of good and bad effects cited by the respondents who mentioned each title. No figures are given of the number of times a given title was mentioned. The method of categorization of student comments is not

made explicit, i.e., the only student quotation reproduced for *The Great Gatsby*, judged Adult and tabulated as arousing 79% good effects and 21% bad effects among its readers, is "made me feel ashamed of America." Nothing indicates whether the statement contributed to the 79% or the 21%.

Research on reading effects is needed. The author deserves credit for tackling the issue and for willingness to work hard, for she had no computer available to tally responses and she did not scorn the open-ended question. But before confidence can be placed in the predictability she appears to see, questions must be raised. For example, did preconceived conclusions affect the research design? On what were interpretations of students' statements based? Why did she not place her research in a framework of theory of behavioral change nor acknowledge questions of relationship between attitudes and behavior or causative vs triggering factors? The President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography still has a job to do.

— IONE F. PIERRON
University of Oregon

Dissent with Dissent

More *Permissive* than *Censored*, 2069 will say as it looks back a century, I am convinced, at the United States.

By the end of the 20th century's seventh decade, the pendulum will have swung so far away from the Establishment, and so near to the Demonstration, that Century 21, from its perspective, will marvel that ALA's Committee still retained the word "Freedom" in its name, instead of "Responsibility."

They will bet, even before they read the report on the Chicago 1968 Democratic convention, on what will follow the "But": The police were brutal BUT, they were provoked unreasonably by demonstrators; or, the demonstrators provoked, BUT the police were unreasonably brutal. Long before the 21st century's graduate student has finished his historical investigation, he will expect bombings in Hanoi to be demonstrated against; murders in Saigon to be ignored with a "liberal" shrug, as "not our department."

Platitudes by middle-aged demagogues, on and off campus, currying favor with the bombastic minority of the younger generation (like "you have inherited problems you did not create") will exasperate Youth 21, when they, in turn revolt, more intellectually, and less physically, I am sure, against the mess their Hippie parents handed them.

Philosophy majors, in Graduate School 21, will ponder what happened to Bertrand Russell, who, among many books, wrote *Education and the Good Life*, which profoundly influenced undergraduate 1926. Perhaps they will be more forgiving of a near-centenarian who, contrary to all he had stood for in the past, condemned

only half a war, and repudiated English traditional liberalism by declaring another nation "guilty until proved innocent."

History majors will be less charitable toward a doctor, who made a fortune on a book of baby-care platitudes, that illustrated Philip Wylie's dictionary-accepted, new word, "Momism." And they will marvel at media, and their mediums—the press columnists and the TV commentators—who handed each other awards for condemning the President of the United States, whom no one had the courage to praise. Lyndon B. Johnson had had the temerity to defy a pat proverb like "the poor will be with us always"; to allot more national income to education than anyone before him; to recognize the subtler form of aggression in "tunneling," by a phoney "liberation front" that, Hitler-like, threatened relatives of non-conformists.

And as for the four-letter word, even undergraduates will chuckle over their parents' sex self-consciousness. English classes will roar with laughter over the 20th century sophisticates' self-righteous insistence that without latrine language, literature is dishonest. They will note, too, consecutive reviews of Broadway drama that praise "courage" in exposing deviations-addictions, perversions, other abnormalities—and marvel that no one had the courage *not* to expose them.

They will read *Catcher in the Rye* and retitle it *Pitcher in the Corn*; conclude the 1960 "oh-so-liberated" praised *Lolita's* "style" to cover up a personal, illegal longing; puzzle over the attraction to a bit of adolescent-adult adultery in something called "Who's Afraid of . . ."; marvel that an inartistic sociological study like *In Cold Blood* should outsell a so-much better written book about murder like *On Iniquity*; and find, perhaps, some clue to the 1960 intellectual climate in the review of Nevil Shute's *Trustee in the Toolroom*, which closed with the contemptuous sentence, "In it, a right guy lives happily ever after."

From the sophisticated clichés of the Twentieth they will, perhaps, sense the dominance of the Establishment's and the Demonstration's single culture. "Tell it like it is" almost annihilated "Tell it like it could be." Their "liberated" parents loved two "gaps" and two "explosions." What the 20th celebrated as the "generation gap" was highly exaggerated. The gaps were greater within each generation. And as for the "credibility gap," it was used when the other guy didn't follow the party line. When it came to the two "explosions" that had to be included in every commencement oration; auto traffic, even more than Viet Nam, was helping repudiate Malthus on "*population*"; value gained steadily on "fact retrieval" in both segments of the Demonstration against librarianship—Audiovisual, and Information Science—to bring about the *Information Implosion*. Century 21 will understand better than C. P. Snow, how single was the culture of the 20th Century.

It was an extremely permissive United States society, 2069 will inevitably conclude.

That the United States became the first nation to repudiate the 1969 sophisticates' adoration of the Spengler and Toynbee historical cycles was due in no small measure to some romantics, who dissented equally with the realism of both the Establishment and the Demonstration. These "Third Themers" had the courage, and it took courage, to resist both party lines at the same time. With the Establishment you could easily be jailed for subversion; with the Demonstration, if you were lucky, you would only be refused the right to speak, in the name of free speech; if you were unlucky, your house, or your library, might be burned, your waste basket urinated in, your neighbor's innocent, child-watcher blinded, as a demonstration of non-violence.

A librarian had once made an Associate Press release by declaring, in a Denver address, for a moratorium on marches; a revival of the town hall in 30,000 libraries; a return to documentation of protests; debate, referendum, initiative, recall, on solutions; prototype urban communities at home, and prototype, comparative, national ways of life in North and South Viet Nam.

But 1969 wasn't ready. It was still jousting with the windmills of censorship. It identified problems *ad nauseam*; abhorred solutions. The climate sought freedom without responsibility.

Fortunately, there was a *Dissent with Dissent*; a tiny voice that was unashamed to prefer *Polyanna* over *Sanctuary*; that understood realism was not a synonym for reality. Out of this beginning, came the Century 21 Committee on Intellectual Responsibility.

— LOUIS SHORES

Needed—More Professional Spine!

It was many years ago that I lost the stars in my eyes concerning the likelihood of finding pat, easy solutions to problems of censorship. However, as chairman of the Missouri Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee since October, 1967, I have grown increasingly uncomfortable over reports, formal and informal, from *school* librarians because the censorship attempts they have been encountering do not involve books like *Candy* or *One Hundred-Dollar Misunderstanding*, in which the line between hard-core pornography and "redeeming social value" is elusive, to say the least. As one exasperated elementary school librarian puts it, "I won't be surprised if they ask me, next week, to take the ABC's off the shelf!"

Typical of books that have recently come under attack in school libraries of Missouri are *Up the Down Staircase*, Hesba Brinsmead's *Beat of the City* (almost a moralizing tract), and de Schweinitz's *Growing Up*. The latter has been in print since 1928 and is listed in

the *Children's Catalog*—can you get more "Establishment" than that?

Worst of all, the standard reaction on the part of school administrators seems to be: "Take it off the shelf until the furor dies down, and then slip it back into circulation." The busy administrator seldom has time to read the book; nor does it seem to occur to him that students who use the library may detect this subterfuge. We would shield our children from clinical information about human reproduction, but easily subject them to moral hypocrisy. I submit that it is no wonder educators are underpaid and under-respected if professional self-confidence can't suggest a better response to essentially irrational criticism.

No one who takes a case to a lawyer would dare volunteer to help organize the brief or decide which arguments should be used in court. Imagine the withering scorn a doctor would direct at the patient who presumed to pass judgment on medicine prescribed for an illness. School administrators, on the other hand, seem perfectly willing to pay a professional salary to a qualified librarian and then permit a random parent or office secretary to make professional decisions in the area of materials selection for the school library. The superintendent or principal should think back to his coaching days: did he go up into the stands to ask a spectator which player to substitute at the climax of a ball game?

Apparently school librarians need to inform their administrators even more painstakingly and persistently about the array of professional reviewing sources consulted, about the visits to materials examination centers, the selection meetings attended, the teacher-recommendations earnestly sought in carrying out the professional responsibility of library materials selection. For there are alternatives to a spineless knuckling under to the least enlightened opinioners of a given community, and librarians everywhere should intensify effort to prevail upon school administrators to use them.

An explicitly stated selection policy and procedure should be adopted and deferred to by each school system. Complaining individuals should be invited to specify their objections on a "Request for Reconsideration of Library Materials" form. A committee of professional librarians and teachers can be appointed to review contested materials. Because most local communities do not welcome publicity as "Horrible Example No. 1," judicious appeal to a state or national professional organization such as MLA or the National Education Association may be effective. Finally, instead of ducking, administrators can accept the challenge to make it clear to the public that professional decisions regarding school matters must be made by those who are employed, at the taxpayers' expense, to make them. For, in the last analysis, it is our children who cannot afford to have their educational horizons restricted by the lowest common denominator of community judgment.

— HELEN KREIGH

All or Nothing at All

By ELI M. OBOLER*

Sometimes the over-conscientious librarian who feels his professional obligations heavily is faced with a dilemma that seems beyond rational solution. This all-too-common quandary is what to do when faced with the issue of just how far the librarian's individual relationship to the obligations imposed by the Freedom to Read really goes.

Read over the "FREEDOM TO READ" statement, and you'll find it urges "publishers and librarians, as guardians of the people's freedom to read, to contest encroachments upon that freedom by individuals or groups seeking to impose their own standards or tastes upon the community at large." Does this mean that every time a patently pornographic or obscene item is sold in a local store, and a "decency group, or even a single individual, prevails upon the local prosecuting attorney to do something about it, and the proprietor is then arrested, that Mr. Local Librarian as one of the "guardians of the people's freedom to read," must become directly involved in the case?

It is not, usually, very easy to determine where concern for the freedom to read ends and protection of other filth starts. The two-dollar one-shot magazine with deliberately pornographic photographs seems to carry a good deal of material that is not *too* different from the casually nude or near-nude advertisements to be seen in many major national magazines, particularly of the fashion type. Should the "guardian" librarian start writing letters to the editor or even become an *amicus curiae* in a particular case that seems pretty remote from the local library?

Within the space of this brief editorial statement, there is hardly an opportunity to go very deeply into the issues involved. Every librarian who feels deeply about the question of intellectual freedom should be prepared, however, to justify either his activity or his lack of it in a particular situation. In other words, know *why* you do or don't do what you're doing or not doing!

There are all too many librarians who seem to be looking for trouble constantly these days, and there are about as many or probably more who are going out of their way to avoid it. What with the growing concern for the social responsibility of the librarian, as evidenced by the newly approved ALA Round Table, this might well be a good time for earnest ratiocination on the very moot question—am I my brother's keeper? We all know in what circumstances the question was asked in Biblical days; perhaps it is not being too far-fetched to say that this has become more than an academic question, and is beginning to become a problem for almost every practicing librarian. If you, as a librarian, do *not* act as a "guardian of the people's free-

dom to read," then who will? And is that freedom absolute, or restricted? It would be very interesting to see some answers to these obviously intentionally provocative questions.

—ELI M. OBOLER

Court of the White Queen

The Alice in Wonderland of Montgomery County, it now turns out, is run by a gang of idiots who, at the first sign of trenchant criticism by long-haired kids imitate the little men of Moscow, Athens and Saigon. They try to imprison and shut down the critics, in this case the *Washington Free Press*.

The assumed horror of the County authorities at the "pornography" of the newspaper is as phony as the alibis given elsewhere for harassing or shutting down the press. For there are far more dirty words and sexual titillation in the books mother buys for her enjoyment than in the somewhat childish way the *Free Press* bandies four-letter words. And the County nabobs had no concern about the *Free Press* until it began to annoy the authorities.

From time immemorial, emperors and minor satraps have tried to imprison the scribes who disturb their sleep of power. Fortunately we have, at least on the books, guarantees that scribes can poke, prod and make fun. This news does not seem to have pervaded the court of the White Queen. — Tristram Coffin in *Washington Post*, 12 April.

CDL Makes a Point

MIDDLETOWN — A novel used for about two weeks in senior English classes at Penncrest High School has been removed from the curriculum by the English department, an administrator of the Rose Tree Media School District said Tuesday.

Asst. Schools Supt. Henry Hoffman, said the book, Peter Matthiessen's *At Play in the Fields of the Lord*, contains "about 15 passages that I think we don't need in our schools."

Hoffman said the teachers in the department made the decision to remove the book Friday, one day after the local chapter of the Citizens for Decent Literature brought the book to the attention of the school board in an executive session. —*Delaware County Times*, Chester, Pa., 2 April.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, this is the first instance of the CDL concerning itself with other than objectionable material on the newsstands, and should serve as reminder and warning to librarians that all censorious activity must be opposed whether or not libraries are under direct attack. LCM.

Dentist Wins Court Fight

Dr. Julian M. Firestone, a dentist, won his battle yesterday against censorship imposed by the First District Dental Society, covering Manhattan and the Bronx.

Four years ago, the society ruled that a manuscript for radio broadcast prepared by Firestone "contained numerous statements that were not in good taste and not designed to uphold the dignity of the profession."

The dentist charged that his constitutional rights were violated and he was upheld in State Supreme Court, but the Appellate Division said the issue should go to trial.

Yesterday, Justice Francis Bloustein ruled as invalid the society's directive that members submit manuscripts of articles or talks in advance. He also forbade the society from taking disciplinary action against a member failing to secure approval in advance.

However, he did not rule out disciplinary action on charges that an article or broadcast offended the code of ethics.—*New York News*, 10 April.

April Fool

Publication of the University of Louisville student newspaper, *The Louisville Cardinal*, was ordered discontinued yesterday by President Woodrow M. Strickler, pending recommendation and guidelines on its content.

Strickler, in a memorandum to David Baker, chairman of the 17-member Board of Student Publications, which is to submit the recommendations, said he was "dismayed" by last Friday's April Fool edition of *The Cardinal*.

The paper, among other things, carried a prominent two-column headline on its front page saying the dean of students had banned use of a four-letter obscenity in *The Cardinal*.—*Louisville Courier-Journal*, 1 April.

A Serious Exploration

Clor, Harry M.: *Obscenity and Public Morality; Censorship in a Liberal Society*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1969. 315 pp. (Price: \$9.50).

The conservative, but not extremely conservative point of view on legal obscenity controls is represented with unusual scholarship and brilliance of style in *Obscenity and Public Morality; Censorship in a Liberal Society*, by Dr. Harry M. Clor, a political scientist.

Dorothy Bendix, with reference to teaching intellectual freedom, stated in the March, 1969, *ALA Bulletin*: "The conservative view on censorship and intellectual freedom should be given wider representation for the following reasons: It seems only fair that library school instructors practice what they preach, namely, that in

line with the 'Library Bill of Rights' they make sure that students are exposed to *all* points of view concerning intellectual freedom. Second, presenting *all* points of view may actually be more effective in teaching a commitment to intellectual freedom than presenting only the liberal side."

Clor's book may aid not only library school instructors and students but practicing librarians to clarify their thinking on legal obscenity controls. Librarians may find it easier to direct discussion with emotional complainants along rational lines. The need for greater sophistication in discussing censorship issues is exemplified in the recording of the public hearings before the Richmond, California, City Council, entitled "What Shall They Read?"

According to Clor, the purpose of his work is threefold: "(1) To analyze and evaluate the arguments, evidence, and assumptions employed in the controversy over obscenity; (2) To explore the difficulties encountered by the law when it seeks to define public morality in a constitutional democracy and in a society characterized by pluralism and rapid change; and (3) To contribute to the development of a philosophy of censorship and a test of obscenity which will do justice to the public interests in morality, in free expression, and in literature."

The classic arguments concerning the effects of obscenity on children and adults are analyzed thoroughly: (1) The "safety-valve" theory: indulgence in obscenity can have positive therapeutic value; (2) The "self-selection" theory: obscenity is in the mind of the reader; (3) The "deeper causative factors" theory: we cannot blame any specific factor for contributing to an evil committed, for the act is rooted in the psychological or social influences in the life of the person committing the wrong; (4) The "total structure of society" theory: salacious books, magazines, and films cannot be a cause of delinquency or crime because these evils are rooted in the total structure of our society; (5) The "forbidden fruit" theory: laws against obscenity only serve to arouse the desire for it. The research literature on reading effects receives critical review, including the Gluck, Kinsey, Kronhausen, Waples, Berelson, and other studies. Clor deems impossible the conduct of studies to determine scientifically conclusive evidence concerning the depth and permanency of reading effects.

The issue of the relation of law to public morality in a liberal democracy, raised by recent court decisions related to obscenity control, is treated at length in the light of social and political theories. The author maintains that legal rules require the support of adequate theory. Judge-made standards on obscenity, such as that involving pandering, will be problematic to the extent that the rationale for the control of obscenity remains problematic. He asks why it should be wrong for the purveyor of obscenity to make a profit, as any

businessman makes profit, if the circulation and consumption of obscenity is considered harmless. Clor's appeal to legislators and the public to examine carefully the assumptions on which obscenity legislation is based is one of the major contributions of the book. He goes on to develop his own case, not based upon religious considerations, for the legal control of obscenity. His stand rests instead on the view that censorship, properly conducted and confined, can serve liberal democracy by helping it to maintain ethical and political proportion.

One of the most controversial areas of the book is the author's attempt to define obscenity and to build a philosophy of censorship. He regards material deserving to be called "obscene" as that which "(1) predominantly appeals to lust; (2) graphically presents and interweaves violence and sensuality; (3) graphically presents human beings as, to use the terms of Wertham, 'sex objects to be bandied around.'" For Clor, obscenity is, in short, a way of looking at man which dehumanizes human purposes and human beings. Thus, obscenity includes the making public of not only sexual but any other intimate physical processes in such a way that their larger human context is lost or depreciated. His philosophy of censorship incorporates concern for the possible long-range effects of obscenity upon mind and character, resulting in a subtle desensitizing of the higher faculties upon which self-control and social responsibility depend.

An "Epilogue" to the work contains an apologia beginning with the following statement: "Friendly critics have observed that, since the trend of recent developments seems to be so contrary to the thesis of this book, its author should face the fact that the thesis may be unrealistic or impractical." Clor does not intend, however, to regard the trend of recent developments as a standard against which to test ideas concerning obscenity and the functions of law, the importance of public standards, and the prerequisites and limits of liberty. Rather, in *Obscenity and Public Morality*, he presents a serious exploration of the problem of obscenity and the law with clarity, a refreshing respect for human dignity, and attention to scholarship.

Florence E. DeHart
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Current Bibliography

Abel, Bob. "I, You, He, She (Am, Are, Is) Curious." *Cavalier*, XIX (June, 1969) 73-77.

Barnes, Peter. "The Army and the First Amendment." *New Republic*, CLX (24 May, 1969), 13-14.

Bellezza, Suzanne. "Definition of Obscenity in Printed Material: Minnesota and the U.S.A." *Minnesota Libraries*, XXII (Winter, 1968), 215-223.

Clark, Barbara. "The Irresponsible Purge." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (April, 1969), 427-428.

Corliss, Richard. "Still Legion, Still Decent" *Commonweal*, XC (23 May, 1969), 289-293.

"Daniel Gore's Painful Experience." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (May, 1969), 553-556.

"Fall-Out in Niagara Falls." *Transaction*, VI (April, 1969), 2-4.

"GI's Who Question Why." *New Republic*, CLX (19 April, 1969), 5-6.

Grannis, Chandler B. "Where Do You Draw the Line?" *Publishers' Weekly*, CVC (14 April, 1969), 73.

Kreigh, Helen D. "Censorship Matters in Missouri." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (May, 1969), 570-572.

Krug, Judith F. "Intellectual Freedom." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (April, 1969), 446-448.

McNeal, Archie. "Librarians as Enemies of Books: or, How to Succeed in Censorship Without Really Trying." *The Southeastern Librarian*, XIX (Spring, 1969), 30-35.

Moffett, Hugh. "Sexy Movies? Chardon, Neb. Tries Gentle Persuasion." *Life*, LXVI (30 May, 1969), 52B-57.

Nyren, Karl. "Girl with the Waterproof Eyes." *Library Journal*, XCIV (1 May, 1969), 1823.

Pilpel, Harriet F. "Content No Longer Sole Factor in Obscenity." *Publishers' Weekly*, CVC (31 March, 1969), 33.

Sherill, Robert. "Must the Citizen Give Up His Civil Liberties When He Joins the Army?" *New York Times Magazine*, (18 May, 1969), 25-27, 120-128.

Shields, Gerald R. "Editor's Choice." *ALA Bulletin*, LXIII (May, 1969), 561-562.

Smith, Roger H. "Mr. Nixon on the Trail of Smut." *Publishers' Weekly*, CVC (12 May, 1969), 34.

Watts, Daniel H. "Censorship, Liberal Style." *Liberator*, IX, (Feb. 1969), 3.

NEWSLETTER ON INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM
1700 Fifth Street • Berkeley, California 94710

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 69
Berkeley, California