CENSORSHIP IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL:
A THREAT TO THE RIGHT TO READ
CENSORSHIP IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL:
A THREAT TO THE RIGHT TO READ

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE HONORS COUNCIL
IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
for
I.D. 499
by
ROBERT J. GROVER
ADVISER - DONALD S. MAC VEAN

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
MUNCIE, INDIANA
AUGUST, 1965
CENSORSHIP IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL:
A THREAT TO THE RIGHT TO READ

Book selection is an important responsibility of the school librarian. In most schools, the librarian makes the final decision in ordering books for the library collection. In attempting to develop a useful, intellectually challenging, well-rounded collection, the librarian may occasionally be confronted by individuals or groups who object to materials contained in it. This paper is designed to present an overview of censorship activities resulting from objections to fiction books in a secondary school library and to offer a course of action to resist attempts at suppression.

Censorship differs from selection in that book selection is made in accordance with the needs of the individual school library and the evaluated literary merit of the individual book. Censorship, in contrast, implies coercive attempts to ban materials; these attempts are based on religious, political, or moral objections. If, in the librarian's opinion, a book is poorly written or apparently would be useless to the collection, he is not acting as a censor by refusing to order the book for
Perhaps the most active groups engaged in book banning are those committees which are appointed by national and local organizations to examine books used in schools to find examples of ideas or practices these organizations condemn. These organizations and other political extremists often attack textbooks and library materials for "softness" on communism, "one-worldism," New Dealism, leanings toward socialism, or plain un-Americanism. Among those prominently engaged in this practice are the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and America's Future, Inc.

The D.A.R. is very critical of textbooks used in the schools, particularly those on American history, civics, economics, and social problems. The organization publishes a periodical, National Defender, and a pamphlet, Textbook Study. Its Textbook Study, 1958-1959 was a master list of textbooks approved by boards of education throughout the United States. Of the textbooks examined, about fifty books qualified as "satisfactory" and 165 as "unsatisfactory."

Among the books labeled by the D.A.R. as objectionable for use in public schools are those by the following authors: Theodore H. White, Margaret Mead, Burl Ives, Lincoln Steffens, Louis Untermeyer, Richard Wright, Bill Mauldin, Langston Hughes, Carey McWilliams, and Gordon Allport. The D.A.R. claims that these people are on
record in the House Committee on Un-American Activities. 12

Historians such as Henry Steele Commager, Herbert Agar, Harold Laski, and Allan Nevins were included in The Daughters' list of "liberal, racial, socialist or labor agitators." 13

Another organization openly concerned with reading materials in the schools is America's Future, Inc. Following are some pamphlets this organization publishes:

How the Reds Won, What's Happened to Our Schools, and How "Progressive" Is Your School? America's Future, Inc. also produces a radio program for John F. Flynn, one of its pamphleteers, and sponsors a Textbook Evaluation Committee that appraises texts in all fields of education. 14

The reasons America's Future offers for its textbook reviewing are similar to the reasons given by other organizations and interested individuals who zealously evaluate textbooks and library materials. The following is a quotation from an America's Future publication:

Many of our young men and women are coming out of our high schools and colleges with a contempt for American ideals. They have, instead, a notion that what they must work for and believe in is Big Government which will do all their thinking for them and guarantee them security from the cradle to the grave. Much of this fuzzy thinking can be traced to the textbooks used in our schools today. 15

Perhaps the feeling of extremists is characterized by the Reverend Ralph E. Wright of Midland, Texas. Mark
Sherwin in his book *The Extremists* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963) describes Wright as feeling "... all America's problems will be solved if he will be permitted to select the books that should be read."\(^{16}\)

Included among the books the Reverend Mr. Wright believes are "sending this country, its children, and adults to perdition" are *Andersonville*, 1984, *Brave New World*, *The Grapes of Wrath*, and *Of Time and the River*.\(^{17}\)

Mr. Wright insists that authors claimed to have been affiliated with the communist organizations should have their books banned. Included are Theodore Dreiser and his book *An American Tragedy*, Sinclair Lewis, Upton Sinclair, Oliver LaFarge and *Laughing Boy*, William Saroyan and *The Human Comedy*.\(^{18}\)

Book banning is, of course, not restricted to objections based on political motives. Many attempts at book banning are accompanied by cries of "obscene" and "filth." Perhaps no other book in recent years has given rise to such heated controversy as that generated by Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*.

The book is a fictional autobiography of Miller's life and thought in Paris during the 1930's. Banned from this country for twenty-seven years, it was first published in the United States by Grove Press in 1961. Since that time Grove estimates that $250,000 has been spent defending the book against obscenity charges in
about 100 courts. 19

A glance at the divergent decisions of a few courts will serve as an indication of the controversy surrounding Tropic. The Illinois Supreme Court unanimously found the book obscene after the Supreme Court in California had unanimously found it not obscene. It was found not obscene in Massachusetts by a 4-3 vote. In New York it was declared obscene by a 4-3 vote. 20 The United States Supreme Court ruled in June, 1964, that Tropic of Cancer was protected in every state.

Critical comment on Tropic is likewise extremely divided in opinion. At the Los Angeles obscenity trial, the criticism was indeed caustic. Frank Baxter, a television personality, had the following to say about the ill-fated book: "If this book depicts the private life of the average citizen of Los Angeles, I welcome with great joy the hydrogen bomb." 21 This criticism was leveled in reaction to the claim that Miller was making an attempt to capture realism.

At the same trial, Dr. Howard McDonald, president of Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences, commented as follows:

After I got through reading the book I wanted to take a bath. . . . I felt that I'd get venereal disease just from reading the book, it was so filthy, rather condoning that kind of life in the world. 22

Dr. Marcus Creighan, a psychiatrist, said "I
believe this book is for cannibals and animals and not for human distribution."\(^{23}\)

Leon Uris, the writer, had this to say at the Los Angeles trial: "I believe we have a right to defend ourselves against this type of garbage the same way we would any other ordinary criminal or any pervert walking the streets of Los Angeles."\(^{24}\)

George P. Elliott, writing in Harpoer's Magazine,\(^{25}\) said that *Tropic* should be censored, not because of the "pornography" but because of its nihilistic force. He claims it attacks the family through many examples of loveless sex.

The chaos in Miller's work was the subject of criticism by Alberto Moravia, writing in Sewanee Review. Moravia conceded that chaos has always existed in great literary works, but he criticizes Miller for never getting beyond chaos - as if held back by retarded growth.\(^{26}\)

In contrast to this harsh criticism, Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, George Orwell, and Edmund Wilson have saluted *Tropic* as a modern classic. Horace Gregory thinks of it as "Huck Finn in Paris."\(^{27}\) (The authors mentioned above have themselves been the object of much controversy.)

Miller has been praised by many for being responsible for an evolution in literary style. Eric Moon, reviewing *Tropic* in Library Journal credits Miller, along with James Joyce and D. H. Lawrence, of setting the style
for modern novels, and says that Miller "... has gone further into enemy territory than either of the other two." 28

Similarly, reviewing Tropic for the New York Times, Harry T. Moore credits Miller with being a "liberating influence" upon other writers. Moore suggests that many of Miller's values, especially "his attacks upon standardization and his reverence for life have been widely circulated and adopted, if only unconsciously." 29

Praise has also been proffered for Miller's account of Parisian life during the 1920's and 1930's. His account of a newspaper proofreader's life has been described as a "masterpiece of insight and expression." 30

Singing a song of limited praise for the book is Stanley Kauffmann in his review appearing in New Republic. 31 He evaluates Miller as being a good writer but says that Miller cannot be considered as great as Hemingway, Faulkner, or DosPassos. Kauffmann does claim, however, that Miller has his place as one providing a "breather" from conventional literature.

The objectionable words which were the basis of complaints by some critics were praised by others as contributing to the completion of a work of art. George Elliott says that "... as a work of art, it [Tropic] has considerable merit, and it could not achieve its ends without the use of intrinsically pornographic episodes
and images."\textsuperscript{32}

His use of taboo words, and his dwelling on sex and perversion is all part of the iconoclastic Miller style. He was attempting to loose the fetters from the standardized literature of the day. In \textit{Tropic of Cancer}, Miller says: "There is only one thing which interests me vitally now, and that is the recording of all that which is omitted in books."\textsuperscript{33}

In reaching this end, Miller has received strong criticism to the effect that his work is "obscene," and "filthy," and not fit for adult reading. It is indeed strange that the book has been kept from the hands for those it was intended - young people. Miller remarked in his essay, "Obscenity and the Law of Reflection" that it was written to appeal to the young.\textsuperscript{34}

Similar is the fate which has befallen J. D. Salinger's \textit{Catcher in the Rye}. The narrative of a sixteen-year-old with his lucid commentary (often utilizing four-letter words) on his experiences, \textit{Catcher} has been a controversial topic for teachers and librarians. A few examples will serve as illustrations.

As recently as December 1964, \textit{Catcher} was removed from the shelves of schools in Chatham County, Georgia by Superintendent Thord Marshall. The local chapter of \textit{Citizens for Decent Literature} complained that the novel "contained too many vulgar words."\textsuperscript{35}
A petition with 216 signatures protesting *Catcher's* presence on the reading list for English classes at Placer Union High School in Auburn, California, was presented early in April 1964 to the school board at a hearing of the book attended by 150 persons, some of whom defended the book for its literary qualities.  

The head of the board of education in Vestal, New York, recently declared that high school students in that town shouldn't be allowed to read some of the books by J. D. Salinger, Ernest Hemingway or James Baldwin. *Catcher*, he said, "is dirty and shouldn't be allowed in the doors of any secondary school in this country."  

Officials of the Tamalpais Union High School District in Marin County, California, received a complaint in November 1961 from a Baptist minister, Rev. Michael Barkowska, concerning *Catcher* and Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* being used in schools. "They bring reproach upon the name of God," he said, and contain "profanity, lewd words, and poor English." The minister read only excerpts from the book because he said he found the language too "sickening" to continue.  

In April of 1964 the Mr. Pleasant (Pa.) Joint School System banned *Catcher, 1984,* and *Brave New World.* The decision to remove *Catcher* was made on the strength of one phone call objecting to the book.  

It is interesting to note, as Edward Corbett points
out, that most reports about the banning of *Catcher* have told that a school principal, librarian, or parent hastily paged through the book and spotted several four-letter words. This was enough evidence to conclude that the book must go.

The best defense for *Catcher's* language is based on the art of the novel: "Given the point of view from which the novel is told, and given the kind of character that figures as the hero, no other language was possible." David Costello, writing in *American Speech*, defends the language in *Catcher* by stating his belief that *Catcher* will be valuable in coming decades, not only as a great literary art, but also as an example of teenage vernacular in the 1950's, just as we now study *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* for its 1884 dialect.

Costello states that reviewers in the Chicago *Sunday Tribune*, the London Times Literary Supplement, the *New Republic*, the *New York Herald Tribune* Book Review, the *New York Times*, the *New Yorker*, and the *Saturday Review of Literature* all mentioned specifically the authenticity of the book's language. Only the writers for *Catholic World* and the *Christian Science Monitor*, both religious publications, refused to believe that the "obscenity" was realistic.

Thus far, several examples of book-banning have been given with specific examples of attacks on *Tropic
of Cancer and Catcher in the Rye, both of which have been criticized for their "obscenities." Examples of banning and attacks on books declared to be "subversive" were also given. Let us now briefly summarize some of the arguments given for book banning and the methods utilized by organizations engaged in the banning of books.

The National Organization for Decent Literature is an active and much-publicized spokesman in the organized effort to fight obscenity. It was founded in December, 1938 by the Catholic Bishops of the United States. Its purpose was "to set in motion the moral forces of the entire country...against the lascivious type of literature which threatens moral, social, and national life."

According to the Rev. Harold C. Gardiner, S. J., in his book Catholic Viewpoint on Censorship, NODL was not considered by the founding bishops to be an exclusively Catholic movement. It was designed to coordinate activities and supply information to all interested groups.

The literature with which NODL is concerned is the comic book, the paperback, and the magazines that are available to youth at a low price. Although NODL is not concerned directly with school libraries, its list of banned books may influence members in a community to attack books purchased for a library, for NODL states its function as that of guiding public opinion. Whatever
suppression of books follows as a result of formed opinion is secondary; NODL does not consider censorship its chief function.45

NODL does reflect the Catholic viewpoint on censorship. That viewpoint, as expressed by Rev. Gardiner, suggests that freedom of the press can be subject to legitimate restriction just as any other freedom. Opposition to censorship rests on the concept of freedom whereby one may do as he pleases. If any freedom, including the freedom to read, is taken as an absolute right "...then the great and imperative human desires and needs will be lost in the shuffle."46

The Catholic viewpoint, as found in the Code of Canon Law and in authoritative commentaries on the Code, is very critical of literature considered to be "obscene." "Obscene," according to Canon Law, may be applied to a work of art intrinsically designed to arouse sexual passion.47

The effect of obscene literature on the mind of youth has been described by New York's Cardinal Spellman. In a 1964 speech, the Cardinal said that obscene pornographic literature "... scoffs at integrity, ridicules personal purity and decency, encourages brutality, injustice, irreverence, disrespect for authority and distorts a proper respect and correct understanding of the God-given gift of sex..."48
An organization with objectives similar to NODL is CDL - Citizens for Decent Literature. Through a program designed to inform and influence the public, it seeks a decline in the publication of literature it considers obscene. Through an aroused public, it encourages and supports the enforcement of law against undesirable publications. CDL does not consider itself a censorship group; it does not boycott stores or publish booklists.

The National Decency Reporter is the monthly newsletter of the Citizens for Decent Literature. Published in this news organ are arguments against obscene literature which are often repeated by persons and organizations devoted to the suppression of "smut" or obscene literature.

An argument often heard against such literature is given by Terry D. Schrunk, mayor of Portland, Oregon, in his "Statement on Obscene Literature" in the March/April issue of The National Decency Reporter. Mr. Schrunk says:

The drastic increases in crime, venereal disease, juvenile delinquency, illegitimacy, the rash disregard for the rights of others is, in my mind, directly related to the increase in the quantity and quality of written and filmed obscenity to which we are subjected.

Schrunk goes on to say that he believes this obscenity is destroying the morals of the country. "I think that it is a fiendish and calculated program to rot the foundations of our house of freedom and destroy the
Judeo-Christian strength upon which our forefathers built this great nation."

Schrunk also condemns the "fuzzy-thinking, so-called intellectuals who will defend this filth on the basis of freedom of expression."

A similar argument is given by J. F. Saunders. Saunders quotes statistics for teenage illegitimacy and venereal disease in Cleveland and concludes that obscene literature is a threat to the physical and moral welfare of young citizens - obscene literature contributes to a decline in morals.

This idea has been supported by experienced people in the field of human behavior. A psychiatrist, Dr. Joseph Zigarelli, has expressed his opinion that a normal person who reads Fanny Hill might go out and commit "abnormal" sexual acts.

In a more restrained version of this same argument, it has been suggested that adolescents have enough difficulty relating themselves to the love experience without being further confused by literature expounding sexual promiscuity and perversity. This concept has led to the belief that schools and libraries should keep the obscene or even the "wholesomely racy" works out of the hands of the immature reader.

Thus we see that books thought to be dangerous politically and morally have evoked a similar reaction
from certain quarters of a sensitive public: These books are too dangerous to circulate!

Before discussing theories surrounding the freedom to read and intellectual freedom, a discussion of the definition of obscenity is in order. The definition and discussion given below is extracted from a paper by Stanley Fleishman, a Los Angeles attorney who has served as attorney for the defense in many prominent censorship cases.

Fleishman points out that the Supreme Court of the United States, in defense of sex literature, stresses that sex is a vital problem of human interest about which information is necessary to enable members of society to cope with problems today.

The Supreme Court has announced the test of obscenity as follows: "...a work is obscene if to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material, taken as a whole, appeals to prurient interest." The court has defined "prurient interest" as "material having a tendency to excite lustful thoughts." It means "itching; longing; uneasy with desire or longing; of persons having itching, morbid, or lascivious longings; of desire, curiosity, or propensity, lewd."

Furthermore, the Supreme Court held that a literary work must be measured by its impact upon the "average
adult," not by its impact upon youth or upon "susceptible" persons.

Fleishman maintains, however, that neither the police, city attorney, juries, nor judges are qualified to censor alone. Only the individual is qualified to determine for himself what he can see or read. In relating this concept, Fleishman is echoing the beliefs of those opposed to censorship of any kind, and he is espousing the doctrine of intellectual freedom as outlined by John Milton in *Areopagitica*.

In *Areopagitica*, Milton attempted to demonstrate that the reading of books is dangerous, but the suppression or censorship of books is catastrophic, more devastating in a way than the taking of a human life. He argued that censorship will not succeed in suppressing scandalous, seditious, and libellous thoughts. The primary effect of censorship is the suppression of all learning - of truth itself.

Milton says that goodness is personal and must be derived from right choices. To choose rightly, a person must be free to choose. How, asks Milton, are men to know good, truth, virtue unless they also know what is evil and false? Aristotle, Dewey, Holmes and others also maintain that a man is free only so long as he may make his own choices. The right to read is basic to a democratic society,
based on the assumption that an educated free man may be entrusted with the power to discriminate wisely. By eliminating choice and imposing standards and tastes upon a community at large, the freedom to read is destroyed. And it is through books that new ideas are able to be communicated to large audiences. Books are one of our greatest instruments of freedom. Librarians have the responsibility of maintaining this freedom by making it possible for the reader to choose from a variety of books and points of view.

However, freedom, in the minds of some men, implies not freedom of thought, but freedom of certain thoughts. "It is the freedom to entertain 'right' ideas rather than the freedom to assert or to examine loathsome and erroneous ideas." These people may object to many literary works because they contain isolated elements considered distasteful. However, the writer - if a true artist - records life as he perceives it and must at times challenge the common values of his culture. The value of any piece of literature must be considered as a whole - not in part. One cannot expect literature to be completely free of unwholesome aspects of life if it is to reflect life accurately. Cardinal Newman once said that we cannot have a sinless literature about a sinful people.

In answer to those persons who debase certain
works because they are politically subversive, it should be pointed out that a person who denounces the right of an American to read a book dealing with Communism, the critic himself has adopted and acted upon a Communist principle. He is violating the fundamental American principle of freedom. 62

Even the Bible is open to objection to one or more of the following areas often cited as reasons for book banning: treatment of ideologies, of minorities, of love and sex; use of language not approved by certain segments of society; the type of illustration; private life or political affiliations of the author.63

Both Tropic of Cancer and Catcher in the Rye were attacked because the language was considered objectionable. Words are taboo only because of convention indefensible by reason. 64 "Ordure" and "copulate" have the meaning of more common four-letter words and evoke the same meaning. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the four-letter words would shock many young people who hear them daily on the streets. Jesse Shera argues the point as follows:

Any child whose working vocabulary of vulgarisms does not exceed by a substantial margin those set down by Mr. Miller in the pages of his book was either born deaf or was reared like Romulus and Remus - and, who knows, the wolves may have a word for it.65

People who fear the effect of literature considered obscene are probably overestimating the influence of
literature on a young person. Dr. Wardell Pomeroy, one of the co-authors of the Kinsey report, has testified that there is absolutely no scientific evidence to support the belief that reading pornographic literature may stimulate people to commit "overt sexual acts, much less crimes." 65

Dr. James N. McClure Jr., a member of the Department of Psychiatry faculty of Washington University, has said that most students of human behavior are skeptical of a link between obscene literature and delinquency in spite of the widely publicized views of police authorities. 67 Dr. McClure said that parents' attitudes and contacts with people around him conditions a youth's moral outlook.

Studies also show that delinquents read less than other youths. 68 Not reading is probably more dangerous than bad reading. A recent study by two faculty members from the University of Minnesota supports the arguments of Pomeroy and McClure and also indicated that delinquents read less than other youths.

A strong argument has been made in favor of pornographic literature by a federal court justice:

There are those who, because of lack of education, the meanness of their social existence or mental insufficiency, cannot cope with anything better. Slick paper confessions, pulp advertising, and comic books provide them with an escape from reality. 70

Another strong argument in defense of the freedom
to read states that attempts to suppress materials appear to have an adverse effect on a teacher's performance in the classroom. A study of 5200 school systems by the National Education Association disclosed that "teachers in many communities avoid discussing anything controversial with their students for fear of reprisals." 71

This same fear, coupled with the pressure of parents, civic groups, clergy, and the conflicting arguments by the National Council of Teachers of English, the American Library Association, NODL, and CDL, may seek refuge behind codes, booklists, and reviews. However, none is a safety zone; codes are generally inadequate for the selection or rejection of individual books, reviews are often conflicting in judgment, and many titles on recommended booklists are often on the banned lists of NODL, the DAR, or other organizations.

For instance, the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries is acknowledged to be a reputable selection guide for junior and senior high school libraries. Books recommended for school libraries in the 1962 edition include the following books which were mentioned earlier in this paper as those having been attacked as unfit for school use: Ben and Me, The Odyssey, 1984, American Tragedy, Laughing Boy, and The Human Comedy. Also recommended are certain works by the following controversial authors attacked for various reasons: Anton Chekhov,
Mark Twain, Sinclair Lewis, Langston Hughes and Upton Sinclair. In addition, the following authors condemned by the DAR have works recommended in Standard Catalog: Theodore H. White, Margaret Mead, Burl Ives, Lincoln Steffens, Louis Untermeyer, Langston Hughes, Carey McWilliams, Henry Steele Commager, and Allan Nevins. Use of the Standard Catalog will not, therefore, protect a librarian against attempts to suppress materials.

Certainly, a librarian should use selection aids, but these should not be expected to serve as a deterrent against censorship attempts. A librarian should be prepared for possible criticism and action against certain books selected. He should have a knowledge of the criteria by which books are evaluated. He should be aware of pressure groups and their techniques, some of which have been discussed in this paper. The librarian should by all means be aware of and be ready to activate methods to deal with objectors.

Means for counteracting the attacks of pressure groups have been proposed and accepted by many national organizations, including the National Education Association, National Council for the Social Studies, American Library Association, Association of American Colleges, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the American Legion, and the National Council of Teachers of English.
The "School Library Bill of Rights" is an excellent policy statement on book selection. This document, affirming the "library Bill of Rights" adopted by the American Library Association, was adopted by the American Association of School Librarians in 1955. It takes a firm stand in support of stimulating wide reading, providing guidance in the practice of critical reading and thinking, examining various sides of controversial issues, and selecting materials of the highest quality for library users.

"The Students' Right to Read" is an excellent pamphlet suggesting a program to counteract literature suppression. In this pamphlet, NCTE suggest a two-part program to protect the students' right to read:

1. The establishment of a committee of teachers to consider book selection and to screen outside complaints.

2. A vigorous campaign to establish a community climate in which informed local citizens may be enlisted to support the freedom to read.

In addition to considering complaints against books, NCTE recommends that the committee of teachers inform the community on book choices and enlist support from citizens, possibly by explaining policies at such meetings of parent groups as those called by the PTA.

NCTE suggests a standard procedure for answering
complaints. If the complainant telephones, his arguments should be heard courteously, and he should be invited to file his complaint in writing on the recommended form, "Citizens Request for Reconsideration of a Book" (See Appendix). If he writes a letter of complaint, acknowledge the letter promptly and politely. Make no commitments, admissions of guilt, or threats.

The teachers' committee to review complaints should re-evaluate the book before the complainant appears before the committee, and the committee should be prepared to explain their findings. If the committee finds the book suitable for student use, they may take their case to the newspaper or other local news channel. In cases in which a teacher is inadequately prepared to teach literature or lacks judgment and receives complaints against his selection, the committee should not blindly defend materials they find substandard or nonliterary.

Complaints to schools unprepared to meet the challenge of censorship may frighten the faculty and administration into an unwise course of action. A standardized procedure will prevent this and will tend to discourage the troublemaker from taking further action. The responsible objector will be satisfied that he will be heard properly.

The above recommendations of NCTE provide for a systematic reply to any individual or group who are dis-
satisfied with materials selection. Parts or all of this or a similar plan should be adopted by every school. Criteria for book selection should be evaluated, stated in writing, and adopted by the librarian(s) and school board. A committee should be activated to review complaints concerning selection, and these complaints should be written on standardized forms. The results of decisions made by such a committee should be publicized.

Such planning for possible attacks on book selection is necessitated by the activities of individuals and organizations seeking to pressure librarians and administrators to remove printed material from the library and classroom shelves. Selection aids and booklists compiled by professional education organizations do not assure freedom from the attack of pressure groups. A knowledge of literature and the motives, organization, and tactics of pressure groups is needed to afford protection against those who, sometimes unwittingly, by attacking books are threatening one of our basic freedoms: the freedom of expression. They are also restricting the students' freedom of choice - the freedom to read differing points of view and to make a choice between these points of view. To the librarian and school administration falls the responsibility of defending the students' right to read. This freedom is attacked by groups and individuals who wish to restrict the freedom
to read to the freedom to read the books they consider "right" and "good"; however, restricted freedom is not freedom at all.
APPENDIX A

SCHOOL LIBRARY BILL OF RIGHTS

School libraries are concerned with generating understanding of American freedoms and with the preservation of these freedoms through the development of informed and responsible citizens. To this end the American Association of School Librarians re-affirms the Library Bill of Rights of the American Library Association and asserts that the responsibility of the school library is:

To provide materials that will enrich and support the curriculum, taking into consideration the varied interests, abilities, and maturity levels of the pupils served.

To provide materials that will stimulate growth in factual knowledge, literary appreciation, aesthetic values, and ethical standards.

To provide a background of information which will enable pupils to make intelligent judgments in their daily life.

To provide materials on opposing sides of controversial issues so that young citizens may develop under guidance the practice of critical reading and thinking.

To provide materials representative of the many religious, ethnic, and cultural groups and their contributions to our American heritage.

To place principle above personal opinion and reason above prejudice in the selection of materials of the highest quality in order to assure a comprehensive collection appropriate for users of the library.

(Endorsed by the Council of the American Library Association, July, 1955)
APPENDIX B

CITIZEN'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF A BOOK

Author ___________________________ Hardcover ______ Paperback ______

Title ______________________________

Publisher (if known) ___________________________

Request initiated by __________________________

Telephone ______ Address __________________________

City ______________________________ Zone ______

Complainant represents

______ himself

______(name organization) __________________________

______(identify the other group) __________________________

1. To what in the book do you object? (Please be specific; cite pages.) __________________________

2. What do you feel might be the result of reading this book? __________________________

3. For what age group would you recommend this book? __________

4. Is there anything good about this book? __________________________

5. Did you read the entire book? ____ What parts? __________________________

6. Are you aware of the judgment of this book by literary critics? __________________________

7. What do you believe is the theme of this book? __________________________

8. What would you like your school to do about this book?

______ do not assign it to my child

______ withdraw it from all students as well as from my child

______ send it back to the English department office for reevaluation

9. In its place, what book of equal literary quality would you recommend that would convey as valuable a picture and perspective of our civilization? __________________________

Signature of Complainant __________________________
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