

Censorship, Intellectual Freedom, Librarianship and the Democratic State

Richard Fitzsimmons, Ph.D.
The Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

This paper will deal with that aspect of intellectual freedom, which encompasses the library as an institution and its role in social change and education. Censorship of specific publications spurred librarians to take initial steps toward establishing a stand supporting intellectual freedom. Censorship, in this context, means not only the deletion or excision of parts of published materials, but also efforts to ban, prohibit, suppress, prosecute, remove, label, or restrict materials. Rightly or wrongly, opposition to these activities emanates from the belief that individual intellectual freedom is basic to the functioning and maintenance of democracy.

This paper will argue that educated, free individuals possess powers of discrimination and are to be trusted to determine their own actions. Further, the paper will hold that only through a thoroughly informed electorate can real choices be made to guarantee the effectiveness and continuance of the democratic process.

This presentation will explain that censorship denies the opportunity to choose from all possible alternatives, and thereby violates intellectual freedom. Opposition to censorship derives naturally from the library's historical role as an educational institution to provide materials to develop individuals' abilities, interest, and knowledge, and that the library professionals' position aims to ensure individuals intellectual freedom for the benefit of society as a whole.

Censorship

In modern thought, censorship is an effort by a government, private organization, group, or individual to prevent people from reading, seeing, or hearing what may be considered as dangerous to government or harmful to public morality.

Censorship may be exercised on political, religious, or moral grounds, making the offense one of treason, heresy, or obscenity. At different times censorship has been undertaken by the state, by the priesthood, and by unofficial groups.

In a restricted sense censorship refers to the work of a person or agency with the authority to come between the producer to publish, and the consumer to acquire knowledge of, the censored materials. In a looser interpretation the term is used to describe the enactment and enforcement of laws that restrict the freedom to publish unless these laws deal with the protection of the rights of others, as in cases of slander, libel, or copyright infringement.

Freedom of the press did not exist in Communist countries, where the press was considered an instrument of the state. A noncritical attitude toward the government was enforced by the government and the press functioned primarily as an agent to report and support decisions of the

government.

Countries that have a free press, on the other hand, believe the citizen should know what the government is doing and must be free to criticize it. This coincides with the democratic belief that a democracy can exist only so long as an enlightened citizenry is contributing new ideas for the guidance of the government _ and is participating in shaping the decisions that are being made.

Tolerance and Intellectual Freedom

Although the history of censorship has been a story of repression and persecution, it has also been a chronicle of tolerance and freedom. Some of the basic premises relating to intellectual freedom have been variously expressed by different people and groups. One of the first philosophers to express a rational defense of freedom of speech was Socrates, who asserted the supremacy of his conscience over the decision of the jury and declared that he was a public benefactor when he exercised freedom of inquiry. Another classic principled argument for freedom from censorship was that of John Milton in *Areopagitica*. Milton believed the first freedom was the liberty to know and to argue freely according to conscience. He said:

We should be wary therefore what persecution we raise against the living labours of publick men, how we spill that season'd life of man preserv'd and stor'd up in Books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom; and if it extend to the whole impression, a kind of massacre, whereof the execution ends not in the slaying of an elementall life, but strikes at the ethereall and fift(h) essence, the breath of reason itselfe, slaies an immortality rather than a life.

John Locke's *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) argued that states should have no control over the religious beliefs and observances of men and that tolerance should be extended to nonconformists and pagans; however, he excepted Catholics and atheists. Much of American constitutional law relating to the freedoms of religion, press, speech, and assembly has been an outgrowth of Locke's theory.

John Stuart Mill believed that every man is the best judge of his own actions and welfare and is competent to choose for himself what he will read or hear. In his essay *On Liberty* (1859) Mill expressed his conviction that bold expression of thought is important:

Who can compute what the world loses in the multitude of promising intellects combined with timid characters, who dare not follow out any bold, vigorous, independent train of thought, lest it should land them in something which would admit of being considered irreligious or immoral? ... No one can be a great thinker who does not recognize that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead... There is always hope when people are forced to listen to both sides. It is when they attend only one that errors harden into prejudices and truth itself ceases to have the effect of truth, by being exaggerated into falsehood.

At the end of the eighteenth century several documents advanced the cause of freedom. These were the American Declaration of Independence (1776), the French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789), and the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution (1791).

Libraries and Intellectual Freedom

The American Library Association (ALA) has fought efforts at library censorship. The Library Bill of Rights adopted by the ALA in 1948 stresses the need to resist "all abridgment of the free access to ideas and full freedom of expression." The Bill has its basis in the first and fourteenth amendments

to the Constitution of the United States. It takes an unequivocal stand on the freedom to read and it supports democracy in full measure in the principle, "There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national and local."

Part of the responsibility of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom of the ALA is guarding, protecting, defending, and extending intellectual freedom. It performs a "backstopping" function for the Library Bill of Rights and stands firm on the ALA statement that "Censorship of books, urged or practiced by volunteer arbiters of morals or political opinion or by organizations that would establish a coercive concept of Americanism, must be challenged by libraries in maintenance of their responsibility to provide public enlightenment through the printed word."

In 1953 the ALA endorsed a "Freedom to Read" statement against groups that seek to remove, censor, or label books. The statement expressed the ALA's responsibility for making "available the widest diversity of views and expressions, including those which are unorthodox or unpopular with the majority." Concern was also voiced about the danger of suppressing ideas. The point was made that freedom had given the United States the elasticity to endure strain, but "Every silencing of heresy, every enforcement of an orthodoxy, diminishes the toughness and resilience of our society and leaves it less able to deal with stress."

Other propositions affirmed in the Freedom to Read statement are: (1) Publishers and librarians do not need to endorse every idea or presentation contained in the books they make available... (2) It is contrary to the public interest for publishers or librarians to determine the acceptability of a book solely on the basis of the personal history or political affiliations of the author... No society of free men can flourish which draws up lists of writers to whom it will not listen, whatever they may have to say. (3) It is the responsibility of publishers and librarians, as guardians of the people's freedom to read, to contest encroachment upon that freedom by individuals or groups seeking to impose their own standards or tastes upon the community at large... No group has the right to take the law into its own hands, and to impose its own concepts of politics or morality upon other members of a democratic society.

Throughout the library profession, as taught in schools of librarianship, the highest professional task of the librarian is the development of a collection that fits the community. Although any member of the community may criticize a particular selection, no one but the librarian should presume to speak for the users of the library. The Librarian is ethically bound not to overrepresent one group at the expense of another with funds that almost always are limited. Various disciplines for the study of community organization will reveal the character and research requirements of a local group and show its diversity as well as its uniformity. Content analysis is an established technique, which, within the constraints imposed by the need for objectivity, can assist in the evaluation of a work, so that the librarian who is asked why he bought a particular work can give an effective and professional answer. Such refined methods are usually unnecessary, but if a case should develop where sanctions may be imposed either on the librarian or the library itself, it being the privilege of a professional organization (or union) to reprimand institutions, some objective means of study is required.

Until it is determined who can censor effectively for everyone, it is not possible to determine whether censorship is valid. The choice must be made on another basis. Is censorship desirable? That can only be determined by various communities and societies, but the decision to restrict or constrain expression almost invariably causes intellectual and artistic stagnation, whatever good effect it may also have. For librarians, whether in a public library or dealing with a special collection, no instrument of censorship may ever be tolerated.

Censorship and Professionalism

The controversial aspects of censorship have reached the point where the librarian cannot afford to

be passive in the life in the community. A strong position, taken early, is the best defense against self-appointed voluntary groups, but only with a rationalization of the laws - a prospect that seems far more likely than ever before - can much of the hypocrisy be shown for what it is. Librarians owe the school and public librarians aid in a particularly difficult position, for the privilege of parents to determine the kind of education a child receives is beyond the scope of law and an area into which the school and public librarian move with great caution.

School librarians are in the position of needing much clearer understanding of their role in order to explain what obligates the library to keep books on its shelves of which some parents disapprove. Where there is controversy, the library serves its greatest function by providing the information which brings the issues into focus and prevents the triumph of propaganda over a balanced understanding of the whole problem. The community is led to deprecate the profession if there is no clear understanding that the librarians are motivated by a desire neither to change society nor to prevent change but to insure the freedom of access to libraries and to library collections by those qualified to use them. Librarians are now closer to the swift flow of communication than ever before; consequently, they enter into controversial areas much sooner than they have done in the past. The librarians' protection is participation in the affairs of the community, utilizing special knowledge for the benefits that society hopes to achieve. University administrators recognize that the university itself is becoming part of a community movement where its role must be recognized as centering on objective research without attempting to twist conclusions to fit established attitudes. The right of privacy must be guarded while the right of access to the public forum is kept unobstructed.

If a librarian truly believes that he/she must fight censorship that prevents access to intellectual resources, whatever they may be, and yet protect the right of privacy, he/she must be willing to participate in community affairs to the extent of monitoring events that conflict with these articles of faith. This means aiding librarians who are fighting censorship, either covert or overt in nature, and beyond that entering into the larger areas when any person or group attempts to become the guardians of public morality. The experience is not pleasant; there is much preparation for testifying at an obscenity trial and one must be prepared for the condemnation that is necessarily possible whenever one seems to be protective of "filth," "smut," and "lewd, obscene, and lascivious" material. The results are often not what is expected and one must be prepared both to endure unwarranted enthusiasm when he is successful - because one victory does not end the war, it only achieves a respite before the next attack begins - and to make disappointment only the spur to further effort, not the end of all hope. Failure may be as temporary as success.

Perspective

Censorship is a negative factor, whereas the basic freedoms are positive and are mandatory in a democratic society. President Eisenhower said in 1953: "As it is an ancient truth that freedom cannot be legislated into existence, so it is no less obvious that freedom cannot be censored into existence. And any who act as if freedom's defenses are to be found in suppression and suspicion and fear confess a doctrine that is alien to America." Speaking for liberation and against repression, with specific application to books, President Whitney Griswold of Yale University said, "Books won't stay banned. They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost. The only sure weapon against bad ideas is better ideas."

Many librarians tend to assume that intellectual freedom in libraries is a tradition. A corollary assumption is that intellectual freedom has always been a principal part of the philosophy underlying library service. Both assumptions are grounded in the belief that the library profession supports a static concept. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth.

Librarianship's attitude toward intellectual freedom has been subject to undulating change ever since the late 1800s when, through the American Library Association (ALA), it first began to

approach such issues with the semblance of a unified voice.

The Association has never endorsed a uniform definition of intellectual freedom. Instead, through its governing Council, and the Intellectual Freedom Committee, and the Office for Intellectual Freedom, ALA has promoted a variety of principles aimed at fostering a favorable climate for intellectual freedom, but delimited by no basic definition. In effect, this approach has allowed a vague definition to evolve, one which, like a stellar constellation, expands and contracts as it moves searchingly through time.

The imprecise definition began with a central thrust: censorship of published materials. From this main trunk of the intellectual freedom tree, numerous branches continue to spring. One concerns the library user and access to all the materials in a library collection. Another pertains to the librarian and the practice of the profession, particularly selecting and making available all published materials to all library users, without fear of reprisals. A variant of this branch involves the librarian's personal intellectual freedom, participation in the democratic process, the right to express oneself freely, the right to pursue a chosen life style without fear of threats to one's professional position.

Yet another aspect of intellectual freedom encompasses the library as an institution and its role in social change and education, particularly regarding the question of advocacy versus neutrality. Each of these main branches has spawned a plethora of leaves, and the entirety makes anything other than an issue-oriented approach a near impossibility. Consequently, the profession's stance on intellectual freedom sometimes lags behind society at large; for the most part it parallels public opinion; only occasionally does it anticipate changes in taste, mores, and social concerns, to take positions in advance of the rest of the citizenry.

Censorship and Published Materials

Censorship of specific publications spurred librarians to take initial steps toward establishing a stand supporting intellectual freedom. Censorship, in this context, means not only deletion or excision of parts of published materials, but also efforts to ban, prohibit, suppress, proscribe, remove, label, or restrict materials. Rightly or wrongly, opposition to these activities emanates from the belief that individual intellectual freedom is basic to the functioning and maintenance of democracy. It assumes that educated, free individuals possess powers of discrimination and are to be trusted to determine their own actions. Only through a thoroughly informed electorate can real choices be made to guarantee the effectiveness and continuance of the democratic process. Denying the opportunity of choice for fear it may be used unwisely destroys freedom itself. Opposition to censorship derives naturally from the library's historical role as an educational institution to provide materials to enhance the development of individuals' abilities, interests, and knowledge. Censorship denies the opportunity to choose from all possible alternatives and thereby violates intellectual freedom. The library profession's position aims to ensure individuals' intellectual freedom for the benefit of society as a whole. Even in this central area of concern, however, the professional stance has fluctuated, being influenced by such considerations as taste, quality, responsibility, morality, legality, and purpose.

The ALA's seminal position opposing censorship emerged in the late 1930s when John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* became the target of censorship pressures around the United States. While some objections to *Grapes of Wrath* referred to "immorality," most opposed the social views advanced by the author.

The ALA's first response to the pressures against *Grapes of Wrath* was adoption in 1939 of the Library's Bill of Rights, the precursor of the present Library Bill of Rights. It became the profession's basic policy statement on intellectual freedom involving library materials. To a large extent, it comprises a definition of various aspects of intellectual freedom as it relates to libraries, library materials, and library service.

A year after adoption of the Library's Bill of Rights, the Association established the Intellectual Freedom Committee (IFC) "to recommend such steps as may be necessary to safeguard the rights of library users in accordance with the Bill of Rights and the Library's Bill of Rights as adopted by Council." Although the IFC's role has varied, its main function has been to recommend policies concerning intellectual freedom, especially -but not limited to - matters involving violations of the Library Bill of Rights. Although its original statement of authority referred only to library users, in reality, the IFC became active in promoting intellectual freedom for librarians and others, as well. Its diversified role was recognized and formalized in 1970 with Council approval of a revised statement of authority which reads:

To recommend such steps as may be necessary to safeguard the rights of library users, libraries, and librarians, the Library Bill of Rights is adopted by the Council. To work closely with the Office for Intellectual Freedom and with other units and officers of the Association in matters touching intellectual freedom and censorship (1).

The original Library's Bill of Rights focused on unbiased book selection, a balanced collection, and open meeting rooms. It did not mention censorship and removal of materials at the behest of groups or individuals. Over the years, though, the policy statement has been revised, amended, and interpreted, often in response to specific situations with general implications. The first was a 1944 amendment against banning materials believed to be factually correct. It was occasioned by attacks on *Under Cover*, an exposé of Nazi organizations in the United States, and *Strange Fruit*, a novel about interracial love. Reference to "factually correct" was later dropped, but the directive against removal of materials remained. Opposition to censorship of nonprint media was amended to the document in 1951 because of attacks on films alleged to promote communism. To combat suppression of communist materials or other allegedly "subversive" publications, the Association issued its Statement on Labeling (approved 1951; revised 1971) which explained that designating materials subversive is subtle censorship because it predisposes readers toward the materials. Responding to pressures against materials about civil rights activities, a 1967 amendment warned against excluding materials because of the social views of the authors.

The present Library Bill of Rights, with its interpretive documents, recognizes that censorship of any materials, in any guise, eventually affects the library. Therefore, it provides principles for libraries to support, in the broadest sense, and to oppose censorship and promote intellectual freedom. Referring directly to censorship practices, it states that no library materials should be excluded because of the race or nationality or the social, political, or religious views of the author, and that no library materials should be proscribed or removed because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval.

If followed by librarians and governing bodies, the ALA's policy statements provide effective means to prevent library censorship. Ideally, application of these policies in materials selection, circulation practices, and complaint handling establishes the library as an indispensable information source for individuals exercising freedom of inquiry.

Free Access to Library Collections

Access to library collections and services is another intellectual freedom concern of the profession. For intellectual freedom to flourish, opposition to censorship of materials is not enough. Access to materials, without prejudice, to every member of the community must also be assured. The ALA first recognized this in the 1939 Library's Bill of Rights which included a provision that library meeting rooms be available on equal terms to all groups in the community, regardless of the beliefs and affiliations of their members. In 1967 this doctrine was amended by the qualification "provided that the meetings be open to the public."

Another policy on access emerged from a study of segregation made by the association's Special

Committee on Civil Liberties during the late 1950s. One result of the study was a 1961 amendment to the Library Bill of Rights stating that "the rights of an individual to the use of a library should not be denied or abridged because of his race, religion, national origin or political views" (2). This amendment was broadened in 1967 when "social views" and "age" were incorporated to emphasize other areas of potential discrimination. The concept of "social" was added to safeguard access for advocates of causes viewed unfavorably by segments of the community. "Age" was included to resolve a long-standing debate regarding the right of minors to have access to library collections on the same basis as adults. The amendment emanated from a special meeting on "Intellectual Freedom and the Teenager" held prior to ALA's 1967 annual conference. The recommendation of the preconference "that free access to all books in a library collection be granted to young people" (3) illustrates one instance in which the library profession acted well in advance of public opinion. Even the United States President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, in its final report in 1970, recommended that minors not be allowed access to access to certain pictorial materials. The Commission pointed out, however, that its recommendation was not supported by empirical data, but was based instead on the finding that most adults believe such materials are harmful to minors.

Notwithstanding the Commission's recommendation, the Association maintains its support of free access for minors to all materials in a library collection. Through its 1973 "Restricted Access to Library Materials: an Interpretation of the Library Bill of Rights," the Association reiterated its policy.

In 1971, at the urging of the Task Force on Gay Liberation of the Social Responsibilities Round Table, the Association supported the intellectual freedom of other groups of library users when it recommended that libraries and members strenuously combat discrimination in service to individuals from all minority groups, whether the distinguishing characteristics of the minority be ethnic, social, religious, or of any other kind.

Another aspect of the library patron's access to materials was broached in 1970 when agents of the Internal Revenue Service requested permission from several libraries to examine circulation records to determine the names of persons reading materials about explosives and guerrilla warfare. Again, the profession's response came through the Association which issued its Policy on the Confidentiality of Library Records, urging libraries to designate such records as confidential and accessible only "pursuant to such process, order, or subpoena as may be authorized under the authority of, and pursuant to, federal, state, or local law relating to civil, criminal, or administrative discovery procedures or legislative investigatory power" (4). Its rationale was that circulation records are purely circumstantial evidence that a patron has read a book, and that fear of persecution or prosecution may restrain users from borrowing any conceivably controversial materials, for whatever purpose.

The question of library records and the confidentiality of relationships between librarians and library users arose again in 1971 regarding the "use of the grand jury procedure to intimidate anti-Vietnam activists and people seeking justice for minority communities." (5) In response, the Association asserted "the confidentiality of the professional relationships of librarians to the people they serve, that these relationships be respected in the same manner as medical doctors to their patients, lawyers to their clients, priests to the people they serve," and that "no librarian would lend himself to a role as informant, whether of voluntarily revealing circulation records or identifying patrons and their reading habits."

Through the Association's various position statements, the profession has established a code of free access to services and materials for all library users, and opposed use of the library as a tool to intimidate patrons. In effect, the intellectual freedom of the library user is enhanced not only by provision of all materials required, but by access to all materials, on an equal basis, without fear of recrimination for pursuing one's interests.

The Librarian and Intellectual Freedom

While the profession formulates policies to help ensure a climate favorable to intellectual freedom, the individual librarian is the ultimate key to achieving the end result. Adherence to policies such as the Library Bill of Rights is the only means to effect the goals of the profession. Consequently, the concept of intellectual freedom also includes consideration for the individual librarian's intellectual freedom, both in pursuit of one's professional responsibilities and in one's personal life. Accordingly, several agencies within or closely affiliated with librarianship function to encourage and protect the commitment of librarians to principles of intellectual freedom.

After ALA's adoption of the Library Bill of Rights and establishment of the Intellectual Freedom Committee, the profession realized that more than just informational sources were needed to foster the practice of intellectual freedom in libraries. Some called for a sort of "policing" effort to publicize censorship problems and bring pressure upon authorities to correct conditions conducive to censorship. As early as the 1948 ALA annual conference, Dr. Robert D. Leigh, director of the Public Library Inquiry, addressed the Council and recommended that "some responsible group" (6) be created to investigate reports of library censorship, to make public reports of investigations, to give possible aid to professionals who become victims of censorship, and in extreme cases, to exercise "a professional boycott against the libraries of censoring authorities." Some of Dr. Leigh's recommendations were debated for nearly twenty years before a national resolution to the problems began to emerge. As a first substantive step, in 1969 the Association adopted its Program of Action in Support of the Library Bill of Rights.

Both as citizens and professionals, we will strive by all legitimate means open to us to be relieved of the threat of personal, economic, and legal reprisals resulting from our support and defense of the principles of intellectual freedom.

Those who refuse to compromise their ideals in support of intellectual freedom have often suffered dismissals from employment, forced resignations, boycotts of products and establishments, and other invidious forms of punishment. We perceive the admirable, often lonely, refusal to succumb to threats of punitive action as the highest form of true professionalism, dedication to the cause of intellectual freedom and the preservation of vital human and civil liberties. (7)

In the combined forces of the Intellectual Freedom Committee, the Office for Intellectual Freedom, the Staff Committee on Mediation, Arbitration and Inquiry, and the Freedom to Read Foundation, the library profession has available a complete program to support the practice of intellectual freedom. The objectives of these efforts are to educate librarians to the importance of intellectual freedom, to encourage librarians to make a commitment to practicing intellectual freedom, and to protect librarians in their pursuit of professional responsibilities. Through the Association's multi-faceted program, the profession has reached a state whereby these objectives may theoretically be met.

In a closely-related area, however, the profession has not yet achieved the same success: the area of the librarian's personal intellectual freedom versus his professional commitment to intellectual freedom. The question of what support should be given to librarians who suffer professionally because of personal beliefs and actions has been approached in individual cases but by no means has been resolved.

The Library and Intellectual Freedom

Each aspect of intellectual freedom in libraries which has been discussed to this point has involved people - the library user and access to all published materials, and the librarian and the practice of the profession or personal intellectual freedom. One last branch of the intellectual freedom tree remains, that being the library as an institution and the nature of its role in social change and education. The issue has been summarized as one of neutrality versus advocacy, and has been one of continuing debate among the profession. In essence, the question is: can libraries, as institutions, advocate social or political causes and still maintain their image as providers of views

representing all sides of all questions?

Whenever the question is raised, it initiates further queries. What constitutes "advocating a cause?" Biased book selection? Biased displays? Prejudicial assignment of library meeting rooms? What constitutes a cause? Peace? Ecology? Democracy? If a library sponsors a display of books on peace, must it - in order to maintain neutrality -also sponsor a display on war?

The questions are complex, and the answers have shown no uniformity whatsoever. The ALA itself vacillated on the main issue, coming to a resolution of sorts in the late 1960s and early 1970s. At the 1969 annual conference, the membership and the Council debated whether or not the Association should take a public stand opposing the war in Vietnam or opposing deployment of an Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM). It was argued that political and moral issues are so deeply entangled with education and library issues that institutions (in this case, ALA and libraries) are obligated to take such positions.

Those who opposed such positions argued in favor of neutrality on questions not directly related to libraries. They argued that intellectual freedom for those librarians opposed to the majority view would be violated if the Association attempted to take stands on social and political issues. They further maintained they had tradition on their side since the Association has always declined to take a stand on issues not directly related to libraries. That argument, of course, was incorrect. The Association had previously taken stands in some instances and refused in others. For example, in June 1921, the ALA Council espoused a very decided position on the question of disarmament after World War I.

However, in 1928, when faced by a request from the American Civil Liberties Union that ALA adopt "one or more resolutions on civil liberty", the ALA Executive Board declined, saying the Association "does not take actions on questions outside the library and bibliographic field. (8) That was similar to the philosophy which prevailed in 1969, when the Vietnam and ABM resolutions failed to pass in Council.

After a great deal of debate, the Council voted at its 1970 annual conference to "define the broad social responsibilities of ALA in terms of...the willingness of ALA to take a position on current critical issues with the relationship to libraries and library service clearly set forth in the position statement."

With subsequent approval of the Vietnam resolution, the Association seemed to give broad latitude to interpretation of the old "library and bibliographic field." However, this more permissive interpretation still did not resolve the more basic question among the profession regarding whether libraries themselves should follow the course of neutrality or advocacy.

A Gauge for Measuring the Profession's Response

The foregoing comments illustrate that anything other than an issue-oriented, time-centered definition of intellectual freedom is impossible. The profession's attitude toward censorship of published materials, print or nonprint, seems quite uniform: all such efforts are viewed with disdain. The attitude toward user access is somewhat uniform, but contains a great deal of dissent on the question of access for minors to all the materials in a library collection. On the question of the librarians' ability to practice intellectual freedom in his/her professional capacity, there is near agreement: every effort should be made to encourage and protect this aspect of librarianship. The librarian's personal intellectual freedom, on and off the job, presents some points of agreement, but major areas of dissent still exist. The same is true in the area of institutional neutrality vs. advocacy.

One conclusion from a review of the history, status, and future of intellectual freedom in libraries is that professional positions and programs provide one of the few gauges for measuring the

profession's response to the problems of defining, promoting, and defending the concept. Gradually shifting positions reflect the steady emergence of a philosophy from among the entire library community. While the philosophy exhibits fuzzy, loose ends, its core grows firmer, based on a history of trial-and-error and forced response to a changing social climate. The evolving philosophy is young, too young to be rooted in tradition. But, gradually, it has gained recognition as a principal part of the total philosophy underlying library service.

References

1. American Library Association, Handbook of Organization 1971_72. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971. 13.
 2. American Library Association, Policies, Procedures and Position Statements. 2d ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1970. 63.
 3. Ervin J. Gaines, "Intellectual Freedom and the Teenager." Newsletter on Intellectual Freedom, 26(5): 55 (September 1967).
 4. American Library Association, Policies, "Addendum to ALA Policies" 6.
 5. "Resolution on Governmental Intimidation," American Libraries, 2: 834 (September 1971).
 6. Robert D. Leigh, "Intellectual Freedom," ALA Bulletin, 42(8): 369 (September 1948).
 7. "Intellectual Freedom Statement." ALA Bulletin, 2(8): 382 (September 1971).
 8. American Library Association. Minutes of Executive Board Meetings (May 29, 1928), 4:142 (June 25, 1927 -May 14, 1929).
-

Bibliography

- Berdson, B., Content Analysis in Communications Research. Free Press, New York, 1952.
- Blanchard, P., Right to Read, Beacon Press, Boston, 1955.
- Bryson, L., "Freedom of Information," in Freedom and Culture, UNESCO, Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1950.
- Bury, J. B., History of Freedom of Thought, 2d ed., Oxford, Toronto, 1952.
- Chafee, Z., Jr., The Blessings of Liberty, rev., Lippincott, New York, 1956.
- Craig, A., The Banned Books of England, Macmillan, New York, 1940.
- Downs, R. B., The First Freedom, American Library Assoc., Chicago, 1960.
- Douglas, W. O., The Right of the People, Doubleday, New York, 1958.
- Ernst, M. L., and A. U. Schwartz, Censorship, the Search for the Obscene, Macmillan, New York, 1964.
- Fellman, D., The Limits of Freedom, Rutgers Univ., Press, New Brunswick, N.J., 1959.
- Gellhorn, W., American Rights, Macmillan, New York, 1960.
- Haight, A. L., Banned Books, 2d ed., rev. and enlarged, Bowker, New York, 1955.
- Hocking, W. E., Freedom of the Press, Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, 1947.
- Konritz, M. R., Fundamentals Liberties of a Free People, Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, N.Y., 1957.
- McKeon, R. P., et al., Freedom to Read, Bowker, New York, 1957.
- Popper, K. R., Open Society and Its Enemies, 4th ed., Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1962.
- Saunders, H. E., The Modern School Library, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, N.J., 1968.