At any given moment of time in any individual library the book collection is the payoff on the librarian's performance as selector (or as censor). The book collection is the basic evidence of the librarian's professional competence in choosing the materials he sets before the public. It indicates whether he understands the community his library is designed to serve, whether he is aware of public demand that is latent as well as that which is blatant, whether he has courage to reject as well as to buy, whether he sees the whole forest while he is selecting some of the trees. The book collection is the eating of the pie of selection. Yet it is so intimate and individual a matter both for the librarian and for the library user, it varies so in its content from library to library, that it is impossible to deal with it practically or in detail except in an extended report on a particular library.

I doubt that I am competent to discuss the book collection in any library but my own. In any case there is not time to describe a total book collection even of a few thousand volumes. What I can do here is to discuss some of the conditions surrounding selection. This will mean giving somewhat more attention to the attitudes of the public and of librarians than to individual books. Books are important in themselves but as volumes on a library shelf they are, first of all, significant in relation to use and potential use within a particular community. Librarians are also to be seen within a social context, and before considering some of the details of their job as selectors, suppose we look at them in longer perspective.

The librarian plays a variety of roles in modern society. But what is his principal role? The answer, I suggest, con-
cerns his efforts as protector, selector, and builder of the book collection. A little more than a year ago in Philadelphia I suggested that the librarian primarily acts in the community as an honest broker of ideas and culture. I was simply and perhaps too literally suggesting that he was an agent at work in the market place of public opinion. Since Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, in his now famous dissent in the Abrams case, used the figure of the market to describe the working of public opinion, it has become a kind of hallmark of the democratic process. The Justice spoke of "free trade in ideas," and noted that "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." I think we all have come to accept this figure of speech as representing the process by which ideas compete against each other and by which a consensus or a majority opinion presently emerges in a series of popular decisions to govern for a time the working operation of society and of the government.

But just as communication itself is no longer a simple process employed by a few voices, so the market is no longer a single mechanism for simple exchange. The modern market place of public opinion does not work automatically. It needs agents and institutions to assist the process of competition, exchange and consensus. It seemed to me that libraries were a part--a most important part--of the great complex which can be called the market place of ideas. They are the location where ideas must be taken most seriously, the place where books are exchanged--books which still surpass all other media of communication for presenting the history, the complexity and the comparison of ideas.

But in calling the librarian an honest broker, it is easy to press the parallel too far. A couple of decades ago the term was frequently used to describe a certain function or concept of democratic government--"the honest broker," the agent for measuring or weighing the special forces or pressure groups in society and aligning them for the common good. But if the honest broker must maintain a reputation for personal integrity, he also wears the air of commerce. If he is objective, he may also seem indifferent. The librarian may play the honest broker to the extent of acting as a middleman in the idea market, of giving factual and balanced advice, of evaluating community pressures. Yet he can hardly be said to buy or sell ideas.
The figure is probably an uncongenial one. Honest or not, there is too much about the broker-librarian that is sterile, too much that seems mechanical. As a person he seems a little inhuman.

Suppose we consider the primary role of the librarian from another view. Let me, at this point, exchange the term "intellectual freedom," so traditional to discussions of censorship, for the "right to know," a term which in some ways is even more broad in concept.

Who first used this term I don't know, but recently it has seemed of particular interest to newspapermen. In a recent book about newspaper work, Mr. Kent Cooper uses the words, "The Right to Know," for his title. Unfortunately, much of the content of the book proves disappointing. The historian and the sophisticated journalist is likely to be disturbed by the author's implicitly partial view of American news practices. Mr. Cooper seems peculiarly the prisoner of his long and distinguished service (25 years as chief executive) to a business enterprise known as the Associated Press. But this should not obscure the fact that in a few pages in his second chapter he has discovered, or perhaps rediscovered and re-emphasized, the revolutionary concept of free communication.

There he translates the traditional phrase "freedom of the press" into this larger term. As a principle, the right to know represents, he says, "not merely a selfish right of printers alone," but "the people's right." He suggests that in order to say what we mean we ought to amend the First Amendment. Instead of the historical prohibition against abridging freedom of speech and of the press, the First Amendment might preferably read: "Congress shall make no law...abridging the Right to Know through the oral or printed word or any other means of communicating ideas or intelligence."

One may be skeptical, of course, of attempts to update the First Amendment. As a practical matter, we may more easily repeal an amendment, as we did with the Eighteenth, than we can revise or amend one. It seems dangerous to begin tinkering with a statement which is clothed in a 165-year history of constitutional decisions. Actually it appears that Mr. Cooper raised the question of revision more as a rhetorical device than as a guide to immediate action. The significant fact is that his concept of the right to know enlarges the scope of intellectual freedom in two important respects,
one implicitly and the other explicitly.

First, in my opinion, one may assume that the process of communication in modern life is essentially one, and that many workers in many institutions have equal responsibilities in keeping the process free and open. The First Amendment defends freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press. But why, for example, are not academic freedom and the freedom to read equally worthy of defense? The concept of the right to know would surely cover not only the daily press, radio, television and movies, which Mr. Cooper explicitly includes, but the publishing of books and magazines, which (perhaps by inadvertence) he does not. It would appear also to offer protection to some of the basic activities of libraries, schools, research institutes, adult education, foundations "for the public welfare"-in fact to any operation devoted to the discovery of new truth or to the dissemination of knowledge and opinion.

The true problem is not so much one of legal change as of popular comprehension. In our world, the freedoms to speak, listen, assemble, write, publish, read, distribute, teach, learn and investigate have come into closer and closer association; often today they are interrelated. Why, one asks, do not the writer, the editor, the publisher, the librarian, the broadcaster, the teacher understand that their problems in the area of freedom are much the same? Why do they not more often cooperate in making clear to themselves and to the public their associated responsibilities toward the right to know?

The significant fact for us here is that the librarian is not alone in his efforts to establish and to maintain intellectual freedom. He has friends, he has allies and co-workers in other professions with essentially similar responsibilities and ideals. The librarian has not entirely ignored this fact. The fourth provision of the Library Bill of Rights reads: "Libraries should enlist the cooperation of allied groups in the fields of science, of education and of book publishing in resisting all abridgement of the free access to ideas and full freedom of expression that are the tradition and heritage of Americans." Over the past several years librarians have occasionally attempted to implement this principle. The concept of the right to know would enlarge the area of potential cooperation still further. I cannot emphasize too much the distance we have yet to travel in this respect. But it will
mean a great deal if in the meanwhile the librarian comes to understand more fully the larger implications of his struggle to maintain intellectual freedom.

Here enters the second aspect of the right to know, and this point Mr. Cooper makes quite explicitly. The rights and freedoms of modern communication are not private but public. They are the rights and freedoms of laymen. The real kicker in the concept of the right to know is that it puts shoes on both feet of the knowledge-able or the knowledge-seeking citizen; it would protect him in his capacity as consumer in communication as well as in his capacity as producer. Whereas the protection for freedom has been offered traditionally to the producer (the newspaper publisher, for example), with protection for the consumer (the reader) only implied, the new concept would protect the freedom of readers or consumers--with protection to the producer, if it is more than implied, still no more than equal. If the shift in view seems radical, it appears more so in the historically legal forms of protection than in the facts of recent technology and social institutions. Modern communication has passed somewhat beyond the experience of a John Milton or a Peter Zenger or a Thomas Jefferson, while the need for maximum freedom is probably both broader and deeper than it has ever been.

American librarians who first tackled the problem of censorship recognized this fact. It is written implicitly into the Library Bill of Rights. In 1940 when the special Committee on Censorship had drafted its provisions, in order to promote their acceptance and interpretation, the ALA Council created the Committee on Intellectual Freedom to Safeguard the Rights of Library Users to Freedom of Inquiry. The title was long and clumsy, and it was presently shortened to the Committee on Intellectual Freedom. But something has been lost in the alteration. In the recent period of stress, there has been a tendency on the part of a few librarians to confuse protection of the rights of librarians and even of libraries with the protection of the rights of library users.

The chief role of the librarian as I have been approaching it now emerges. He is a trustee of the public's right to know. As a trustee, he is one of a number of fellow-agents in the great complex of modern communication. And when he exercises or protects freedom, he should be acting in behalf of the public right of citizens to understand, to compare and to find out. Let us keep these large implications in mind as we
examine some of the more detailed aspects of censorship and selection.

II

I presume it is a cliché to say that librarians, as part of their professional creed, are constitutionally opposed to all forms of censorship. Certainly their opposition can generally be assumed to be adamant and all-inclusive. They know that censorship, particularly in the form of external pressures, is a threat to the integrity and sometimes to the continued existence of their own libraries. For much of the value and reputation of a book collection depends on the ability of the librarian at any moment freely to buy and display such items as meet the needs of current controversy.

Censorship is usually recognizable for what it is. Not always, however. In the past few years, a number of libraries found their normal flow of certain imported materials interrupted. It was not immediately understood that the United States Customs Service and the Post Office department were combining to halt from abroad material which their officials interpreted as containing foreign propaganda.

In 1938 the Congress passed the Foreign Agents Registration Act which was designed not for censorship of material but simply to identify foreign agents distributing foreign propaganda in the United States. In 1940 a "wartime" interpretation by the Attorney General held that the act applied not only to agents of foreign principals in this country but to those outside the United States. Action under this interpretation presently lapsed, but in the early 1950's the Customs Service and the Post Office "rediscovered" it and began systematically to screen foreign publications coming into the United States; without notice to sender or recipient, they proceeded to impound or destroy whatever material their officials thought contained "political propaganda" under the act's very broad definition of that term. In 1955, for example, the Post Office refused to deliver copies of Pravda and Izvestia, certain foreign pamphlets requested by the American Friends Service Committee, and Russian copies of works by Shakespeare, Dickens, Tolstoy, and Mark Twain because of "propaganda" introduced in prefaces by their Russian editors. Though it later relaxed its ban somewhat, the Post Office did
so without relinquishing the principle involved in the Attorney General's 1940 opinion.

What can the librarians of small or medium-sized libraries do in the face of censorship by the federal government? Probably very little, directly. But it seems important that they constantly keep alive an opposition to the idea of censorship and that they support leaders in the profession who may be able to take action. In this instance, although the House Judiciary Committee and the United States Supreme Court had some years earlier explicitly held that the Foreign Agents Registration Act was not designed for censorship, a proposed amendment was introduced into the Congress which would have written the Attorney General's 1940 opinion into law. But last July at hearings on the bill before a House committee, with librarians taking the initiative, a number of witnesses testified that under the act's broad definition of propaganda, the proposed amendment could prohibit importation of such publications as the London Times and the London Economist, because they publish editorials. Furthermore, under the requirements of the bill, a library seeking an uninterrupted and "legal" flow of foreign publications would either have to register itself with the federal government as the agent of a foreign government--a designation any respectable institution would seek to avoid--or it must "insist" that foreign principals sending it publications would register as foreign agents--something no American library, even if it wished, could enforce or expect to be enforced. After this testimony, further hearings were postponed and presumably the bill is dead and buried.

Historically, the chief source of censorship has been national governments. In spite of the instance I have just recounted, this has not been true in recent days in this country. Government at the state level has been far more at fault. I doubt that in the past five years there has been a single state legislature which has not considered at least one censorship bill, and many of them have been considering one bill after another in session after session. Moreover, some of these bills passed. In some states, as in New York, the struggle over censorship has actively continued month after month, session after session, at least since 1952, and I think before that. Four years ago an atrocious book labelling bill was introduced into the Texas legislature. After a noisy fight it was defeated. Not long afterward almost the same bill was
introduced in Alabama. It passed, and for five months after it went into effect, Alabama librarians lay in a state of shock until the state Supreme Court mercifully declared the act unconstitutional.

In South Carolina last spring the legislature passed a joint resolution asking the removal from public libraries of books which are "antagonistic and inimical to the traditions and customs of this state." The resolution was inspired by the discovery that copies of Jerrold Beim's *Swimming Hole*, which portrays Negro and white children swimming in the same creek, were on the shelves of some of the libraries in the state.

In 1955 the Rhode Island assembly appointed a nine-member commission, headed by the librarian of the Providence Public Library, to study newsstand literature and its effects on the minds of young people. Last February after the commission made its report, the assembly passed without opposition a bill to stop the distribution to anyone under 18 of publications (including paperbounds) which may be construed as obscene or pornographic. One of the books upon which the commission based its findings was Henry James' *Turn of the Screw*.

More recently a Massachusetts state commission, of which the editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* was a member, studied "the relation between juvenile delinquency and the distribution of publications portraying crime, obscenity and horror." Acting on the report's recommendations, the state legislature, without the usual committee hearings, unanimously passed a bill penalizing anyone convicted of selling, distributing or advertising for sale any printed material which might harm the morals of children under 18. After passage, a number of legislators agreed that the act put bookstores and newsstands in the same legal category as barrooms and liquor stores but that the legal restrictions on such book agencies were not so precisely defined as in the liquor laws.

What is a librarian to do about such problems of censorship? With a very few exceptions, these bills and acts are not directed at libraries. Yet many of them do affect the intellectual climate, the atmosphere in which censorship exists or grows. Few social problems are so pervasive today in the United States. I can only suggest here that the librarian join with others in seeking the best solution in his own area. No other state has been more plagued with a
repeated rash of ill-considered bills concerned with censorship than Minnesota. There librarians have joined others in the Minnesota Council for Freedom to Read, not only to fight such legislation but to foster a model bill of their own providing sound legal procedure for handling objectionable printed literature. They have, incidentally, published a five-page mimeographed statement entitled "How Can Obscene Literature Be DEALT With Effectively?"

Municipal councils have sometimes followed in the wake of state legislatures, in the urge to pass legislation, but they have not been successful with the same frequency. There was, of course, the paroxysm of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, where the city government removed the librarian and the library board from office because they did not comply with censorship, and there is the case of San Antonio, Texas, where the librarian and her board were prevented by the city council for months on end from normally conducting library business, because they would not label their book collection. But the chief problem on the local level arises not from legislative or governmental interference but from private pressure groups. These same groups support repressive state legislation, but locally they foster private or "citizen" action. From a representative of one of these pressure groups I recently received a printed statement called "Modesty and the Printed Word" which concluded that "legal statutes will never suffice in matters of this kind." It may not be immediately clear in any given instance whether citizen pressures are legitimate or whether they have edged over into the area of censorship. But it is usually worth a librarian's time to find out.

For it is clear that librarians have a stake in these matters—whether or not their own libraries appear to be directly involved. Some of the paperback books interdicted on the widely used Publications Disapproved list of the National Organization for Decent Literature have their counterparts in hard covers on library shelves. It is a blow to any community's integrity, not to say its climate of opinion, to have the literary judgments of a group of Catholic Mothers in Chicago enforced, willy nilly, on local newsstands.

On the assumption that their interests are involved and that it is one of their responsibilities to promote the better types of literature, some librarians have taken part in the widely popular "swap plan" by which an acceptable book has
been offered children for every five or ten horror comics which they were willing to bring in--and some have brought the swaps right into the library. Other librarians have been able to take advantage of the interest of women's clubs, stimulated by the excitement about comic books, to improve library book collections, to supply parents with reading lists, to establish new libraries, and to initiate special youth corners and story hours in libraries.

The answers to local problems of censorship are not all written down, and sometimes the librarian has to play by ear. I am reminded of the uproar in Galion, Ohio, two years ago when the board of education voted to screen all the books in the high school library. Private opinions about three books--one by Richard Wright and two by Hervey Allen--had originally led to the demand for screening. I am sure that the librarian of the Galion Public Library does not see herself as heroic. She was acutely uncomfortable when a photographer from a city newspaper took a picture of her pointing to copies of two of the allegedly objectionable books on her own library's shelves. Later, she was asked as an expert on books to do the screening of the high school collection. (I am sure there were some in Galion who thought it an honor.) It was a simple request but she refused it.

When your library is attacked directly, there is no substitute for raw courage. Mildred Harlan had it recently in Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania, when she and her library board were repeatedly belabored by a belligerent American Legionnaire for tolerating not only books that were presumed without evidence to be subversive but for associating with a reputedly subversive organization known as the American Library Association.

Mildred Harlan had the support of her library board. Sometimes one needs more than that. And sometimes the support is more than the librarian expected. Universities have defended campus appearances of speakers with unpopular opinions and adult education discussions of civil liberties, together with the fact that the library contained books on Communism. And let me quote here the words of the trustees of the Dallas Art Association as they summed up a vigorous defense of their own right of free selection of paintings: "...the fundamental issue at stake is that of Freedom and Liberty--not just for the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, but eventually for our school system, our free press, our
Library, our orchestra, and the many other institutions of our society." (Incidentally, in my copy "Library" is the only general noun that is capitalized.)

I have suggested that librarians should act as trustees of the public's right to know. There are others in the community also fitted and sometimes willing to play a similar role. Is it too much to add that in some communities what we need is a kind of informal board of such trustees?

III

What is the relation of the librarian to his own library book collection? How is he to tackle the job of selection? Up to this point we have avoided the possibility that the librarian himself may act as his own censor. Yet the possibility exists, and it is a fact that librarians have sometimes been charged with this form of malpractice.

In an article in Human Events entitled "Book Burning: How the Librarians Do It," Victor Lasky cited the rejection of three books in a few eastern libraries in contrast to the purchase of other volumes as examples of censorship. He commented that whether these books were "good or bad, accurate or inaccurate" is not the point. And he concluded that "the real issue is whether librarians should be permitted to purchase books solely on the basis of their personal opinions," whether, in fact, they "should be permitted to put their own form of 'thought control' over on the American people."

Mr. Lasky's treatment of library book selection was inaccurate, "loaded" and unfair, and his insinuations led to a conclusion about popular demand which I want to refer to elsewhere. But of course it is possible for librarians to allow personal opinions to interfere in the practice of book selection. And granted that they have to choose some books and reject others, how can they be sure that they are practicing selection and not censorship?

The line between the two may sometimes be thin, yet it will always be significant. I know no better treatment of this difference than Lester Asheim's "Not Censorship But Selection." The major difference, says Mr. Asheim, is that the selector takes a positive approach, the censor a negative one. The selector seeks values, strengths and virtues; the censor
looks for "the objectionable features, the weaknesses, the possibilities of misinterpretation." The selector "asks what the reaction of a rational intelligent adult would be to the... work; the censor fears for the results on the weak, the warped, and the irrational."

Mr. Asheim points out that one of the consequences of the negative approach is to concentrate on isolated parts of a work rather than on the whole, and that this point of view has led to some of the worst examples of censorship in modern history. Mrs. Anne Smart of California recently furnished us a footnote on this point that is almost spectacular. As many of you know, Mrs. Smart has qualified over the past few years as the number-one individual would-be censor in the United States; and the primary targets of her attention have been high schools and libraries. In her latest campaign against what she terms "obscene and subversive" books in the Tamalpais and Drake High Schools in Marin County, California, she has been mailing out quotations from Richard Wright's Black Boy, Bucklin Moon's Without Magnolias, Oliver LaFarge's Laughing Boy, Carey McWilliams' Factories in the Field, and Margaret Halsey's Color Blind; each of the five, she says, is on a list of 200 used for an English course called "Intercultural Understanding." The Larkspur, California, postmaster, however, recently ordered her to stop mailing the quotations because they violate a section of the United States Code which prohibits the mailing of "obscene, lewd, lascivious or filthy publications or writings." School officials have said that the quotations were taken out of context and have presumably left the booklist intact.

The negative approach, says Mr. Asheim, also leads to the judgment of books by external rather than internal evidence. The selector asks what the book has to say, what total message it suggests, what basic values may be lost if the work is suppressed. But the censor looks at the author's political affiliations, at his color, his race or his religion, or he may even base his judgment on circumstances surrounding publication.

The aim of the selector, says Asheim, "is to promote reading, not to inhibit it; to multiply the points of view which will find expression, not limit them; to be a channel for communication, not a bar against it."

In drawing the line between selection and censorship, Mr.
Asheim is describing attitudes of mind. This is basic for understanding, and I suggest that any librarian who has not already done so read this essay in full.

For some other aspects of selection I want to draw upon materials in the proceedings of the Philadelphia Conference on Book Selection published in the PLD Reporter for October, 1955.

One of the problems in selection concerns who is to make book selection policy and who is to be responsible for making individual decisions. At the Philadelphia Conference it was agreed that all libraries should have an explicit statement of book selection policy, that the Library Bill of Rights might be the basis for such a statement, that the statement should reflect the library's philosophy and over-all objectives, and that the policy should be periodically reviewed. One participant at the conference argued from the floor that book selection policy should be the responsibility of the library board, and another contended that the board was qualified to do no more than approve the policy worked out by the librarian and staff. It was generally agreed, however, that the trustees or governing body, the librarian and the staff, if possible, should all participate in formulating selection policy. Ultimate responsibility for selection will usually rest in the chief librarian. Yet the privilege and responsibility for selection of books rightfully belongs to every member of the staff capable of exercising particular judgments.

In Philadelphia many of the small discussion groups emphasized the importance of knowledge of the community and awareness of its "climate." They spoke of the need for the librarian to know about hidden pressures and to be able to anticipate what is going to happen, being prepared to back up what has been done and to explain why it was done. The local climate of opinion can be emphasized, of course, until it becomes an inhibiting force. Climate should never control book selection. In fact, the library has a responsibility for affecting the climate of opinion by providing books on many sides of issues, especially in communities already tending preponderantly toward a minimum of shades in the opinion spectrum.

This conclusion becomes clearer as one considers the problem of public demand or listens to someone speak glibly of giving the public what it wants. How does anyone know what the public wants without giving it a chance to see some
items about which it has expressed no opinions. The public can be inarticulate on subjects it knows nothing about. It must sometimes see what it may want, or any evaluation of public demand will be unrealistic. Furthermore, librarians sometimes mistakenly assume that there are no segments of the library public outside the women and children who have traditionally used its facilities, or that attempting to serve segments of the public unaccustomed to visiting the library is useless.

Public demand should change continuously, with the librarian influencing it. Being sensitive to popular demand is a way of keeping open the channels which may result in the chance to meet more fundamental and less obvious needs.

Looking back upon the Philadelphia Conference, I think one of the aspects we gave too little attention to was the use of book reviewing and annotation authorities in making selection. I assume everyone would reject the use of the NODL's Publications Disapproved blacklist—though to someone's everlasting shame, we did find one library in Michigan using this criterion for what Lester Asheim would call not selection but censorship. But what about the Standard Catalog for Public Libraries, the A.L.A. Catalog, and similar authorities? Last year the A.L.A. Committee on Intellectual Freedom had to attempt to placate an irate author who claimed his book had been discarded by a library after the volume had been purchased because of its being listed in one of these catalogs. A sticking point in the controversy was that the librarian had admitted purchasing the book because it was on an "approved" list. That may be one reason among several for buying a book but it should hardly be the reason. Soundly conceived booklists and a variety of reviews may all be used in book selection but not individually in isolation. And there is as yet no real substitute for reading the book, particularly the book which may be considered "controversial" or a book which readers may talk about.

A word, too, about labelling—although this is not strictly a function of selection. I am reminded that at the 1952 Intellectual Freedom Conference in New York someone from the floor asked for a definition of labelling, and in the stunned silence which ensued there was no answer. Labelling is a mark or any other device designed to scare off an individual from examining or reading a book on its own merits. Librarians are properly aghast when a congressman suggests that
the books in the Library of Congress be labelled, or when a Texas legislature considers a labelling bill, or when an Alabama legislature passes such a bill. But there are cases in which librarians have done their own labelling. By a roundabout route I recently received a letter from a library user in an eastern city announcing that the copy of Paul Blanshard's American Freedom and Catholic Power in the local public library was "labelled," that inside the front cover was a pamphlet, "securely taped, and stamped with the library's stamp," a "reply" to Blanshard, reprinted from the magazine America. To the librarian, who, it so happened, had occasionally sent me news clippings about censorship in other communities, I sent a copy of the complainant's letter. She authenticated the case, and commented that she did not believe in labelling as such, but that she felt in the case of Blanshard, the only book in the library to receive such treatment, the volume needed a counter-balance; with no full-length book available, she purchased the America reprint. "On its arrival," she wrote, "I found it so thin that it would have been lost if catalogued for the shelves along with the Blanshard book. I therefore had it tipped into the front of the Blanshard copies. It seemed to me that there was no compulsion to read it. Its point of view was clearly stated in the title ["Religion and American Democracy--a Reply to Paul Blanshard's American Freedom and Catholic Power"])." One may wonder satirically whether that library contains any other "controversial" books, and if it does, why they didn't receive similar treatment. Yet there are other similar subterfuges practiced by librarians in the handling of controversial material. A prominent librarian in the Midwest said the other day that many public libraries had simply moved their controversial books out of the way--down in the basement or up in the attic.

Librarians often talk about the climate of opinion in their communities and about the pressures exerted on library book collections. But except for the controversies which break out in the newspapers, what do we really know about such pressures? It is only too easy for librarians to make compromises in an effort "to avoid trouble." All aside from the disastrous effect of compromise on the library collection, the librarian's assumption about the climate of opinion and community pressures may be wrong. There is now going on in the state of California a study of community pressures concerning libraries and books. Readers, trustees and librarians are being
interviewed about their knowledge and opinions. When the study is concluded, we should know more not only about the actual pressures against book selection and their effects but also about the realism and judgment of librarians. Speed the day.

In a further effort to illuminate some of the practical problems of book selection, I had planned to close this talk with a hypothetical case history of book selection on the subject of academic freedom. I must, however, cut it down to a brief suggestive outline. If you were to consider buying books on academic freedom for a small or medium-sized public library you would realize, first of all, that academic freedom today is part of a larger complex, which has been described as national security and individual freedom. (One of the best intellectual roundups in the larger area is a book by Harold Lasswell with those very words in the title, but it is somewhat difficult to read and is hardly a first purchase for a public library.) Our first move, then, is to back up a bit and consider the fact that national security and individual freedom for several years has been one of the most important of national issues. If the librarian has been on the job, he has already purchased some of the books on the issue. If the library doesn't have Lasswell, it probably has several such books as Sidney Hook's Heresy, Yes - Conspiracy, No!, Alan Barth's The Loyalty of Free Men, Henry Commager's Freedom, Loyalty, Dissent, Elmer Davis' But We Were Born Free, Buckley and Bozell's McCarthy and His Enemies, Rorty and Decter's McCarthy and the Communists. Several of these books have chapters on academic freedom. Thus if the library is small or higher education is not a major interest in the community and if the library has a reasonable spread of magazines and if it subscribes to the "Reference Shelf" with the volume Freedom and Loyalty in Our Colleges, then perhaps no book devoted solely to academic freedom need be purchased.

But let's assume that the subject is of considerable interest in the community and that money is available. A first purchase, I believe, would be Metzger and Hofstadter's The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. This is a book of history and is in itself a fresh contribution to the subject. A second purchase would probably be Robert MacIver's Academic Freedom in Our Time, and if this seemed worth while, a third and probably a fourth are in order—
Russell Kirk's *Academic Freedom* and E. Merrill Root's *Collectivism on the Campus*. Professor MacIver has been criticized as exaggerating the violation and the problem of academic freedom. Russell Kirk is the leader of the New Conservatism. Professor Root is a member of the school of rampant individualism one associates with the publication *Human Events*. Somewhere along the way, the library may have been asked to buy or even been presented with a copy of William Buckley's *God and Man at Yale*, but unless the community has some special interest in the Ivy League, Root will provide a broader base for the same thesis and even parts of Kirk may be an acceptable substitute. Metzger and Hofstadter, MacIver, Kirk, and Root provide four points of view on academic freedom. I find a kind of perverse interest in bringing up the subject, for the two conservative books have provided incidents of censorship. A librarian at a university in the West withheld Kirk's book from his library because the book referred to the university's president as stupid. And at Miami Beach, the librarian of an eastern public library said that he had rejected requests for Root's book because, if I remember correctly, it was wild and reactionary.

We are all trustees of the public's right to know. And after selling the thesis that all sides of controversial issues should be represented in the library, we can hardly reject a conservative book because it steps on someone's toes or even a reactionary one just because many people would describe it that way. There the case rests.