

The Censorship Phenomenon in College and Research Libraries: An Investigation of the Canadian Prairie Provinces, 1980-1985

Alvin M. Schrader, Margaret Herring,
and Catriona de Scossa

Although college and research libraries in North America are generally thought to be immune to censorship pressures, no impartial research has been undertaken to date to verify this perception. A five-page questionnaire was mailed to the libraries of 68 postsecondary educational institutions in the three prairie provinces of Canada in order to determine two things: first, the extent of pressures to remove, relocate, or reclassify library materials between 1980 and 1985; and second, to determine the effectiveness of written selection policies in dealing with such pressures. Among the 47 responding libraries, 14 (30 percent) reported that they had experienced some kind of censorship pressure during the six years under study. Almost all of these libraries served student populations under 5,000, but some of the larger institutions also reported challenges of one kind or another.



College and research libraries are generally thought to be immune to censorship pressures. For example, John Robotham and Gerald Shields (1981) asserted that "the libraries of educational institutions are generally free from public pressure to acquire or reject a particular item. There is, of course, a kind of general pressure on them to adapt to a changing society, but this doesn't apply to any one book or film."¹ The lack of concern with censorship at postsecondary institutions is nowhere better revealed than in *Library Literature* itself: between 1980 and June 1988, we found only two articles dealing with this topic.

This state of affairs is somewhat under-

standable, given the mandate of institutions of higher learning generally. Colleges and universities are perceived as forums for the free exchange of ideas, differing from public schools which are, among other things, agents of socialization. To conduct research and produce legitimate scholarship at the postsecondary level, it is widely recognized that students and faculty alike must have access to all sides of an issue, no matter how controversial the subject matter. Presumably, college and research libraries are included in the intellectual mandate of their parent institutions.

But just how justified is this presumption? Are there no restraints on intellectual freedom, no pressures at all on these

Alvin M. Schrader is Associate Professor, Faculty of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J4. Margaret Herring is Librarian/Cataloguer for the Calgary Board of Education, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2G 3C5. Catriona de Scossa is Associate Professor, Faculty of Library and Information Studies, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2J4. The authors thank Dr. Dianne Hopkins, Assistant Professor of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, for critiquing a draft of this paper.

libraries to remove materials or to restrict access to them? The literature provides no clues.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire survey reported here is the first known effort to collect impartial empirical evidence about these questions from postsecondary libraries. (Although two or three statewide investigations in the recent past have included academic libraries along with public and school libraries, they did not distinguish the censorial incidents by type of library.) In addition, this study has attempted to provide a more complete and accurate picture of the link between possible censorship pressures and the effectiveness of standard written procedures and selection policies to deal with any such pressures.²

This investigation was limited to the libraries of postsecondary institutions situated in the Canadian provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, and covered the six years from 1980 to 1985. It was designed to elicit specific information regarding each request to remove, relocate, or reclassify materials. The information solicited included the title and format of the material involved; the type of individual initiating the complaint; the reason given by the individual for the complaint; the role of a written selection policy in dealing with the complaint; and the final disposition in each case.

A number of important decisions had to be made at the outset of the research project. The first of these concerned the geographic and time parameters of the survey. College and research libraries in the three prairie provinces of Canada were selected for two reasons: first, a study sample of adequate size would be assured; second, the Canadian prairie provinces constitute a fairly distinct regional entity. Although different in several respects, they share a number of similar characteristics, including cultural history, educational practices, economic and industrial objectives, populist political behavior, and religious movements. The study period, 1980 to 1985, was chosen in order to be able to produce a comprehensive picture without too much risk of inaccuracy

due to destroyed records or unreliable memories.

The second major decision concerned the type of instrument that would be used to gather information. It was decided that a mail questionnaire would be most appropriate for several reasons. First, the geographical scope of the study made face-to-face interviews virtually impossible; the time, travel, and expense that would be involved ruled this choice out immediately. The mail questionnaire, on the other hand, is a relatively quick and inexpensive method for the researcher to gather data. The respondent can answer the questions conveniently and in privacy. Consequently, answers may be more candid than if the respondent were confronted with an interviewer face-to-face.

However, mail questionnaires do not allow the researcher to control the conditions under which the questionnaires are completed or to probe deeply into the respondents' actions and attitudes. Furthermore, mail surveys often suffer from low response rates. These limitations may render the information collected somewhat less reliable. When all aspects were taken into account, it was decided that a questionnaire was still the instrument of choice for this research project.

The survey included all English-speaking university libraries, community and technical college libraries, and the libraries of religious, biblical, theological, and seminary postsecondary institutions in the three prairie provinces. At least one of these postsecondary institutions offered a mixed curriculum for both senior high school and college students.

The second volume of the thirty-eighth edition of the *American Library Directory* (1985) was used to compile the list of libraries to which the questionnaire would be sent. While the *Directory* classifies each library according to type (university, college, public, special, religious, etc.), some discrepancies were noted. For example, the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) was classified as a college library, while the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) was classified as a special library. Every effort was made to detect these discrepancies, but the pos-

sibility nonetheless exists that some relevant libraries were missed. This *Directory* was supplemented by the *Directory of Community and Technical College Libraries and Resource Centres in Canada* (1983), which included a number of libraries that had been omitted from the *American Library Directory*. The final list comprised 68 libraries (one other library, initially included, was later found to be a high school library and therefore was omitted from the study figures).

Working from previously published research and research instruments, principally related to public and school libraries,^{3,4} the questionnaire and covering letter for the study were evaluated by two faculty members and two students in the Faculty of Library and Information Studies, University of Alberta. As a result, several major revisions were incorporated into the second draft, which was reviewed again. Only minor modifications were suggested at this stage, and these were incorporated into the third and final version of the questionnaire. Each of the covering letters was personalized with the name of the librarian or information officer in charge as well as the address of the library. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was provided for each questionnaire.

Questionnaires were mailed at the end of January 1986, with three weeks allowed for returns. There was no follow-up letter because of the project's time constraints and the additional expense that would be incurred.

FINDINGS

From the initial population of 68 libraries, 47 usable questionnaires were re-

ceived. This represents a response rate of 69 percent, relatively high for a mail survey of this type, and indicates widespread interest by prairie postsecondary educational institutions in the issue of censorship. Most of the 44 responding libraries that provided enrollment data served populations of fewer than 5,000 students. The overall median per parent institution was 893 students, with a range from 70 to 23,000.

"Fourteen of the 47 respondents (30 percent) reported some kind of censorship pressure between 1980 and 1985."

Table 1 shows that 14 of the 47 respondents (30 percent) reported some kind of censorship pressure between 1980 and 1985. Overall, 79 percent of the affected libraries served institutions with fewer than 5,000 students.

Of these 14 libraries, the majority experienced multiple cases of censorship pressure, ranging as high as five incidents during the six-year period under study. (See table 2.)

All told, these 14 libraries reported 36 instances of censorial pressures. Most of the incidents involved requests to remove library materials. One incident, however, was a case of suggested mutilation—a request that the offending matter be cut out. Another request involved pressure to not purchase material. For a full history of the 36 incidents, see appendix A.

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF CENSORSHIP PRESSURES ON
POSTSECONDARY LIBRARIES, 1980-1985

Number of Students (FTE)	Libraries						Total	
	No		Yes		Number	Percent		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent				
Under 5,000	27	82	11	79	38	81		
5,000-9,999	2	6	—	—	2	4		
10,000-14,999	—	—	1	—	1	2		
15,000-19,999	—	—	1	21	1	2		
20,000-24,999	1	3	1	—	2	4		
Unreported	3	9	—	—	3	7		
Total	33	100	14	100	47	100		

TABLE 2
CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS PER
POSTSECONDARY LIBRARY, 1980-1985

Censorship Incidents per Library	Number	Libraries	Percent
1	3		21
2	4		29
3	4		29
4	2		14
5	1		7
Total	14		100

Table 3 shows the full range of censorship pressure on postsecondary libraries during the period under study. The majority of the incidents (27 of 36, or 75 percent) occurred in libraries serving fewer than 5,000 students. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that several of the larger institutions also reported challenges. And in statistical terms, this study demonstrates that the larger the student population, the more likely the library will experience censorship pressures.⁵

Respondents indicated that two-thirds of the challenged materials were books; the remainder involved eight periodicals, two films, one encyclopedia, and one videotape.

The content of the challenged material varied widely, from diet, biography, and best-seller fiction to historical revisionism and homosexuality. Two principal types of content could be identified: (1) material that was sexually explicit or dealt with human reproduction and sexual relations; and (2) material that was alleged to be blasphemous, or that dealt with the occult, or that was otherwise in conflict with the religious affiliation of the parent institution.

Sexuality materials constituted the larger of the two major types and included such titles as: *The Act of Love*, author unknown, *The Intimate Marriage* by Clive Bell, and *Lying in Bed* by Mary Howes. Two periodicals were reported: *Playboy* and *Sports Illustrated* ("swimsuit edition"). The film, *Not a Love Story*, and videotapes used in sex therapy courses also fell into this category. The materials in this category were alleged to be offensive, provocative, or exploitive. Many also felt that these works were sexist and degrading to women and that users were not mature enough to deal with them responsibly.

Among the second group of works were such titles as *The Far Country* by Paul Twitchell, *Satanic Bible* by Anton S. La Vey, *Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times*, and *Wittenberg Door*. According to one respondent, the latter is the Christian equivalent of *National Lampoon*; that is to say, it is a periodical that parodies Christian doctrine and issues. Some of these types of materials were alleged to be dangerous or harmful to readers.

A third group of material, much smaller than the two just discussed, could also be distinguished. This category included materials that were considered to be racist or hate literature. Only two specific titles were reported by respondents: the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* by Arthur R. Butz. A third incident involved a general complaint regarding LC subject headings concerning homosexuality.

Other titles could not be placed readily into one of these categories. They covered a wide range of subjects, including suicide, poaching, dieting, crime, and the Soviet Union.

TABLE 3
TYPES OF CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS
BY 1985 STUDENT POPULATION

Requests to	No. of Incidents		Total	
	< 5,000 Students*	> 5,000 Students†	No.	%
Remove	22	7	29	81
Relocate	5	—	5	14
Reclassify	—	2	2	5
Total	27	9	36	100

*Libraries serving under 5,000 students.

†Libraries serving 5,000 or more students.

With regard to the source of complaints, every major academic constituency was represented. Students and members of the teaching staff initiated approximately 40 percent of the complaints, while administrative officials were involved in another 20 percent. More significant is the fact that, in 40 percent of all cases, a member of the library staff initiated or was one among several initiators.

Of the 47 responding libraries, 29 (62 percent) said they had a written selection policy. Many librarians, however, qualified their answers somewhat with additional phrases like "in part," "a general one, prioritizing types of acquisitions," "sort of," "but it needs updating," and "draft format."

Of these 29 respondents with a written selection policy, only 7 reported that the policy provided a standard written procedure to be followed in the event of requests for removal, relocation, or reclassification of library materials. Moreover, in only 10 cases did the written policy specify the library's position with regard to intellectual freedom.

In spite of the frequent existence of written policies, and in spite of the majority view that a written policy is an effective tool to prevent censorship, respondents reported that the policies were ignored in two-thirds of the complaints received during the period under review in this study. Also noteworthy is the fact that in 3 of the cases reported, a written policy was actually used to expedite censorship rather than to prevent it.

"In approximately 60 percent of the incidents, some kind of censorial action was taken: either removal, relocation, or reclassification in accordance with the complaint."

With regard to the final disposition of the reported complaints, the data are not altogether encouraging. In approximately 60 percent of the incidents, some kind of censorial action was taken: either re-

moval, relocation, or reclassification in accordance with the complaint. (In several of these incidents, the material was removed only temporarily and then replaced when the conflict had subsided!) In only 40 percent of the incidents was the challenged material retained on the shelves intact.

Comments by respondents added many further insights into the complexities of the censorship phenomenon in college and research libraries on the Canadian prairies:

The only restriction I can think of in an academic library would be in the case of revisionist literature. The rest are curriculum-based.

One of the most insidious forms of censorship is hidden from the kinds of activities listed in this questionnaire. Many of the books we hold, for example, would not appear in other libraries because of a silent censorship applied to materials with an evangelical Christian perspective. They are just not purchased. Too bad you cannot measure such prejudicial tendencies.

Some distributors place restrictions, for example, a number of criminology items may be viewed only with instructor's permission. We also abide by "restricted adult" ratings as applied by the Alberta Board of Censors.

I have had no requests to remove or reclassify but have had to go through long verbal defenses of some items I have purchased.

Screening and censorship of materials takes place in the selection and buying process. Most materials which are considered inappropriate or objectionable (by library staff or faculty) are screened upon arrival and are not cataloged. (These items are returned, sold, or remain in the librarian's office; the latter items are not considered part of the collection.)

Our selection policy is really quite general in that it states our major collection in the religious field consists of books in the . . . tradition but that books with a different persuasion are collected for reference purposes. In [our] incidents, it was understood that the materials removed went beyond reference to persuasion of something in conflict with our persuasion. Thus I would say it was effective in making the decision to remove.

I think as little fuss as possible should be made; the material should simply be removed if it does not agree with the school's principles and standards and beliefs.

Since a college of our nature would not consider acquiring obscene or pornographic materials, the selection policy is quite adequate to assure that the collection contains only ideas—and we should have no fear of ideas.

Obviously we can live without [a selection policy]. It's handy to have something to point to but that doesn't mean, in my opinion, that you can't ever make exceptions."

[Selection policies] work for library internal processing but are completely ineffective when the administration becomes involved, especially when a donor is involved.

. . . filling out this questionnaire has made me realize that we'd better revise the section on censorship in our acquisitions policy.

We censored the *Sports Illustrated* issue on bathing suits because of the environment in the library when the issue was left uncensored. The female staff felt exploited as fellows (mostly high school) used the magazine. We do restrict access to sexual or human reproduction materials because there have been problems with students in these areas who have accessed the material. Now upon request the material is provided but a request must be given—this has controlled the problem earlier identified by the counseling department. By and large we restrict our book selection rather than censor and we make very sure of the grounds for a book if questions could arise. Once acquired we group sexual material separately, otherwise we take a hard line on censoring and argue for direct access in the stacks.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has revealed that censorship pressure is very much a reality for libraries at the postsecondary educational level. Three of ten respondents reported receiving a request to remove, relocate, or reclassify some kind of library material.

The data regarding the incidents themselves are interesting for a number of reasons. First, censorship attempts were not confined to any particular format: books, periodicals, films, and videotapes were all targets of complaints. Second, the content of the challenged materials varied widely, although distinct categories did emerge. Diet, biography, best-seller fiction, the occult, human reproduction, historical revisionism, homosexuality—all were the object of censorship attempts. This would seem to substantiate the assertion that no material is neutral for everybody: even the

most seemingly innocuous work has the potential to offend someone.

With regard to the effectiveness of written selection policies in preventing censorship, the data are not altogether encouraging. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents stated that their library has a written selection policy. Very few of these policies, however, provided standard procedures to deal specifically with a censorship attempt. This would seem to indicate that many of the respondents did not feel that censorship is a serious threat to the intellectual integrity of their collections and that, should such incidents arise, ad hoc measures would be adequate to deal with them.

"In only one of every three incidents was the written policy used to deal with the case. The problem is compounded by the frequent participation of librarians and other members of the library staff in censorship attempts."

Moreover, in only one of every three incidents was the written policy used to deal with the case. The problem is compounded by the frequent participation of librarians and other members of the library staff in censorship attempts. Perhaps it is not surprising, therefore, to learn that in almost 60 percent of the incidents, some type of censorial action was taken.

Although this study has revealed that far more censorship attempts have occurred in academic libraries—at least in the Canadian prairie provinces—than was previously assumed, the data regarding the effectiveness of written selection policies in dealing with this censorship are inconclusive. It seems that perceptions held by college and research librarians on the nature of this issue do not necessarily accord with reality. While a majority of them believe that written selection policies would be effective in dealing with censorship, only a minority have actually established such standard procedures. Even

the existence of a standard procedure does not necessarily give the library an advantage, for, as noted, the procedure might not be used at all in dealing with a censorship attempt or, if used, its purpose might be subverted to expedite censorship rather than to prevent it.

In at least one respect, this project is the first of its kind. To the best of our knowledge, no other comprehensive study has been undertaken of the censorship phenomenon in the libraries of postsecondary educational institutions in either Canada or the United States. Given the broad cultural similarities between the Canadian prairies and the American Midwest, the censorship phenomenon may turn out to be a common pattern that crosses political boundaries.

Although the academic institution in North America is widely perceived as an open forum for the free exchange of ideas, the study reported here demonstrates that this idealistic perception is at least partially inaccurate and illusory. It is hoped that similar studies will be undertaken in the near future in many other geographic areas, nationally and internationally, so that our understanding of the issues is broadened, and so that senior administrative policymakers—and librarians—will be forewarned. Based on the present study, we believe that library censorship is a reality at the postsecondary level everywhere in the democratic world, in spite of hitherto unquestioned assumptions to the contrary.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. John Robotham and Gerald Shields, *Freedom of Access to Library Materials* (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1981), p.19.
2. For the full technical report of this project, see Margaret Herring, "The Effectiveness of Written Selection Policies in Preventing Censorship in Academic Libraries in the Prairie Provinces Since 1980" (M.L.S. research project, University of Alberta, 1986).
3. David Jenkinson, "The Censorship Iceberg: The Results of a Survey of Challenges in School and Public Libraries." *School Libraries in Canada* 6:19-30 (Fall 1985). Also published in *Canadian Library Journal* 43:7-21 (Feb. 1986).
4. Keith Walker, "Censorship in Alberta Public Libraries: A Survey of Requests for Removal of Library Materials" (M.L.S. research project, University of Alberta, 1984). Published as "Censorship Iceberg: Results of an Alberta Public Library Survey," by Alvin M. Schrader and Keith Walker, *Canadian Library Journal* 43:91-95 (Apr. 1986).
5. Statistical analysis of the data reveals a moderately strong relationship between size of student population served by the library and reported number of censorship incidents (Pearson correlation coefficient = .31, significance = .019, valid cases = 44).

APPENDIX A

HISTORY OF CENSORSHIP INCIDENTS REPORTED BY COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIANS IN THE CANADIAN PRAIRIE PROVINCES, 1980-1985

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
1. Book	Dominian, Jack	<i>Marital Breakdown</i>	Relocation	Administrative official of the institution	Censorship	Yes	No	No	Request was acceded to	Material relocated to library office. Returned to shelf when complainant left the institution.
2. Periodical		<i>Wittenberg Door</i>	Removal	Member of the teaching staff	Blasphemous material	Yes	No	No	Request was acceded to	Subscription cancelled
3. Book	Unknown	<i>Uncut</i> (a book about censorship in the Canadian film industry)	Removal	Member of library staff	Nudity in some illustrations	No	No	No	Request was from a former librarian who removed the book after an argument with the instructor	Material removed
4. Book	Davis, Adele	<i>Let's Eat Right to Keep Fit</i>	Removal	Community member	Diet suggested by author is dangerous	No	No	No	Reference staff handled the complaint	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
5. Books		No titles specified (best-seller fiction)	Removal	Member of library staff	Junk books—have no place in a college collection	No	No	No	Request from a former librarian, discussion with staff	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
6. Book	Unknown	Unknown	Removal	Member of teaching staff	Viewpoint outdated	No	No	No	Unknown	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
7. Book	Unknown	<i>The Act of Love</i>	Removal	Student, parent of student	Sexually explicit material	No	No	No	Verbal discussion with complainant and library committee	Verbal discussion with complainant; material removed temporarily, later replaced
8. Book	Unknown	<i>The Act of Love</i>	Removal	Student	Sexually explicit material	No	No	No	Verbal discussion with complainant and library committee	Verbal discussion with complainant; material removed temporarily, later replaced
9. Book	Bell, Clive	<i>The Intimate Marriage</i>	Removal	Student, member of library committee	Sexually explicit material	No	No	No	Verbal discussion with complainant and library committee	Verbal discussion with complainant; material removed temporarily, later replaced
10. Book	Horner, Tom	<i>Jonathan Loved David: Homosexuality in Biblical Times</i>	Removal	Member of teaching staff	Not in keeping with institutional doctrine; unscholarly work	No	No	No	Librarian argued with complainant; decided it was an improper choice	Material removed

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
11. Book	Twitchell, Paul	<i>The Far Country</i>	Removal	Student	Material harmful to readers because it dealt with the occult	Yes	Yes	Yes		Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
12. Films		No titles specified (deal with issues in law enforcement, e.g., arson, fraud, etc.)	Relocation	Student	Sensitive material—shouldn't be available to general public	Yes	Yes	No	Material relocated to accommodate faculty	Material moved to reserve collection for use by a specific group of students
13. Book	Benson, Ragnar	<i>Survival Poaching</i>	Relocation	Member of teaching staff	As above; also concern that the library could face legal action as a provider of information	Yes	Yes	No	Material relocated to accommodate faculty	Material moved to reserve collection for use by a specific group of students
14. Periodical		<i>Sports Illustrated</i> (swimsuit edition only)	Removal	Member of teaching staff	Caters to the lust of students which distracts from the inspirational and educational value of the magazine	Yes	Yes	Yes		Material removed
15. Book	La Vey, Anton	<i>Satanic Bible</i>	Removal	Student, member of library staff, administrative official of the institution	Serves as temptation to explore the occult rather than serves as a reference tool about Satanism	Yes	Yes	Yes		Material removed

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
16. Book	Flumiani, Carlo Maria	<i>How to Read a Book for Pleasure and Profit</i>	Removal	Member of teaching staff	Book hardly deals with topic suggested—contains "way out" ideas about a lot of unrelated topics—basically a "ripoff"	Yes	Yes	Yes		Material removed
17. Books		No titles specified (books on the occult)	Removal	Administrative official of the institution	Possible use of books in occult activities	Yes	No	No	Request discussed by representatives of library committee with a professor of counseling for his opinion	No action taken
18. Periodical		<i>Wittenberg Door</i>	Removal	Student	No reason specified	Yes	No	No	Library committee rejected request	No action taken
19. Book	Bowes, Mary	<i>Lying in Bed</i>	Removal (keep out of circulation)	Member of library staff	Illustrations offensive	Yes	No	No	Explained verbally to complainant that the book had been ordered for a particular course and was needed both by students and faculty	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
20. Periodical		<i>Soviet Life</i>	Removal (request to stop buying)	Member of library staff	Complainant "sees red" when she sees the word "Soviet"	Yes	No	No	Explained to complainant that material in the library presents various points of view	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
21. Book	Unknown	Unknown	Removal	Student, member of teaching staff, member of library staff, administrative official of institution	Ours is a private church school and the material in question was not suitable for our school	Yes	No	No	Librarian simply examined the material and withdrew it from the shelves	Material removed

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
22. Books		No titles specified (children's books)	Removal	Student	Inaccurate portrayal of women's skills, abilities, and role in society	Yes	No	Yes	Explanation of collecting policy of academic library to provide access to all types of material and role of educators to be aware of such materials in directing studies	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
23.			Reclassification	Member of library staff	Judgmental bias of traditional terms used in subject headings	Yes	No	Yes	Referred to cataloging policy groups for subsequent guidelines on internal practice and communication with LC regarding practice	Preference given to up-to-date subject headings as authorized
24. Periodical		<i>Sports Illustrated</i> (swimsuit edition only)	Removal/relocation (cut magazine up to remove pages)	Student, member of teaching staff, member of library staff, administrative official of the institution	Offensive material—provocative poses and revealing non-clothing	Yes	Yes	Yes		Pictures cut out, i.e., worst ones (this is the only case of altering the entity allowed in our policies)
25. Periodical		<i>Wittenberg Door</i>	Removal	Student, parent, member of teaching staff, member of library, administrative official of institution	Offensive material—a Christian equivalent of <i>National Lampoon</i> —many people find it hard to laugh at themselves	Yes	Yes	Yes		Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
26. Encyclopedia		<i>Encyclopaedia Britannica</i> (11th edition)	Removal/relocation	Member of teaching staff	Negroes section is blatantly racist	Yes	No	Yes		Written letter of complaint came to director; no further action taken

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
27. Book	Butz, Arthur R.	<i>The Hoax of the Twentieth Century</i>	Reclassification	Community organization (B'Nai B'Rith) Anti-Defamation League)	Revisionist material should not be treated as history	Yes	No	Yes		Classification unchanged; subject heading modified
28. Book	Butz, Arthur R.	<i>The Hoax of the Twentieth Century</i>	Removal	Law enforcement official	Material prohibited under Customs Act	Yes	No	Yes		Material removed initially but recovered on appeal
29. Periodical		<i>Playboy</i>	Removal	Student, member of library staff	Material is sexist, un-academic, demeaning to women	Yes	No	No	Incident handled at area library level	Material removed
30. Book	Trudeau, Margaret	No title specified (her biography)	Request not to purchase	Unknown	Material is trash	Yes	No	Unknown	Incident happened upon by chance by director of libraries	Area concerned instructed to purchase
31. Books		No titles specified (books on human reproduction and sexual relations)	Removal/relocation	Student, parent, member of teaching staff, member of library staff, administrative official of institution	Offensive material—much of our constituency and students are very sensitive to seeing this material in print and consider it pornography	Yes	Yes	Yes		Material relocated to special collections for sexual materials
32. Film		<i>Not a Love Story</i>	Relocation/restricted access	Member of teaching staff	Our students are not mature enough to see the film without guided discussion afterwards	Yes	No	No	Discussion at librarians' meeting	Decision to restrict access to users 18 years and older in conformity with the film's "R" rating

APPENDIX A (Continued)

Type of Material	Author	Title	Type of Request	Complainant	Reason for Complaint	Written Selection Policy	Procedure for Complaints	Policy Used	Method of Handling Incident	Final Result of Complaint
33. Book	Portwood, Doris	<i>Common Sense Suicide</i>	Removal	Student	Library should not provide material which would assist someone with suicidal tendencies	Yes	No	No	Student left material at reference desk for librarian to make a decision	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
34. Books		No titles specified (popular religion)	Removal	Member of teaching staff	Items are trash and not suitable to support course	Yes	No	No	Librarian pointed out to complainant that these books are of use to students in psychology and sociology	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken
35. Videotapes		No titles specified (sex therapy)	Relocation/restricted access	Member of teaching staff, member of library staff	Students would use them as "pornography shows" since the full variety of sexual activities were shown	Yes	No	No	Portions of videos shown at librarians' meeting, followed by discussion	Relocate/restrict access to those students who have professor's permission
36. Periodical		<i>Playboy</i>	Removal	Student, member of library staff	Inappropriate, not course-related, in tatters within two weeks	Yes	No	No	Discussion at librarians' meeting	Verbal discussion with complainant; no further action taken