

## Commies and Sex

---

I was no stranger to some of the attitudes so well voiced in the last chapters. I did not need to go to West Virginia to hear them. My parents were Southern, and I grew up in Jackson, Mississippi, until high school age, when we moved to Toledo, Ohio. So I knew well how many people feel in the Deep South and Middle America. In the sleepy Jackson of the Depression era nearly everyone I knew routinely talked against Jews and Catholics and treated blacks still with a mixture of intimacy and subjugation left over from slave days. Some people were still fighting the Civil War with a chip on the shoulder and a regional chauvinism comparable to that in West Virginia. People of both states have striven by overcompensation to repair the damage to identity entailed by secession and by living as a subculture within a larger general culture—a plight, we note, shared by those other minorities against whom they have often discriminated. Tracing family genealogy has always been a heavy industry in Mississippi and the rest of the Deep South, where one way to recoup status has been to prove blood purity and descent from illustrious forebears.

I was dismayed, hurt, and angry when these book-banners knocked down the program on which I had spent over three years of full-time work and which I had expected to spiritualize some of public education. But I understood these people. Hearing them in the interviews was like listening to voices from the past, not just from my youth but from many visits to West Virginia with my wife and daughters.

My heart is with them. They are right about many things or at least right in a sense, at some level of understanding. They should *not* have had my books crammed down their throats. Avis' daughter should *not* have been forced to do a book report on evolution. A metropolitan school district should *not* have ignored the known feelings and views of part of their constituency in catering to the wishes of the more articulate and affluent. (But I grieve too for the suffering of those school administrators and teachers torn by the forces around them. I know how they feel too.) The curriculum should *not* be a standardized thing forced on all

alike. It *is* wrong for opportunistic outsiders to rob and pollute the land and siphon off the profits out of the region. Appalachian folk should *not* be derided and disparaged by people with more money or education than wisdom or compassion. They *should* resist materialism and stand up for the underlying spiritual nature of reality.

I would like Alice and Avis, Elmer and Ezra, and others who think as they do, to know that a person responsible for one of the programs they so abhorred does not at all resemble the enemy they picture and does not regard them as the enemy. I'm a family man, love this country, and believe in the underlying spiritual nature of reality. I think the Soviet Union is totalitarian and the United States has come closer to a spiritual realization of government than any other country on earth. But I think the objectors are dreadfully wrong in some ways that endanger far more than outsiders the very family, country, and religion they think they are upholding. So while letting the objectors speak in their own words I am also going to comment and interpret. Such profound and explosive misunderstanding must be counteracted and defused. If I were to let the objections stand, at face value, I could not fulfill the purpose of this book, which is to illuminate and thereby perhaps help to alter some dire courses of events.

Also, as a creator of the disputed textbooks I am in a unique position to know some things, and I must say what I know. I know exactly how and why *Interaction* came into being. In fact, I am, necessarily, the only person who was so situated as to know at once all the details and the overview of this vast undertaking—to negotiate with the publisher, to read all the thousands of selections that did and did not go into the books, and to work with the two and a half dozen co-authors who compiled the books and the army of company editors who assembled items and ordered art on the publisher's end.

Given an unusually free hand, I decided what books there should be and set the concept of each book. I did this according to categories of literature like fables and sonnets, plays and essays, or of other familiar library classifications—into topical fiction like mystery stories and science fiction, into nonfiction like autobiography and chronicles, or into information such as reportage, research, and how-to-do-it. The neutrality of this derived quite naturally from the intention to represent every kind of reading matter produced by our society and to do so by common types encountered outside of school, as in libraries and bookstores, or by the more unusual categories of the various first-person and third-person viewpoints from which much fiction and nonfiction are written (*Fictional Memoir* or *Letters Real and Imagined*, for example). Some other unusual categories for school books were riddles, brain

teasers, maps, captioned photos, comics, advertisements, transcripts, and jumprope jingles, but these too are common types of discourse.

The importance of this breakdown here is that it aims entirely at familiarizing students with the range of available kinds of reading matter and hence rules out books organized by themes or ideas. The ideas that might enter into a given book were totally open, biased only by the nature of the *type* of writing—folk literature or scientific reportage, for example.

Within a single book, my job was to set the balance and representation of different factors such as epoch, ethnic or geographical origin, style, tone, reading difficulty, sex and other personal author traits, topic or theme, and so on. Not all of these can be perfectly balanced within each book, because each type has limitations and each book is too short, but one can achieve balance across the whole classroom library of books, as I believe I did with co-authors' collaboration. Many of their first submissions I rejected and we were constantly juggling selections in a book till it seemed to me to settle down right. I never deliberately biased a book or tried to give it a message. We were aware that many youngsters would be meeting some types or topics for the first time, including definitely the children of so-called liberals and radicals, but such opening of doors partly defines education itself.

As the director of a textbook program denounced as a part of radical or Communists conspiracy, I feel obliged to state publicly that no collusion occurred between the publisher, the authors of *Interaction*, and any political or other ideological organization, nor did any of us aim to put over a particular philosophy. As large corporations, textbook publishers tend toward conservatism, political and otherwise—not perhaps the editors but certainly the executives, who make the big decisions. The NEA put the matter very well:

To accuse American textbook publishers—one of the most highly competitive participants in the American system of free enterprise—of taking part in a communist plot to overthrow this very system is such a self-contradictory allegation that it defies rational response.<sup>1</sup>

Nor was the federal government involved in any way in the production of *Interaction* or, so far as I know, any of the other language arts programs listed in Kanawha County. The charge of federal influence, which Fike made there and the Gablers in Texas, has a rational basis, however, because the Great Society policy of the sixties did include funding for the development of new curricular approaches designed to offset the Soviet educational lead implied by the launching of Sputnik. The United States government did fund textbook development in math and science, social

studies, and even English to the point that when commercial publishers began to bring out these programs special royalty arrangements had to be made in shifting from the public to private sectors. But this trend had died away by the time the programs purchased in Kanawha County were being produced.

In any case, I would never have done a program under federal auspices, and indeed *Interaction* was regarded as being personal in conception to a remarkable degree. I chose my co-authors for their understanding of how children learn and their knowledge of literature, language, and communication, not for any political, economic, or religious view. I take responsibility for whatever similarity they share, and what they share most is a commitment to growth.

What the objectors do detect that seems to them like a conspiracy is precisely this commitment to growth, which conflicts, as we will see, with some parents' wish to keep their children as they made them. If you feel that enlarging your child's repertory of information, ideas, and points of view will alienate your child from you, then you will of course feel also that educators are guilty of brainwashing and psychological kidnapping. To the extent some parents want schools to do little but reinforce their home training and transmit their culture, they must construe our less selective offering as betrayal and alien indoctrination.

Elmer Fike was closer to the truth in rejecting actual conspiracy in favor of the less distorted view that the "Eastern publishing and media establishment" controls textbooks and imposes its values on the books. He felt that "liberals" in power just naturally turn matters their own way, including textbooks. But we have to ask why it is that news-gathering media like TV and the press, or authors of textbooks, or publishing editors generally believe in the open market of ideas and oppose cultural bias.

More broadly, we have to ask why, generally, the better educated people are the more they support a textbook program such as *Interaction*. Why do more teachers support it than parents? It is clear that the supporters in Kanawha County were better educated than the opponents, and this holds true generally all over the country in censorship cases. Academic learning certainly does not guarantee intelligence or wisdom, and some of the most creative and original minds shun it, but if people who have had more of it are wrong about what it requires, then we should just scrap formal education. The significant minority of well educated people who do oppose books like ours tend to be in business, people of a type that Elmer Fike fairly represents.

At any rate, the real explanation, as Fike realized in his own way, is that people committed to learning—teachers—or to fact-finding—the media corps—or to dissemination of learning and information—editors and librarians—naturally favor textbooks that most further growth,

information, and learning. These are all relatively well educated people as well. It is in the nature of conservatism to hold back more on growth, information, and learning (to conserve). In other words, what may be felt by some conservatives as a deliberate collaboration to brainwash children — a conspiracy — results logically from the nature of certain professions.

There is one other unfounded and libelous generalization about the textbooks that I must reject out of hand before plunging into the specific objections, which can be commented on individually. Like the charge of conspiracy, the charge of “filthy” and “pornographic,” leveled repeatedly at nearly all of the disputed programs, amounted to a blanket accusation that opponents never supported by citing passages from the books because nothing in any of the books even vaguely approached the explicitness about sexual organs or sexual acts, the obscenity of sexual expletives, or the intention to titillate or arouse, to which the term “pornography” is commonly applied in either legal phrasing or common parlance. For this point let’s look at the most popular mold of opposition to the books in Kanawha County.

Before the Textbook Review Committee amassed its detailed book of objections, the means for proclaiming the books’ abominations were excerpts exhibited on radio and television, in leaflets and fliers. These disseminations typically quoted from the books and embedded the passages in criticism. Since these excerpts aimed to arouse the public to block or rescind adoption, we may suppose that the excerpters chose the most damaging and inflammatory passages. Distributions at rallies and small church meetings were extremely effective as a matter of fact. Catherine Candor-Chandler describes a flier put out during June of 1974, before the books had been formally purchased.

The protest was escalated by the distribution of an estimated 50,000 fliers addressed to “Concerned Citizens—Be Aware of School Book Controversy.” The flier contained twelve excerpts from the proposed books. Of these twelve two were identified by title only, one was identified by title and the author’s name with the comment “A black American poet,” and one was identified only as having been written by Eldridge Cleaver. The other eight excerpts gave no indication of either the title or the author and in many cases started in the middle of a sentence. Nowhere did the name of the series or the grade level in which the material was to be used in appear.<sup>2</sup>

The fact that the protesters could never find any “filthy” or “pornographic” passages in the books comes across most clearly in ruses resorted to to fill the empty accusation. This ethical violation was pointed out by three very different chroniclers. In chapter 1 I have already quoted Candor-Chandler’s account of the dissemination of false excerpts.

Another account issued from George Hillocks, Jr., who did research in Kanawha County on the controversy and mentioned the same flier. An author of one of the other textbook series criticized Hillocks' commentary for being soft toward the protesters,<sup>3</sup> which makes Hillocks' following account of the flier especially credible, although I think Hillocks was merely inclined, like myself, to temper his analysis with sympathy.

The most egregious distortion was a four-page flyer distributed under Ezra Graley's name as leader of a group calling itself Concerned Parents Protesting Text Books. The first and fourth pages quote extensive passages from the textbooks in question. At the top of the first page the following headline appears: "What Is the Kanawha County Text Book Protest All About? Judge for Yourself." At the bottom of the first page appears the words, "continued on last page." Interleaved between pages one and four are diagrams taken from books entitled *Facts about V.D. for Today's Youth* and *Facts about Sex for Today's Youth*—purportedly for use with seventh to ninth graders. Page two of the flyer presents diagrams of a "rubber" and how to use it. Page three presents a definition of sexual intercourse, along with the "street words" for vagina and diagrams of the "erect" and flaccid penis. The clear intent of the flyer is to suggest that the interleaved pages were in the textbooks. They were not, of course. According to board of education officials, the pages were copied from books in school libraries.<sup>4</sup>

Candor-Chandler noted that this flier was printed as a public service by the American Opinion Bookstore in Reedy, West Virginia. In its list of outsiders supporting the protest, the NEA confirms that the "store's manager has printed excerpts from the disputed textbooks and other handouts for the protesters," and it describes the store as "one of the outlets for the John Birch Society materials."<sup>5</sup>

Our third informant on the practice of substituting excerpts is the member of the Kanawha County Schools staff whom I interviewed. It was from her I first heard of it.

STAFF: So much of it was hearsay. Protest groups printed excerpts not only from the books under adoption, but they printed excerpts we never did find. We hunted and we looked and we never did know where they got them. And some of them were frightening.

MOFFETT: Were some of them not from the textbooks at all?

STAFF: Some of them weren't and some of them were. . . . One of the fundamentalist preachers went to Washington, for example, and took some books and didn't identify what books—I have no idea that he had the books that were adopted in the school system—took them to our senator, Byrd, a leader in the Senate, and said, "Would you want your grandchild to read these?" and he said, "No." Well, that just spread all

over the papers. That was our senator condemning our textbooks. And I would be willing to bet that the books were not the adopted books. So it was a maneuver that paid off for them. In Reedy, a little 400-population community in Roane County, which is one of the adjacent counties, there is a man who is an avowed Nazi—there have been several feature stories in our papers about him. He's one of the biggest publishers in the world of anti-Jewish literature, and much of the material that was published and disseminated over the valley and surrounding area, most of those materials were published in his bookstore.

MOFFETT: Is that where the passages came from?

STAFF: I don't know that he created the passages, but he did print all the material. And they stood at the gates of companies like Union Carbide and the Du Pont plant and they handed out these leaflets full of passages from the books, and some, as I say, were not even from the books.<sup>6</sup>

Elmer Fike's Business and Professional People's Alliance for Better Textbooks cited series, book, and page or title with reasonable if not total accuracy when they quoted excerpts in a two-page ad, "What Your Children Will Read . . .," in the *Charleston Gazette* in mid-November and (revised) the following April. These quotations presumably represented the worst the protesters could come up with regarding vulgar language and sex and other offending material detectable in brief quotations. The ad does not claim that more offensive material was found elsewhere or allude to passages unquotable in a newspaper. The majority of these excerpts take the form of lists of single words or phrases, mostly the same swear words repeated over and over. The reviewers had a field day with *Interaction's* books of play scripts. Of course, vulgar language in the textbooks occurs almost entirely in direct dialogue, which is to say it is used to mimic actual colloquial conversation.

The samples below were taken from the ad and represent the very worst words used in *Interaction*, and, I feel sure, in the other series too. In reading them please take account, in your reaction, of the effect that lists like this, endlessly repeated around the community had on people by reducing thousands of selections in hundreds of books, written by all sorts of authors on all sorts of subjects, to a few column inches of coarse expressions. This tactic may very well prejudice even people who don't worry about "swear words" in school books, just because such drastic reduction inevitably leaves the impression that the books contained nothing of value. Besides, swearing palls on you very quickly whether you disapprove or not.

Except for a rare hell or a damn perhaps in the more mature selections, elementary school books were not really involved in this issue at all. Vulgar language arises in certain selections in certain books in secondary

school—some plays, short stories, or monologues containing the directly quoted speech of certain kinds of characters who use that kind of language, the omission of which would make very difficult the realistic rendering of those characters. These passages were in level #3, ordinary secondary.

*Scripts 2*

- page 163 "Feel my old bag's tits"
- page 173 "them sons-bitches too ornery"
- page 190 "Goddammit! All this crapping 'round and footsyng" . . .  
"Ass!"

*Scripts 3*

- page 87 "That fat old bitch"
- page 91 "God, he'll fix it." "Hell, no."
- page 92 "Damn thing" "Yes, by God"
- page 99 "Goddam cards"

All the examples from *Scripts 3* are from one play, *Blue Denim*, which deals with teen-age difficulties and centers on an unwanted pregnancy. It tried to help teen-agers consider such issues more maturely. So this play disturbed objectors for its subject matter as well. "Page 99 is reproduced in its entirety," the ad said, "to give you a better idea of the content of this play."

( . . . ERNIE deals him two off the top and taps the deck to indicate he doesn't want any cards. Then, carried away by his own act, continues:) Matter of fact I had occasion last week to help a fella out of a jam.

ARTHUR: What're you talking about?

ERNIE: Clifford Truckston. The guy that lives next door to my aunt. Getting drafted next month and his girl's knocked up.

ARTHUR: (Impressed.) No kidding!

ERNIE: And who's he have to come to, to steer him to a doctor? Me.

ARTHUR: Did he have to? I mean, do *that*?

ERNIE: At first he thought he'd get four other guys to swear she'd put out to *them*, too, but then he decided he'd better do the honorable thing and get her an abortion.

ARTHUR: (Throws in his cards.) I'm out. Deal 'em.

ERNIE: (Picks up the cards. They ante.) Cost him over a hundred, cash! (Shuffles and deals.)

ARTHUR: (A great effort to be nonchalant and keep up his part of the "man of the world" act.) I'm gonna be *really* careful from now on!

ERNIE: A guy's gotta be. (A very short pause.) Did your old man ever take you into the bedroom and give you the old pep-talk? About women and diseases and all?



ARTHUR: No, he never.

ERNIE: Mine did. He really did. Only he waited till I was twelve, for God-sake! All I could do to keep a straight face.

ARTHUR: (Puts down two discards). My dad never told me a thing. Too embarrassed.<sup>8</sup>

Presumably this is one of the "dirty" passages.

Unquoted from elsewhere in the play are these two exchanges, which, had they been included, would certainly cause one to look very differently on the page that was quoted. Janet is the girl friend of Arthur.

JANET: (Crossing Up Left of the couch and above to Center of couch, and watching them with amusement.) You know something? You guys slay me!

ARTHUR: What?

JANET: (Crossing to above the table.) This big act you put on!

ARTHUR: What act?

JANET: (Crossing to above Right of Ernie.) Down here playing poker—drinking beer—swearing every other word!<sup>9</sup>

Later, after Janet and Arthur have become more involved and Janet has become pregnant, the two boys return to the subject that before was only a joke.

ERNIE: If it was me, I'd give up this abortion idea. No kidding, Art.

ARTHUR: How can we? I can't just go upstairs and tell 'em! My mom'd start to shake—when she gets upset she starts to breathe funny. And my old man just goes up in smoke! If I was to go up and just tell 'em something like this—the shock might kill 'em even. Besides, Ernie, they trust me, and they're countin' on me.

ERNIE: (Seriously.) Look, I'm not trying to scare hell out of you or anything, but—Well—like I said before—it's murder.

ARTHUR: (Sharply.) Don't keep saying that. We didn't mean it to be a baby. (Quietly.) It was just her and me—we didn't think—(Suppressed vehemence.) Besides, it hasn't even got a heart or a name yet. It's not a person—just—trouble!

ERNIE: (Strongly.) It's *alive*, isn't it?—listen, Art, these operations are dangerous. I mean, the doctors that do it aren't so hot sometimes. That's why they got kicked out of the profession, 'cause they weren't very ethical to start with.<sup>10</sup>

A major purpose of the play was obviously to let teen-agers raise with each other those very points that some adults might raise in regard to swearing and abortion.

I can understand that this swearing should bother certain people, espe-

cially if some of it is regarded as "taking the Lord's name in vain," but where is the filthy content and the pornography? Whether coarse street words should never appear in some school books depends of course on one's assumptions; my purpose here is only to show that the protesters misadvertised the books in claiming they contained "four-letter words," since what people usually understand by "four-letter words" are those that did not appear in the books, certainly nowhere in *Interaction* and, so far as I know, not in the other textbooks either. Had they found them, the protesters could certainly have cited the selections. As with all of the worst accusations, one searches vainly *in the textbooks themselves* for the actual evidence.

Long before the Kanawha County incident publishers were terrified of incensing schools. They do their own precensoring and always have, no matter how ridiculous editors may personally feel it is to be shocked by taboo words or by natural functions of the body that the Creator allotted us. To the extent swearing expresses negative emotion I can agree that it is not a good thing, but this avails little if the same negative emotion comes out anyway in more acceptable language and other behavior. The real problem of course is the anger, disgust, hostility, and so on that engender the use of words that provoke others.

Let us hope society will arrive at a stage where our own words no longer hold a power over us beyond our control as if they issued from a supernatural agency. "Fighting words" is a false expression; *people* fight, not words, nor can words "make" us fight. That too is primitive magic thinking. We cannot blame others if we react with anger, shock, dread, or lust to their choice of words. My reactions are my own response and my own responsibility. Words are servants, and, like the Sabbath, are made for man, not man for words.

Since profane or coarse language often fills the speech of people living in dehumanized environments—battlefields, ghettos, assembly lines—the practical effect of banning such speech is to cut off the voices of soldiers, workers, minorities, or others whose plight tells us things we don't want to hear. Witness the banning from some libraries of combat stories of Vietnam, the ruckus in Pennsylvania about Studs Terkel's book of interviews, *Working*, or the incessant objection to black and Hispanic accounts of their experiences, all on grounds of vulgar language.

But let's not forget either that most people who object to swearing do it themselves. Censoring can be a misdirected effort to clean up one's own act. The basic meaning of "vulgar" is "common," from which derives the meaning "coarse," and the fact is that coarseness is common—widespread—and the language of the man in the street is street language. We can ban this language on behalf of raising standards, but we must realize that in keeping these voices out of books we discourage the owners of those

voices from reading books or, for that matter, from improving their language.

The most sexual content Fike's crew could come up with for their ad—or that any other group could in any other dissemination of quotations—were the following two passages from *Interaction*. The first excerpt was quoted over and over as an example of, presumably, explicit sex or pornography, and the Rev. Graley referred to it in the interview in chapter 4.

# "A True Story"

A tall, red-headed chick. She had been mainly a whore, actually, with very expensive johns, who would pay her a hundred dollars a shot. And she was a very lively chick, who took a lot of pot. Really a remarkable, beautiful, good-hearted, tender girl. I had a special regard for her from years before, because she had really put herself out to straighten me out and here she was like a big, expensive whore.<sup>11</sup>

"A True Story" is a title the Alliance made up. The selection was Jane Kramer's "Allen Ginsberg at Columbia" from *Biography 2*, an account of his undergraduate days in the forties that plays up the dark comedy of the difficulties he and his friends got into. Kramer quotes at length Ginsberg's own recital of events, and it is from this quotation that the offending passage is taken. He mentions the whore briefly while describing how she and other old friends that he thought too much of to throw out began to take over his apartment and, over his protest, fill it with stolen goods. He finally went away himself. The whore figures only in the passage quoted.

Ginsberg comes off as a picturesque character from another era. Other selections in the book, are Winston Churchill's "Henry Plantagenet," Virginia Woolf's "Mary Wollstonecraft," Gaius Suetonius' "Nero," and biographies of Anaïs Nin and Bucky Fuller. Stripping the selection of its real identity and setting certainly leaves the impression that the whore is featured in some sexual story. Actually, it is the familiar story of a kid getting in trouble in college through the company he keeps.

You will not learn from the ad that both of these passages appeared in *Interaction's* level 4, our most advanced, which was intended for college-bound senior high students. Furthermore, the ad pointedly states that the samples were taken only from those books that the board returned to the classrooms November 8, whereas *Interaction's* level 4 was *not* returned. This means that two of the eight excerpts displayed in the ad, the two quoted here, were not, as the title claimed, "What Your Children Will Read." Never identified, the fictional diary from which the second excerpt came was "Me and Miss Mandible," a short story by Donald Barthelme.

## Fictional Diaries

13 September

Miss Mandible wants to make love to me but she hesitates because I am officially a child; I am, according to the records, according to the gradebook on her desk, according to the card index in the principal's office, eleven years old. There is a misconception here, one that I haven't quite managed to get cleared up yet. I am in fact thirty-five, I've been in the Army, I am six feet one, I have hair in the appropriate places, my voice is a baritone, I know very well what to do with Miss Mandible if she ever makes up her mind.

9 December

Disaster once again. Tomorrow I am to be sent to a doctor, for observation. Sue Ann Brownly caught Miss Mandible and me in the cloakroom, during recess, and immediately threw a fit. For a moment I thought she was actually going to choke. She ran out of the room weeping, straight for the principal's office, certain now which of us was Debbie, which Eddie, which Liz. I am sorry to be the cause of her disillusionment, but I know that she will recover. Miss Mandible is ruined but fulfilled. Although she will be charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor, she seems at peace; her promise has been kept. She knows now that everything she has been told about life, about America, is true.<sup>12</sup>

Barthelme's language is perfectly inoffensive, the story is not offered as realism but as an amusing satire on many aspects of society, and the diarist — as so often with stories told from this point of view — shows himself as a bit cracked, however perceptive some of his observations may be. The two diary entries quoted above did not occur back to back, as presented in the ad (without indication of elision). By skipping over the many other entries dealing with social satire, the protesters create the impression, again, that the selection deals exclusively with sex. Whether or not one disapproves of the sexual references themselves in "Me and Miss Mandible" the story simply cannot honestly be called "pornographic" — or even "filthy" because "filthy" to most people is a synonym for "pornographic." The passages quoted in this chapter were the worst that the protesters ever cited from any of the textbooks to support such terms as they bandied about in rumors and meetings and accusations in the media. Recall that the coalition of ten ministers of various denominations defended the treatment of sex in the textbooks (see chapter 1). Even Citizens for Decency through Law (formerly Citizens for Decent Literature), for whom Robert Dornan was public relations representative, "has expressed the view that the books adopted by the Kanawha County School are not obscene or pornographic."<sup>13</sup>

While it has been necessary to deal roundly at the outset with the two blanket charges of conspiracy and pornography, because the absence of

supporting evidence doesn't become apparent simply by examining the following objections, I don't mean to say that other objections were equally unfair and unwarranted. Some I actually agree with. Many quotations support the point being made, in which case they concern some difference in values, or at least the protesters honestly misunderstand what they are quoting. I would be naïve and the perpetrator of naïveté, however, if I did not point out downright deception and misrepresentation.

Illumination requires the effort to distinguish misrepresentation from misinterpretation, subtle as that task becomes at times. In order to clarify the thought underlying censorship and bigotry we need to assess what is deliberate and what is unconscious in the objections to the books. Dishonesty no doubt occurred as part of the zealot's conviction that the ends justify the means, but certain emotional premises may cause authentic distortions of perception. It is possible that at times the protesters really thought that things were included or omitted from the books when in fact these perceptions can easily be shown wrong. I am not so concerned about deliberate falsification as I am about unwitting falsehood.