

⁶Leet, *Geology*, p. 246

⁷Morris, *Twilight*, p. 30.

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 14-15.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹¹*Ibid.*

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 20

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 25.

¹⁵Editorial, *The Dallas Morning News*, February 1, 1977.

¹⁶Gish, Duane T. "A Decade of Creationist Research." Reprinted from *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, June, 1975, p. 2.

CENSORSHIP IN LITERATURE

by Agatha Lubbers

The author presented the following article as a speech in October, 1976, to several sectionals at the Protestant Reformed Teachers Institute annual convention. The author teaches literature at Covenant Christian High School.

Introduction

The September, 1976, issue of *Perspectives in Covenant Education* contains an article, which I wrote, entitled "Creativity and the Reformed Christian Teacher." In this article I stated that an important topic related to creativity is "Censorship and Its Proper Role." During the spring of 1976 I had been assigned the task of making this presentation this morning for the P.R.T.I. Convention on "Censorship in Literature." I had never completely realized the enormity of this problem, nor had I been conscious of the reams of paper that have been consumed in discussions of the problem. As I sat down five days ago to prepare my presentation for this morning I attempted to see the last few roses blooming in the rose garden outside my study window but they could barely be seen because of the height of the stack of material lying on my desk related to this topic.

Most of the materials available on the topic which have been written in the past decade are not written from a specifically

Reformed or even broadly Christian perspective. Pragmatic and humanistic principles prevail in the discussion of the problem. The so-called principle of academic or intellectual freedom is the touchstone most often selected to determine the direction of the argumentation on all sides of this sometimes seamy, certainly sensitive, and controversial issue.

As I pondered the topic "Censorship and Literature," I concluded that I have been in the business of censorship and certainly selection for several decades, but the enormity and the importance of the endeavor had never completely dawned upon me until I was forced to prepare for this sectional of the convention on "Censorship and Literature."

As I thought about the topic, I was forced to initiate a more serious and comprehensive inspection of my function as a teacher of Covenant children and adolescents in the Protestant Reformed community. I became immensely impressed with those passages of the inspired Word of God which appeared to shed light on this important function of mine.

Paul says in Philippians 4:8, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are

pure, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be by any virtue, and if there be by any praise, think on these things."

In addition the inspired writer Paul says in Colossians 3:8, "But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, **filthy communication out of your mouth.**"

The apostle Peter teaches that we must have an attitude similar to that of Lot in godless and sex-obsessed Sodom. Peter says that Godly Lot was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked, II Peter 2:7."

James, the brother of our Lord Jesus Christ, says to his fellow believers in the first century Christian churches, "Wherefore lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, James 1:21a."

The apostle John writes in the third epistle to well-beloved Gaius (perhaps an elder at Pergamum) and to all the churches and Christians of his day; "Beloved follow not that which is evil, (i.e. imitate not, or do not mimic the evil, AL) but that which is good. III John 11."

In that well-known and much-loved Psalm which begins "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God" (or NO! GOD! AL), David writes, "They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no not one. Psalm 14:3."

In addition to all these texts that cry out to the child of God from the Holy Scriptures come also additional profound but perspicuous Scriptural exhortations from the apostle Paul, who in many places reminds the redeemed Christian that he is in the world and that he cannot flee from the world but he nonetheless must not be of the world. He must be transformed and not be conformed to this world. Paul writes specifically about this position of the Christian when he says in I Corinthians 7:29-31, which I freely quote from various sources, "But this I say, brethren, the time is short: from now on, let those who have wives live as though they had

none, etc....and those who deal with the world as though they had no dealings with it." Edgar J. Goodspeed translates this last section of verse 31 in his paraphrase as follows: "...and those who mix in the world, as though they were not absorbed in it."

In the same general tone Paul also says to the Corinthians and to us all in I Corinthians 5:9-10, "I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company (i.e. be intimate, AL) with fornicators; yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world (i.e. not at all meaning the immoral of this world, AL) or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world."

It appears therefore that the task of the Christian censor of literature is clear-cut and specific. This task is not to be freighted with the academic free-thinking baggage of intellectual liberty, but is soundly rooted in the freedom which we have as believers in Christ—a freedom in Christ which is judged by the conscience of another, cf. I Corinthians 10:29. In all our life, including the censoring of literature we teach and in selecting the literature we read, we are called to discriminate as Christians and to please our neighbor for good to edification. Romans 15:2. In this way we do all things to the glory of God.

In order to understand censorship as it applies to literature and the reading we do or will permit our students to do, we should investigate at least four important questions.

1. What is the **History** of censorship?
2. What is the **necessity** for censorship?
3. What is the **purpose** for censorship?
4. How does one **implement** the censorship process?

It is my intention to survey these four questions. I shall devote the remainder of the time for this sectional to a general discussion of any of these four questions

but particularly to the implementation of the censorship process—a question to which I will devote the least time in my formal presentation. I also invite discussion of any unanswered questions or disputable answers to questions in my presentation.

1. The History of Censorship

Censorship of literature and the writings of men is obviously an old question. The Roman Catholic Church instituted the *Index* (i.e. the list of censored books) in the 16th century after the famous Council of Trent. That books were censored for their contents in the 16th and 17th centuries and even in later centuries in Europe is a matter of record. Censorship is really an old story and is not merely some late 20th century development. Socrates, Galileo, Luther, and Milton are only a few of the names of famous men whose ideas and writings have been suppressed as dangerous and heretical. In some cases it is true and in others it is not true.

In addition, there is an equally illustrious group of men who have defended the right to be heard. They are Socrates, John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, John Stuart Mill, and John Milton—a man who always was an antagonist of intellectual bondage.

There is of course a sense in which bondage of sound and correct ideas is fundamentally wrong! Martin Luther pinpointed it when he said, "I am persuaded that without the knowledge of literature theology cannot at all endure, just as heretofore when letters have declined and lain prostrate; nay, I see that there has never been a great revelation of the Word of God unless God has first prepared the way by the rise and prosperity of language and letters as though they were John the Baptists."

John Milton writes in his "Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing to the Parliament of England"—a speech he

called the *Areopagitica*, concerning the suppression of ideas. He writes condemningly about the Council of Trent and Spanish Inquisition which he said brought forth those "catalogues and expurging indexes, that rake through the entrails of many an old good author, with a violation worse than any could be offered to his tomb."

Milton continues in the same *Areopagitica* as follows: "Nor did they stay in matters heretical, but any subject that was not to their palate, they either condemned in a prohibition, or had it straight into the new purgatory of an Index. To fill up the measure of encroachment, their last invention was to ordain that no book, pamphlet, or paper should be printed (as if St. Peter had bequeathed them the keys of the press also out of Paradise) unless it were approved and licensed under the hands of two or three friars..."

Milton continues as follows: "I fear their next design will be to get into their custody the licensing of that which they say Claudius intended, but went not through with." (The reference to Claudius by Milton is to the Roman emperor who supposedly was considering the granting of pardon to those afflicted with intestinal disturbances at the table. With this hyperbole Milton attempts to show to what extent censorship can go and how it can become ridiculous.)

Bear with me as I quote one more of these gems from the *Areopagitica* by Milton: "Solomon informs us that much reading is a weariness to the flesh, but neither he nor other inspired author tells us that such or such reading is unlawful; yet certainly had God thought good to limit us herein, it had been much more expedient to have told us what was unlawful than what was wearisome."

At this point Milton may be pushing the case a bit too far, but I think the point has been sufficiently made that early in history there was censorship and such censorship as existed and was practiced

was often incorrect.

The history of censorship includes the censoring of children's books. Only in recent times can one find a record of, or reference to censorship in children's literature. This is undoubtedly in great part due to the fact that the publication of children's literature is a recent phenomenon. A virtual plethora of such literature currently exists while this was not true in the past. Children and adolescents in the earliest days of book publishing and education read adult literature. No vast libraries or school media centers were filled with children's literature.

The 19th century records provide well-documented evidence of the suppression of certain books to protect children. Anthony Comstock is cited by Richard L. Darling in *Elementary English*, May, 1974, as one of the better-known censors of 19th century America. Comstock wrote as follows: "There is at present no more active agent employed by Satan in civilized communities to ruin the human family and subject the nations to himself than evil reading.... Vile books and papers are branding-irons heated in the fires of hell, and used by Satan to sear the highest life of the soul." Comstock persuaded the federal government to pass the **Comstock Act** which would begin using the postal department to suppress books. In the tons of books and magazines confiscated, however, there were no books which could specifically be called children's books because this act preceeded the publishing boom of children's books.

Another agency in the 19th century for the protection of children was the American Sunday School Union. This organization set up standards for juvenile literature. Emphasis was on the moral and religious character of books although criteria concerning style and appropriateness for the growing mind of the child were also included.

It is reported that one of the most influential agencies to censor children's

books in the late 19th century was the Ladies Commission on Sunday-School Books. In an article submitted to the *Unitarian Review* of June, 1874, the Commission described their work. They said they had examined 343 books, and had approved 82. They listed the most common reasons for rejection of certain books. Most of the reasons were literary—relating to style, structure, characterization, motivation, and stereotyped character and action, but many were condemned for their sensationalism, exaggeration of incident, lack of proper connection between cause and effect, (i.e. coincidence), "a startling and even horrible character of events," for "vulgar words" and "vulgar thoughts." The Ladies Commission suggested that writers for children take the advice of St. Paul in Philippians 4:8, with one word changed, "write on these things" rather than "think on these things."

During the 20th century the controversy concerning the legitimacy of certain books and the controversy over the practices of certain censors has proliferated. Richard L. Darling writing in the May, 1974, edition of *Elementary English* writes that although censorship of children's books is a 20th century phenomenon, "it is peculiar that there has never yet been a book for children declared illegal by a court of competent jurisdiction." (He wrote this prior to some later decisions by courts.) Darling continues as follows in his article: "The story of censorship of children's books and other reading materials is a tale of pressure groups, of illegal actions, of timidity, even cowardice among librarians and other educators, and of almost unbelievable prejudice and stupidity." One of the instances of this kind of prejudice cited by several journalists was that which occurred in Caldwell Parish, Louisiana. Librarians in this parish painted tempera diapers on the naked hero of the child's story book *In the Night Kitchen* by

Maurice Sendak, and published by Harper in 1970. *In the Night Kitchen* has been condemned by censors and book selectors because it celebrates childhood sexuality—or at least childhood sensuality. Some have called it a “masturbatory fantasy.” Now it surpasses my imagination and understanding to know why such literature will be helpful to young children. In what sense is it proper for young children?

The cynical and antinomian opinions of Richard L. Darling, Dean at Columbia University's School of Library Services, New York City, and those of Mary Lou White, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, who writes in the October, 1974, edition of *The Elementary School Journal*, University of Chicago publication, are the prevailing opinions of persons in positions of leadership today.

This kind of evidence prompts one to recall another of the famous phrases of the erudite but pious Martin Luther. “I am much afraid that schools will prove to be the great gates of hell, unless they diligently labor in explaining the Holy Scriptures, engraving them in the hearts of youth.” This the schools do not do today.

I was surprised to read, however, in the course of my research an article appearing in the *School Library Journal*, February, 1973, p. 44, under the title “Sexuality in Books for Children: An Exchange” between Barbarra Wersba and Josette Frank, the rather unusual but also ambivalent point view expressed by the matronly appearing Josette Frank, who is the director for Children's Books and Mass Media at the Child Study Association in New York. Permit me to quote at some length from her part of the literary exchange.

Josette Frank begins by saying, “There is nothing new about discussion of sex education for children. Books purporting to tell children the ‘facts of life’—as it was then polite to call them—began appearing about the turn of

the century.”

Frank continues later in the article after indicating that “adults should make available books to the young and immature that will stretch the mind and spirit” the following: “Therefore when, in an otherwise conventional take, we come suddenly without warning, to an episode in which a 13-year-old girl teaches a boy the way of what she calls ‘mating,’ we wonder how this can profit the young reader. Is it information he or she needs or can use at this point in maturing? Is it an integral part of the story or is it dragged in for titillation? When we give this book, or others like it, to a young teenager, are we, in effect saying, ‘Try it—you’ll like it?’”

Finally after expanding still further on this topic Frank writes: “I confess I am thinking in terms of shielding children from unnecessary premature, unhealthy sexual stimulation, beyond their present maturity and capacity to manage. Just when and how that capacity arrives cannot be defined for all children. Their exposure to sexual behavior in the omnipresent media most certainly hastens their information and their sophistication. Whether it hastens their maturity is an unanswered question.”

Josette Frank concludes by saying, “Therefore I feel we adults—and this includes especially writers and editors—have a grave responsibility in commending books to children's attention, to give them books whose positive value we believe in. I do not consider this censorship.”

Although Josette Frank considers this selection and not censorship, it cannot be denied that when one selects certain books and denies others he is censoring certain things away from a child. There are those who would claim that this is un-American because it is anti-bill of rights behavior.

The history or direction of censorship in the past several years includes what has been happening in places like Drake,

North Dakota, where copies of the profane and obscene novel, *Slaughterhouse Five* by Kurt Vonnegut were summarily confiscated and burned in spite of the protestations of Mr. Severy, English teacher at Drake, and in spite of the dissent of Donald B. Veix who writes in an article appearing in the *English Journal* of October, 1975, "Teaching a Censored Novel: *Slaughterhouse Five*." In the article Viex writes, "It grabs me. I enjoy teaching it."

The recent history of censorship also includes what has been happening in places like Kanawha County, West Virginia. The American Library Association reported in June of 1975, that its TNT list (Titles Now Troublesome) had grown from 11 to 30 in six months. The books on the list included: *Jaws*, *Rosemary's Baby*, *The Summer of 42*, *Slaughterhouse Five*, *The Exorcist*, *Jonathan Livingstone's Seagull*.

In New Hampshire legislators introduced a bill to impose a \$1,000.00 fine or a year's imprisonment on any public school teacher who assigned books containing words the state defines as obscene. During the debate in the legislature, one opponent of the bill observed that the bill's provisions would mean jail for a teacher who taught Shakespeare or Chaucer. "That's right," snapped one of the sponsors. "And those books ought to be read in college, not before."

In Dallas, Texas, school officials have not waited for protests before banning books from the schools. The *Newsweek* of June 9, 1975, reports that *Jaws*, *Go Ask Alice*, and *North Dallas Forty* have all fallen short of the strict standards of a school board screening committee.

In Syracuse, Indiana, several parents recently forced their local high school to ban John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men*. They complained that it contains "cuss words."

School administrators in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, have given up an unexpurgated textbook called *Mass Media*

and the *Popular Arts* because it includes excerpts from news stories about the Democratic National Convention in 1968—complete with four-letter expletives from the protesters in the now well-known Chicago fiasco.

Judith Krug, who heads the ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom, has an opinion to explain this spreading sentiment for censorship in the 70's. She says, "People feel helpless, and they find it easier to censor school material than it is to express what's really bothering them." Krug continues, "They say, 'If my kid didn't read *Go Ask Alice* then the drug problem would go away.'"

We have undoubtedly written enough about the history of censorship to indicate that censorship has been and is a live issue. The Christian School is also involved in this procedure and ought to be. In 1971 the National Union of Christian Schools published a Curriculum Resource Paper authored by Henry Baron. It was entitled '*Dirty Books*' in *Christian Schools: Principles of Selection*.

A consideration of this fact leads me to ask and answer my second question, "Why is Censorship Necessary?"

2. The Necessity for Censorship

In a review in the *Christian Educators Journal*, January, 1969, Gerda Bos of Trinity College discusses the '*Dirty Books*' resource paper authored by Baron. Within the review by Gerda Bos can be found a statement which expressed the need for a study of censorship. Gerda Bos says, "A serious application of Henry Baron's proposals would result in better preparation for teachers, better education for students, and better relations between parents and teachers. These would all be significant consequences of a paper which sets out to suggest a program whereby parents, teachers, and boards may avoid the hassles resulting from the assignment of books which parents find objection-

able." That is an exceedingly pragmatic statement but expresses adequately the current felt need in the Christian schools for censorship and proper selection of books for children and adolescents.

Parents, teachers, and students are all members of the community of Christians denominated as the body of Christ. They are commanded by God to edify one another. When a teacher assigns a book or makes available to a student or a group of students a book, or other literary materials which are not acceptable to the parent there will be a conflict. When such conflicts occur the child suffers, the school system suffers, the body of Christ suffers, the whole Christian community suffers. That which is causing the trouble must be evaluated, critiqued, and perhaps censored. This is part of the selection process. The Scriptural principle which we stated earlier in this presentation, and which is to the point is that stated in Romans 15:1-3a by the Apostle Paul. "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves. Let everyone of us please his neighbor for his good to edification. For even Christ pleased not himself..."

The necessity for censorship is dictated in the Christian community and the Christian school by the fact of sin and God's commands. Man's sinfulness has caused a total polluting of the products of men including his literature or his cultured responses to reality. Undiluted and unsophisticated common sense plus sheer classical decorum and Christian moral sensitivity makes censorship of much of that which is peddled as literature necessary. We cannot help but be repelled by what seems to be a virtual obsession with many modern writers. Dr. Tiemersma writing in an article entitled for "Adults Only" in the *Christian Educators Journal*, January, 1969, cuts with characteristic incisiveness into the problem; "So pervasive is the preoccupation with the purely biological functions of man," says

Tiemersma, "with sex and perversion, with defecation and urination, that even non-Christian critics have begun to protest, if not in the name of decency, at least in the name of art."

Tiemersma's analysis of the current 20th century syndrome reminds me of a comment made by 18th century Samuel Johnson in his critique of the love theme which was so prominent in most or all of the 18th century dramas and plays. Johnson writes, "Upon every other stage (except Shakespeare's, AL) the universal agent is love, by whose power all good and evil is distributed, and every action quickened or retarded. To bring a lover, a lady, and a rival into the fable; to entangle them in contradictory obligations, perplex them with oppositions of interest, and harass them with violence of desires inconsistent with each other; to make them meet in rapture and part in agony; to fill their mouths with hyperbolic joy and outrageous sorrow; to distress them as nothing human ever was distressed, to deliver them as nothing human ever was delivered—is the business of a modern (i.e. 18th century, AL) dramatist. For this (i.e. the love theme, AL) probability is violated, life is misrepresented, and language is depraved. But love is only one of many passions..." This quote from the *Preface to Shakespeare* by Samuel Johnson serves to illustrate the simple fact that the same preoccupation with sex and lust only more pornographically and more naturalistically infests literature of the 20th century. Man does change—he becomes more sinful. Sin develops.

Dr. Tiemersma includes in "For Adults Only" a brief analysis of the 20th century reaction against Victorian prudery. He says this reaction may in some respects be a healthy one and that the "see no evil—hear no evil—speak no evil pose" of the 19th century might have contained more than the usual proportion of hypocrisy. Tiemersma also observes that neither culture nor morality seems

have been noticeably benefitted or improved by Dr. Bowdler's expurgations of Shakespeare. "But," says Tiemersma, "although Victorians and Christians have been frequently accused of playing the ostrich, one is tempted to ask in all seriousness whether society has gained measureably by pulling its head out of the sand and thrusting it into the chamber pot."

The necessity for censorship in the school becomes all the more evident when one considers what has happened to literature for adolescents. Previous adolescent literature stayed at the low, somewhat sacharrine, and perhaps unrealistic and romantic level of *A Touchdown for Old Siwash High*, or *Class Ring*, or *A Pet for Cynthia*, or *Pirates of the Deep*. Today's literature written for the adolescent is more likely to mirror the real world of today's young people—drugs, racism, school dropouts, divorce, sex, permissiveness, high school gangs. (cf. *English Journal*, November, 1972.)

I am not holding a brief for unrealistic and for romantic sentimental drivel. I am stating, however, that the quantity of today's literature which rises no higher than the level of gutter language has so proliferated that knowledgeable censoring of literature is an absolute necessity.

3. The Purpose For Censorship

I come now to a short discussion of the purpose for censorship in literature.

Grace Huitzing, editor of the Language Arts Department of the *Christian Educators Journal* in 1967, quotes the late Dr. Henry Zylstra, who quotes Professor Herbert Pottle. "We protect children from books that might cause trouble, as we keep certain kinds of food from them, but when they grow up they must decide by the testimony of their own lives and their own consciences. It was profoundly said by St. Augustine that all morality can be summed up in the injunction, 'Love God and do what you will.' The saying could as

well take the form, 'Love God and read what you will.' "

The point that is obviously being made is that young people and perhaps children, too, need not be cloistered not should they live in "ostrich-like" seclusion (and they don't). Nevertheless, the young person must be mature enough to read the materials that they voluntarily select or those that are selected for him to read.

We do not espouse or support the *Students' Right to Read* position of Kenneth Donelson, who has prepared recommendations in a little booklet which will handle citizen's complaints about books and other materials used in the schools. He proposes a six-point program (which we have no time to consider now) in the February, 1974, issue of the *English Journal* for English departments to follow so that they will be prepared for the activities of the censor.

We do agree with Mary Lou White in an article in the *Elementary School Journal*, October, 1974, when she writes, "The ultimate threat of controversy is censorship, even though one of basic tenets of democracy is the individual's right to read. When we place restrictions on this guaranteed right by censoring books in any form we deny the child not only his intellectual freedom, but his constitutional freedom."

I maintain that children are not free to read whatever they please just as they cannot do as they please. Anarchy reigns in many a home and school for just that reason. Children like adults must learn to subject themselves to the plain and infallible teaching of the Word of God. In addition, children need guidance and they need a healthy reading diet—a diet which can best be determined for them by God-fearing teachers and parents who don't wish to pervert and destroy the seed of the Covenant but wish to discipline and nurture that seed of the Covenant to the glory and to the praise of God.

Adolescents are certainly to be taught the errors of false philosophy and the error of pornography, but they also are to be protected and "sheltered" from the false philosophy and kinds of evils that are "humorously peddled" in the supposed seriousness of a perverted book like *Slaughterhouse Five*. When humor and supposed seriousness is used to peddle graffiti found usually on the walls of bathrooms, then our children are to be told that it is not necessary to read about that from which they have been saved and concerning which the apostle Paul wrote in Ephesians 5:12, "For it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret;" and concerning which Paul said in I Corinthians 6:18, "Flee fornication." In a discussion of a similar problem the *Heidelberg Catechism* says, "Since both our body and soul are temples of the Holy Spirit, he commands us to preserve them pure and holy: therefore he forbids all unchaste actions, gestures, words, thoughts, desires, and whatever can entice men thereto."

There is only a short step between depraved realism, titillating naturalism, and the erotic literature of the porno pushers.

The purpose of our reading programs and our literature study programs is to produce mature Christian thinkers. They are not to be the "great gates of hell." The purpose of our literature and reading programs is to instruct, to discipline, to educate and not to titillate and satisfy the passions.

This makes the teaching literature a battle.

This is the challenge.

In the world, but not of it means exactly that! In the world, but not of it means to crucify and mortify our old natures and thus walk a godly life.

I do not mean to propose that I think our young people are naive and should remain naive concerning the world's ills. The Bible doesn't do that to them, neither

does literature have to be some kind of syrupy pabulum. I do mean to state, however, that the literature our young people read must be both enjoyable and instructive; but not seductive as much contemporary literature is under the guise of that well-known slogan, "It has redeeming social value." That's hogwash!!

We must beware, therefore, lest we become laborers for and with Satan, the father of the lie, who is Belial, rather than being what we ought to be, "Colaborers together with all the holy apostles and holy men of every age of God in Christ."

I am not promoting a Polyanna-type literature, nor the Horatio Alger type of literature in which the good boy makes good in the world. Deistic and rationalistic morality must also be censored as being perverted and ill-bred.

I am advocating a healthy God-fearing censorship and selection of literature which I believe is the personal and collective responsibility of all who are involved in the instructing of the youth of the Covenant.

This all reminds me of a quotation I have used before and which appears on page 35 of the *Literature Studies Guide*, published by the Federation of P.R.C.S. in 1971. Leland Ryken writes: "I believe that the best criterion for what a Christian ought not to be reading is simply the test of enjoyment. The regenerated Christian cannot enjoy literature that **dellights** in the portrayal of immorality, that attempts to arouse impure sexual thoughts, that trades in profanity, or that blasphemes the sacred things of the Christian religion. The Christian mind, I say, is repelled by all this because of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, and it can be trusted to stay away from such literature if it is allowed to follow the standard of Christian enjoyment." I know that this kind of attitude creates problems too, but it is a healthy sound approach to the difficult area we are discussing. It fits with

Augustine's, "Love God and do what you will!" Our task is to produce the discriminating reader through selection and censorship.

4. Implementing Censorship

This leads me to the last topic for this paper and of this sectional. I should like to leave most of this for discussion purposes. I only wish to state that we can hardly do better than was done in the Principles for Selection and Censorship of Literature in the Literature Studies Guide, 1971. Here are those principles.

A. We select literature which provides insights into reality.

B. We select literature which demonstrates effectively literary form and literature which develops a discriminating reader.

C. We select literature which conveys the feeling of living in a different time and place.

D. We select literature which effectively provides an insight into the student's own life.

E. We select literature which is appropriate to the intellectual, social, and emotional level of the covenant child.

F. We believe that the teacher must consider the spiritual maturity of the child in choosing works of literature for classroom use.

G. We believe that the teacher is primarily responsible for all materials selected in the literature class.

H. We promote the use of the writings of Christians, especially those writings which artistically show the conflicts of the Christian pilgrimage and the resolution on these problems by grace, the atonement through Christ.

I. We strive for balance by selecting from literature, all types (genre) of literature, writings from all periods, and writings of both Christians and non-Christians.

J. We reject some "literature" which is so evil that it is part of the things which "should not be once named among you." (Cf. Ephesians 5)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bos, Gerda, "Review of 'Dirty Books' in Christian Schools: Principles of Selection," *Christian Educators Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 5, (May, 1971) 8.
- Darling, Richard L., "Censorship—An Old Story," *Elementary English*, Vol. 51, No. 5, (May, 1974) 691-696.
- Donelson, Ken, "Censorship in the 1970's: Some Ways to Handle It When It Comes (And It Will)," *English Journal*, Vol. 63, No. 2, (February, 1974), 47-51.
- Donelson, Kenneth L., "White Walls and High Windows: Some Contemporary Censorship Problems," *English Journal*, Vol. 61, No. 8, (November, 1972) 1191-1198.
- Frank, Josette, and Wersba, Barbara, "Sexuality In Books for Children: An Exchange," *School Library Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, (February, 1973) 44-47.
- Harvey, James A., "Acting For The Children?" *School Library Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, (February, 1973) 26-29.
- Huitsing, Grace, "Editorial: Love God and Read What You Want?" *Christian Educators Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 4, (April-May, 1967) 23-24.
- Hurley, John, and Sullivan, Jerry L., "Teaching Literature to Adolescents: Inoculation or Induction?" *English Journal*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (January, 1973) 49-59.
- Levine, Alan H., "'Impressionable Mind' ... 'Forbidden Subjects': a case in point," *School Library Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 6, (February, 1973) 19-25.
- Pollan, Corrine, "What High School Students Are Really Reading," *English Journal*, Vol. 62, No. 4, (April, 1973) 573-576.

Rey, Greta, "Discernment, Not Censorship," *Christian Educators Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 3, (February, 1967) 27-28.

Sheils, Marrill, "The Book Banners," *Newsweek*, (June 9, 1975), 57.

Tiemersma, Richard R., "Adults Only," *Christian Educators Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, (January, 1969) 27-28.

Veix, Donald B., "Teaching A Censored Novel: Slaughterhouse Five," *English Journal*, Vol. 64, No. 7, (October, 1975)

25-33.

White, Mary Lou, "Censorship—Threat over Children's Books," *The Elementary School Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 1, (October, 1974) 2-10.

Literature Studies Guide (Preliminary Education), published by the Federation of Protestant Reformed Christian Schools, as the result of a workshop, directed by Miss Agatha Lubbers, 1971.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION MUST EDUCATE

by John Zandstra

The author of this contribution teaches in the junior high at Hope Protestant Reformed Christian School. He teaches tenth grade boys physical education at Covenant Christian High. He is a graduate from Dordt College, Sioux Center, Iowa.

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." (Romans 12:1) (KJV)

What does it mean to be in a physical education class? To some it means "fun and games," while to others it means working out in the gymnasium on a regular basis. To children of farmers it may seem to be a waste of time: after all, they already have muscles. Others think of physical education as athletics or sports. Still others suppose that "a sound mind in a sound body" presents a dichotomy, by this they mean to say that the "sound body" has no bearing on a "sound mind."

Let us first examine what the Scriptures say. What do the Scriptures teach concerning physical education? How should a Christian view physical education? What is the Christian's responsibility with regard to the physical aspect of

man? Who made this body? How important is our body?

The Bible gives us a fundamental directive for physical education. This is not explicit in the Scriptures but it is certainly implied. The Holy Scripture furnishes us with some guidelines when it comes to the importance and use of the body. In creation God made everything and everything He made was good (Genesis 1:31). Man is in that creation. Psalm 100:3 says, "Know ye that the Lord He is God; it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves; we are his people; and the sheep of his pasture." Genesis 2:7 tells us, "And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Thus Scripture plainly teaches that God is the maker of our bodies. Therefore our bodies are important and, therefore, we do have a responsibility to our Maker. Romans 12:1 which I quoted in the beginning of this paper says, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." In I Corinthians 6:19