

The Catholic Church and Censorship in Literature, Books, Drama, and Film

Aurelie Hagstrom

Who among us was not at least slightly offended when we saw the news clips of the Taliban blowing up the statues of the Buddha? Who among us was not outraged as we saw the scenes of the tanks of the Chinese Army rolling into Tiananmen Square in the midst of student protestors? Who among us didn't recoil at least slightly when we learned of the death sentence issued by the Ayatollah Khomeini to Salman Rushdie after the publication of his book, *Satanic Verses*? These dramatic actions of censorship towards art, free speech, and literature strike us as perhaps repressive, puritanical, and unenlightened. But as offensive as these acts of censorship might seem to us, do they necessarily lead us to the conclusion that all forms of censorship are wrong, unjust, and intolerable?

The theme of our conference is community: living with difference in art, religion, and politics. My paper is on the topic of censorship, and in a particular way, I would like to explore briefly the notion of censorship and the Catholic Church. But I would like to set the reality of censorship in our wider context of the theme of community. In fact, the only way to understand censorship, it seems to me, is to begin with the context of community. Censorship implies the social, the communal, the public. And when we consider censorship, I think a legitimate question to be raised is whether or not censorship is a repressive, controlling attack on ideas and values or is censorship primarily a way of attacking something outside the community or a way of preserving something within the community?

DEFINING CENSORSHIP

Censorship does not readily lend itself to definition. It is difficult to get a handle on a brief definition because censorship is always an idea that engages our prejudices, penetrates to the level where our morals and manners take shape, and forms our attitudes towards the whole notion of the rule of law. Censorship is an idea that provokes deep responses, both positive and negative. And it is a challenge because its theory demands some decision in practice. Censorship is considered one of the gauges of civilization and a measure of individual rationality and liberalism.

Censorship can be defined simply as the restriction, by proper authorities, of intellectual, literary, or artistic materials in any format. The Oxford Dictionary defines a «censor» as: any person super-

vising or criticizing the morals and conduct of others. The word «censor» is derived from the Latin verb *ensere*, meaning to «assess or estimate». Our notion of censorship goes back to a decision of the Roman State in 443 BC to establish an office of censor.¹ Originally the censor had the duty of taking a census of all the Roman citizens for purposes of taxation, voting, and military service.

In time, the power of the censor grew until eventually the censor became the official arbiter of Roman manners and morals. The censors presided at the Tribunal of Fame wherein they paid honor to the citizens whom they found had performed noble or virtuous deeds. At the same time, they barred from public life anyone who had violated the accepted rules of conduct. All Roman citizens, commoners and aristocrats, faced the possibility of losing their civil rights for actions which the censor considered inconsistent with Rome's moral standards. The authority of the Roman censor could not be challenged by either station or influence. Even powerful Roman senators were not immune from the threat of the Roman censor. Some found themselves removed from office, publicly ostracized, or even banished from the city of Rome.²

The Roman censor was not unique historically, however. Censorship of persons, official or unofficial, has a long unbroken thread that can be traced back to antiquity. The officials of ancient Greece, for example, had high regard for freedom of religion and freedom of speech. However, they refused to allow the free expression of opinions that went against the state religion. They feared that the gods would become angry and this might bring harm to the people of Greece. The first known victim of censorship was Socrates in 399BC. He was accused of showing disrespect for the gods and corrupting the morals of the young. The death sentence handed to Socrates for allegedly degrading the morals of ancient Athens is but one example of censorship in the ancient world.

Why is censorship such a pervasive element in human history? Perhaps it is consistent with certain behavioral traits in humans? Is it the case that most, if not all people strive for conformity? Or does censorship touch upon a deeper issue of human commitment to community identity - whether social, religious, or political? Of course, the two are related. Every human being, from childhood, is taught to adhere to certain forms of behavior which conform to parental and community standards. To say «conform to that which I believe is right» is the same as saying «avoid that which I believe is wrong». And so, «wrong» behavioral traits or attitudes will be censored and «right» ones will be rewarded. Each of us, perhaps, has been subtly nurtured in the art of censorship.³

CENSORSHIP AND THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

Censorship is best understood in the context of community. The Church is one such community which has exercised censorship from its very beginnings. In the New Testament text of the *Acts of the Apostles*, the converts of Paul in the city of Ephesus gathered in the market place to burn their superstitious books at his command (19:18-19). The content of these books on magic was deemed to be inconsistent with their newly found faith in the name of Jesus. In his letters, Paul often exhorts his churches to avoid false teachers and to reject erroneous doctrine. Paul even gives the pattern for the censorship practice of excommunication of a fellow believer for immoral conduct in I *Corinthians* 5:9-13.

Of all four Gospels, it is Matthew who gives us the most developed theology of the Church, or ecclesiology. The only Evangelist to use the word *ecclesia*, or «Church», Matthew gives some very practical

instructions in Chapter 18 for dealing with scandal, problems, and administering fraternal correction to fellow members of the Church. Matthew even outlines the steps for excommunication of an obstinate sinner. One provocative dimension to Matthew's ecclesiology in Chapter 18 is his highlighting of the «little ones» in the Church. Certain members of the Church are the «little ones» who seem especially susceptible to scandal. The «little ones» are to be pastorally protected lest their faith be damaged by the sins of other members of the Church. These «little ones» have angels which constantly behold the heavenly Father's face (v.11). Jesus says that we should never despise one of these «little ones» and if we lead one of these astray, it would be better that we have a millstone tied around our neck and be cast into the depths of the sea (v.6).

Jesus says that it is no part of the Father's plan that even a single one of these «little ones» ever comes to grief (v.14). It seems to me, then, that according to Matthew 18, there is not exactly a sameness or exact uniformity in the Church. That is, there are some of us who are to be considered the «little ones». Who are the «little ones» in the Church? Are they the children only? Or are there others that Matthew is referring to? Is it to be equated simply with naivete? Who needs to be protected from scandal? Who is less able to successfully scale over a stumbling block to their faith? And how are the «little ones» to be shielded from scandal? Perhaps the concept of the «little ones» seems patronizing and insulting to us. Be that as it may, it seems to me that this view of the Christian community in Matthew 18 is part of the foundation of the practice of censorship in the Catholic Church. To preserve the life of the community, it is necessary to censor ideas, teachings, behaviors, or doctrines that are inconsistent with the rule of faith. This is what I would call «in-house» censorship because it is censorship within the Church among believers. The inner life of the Church includes the reality of the «little ones» and hence the practice of censorship to avoid scandal by way of teaching, behavior, or doctrine is justified. The censorship is to place someone outside of the community, *ex-communico*, if they are living or teaching or promoting what is contrary to the Church's faith and morals.

Another dimension of the Church's attempt to protect and preserve the faith of the «little ones» was the practice of censoring materials and ideas from outside of the life of the Church. The Church looked outward to the world and began to make judgments on ideas, philosophies, behaviors, and books that were contrary to Christian faith and morals. This is a different sort of censorship from the «in-house» approach, since it is directed outward to the world. The most famous instrument of this type of censorship was perhaps the *Index of Forbidden Books*, or *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, established in 1557 by Pope Paul IV, but having historical precedence as early as 496, in a Decree issued by Gelasius, listing heretical and apocryphal books banned by preceding councils and popes. The Index was a list of titles which Catholics were forbidden to read or even to own without ecclesiastical permission. This Index was compiled, revised, and constantly updated right up into the twentieth century. The penalty for owning or reading was excommunication.⁴

The Index may seem like a preposterous institution to us today. But viewed through the lens of the «little ones» it perhaps makes more sense. The Index was an attempt to censor the literary danger inherent in texts which contained ideas or morals that were potentially harmful to the life of the Church. One way of interpreting the Index is that the Magisterium of the Church took reading seriously and were commendably aware that books can shape the minds and hearts of believers. Although the Index may seem to us like a patronizing and misguided effort or a relic of clerical control, the intended purpose behind it can be appreciated through the lens of the «little ones».

Banning books was not the only method of censorship that the Church used in the past that was directed towards the world. The Church also has censored works of art. A famous example, within the confines of the very Vatican itself, is the painting of fig leaves over the figures in Michelangelo's *Last Judgement* in the Sistine Chapel, since the original work with nude bodies was deemed obscene and scandalous. The Church has also censored dramatic works of art and most recently films. In our own country, the American Catholic Church was heavy handed in its censorship of Hollywood long before the likes of Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, and the Christian Right. For more than three decades, from 1934 to the late 1960's, the Catholic Church, through its Legion of Decency, acted as a moral guardian of the American public by dictating to Hollywood producers the amount of sex and violence that was allowable on the screen. The producers meekly removed any scene that offended the Church.⁵

SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL

Like many things in Catholic faith and practice, the Church's approach to censorship was changed by Vatican II. The teaching and spirit of Vatican II was like a new Pentecost in the life of the Church. The Council sought to meet the needs, answer the questions, and challenge the assumptions of modern men and women by reading the signs of the times and applying the perennial teachings of the Gospel to contemporary life. The result was a *risorgimento* - an updating and renewal of the Church from the inside out. One particularly compelling concern throughout the Council was the articulation of the Church's relationship to the world.

The Conciliar documents reflect this concern to relate to the world in a new way. Moving away from the old confrontational model, of «Church versus world», the Church described itself as being the «Church in the world». Instead of taking the attitude vis a vis the world as separation for the sake of sanctity, Vatican II called Catholics to immersion for conversion. That is, Catholics are to immerse themselves in the affairs of the world in order to act as a leaven for the conversion of the world to Christ. The Council urged Catholics to become intimately involved in temporal affairs in order to bring the Kingdom of God to fulfillment. The model for the Church's relationship with the world became engagement, rather than estrangement. Catholics were challenged by the Council to dynamically and robustly live their faith in the midst of culture, not in order to be sectarian, but to be something far more compelling and dangerous - counter cultural.

The Conciliar document on *The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, or *Gaudium et Spes*, makes reference to the old confrontational model of the Church in regards to culture when it admits that there have been «difficulties» in the way of harmonizing culture with Christian thought. (What an understatement!) However, the document insists that grace can and does resound through the occasional dissonance arising from the encounter between a disciplined community of believers and an indifferent, and even occasionally suspicious culture. The «difficulties» do not necessarily harm the life of faith, but can actually deepen faith through better understanding. The Council even admits that literature and art are, in their own way, very important to the life of the Church because they seek to express human nature, with its problems and experiences. Literature and the arts shed light on human sufferings, joys, needs, and potential and so the Church should support and encourage artists and give them freedom to enter into a better relationship with the Church. This is a far cry from the censorious attitude of the Church in the past towards authors, artists, filmmakers, and musicians!⁶

The other Conciliar document, which precipitated the changing of the Church's practice of censorship, was *Dignitatis Humanae* or the *Declaration on Religious Liberty*. This document articulated the role of the individual conscience of each person. By giving more responsibility to the individual Catholic to think for oneself, this document exalted the role of the well-informed conscience. The human conscience is seen as a sanctuary of the human person that cannot be violated by coercion or compulsion. Human rights and religious freedom are also described in a renewed way by this declaration. A community of believers with well-formed Christian consciences, acute moral sensibilities, and intense commitment to the Gospel eliminates the need for the Church's role in censorship. The Declaration proclaims that truth can impose itself on the human mind only in virtue of its own truth, which wins over the mind with both gentleness and power.⁷ Therefore, in the spirit of the Council, the Church ceased its activities in censorship of literature and the arts, most dramatically by abolishing the *Index of Forbidden Books* in 1966.

This renewed articulation of the Church's relationship with the world brought about a new ecclesial stance in regards to culture. Vatican II positioned the Church in dialogue with the world, rather than confrontation. By engaging the world in a dialogue about things like the nature of the human person, the search for truth, and the ends of human life, the Church could be the light of the world and the salt of the earth, rather than simply the opponent or the censor of the world. This is by no means, however, a move, on the part of the Church, to embrace the values of the world or the philosophies of the world that are contrary to the Gospel and Tradition of the Church. It is not a sort of «gag rule» on the Church by which it is not permitted to speak out against that which is morally objectionable. Rather, it is a way in which dialogue opens up a space for personal encounter and loving interaction with others who do not share our Christian faith. In the spirit of Vatican II, the sanctifying and social mission of the Church is based upon a robust dialogue with the world through which Gospel values can shape and transform culture. The transformation of culture comes not by censorship, but by engagement and courageous articulation of the Christian worldview, values, and principles that flow from Divine revelation.

Within this dialogical mode of the Church's engagement with the world, it must always be kept in mind that culture and the secular sphere are distinctive although not separated from the Church. In fact, after the Council, the Vatican set up a Pontifical Commission on Culture in the view that dialogue with unbelievers can take place within the wider context of culture. The Catholic Tradition proclaims the autonomy of culture and the secular sphere in general, including politics, for example. Beginning with Aquinas, and even right down to Vatican II, the Church has taught that religion and culture should not be separated; at the same time they should not be confused, because they are not one and the same. When Vatican II mentions the autonomy of the secular sphere, its operative word is *distinction*. While honoring the autonomy of culture, however, the Church maintains its right to judge culture based on its own Christian values. This does not mean dismissing contemporary popular culture as a whole, for instance, but rather judging «pop culture» on a case by case analysis.

This Vatican II perspective on the autonomy of culture differs from what I would consider the Protestant Fundamentalist approach to culture. Fundamentalism in general, consists in denying the autonomy of culture and the secular sphere, claiming that there should be no distinction between

religion and culture. Fundamentalists, from a Catholic point of view, are not wrong in their diagnosis of the modern illness - that of separating or divorcing religion and culture - we would agree that this is a problem. But the Fundamentalist cure for this situation is what we would disagree with. Catholics want to keep culture distinctive, not completely separated. And Fundamentalists do not want any distinction at all. The contrast of these two views is very subtle, but it has profound consequences in terms of understanding the Church's sanctifying and social mission in the world. When it comes to pop culture, for instance, Fundamentalists reject products of contemporary culture because their forms of production, language, and style are not intrinsically Christian. A case in point in our own country is the controversy over the Harry Potter books among Protestant Fundamentalists. There were actually incidents of book burnings down South by groups which wanted to censor the language of magic that is used in the Potter series. The Harry Potter books are a social production of popular culture that is not controlled or determined by the Church or the Christian community. So, the response was to have a book burning.

The Fundamentalist form of censorship sounds much like the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages or the institution of the *Index of Forbidden Books*. Today the Catholic Tradition has a different perspective about the autonomy of culture. Instead of banning or censoring, our model is engagement, dialogue, and a clear articulation of the critique of modern culture based on our Catholic worldview, principles, and values. For instance, when Pope John Paul II critiques the modern world for promoting what he calls a «culture of death», he calls Catholics, not to abandon the world, but to permeate it, engage it, and transform it with the gospel of the way, the truth, and the life - which is Christ himself.

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

Now the question can be raised: If the old methods of censorship are no longer used by the Church, such as placing books on the Index, working to ban films, or shutting down art exhibits, then how does the Church respond to anti-Catholic works of literature, film, art, or drama? In this dialogical mode of engagement of the world - how do we respond? Engagement means that we take the arts seriously, and not just as a form of entertainment. The arts can establish or teach the customs, morals, or ideals of a society, and not just provide amusement or recreation. We are called to speak up and let our positions and views be known. This can take a variety of forms, of course. Decisions about a response take moral discernment, wisdom, and prudence, as well as courage.

In our country there is a conservative Catholic organization known as the «Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights». The president of the Catholic League is William A. Donohue. This is a kind of conservative watch dog group - sort of like the «Catholic anti-defamation league». Interestingly, Donohue does not believe in censorship or gag rules. He says that moral suasion is the best response of the Catholic community when «anti-Catholic atrocities», as he calls them, are committed. In fact his group opposed a lawsuit filed against Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne for deciding to host the Terrance McNally play called «Corpus Christi». This play depicts Christ having sex with the 12 Apostles and has the Christ figure exclaim «F- your mother, F- your father, F-God.» Donohue said that a gag rule was not the answer. But the Catholic community does have to make its critique of the play known and point out what we find to be morally objectionable. But this is done in the context of dialogue rather than censorship.⁸

Earlier in the paper I spoke about two movements of censorship in the Church. 1.) The «in-house» censorship referred to censoring ideas, teachings, and behavior that were inconsistent with the faith and morals of the Church. 2.) The outward looking censorship concerned the expression of morally objectionable ideas, teachings, or values in books, literature, drama, film, etc., in the world. Concrete examples of this outward looking censorship were the *Index of Forbidden Books* or the censorship activities of the Legion of Decency. We have seen the changes in the Church's approach to outward looking censorship. What about «in-house» censorship? This seems to be the context wherein the concern for the «little ones» in the Church is still expressed through censorship. Today we would call them the «simple, pious faithful».

There is still a vestige of the Matthew 18 concern for avoiding scandal in the life of the community at work in the Church's censure of theologians, for example. The silencing of the theologian Leonardo Boff in South America, or the removal of the teaching license of Fr. Charles Curran as a Theology professor at Catholic University in the 1980's are examples of this inward looking censorship. Another example of this form of censorship within the Church is Canons 822-832 of the *1983 Code of Canon Law* which concern the necessity for ecclesiastical approval of certain kinds of books such as: Scriptures, liturgical devotional books, catechisms, and theological textbooks. The stamp of approval or *Imprimatur* or *Nihil Obstat* is another expression of maintaining the integrity of Catholic faith and morals.

Again the question must be raised of whether or not this censorship is a form of repression or an attempt to maintain the identity of the community. Is the mandatum for Catholic Theology professors, for example, a kind of controlling restraint or an attempt to maintain the integrity of the community and its teachings? This type of censorship certainly seems consistent with the New «Testament injunctions to avoid false teachers and to identify heretical teachings in our midst. Paul exhorts his communities in the Pastoral Epistles to maintain sound doctrine, avoid false teachers, and embrace upright moral living (e.g., *I Timothy* 4:6-8; 6:2-6). In this way the life of the community would be preserved, nurtured, and strengthened. In the Johannine Letters, the author warns against false prophets and goes so far as to advise not receiving in one's home anyone who is a false teacher and not rooted in the teaching of Christ (*II John* vv.9-10). While we might balk at some of the censoring activities of Cardinal Ratzinger and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, it is hard to argue that this sort of censorship cannot be grounded in the teaching of the New Testament and the practices of the early Church.

CENSORSHIP IN AMERICA

It seems, then, that censorship, in one form or another, is part of every human community. In fact, the only way to understand censorship, it seems to me, is to begin with the context of community - which is the theme of our conference this weekend. Censorship implies the social, the communal, the public. And when we consider censorship, I think a legitimate question to be raised is whether or not censorship is a repressive, controlling attack on ideas and values or is it rather an attempt to preserve community identity, ideology, and boundaries? That is, is censorship primarily a way of attacking something outside the community or a way of preserving something within the community? Even in our liberal, pluralistic democratic society of the United States, we practice forms of censorship.⁹ We like to think that our first amendment of the Constitution protects our free speech and therefore prohibits censorship. But the fact of the matter is that we have various modes of censorship in America.¹⁰

The classic example of when the first amendment would not protect free speech is the sanction against yelling «fire!» in a crowded movie theater. What are other forms of censorship in America? How about the censorship in the rating of movies - G, PG, PG-13, R, and X? These letters represent ratings based on the content of sex, violence, and obscenity.¹¹ What about the rating of TV programs? We have all noticed the announcement before a TV show that warns viewers that some language, violence, or material may be offensive to younger or sensitive viewers. In America we have had public debates over book banning in public libraries. In fact, in the past there was book banning in U. S. libraries.¹² We have had a public debate over the use of the so-called «V chip» in TVs as a form of censorship. Our news media also practices censorship in certain cases. For example, when the Bush administration asked TV networks to stop airing the videotape of Osama Bin Laden after September 11th because it was feared that he might be relaying secret messages to his followers on the tape, the networks complied. A kind of censorship was evident in the decision by certain networks to stop showing the video footage of the planes crashing into the World Trade Towers. There is an ongoing public debate about funding for the arts and what sort of art should get approval from Congress in the National Endowment for the Arts budget. Just think of the N.E.A. funded Robert Mapplethorpe photography exhibit and the controversy it created. Even in America, censorship is part of our community life together.

The last form of censorship I will mention is the censorious effects of the political correctness movement. A movement that prizes tolerance as the cardinal virtue and claims to be open to others is surprising intolerant of ideas that challenge its principles. Think of the new definitions of speech and speech acts provided by the political correctness agenda. «Hate speech» is a phrase that can be widely defined to include discourse that in the past was simply described as provocative or challenging. This new orthodoxy of the academy, which asserts itself as liberal, is not immune to censorship in its evaluations of what counts for curriculum, scholarship, or pedagogy. Something that is not «politically correct» is censored, whether it is in the arena of politics, education, literature, or the arts.

CONCLUSION

This paper has reflected on the concept of censorship, and specifically the practices of censorship by the Catholic Church. I have attempted to ground the discussion of censorship in the context of human communities in general and the desire for conformity and maintenance of communal identity. Within the experience of the Catholic Church, I have made a distinction between two basic forms of censorship. Censorship within the community is the kind of judgment that is made concerning teaching and behavior that are not consistent with Catholic faith and morals. Censorship outside of the community is the kind of judgment about literature, books, drama, films, and artistic expressions that contain content which is morally objectionable from a Catholic perspective. Throughout any discussion about Catholic censorship, it must be borne in mind that censorship is of ideas and behaviors and not persons themselves.

Even with the post-Vatican II change in the Church's attitude about our engagement with culture and the virtual elimination of censorship that is outward looking, there are still some serious questions that need to be debated within the Church. How do we respond to Catholic bashing in our culture? How do we respond as a community to certain expressions of the arts that are blatantly anti-Catholic? How do we decide what is morally objectionable? These are not easy questions. For example, should a Catholic institution sponsor an art exhibit or host a play which

contains morally objectionable or anti-Catholic material? Should a Catholic university invite an author to give a lecture and a book signing on campus if his or her work is opposed to Catholic faith and morals? Should a Catholic university invite a graduation speaker who is publicly known to be pro-choice? Or invite a graduation speaker who is publicly known to be pro-death penalty? These are difficult questions that can divide well-meaning Catholics on both sides of the issue. All the more reason for the debate about censorship to continue.

of God.

NOTES

1. John McCormick, Mairi MacInnes, *Versions of Censorship*, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962), p.xi.
 2. See Melvin Berger, *Censorship*, (New York: Franklin Watts, 1982)
 3. See Terry O'Neill, Editor, David L. Bender, Bruno Leone, Series Editors, *Censorship: Opposing Viewpoints*, (St. Paul: Greenhaven Press, 1985)
 4. See *National Federation of Catholic College Students, A Study Guide to the Index Librorum prohibitorum and the Censorship Regulations*, (Detroit: MaryGrove College, 1957)
 5. See Gregory D. Black, *The Catholic Crusade Against the Movies, 1940-1975*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Frank Walsh, *Sin and Censorship: The Catholic Church and the Motion Picture Industry*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996); Gregory D. Black, *Hollywood Censored. Morality Codes, Catholics, and the Movies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
 6. See Second Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes, The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, section 62.
 7. See Second Vatican Council, *Dignitatts Humanae, Declaration on Religious Liberty*, section 1
 8. William A. Donohue, «The Ten Worst Anti-Catholic Atrocities of 2001 », *America* February 18, 2002, pp.12-14
 9. See Patrick Garry, *An American Paradox: Censorship in a Nation of Free Speech*, (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1993)
 10. See Mary E. Hull, *Censorship in America*, (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 1999)
 11. See Frank Miller, *Censored Hollywood: Sex, Sin & Yolence on the Screen*, (Atlanta: Turner Publishing Inc, 1994)
- APRIL 200
12. See Nicholas J. Karolides, Margaret Bald, Dawn B. Sova, *100 Banned Books*, (New York: Checkmark Books, 1999)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berger, Melvin, *Censorship*, (New York: Franklin Watts, 1982)

Black, Gregory D., *The Catholic Crusade Against the Movies 1940-1975*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

- Black, Gregory D. *Hollywood Censored: Morality Codes, Catholics, and the Movies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Donohue, William A. «The Ten Worst Anti-Catholic Atrocities of 2001 », *America* February 18, 2002, pp. 12-14
- Gardiner, Harold C., *Catholic Viewpoint on Censorship*, (Garden City: Hanover House, 1958)
- Garry, Patrick, *An American Paradox: Censorship in a Nation of Free Speech*, (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1993)
- Garvey, Michael O., «Communications and the Arts: Lost: The Mind of the Church», in *The Catholic Church in the Twentieth Century*, John Deedy, editor, (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), pp.203-215
- Green, Jonathon, *The Encyclopedia of Censorship*, (New York: Facts on File, 1990)
- Hull, Mary E., *Censorship in America*, (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 1999)
- Karolides, Nicholas J., Margaret Bald, Dawn B. Sova, *100 Banned Books*, (New York: Checkmark Books, 1999)
- Lang, Susan S., Paul Lang, *Censorship*, (New York: Franklin Watts, 1993)
- McCormick, John, Mairi MacInnes, *Versions of Censorship*, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1962)
- Miller, Frank, *Censored Hollywood: Sex, Sin & Violence on the Screen*, (Atlanta: Turner Publishing Inc, 1994) National Literary Commission, *A Study Guide to the Index Librorum Prohibitorum and the Censorship Regulations*, (Detroit: Mary Grove College, 1957) O'Neill, Terry, Editor, David L. Bender, Bruno Leone, Series Editors, *Censorship: Opposing Viewpoints*, (St. Paul: Greenhaven Press, 1985)
- Pope John Paul II, *1983 Code of Canon Law*, (English translation by the Canon Law Society of America) Second Vatican Council, *Dignitatis Humanae, Declaration on Religious Liberty, Gaudium et Spes, The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* Stay, Byron L., Editor, David L. Bender, Bruno Leone, Series Editors, *Censorship: Opposing Viewpoints*, (St. Paul: Greenhaven Press, 1997)
- Walsh, Frank, *Sin and Censorship: The Catholic Church and the Motion Picture Industry*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)

Address correspondence to:

Aurelie Hagstrom

Department of Theology and Philosophy University of St. Francis

500 Wilcox Street Joliet, Illinois 60435

[Back to current electronic table of contents](#)