Censor: An official empowered to examine written or printed matter . . . in order to forbid publication, circulation, or representation if it contains anything objectionable.—Webster’s Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1961).

Whether the censors ever succeeded in suppressing a worthy book or not, it is pretty certain that they never succeeded in suppressing a pernicious one.—Richard Garnett, in his preface to William Blades, The Enemies of Books (London, 1896).

During the 1890s the Department of Printed Books at the British Museum was beset by problems of censorship, most of them arising from complaints of libellous statements in library materials, and one of them actually resulting in litigation. The mere thought of being taken to court distressed the officers of the Museum, who deplored alike any unfavourable publicity for the institution or any hint of dereliction of duty on their own part.

Although it was the Trustees and the Principal Librarian who were addressed by those who wished to restrict the circulation of items in the collections, the man who bore the brunt of the responsibility for action was the Keeper of Printed Books, Richard Garnett. Garnett had entered the library in 1851 and served as Keeper from 1890 to 1899 (fig. 1). He was in charge of acquisitions as well as of the reading room where books were given out to readers, and his superiors often called on him for counsel. He was a man of letters and an experienced librarian whose taste could be relied on to reflect Victorian values and who could intelligently sort out what should be kept from the reading public and what should not. His attitude varied according to the work at issue, its subject, apparently even the social status of the author, and to the situation that gave rise to the complaint. In addition to the prevailing norms of decency, his decisions took into account the possibility for harm to the library from successful legal action as well as possible harm to readers from being deprived of a given piece of printing. In the end he showed himself to be firmly on the side of freedom of access to reading matter, so long as that freedom was not abused, and so long as the statements objected to were not flagrantly untrue or otherwise unnecessarily damaging.

The eleven difficult cases¹ on which Garnett was required to act had such disparate
Fig. 1. Richard Garnett at his desk, c. 1898. (By courtesy of Patrick Garnett, Esq.)
origins as social agitation, colonial development policies, and personal pique. They had their roots in earlier years of the century, but came to a head in the final decade, making it a time of successive threats to freedom of access to the library’s collections. On some occasions it seemed to Garnett a matter of etiquette to withhold questionable publications; at other times he bowed to pressure from those who considered themselves vilified in print, especially if these persons declared themselves ready to take legal action. After such a threat was eliminated, however, he favoured restoring worthy works to the library and to the catalogue. Only if the material was clearly obscene, had been adjudged libellous and not proper for circulation, or contained confidential information not intended for the public would he feel compelled to sequester it.

The law to which individuals who felt themselves slandered might have recourse came from that of Rome, wherein *libelli* were written satires, insults, or insinuations, posted in a public place, or otherwise given currency. Defamatory statements have since then been considered to be libellous if they were transmitted, usually through print, to persons other than the subject. Everyone is entitled to a ‘good name’ in society and may protest both the publication and the dissemination of certain information as harmful. Writers and publishers have been the usual targets of legal actions for libel; but in the 1890s the British Museum became the object of such suits, under the contention that to allow a libellous book or periodical to be read in a library amounted to participation in the libel.

The persons who were most vulnerable to libel were politicians and civil servants, but those who were most commonly criticized, and sometimes were the most thin-skinned about criticism, were the ‘freethinkers’, who deliberately flouted society’s ideals and customs, and then were hurt when society took offence. The foremost of the Victorian freethinkers was Charles Bradlaugh, who died in 1891, and in defence of whose memory the first libel protest of the decade was made to the Museum. Bradlaugh was a political and social reformer, proprietor of the Freethought Publishing Company, and an atheist who brought down the wrath of the pious upon his head by making speeches against religious orthodoxy during the 1860s and 1870s. He adopted the sobriquet ‘Iconoclast’, stood up for working men and underdogs in general, and daringly advocated birth control.

Elected to the House of Commons in 1880 and 1884, Bradlaugh was denied his seat because he refused to swear an oath on the Bible. In 1886 he was allowed to enter the House after ‘affirming’ his oath, and two years later he successfully supported legislation making affirmation acceptable both in Parliament and in courts of law. Just before his death the record of his original exclusion from the House was ordered to be expunged from the copies of the *Journal of the House of Commons* in the Commons library, at the university libraries, and at the British Museum. In a way this was an act of censorship, yet it was also a gesture of restitution for a long-standing wrong.

Despite his admission to Parliament, Bradlaugh had many enemies, and a group of them conspired in 1888 to write and publish, under the name of Charles R. Mackay, a biography which was virulently defamatory from beginning to end about Bradlaugh, his family, and his associates. Bradlaugh’s detractors despised his politics, but it was his
promotion of birth control that outraged them and called forth their most bitter
invective. Bradlaugh ferreted out those principally responsible for the book and
instituted action in the courts, as a result of which the book was declared legally
unsaleable, and copies of it were recalled from the publisher.

Early in 1892, a year after Bradlaugh's death, a letter was addressed to the Trustees of
the British Museum by the solicitors for Mrs Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner, 'daughter and
executrix of the late Mr. Bradlaugh, M.P., calling attention to the libellous character of
a book in the Museum library and asking that the work referred to may no longer be
available for use by readers and visitors'. Mrs Bonner, having secured the judgment that
the book was libellous, had set out with her son to effect the removal of its title from
the catalogue of every public library in England, a project in which they were largely
successful.

The Trustees, acting on Garnett's advice, ordered that the biography be taken out of
circulation and the title removed from the catalogue. However, the section of the great
printed catalogue including 'MacCormac to Macky' had been published in 1891, and
the Mackay life of Bradlaugh is still to be found entered there. The book itself,
however, remained unavailable to the public until very recently, when two copies
were released.

The next such incident was reported to the Trustees by Garnett in January of 1893, and
in this he had played an unusual role. The book concerned was called Twenty-five Years in
the Secret Service, and shortly after publication it had been challenged by an Irish
Member of Parliament. The author, who had infiltrated the Fenian movement in
America, had harsh things to say of many of the Irish patriots who were agitating for home
rule. Among these was James J. O'Kelly, MP for North Roscommon, who was accused on
page 153 of misappropriating the agitators' funds to get himself re-elected.

The book was very popular, going into a second edition within a month of publication,
and was in the fifth edition when the complaint was lodged. The publisher withdrew the
fifth edition, of which the Museum had a copy, and issued a sixth, in which the libellous
statement was omitted; but O'Kelly continued with his suit. Garnett learned of this when
O'Kelly's solicitor came to the Museum and asked to see the book. The situation made
Garnett uneasy, for although he felt he could not refuse such a request, he was bound to
protect library property and to defend the library function. After the solicitor's visit,
Garnett kept the book in his office and 'applied for the sixth edition under the Copyright
Act on the ground of its differing from preceding editions by retrenchment'. So far as he
knew, this sort of claim had never before been made of a publisher, but it was honoured,
and the expurgated sixth edition was shelved. Then O'Kelly's suit was dropped, and the
fifth edition was allowed to remain in place.

Although Garnett was relieved to learn that the danger was past, he was not sure that he
had been right in allowing the solicitor to see the unexpurgated book, so he requested that
the Trustees draw up a policy for his guidance in such cases. In his opinion, the library
officers should be given some discretion as to the legitimacy of any request to see a book
involved in litigation and should be allowed to respond to each situation as it developed.
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The Trustees realized that this was the only sensible course, even though it would be they who would be prosecuted if anyone took offence at the Keeper’s decision. Yet they were reluctant to frame a firm policy for unknown future possibilities.

Barely a month later the most serious of all the cases got underway. This was the suit brought by Victoria Woodhull Martin and her husband against the Museum for circulating library materials allegedly libellous of her. Since it has been recounted in detail elsewhere, it may be dealt with briefly here. Victoria Woodhull was a notorious American freethinker, lecturer, and writer on such subjects as free love and women’s rights who had become involved in the Beecher-Tilton scandal through her friendship with Theodore Tilton and her failure to obtain the support of the Revd Henry Ward Beecher for her views of love and marriage. It was she who had made the original public statement about the affair between Beecher and Mrs Tilton that had resulted in Tilton’s suit against Beecher for alienation of his wife’s affections. Victoria had emigrated to England and had married a respectable banker, John Biddulph Martin; but her publications, and those about her, had followed her abroad because of the intense interest aroused by the Beecher-Tilton suit.

Oddly enough, when Charles Bradlaugh had gone to New York to lecture in 1873, Victoria Woodhull, as a sympathizer with his causes, had called on him at his hotel and had impressed him most favourably. Whether knowledge of Mrs Bonner’s attempts to banish copies of the Mackay book libelling her father and herself had reached Victoria Woodhull Martin and stimulated her to similar activity is a matter for conjecture.

The heart of Mrs Martin’s charge against the Museum was that the purchase of a book for a library involved deliberate selection and that those who chose a libellous book were parties to the libel. To Garnett this was a most dangerous and crippling concept, from which libraries must be protected for the good of the general public. He was quite willing to sequester an ‘obscene’ book, and Mrs Martin so labelled one of the pieces involved, though she also considered it libellous. But to remove a work of historical value because of a few unflattering words about someone was to him reprehensible. Furthermore, Mrs Martin wished the officers of the Museum to reveal the name of the agent from whom the work had been purchased and to publish an apology for having circulated it. This the Trustees would not do.

The Museum was defended in court by the Attorney-General, and for his information there were sent for from America copies of two issues of Mrs Martin’s own journal, *Woodhull & Claflin’s Weekly*, wherein the Beecher-Tilton affair had been publicized, and which were considered libellous of Henry Ward Beecher. Here the offensive publications were indeed deliberately ordered by the British Museum; but after settlement of the suit in the Museum’s favour, when they were returned to the library, along with the six books protested by Mrs Martin, they were promptly ‘sealed up’ at Garnett’s suggestion. In the same advisory letter to the Trustees, Garnett suggested withdrawing the first edition of the family biography of Henry Ward Beecher, which was included in Mrs Martin’s list of offensive works because it accused her of blackmailing Beecher. Garnett was here
accepting Mrs Martin’s word, in an interview before the suit was brought, that she had 'commenced or threatened' legal proceedings against the publisher, and that an expurgated edition was forthcoming. His experience with the O’Kelly suit gave Garnett reason to suppress such a book and to substitute a copy of the edition with the offending passages removed. Mrs Martin, however, had not been accurate in her statement. No such second edition was ever issued, and the first was eventually restored to the library, along with two books whose circulation the judge had declared to be legitimate. The other publications were consigned to the locked case in the Arch Room to be given out to selected readers only under very special circumstances.

In the autumn of 1894 a different sort of book was restricted, this time at the instigation of a government agency rather than an individual, and Garnett was given responsibility for enforcing the ban. The work was a new edition of *A Dictionary of Explosives*, a text originally published by the Royal Engineers in 1889. The British Museum library, along with other libraries which were to receive it under the Copyright Act, was asked by the Home Office not to issue it to any reader ‘unless such reader is reasonably known as a person likely to be legitimately interested in the subject’. The Museum authorities were asked to give their views as to how such a determination might be made.

The Trustees, in answer to this request, ordered that: ‘All editions of the work named be kept under lock and key by the Keeper of the Printed Books who will act on his own discretion in allowing access to them.’ The Home Office subsequently made the helpful suggestion that the matter might, in case of doubt about the bona fides of a reader requesting any of the editions of the book, ‘be referred to H. M. Chief Inspector of Explosives’. The burden of trying to detect budding revolutionaries must have weighed heavily on the amiable and tolerant Garnett. However, the precautions were none too soon, for on 4 November a home in Mayfair near that of a judge was bombed, and on 12 November a bomb was found at the Royal Courts of Justice and was doused in a pail of water by a constable.

Even so, it was the possibility of a libel suit that disturbed Garnett most, for he felt vulnerable without some ruling by the Trustees, or, what would be better yet, an Act of Parliament to protect librarians. Looking about the library, he discovered three more works which exemplified the potential danger of libel action against the Museum. One of them was the standard history of New Zealand, written by an Australian, G. W. Rusden. Rusden was sympathetic to the plight of the Maoris, who were being exploited as indigenous populations have always been by European settlers, and he was particularly indignant about the behaviour of the New Zealand government in repressing Maori protests over loss of their lands and the despoiling of their religious houses. He had heard a tale that outraged his sense of justice, and he put it into his book in extreme language.

The incident involved the Hon. John Bryce, Minister for Native Affairs of New Zealand from 1879 to 1884, who, as Lieutenant Bryce in 1868, had led a troop of soldiers to establish peace in a rebellious Maori district. Rusden accused Bryce of having on that occasion shot down innocent Maori women and children in a sort of nineteenth-century
My Lai massacre. Bryce denied having done any such awful deed, and he sued the
publishers of Rusden's history to halt its distribution. He then sued Rusden for libel, and
the case was heard in March of 1886, ending in a 'crushing defeat for the defendant'.
The jury awarded £5,000 damages, a very large sum, which was eventually reduced by
mutual agreement.

Despite the newsworthy nature of the case and the clear affront to the honour of Bryce,
no suggestion had been made that copies of the book already in libraries be withdrawn.
The British Museum's copy had even been placed on a reference shelf for free access to
readers. Garnett expressed satisfaction that there had been no attempt to suppress the
work, and stated that he considered it indispensable as the only history of an important
part of the British Empire.

He was, nevertheless, on his own initiative, holding back from the cataloguers a
pamphlet recently received under copyright which made what seemed to him libellous
comments about the behaviour of a Member of Parliament, J. H. Wilson, who was himself
accused by another man of gross libel. Wilson was an ardent defender of the rights of
seamen, especially those in the merchant marine, and was also an organizer of trade
unions, a subject almost as inflammatory as sex in those years. According to a repre-
sentative of the Shipping Federation, a group of owners, Wilson had forged a docu-
ment in their name which showed them to be conspiring to hold down wages in the
industry. Wilson denied responsibility for the forgery and made severe counter-
accusations against the Federation, saying that he would sue them for libel if only he had
sufficient funds. It was this possibility that made Garnett intercept the pamphlet on its
way to the catalogue. He had already 'thought of issuing a circular to cataloguers enjoining
special vigilance for the detection of libels, but [had] hitherto been deterred by the
apprehension of seeming to admit a responsibility which could not be adequately
discharged . . .'. So while feeling strongly that librarians should not be held liable for the
contents of the books they dealt with, he preferred to take precautions against litigation
when a controversial item came to his attention.

Another potentially dangerous piece of writing Garnett had noticed was the third
instalment of George du Maurier's Trilby, in Harper's New Monthly Magazine for March
1894, in which James McNeill Whistler was lampooned. Du Maurier, who had been a
fellow art student of Whistler's in Paris, described among the friends of the model, Trilby,
one Joe Sibley, who had the worst of Whistler's distinctive personal characteristics and
who looked exactly like him in the cartoon provided by the author as illustration. Then,
'llest there be any doubt as to his identity', du Maurier gave a description of Whistler's
appearance which, together with the drawing, made the attribution unmistakeable. The
author pretended to be teasing, but he went too far when he wrote that 'Sibley's'
friendship could quickly turn to puerile enmity and that he worshipped himself and his
own painting.

Whistler threatened Harper's with a suit for libel if they would not suppress the
European sale of the March issue of the magazine. But he had not noticed the story until
midsummer, so that by the time the British Museum library received word from the
publishers about Whistler’s complaint, the issue had been in circulation for six months, and much of the possible harm from the article had already been done. The thought, however, that Whistler might legally have demanded that the offending parts of the story be excised from the library’s copy of the magazine stimulated Garnett’s desire to forestall such an eventuality by pressing for a ruling from the Trustees. To him, apparently, du Maurier and Harper’s were worthy of being fully represented in the Museum library, although, as we shall see, he was prepared to countenance the removal of other authors’ writings from less reputable journals. In the event Whistler himself was satisfied when Harper’s printed an apology in the January 1895 issue, and when Trilby came out in book form, ‘Joe Sibley’ had been entirely removed by the author.

The disposition of a book on a delicate topic occupied Garnett’s thoughts in 1896. This was ‘the late Lord Broughton’s “Contemporary Account of the Separation of Lord and Lady Byron”, privately printed in 1870’. John Cam Hobhouse, Baron Broughton, had been Lord Byron’s closest friend, and had written this account to set the record straight in regard to his own conduct and that of Byron in the affair. He had intended to publish it as an answer to Lady Byron’s Remarks Occasioned by Mr. Moore’s Notices of Lord Byron’s Life (London, 1830), which he considered biased, but friends had dissuaded him. After Lord Broughton’s death, his daughter had had a few copies of the manuscript printed for friends, as he had requested. The copy in the Museum library had been bought at a public sale and had some manuscript additions. Garnett now discovered that it had been stolen from the recipient.

There was no question of restitution involved, however, merely of the advisability of allowing the title to show in the catalogue. Garnett, knowing that it ‘was not originally intended for publicity’, had asked a representative of the author’s family to come and look at the book, and meanwhile had kept it locked up in his study. But no one had come; so, lacking direction from Lord Broughton’s heir, and having assured himself that nothing in the book ‘could reasonably give pain or offence to any person now living’, Garnett suggested to the Trustees that the book be kept out of circulation until the end of the century. At that time Lord Broughton’s manuscripts, which had been bequeathed to the Museum, were to be opened to the public, and the book, Garnett felt, could well be released with them. This decision was taken with probity and in accordance with custom, for the temporary withholding of a book out of courtesy to a famous family has always been accepted library practice. But the book was not released when the manuscripts were incorporated into the Museum’s collections in 1900; rather it was kept in the ‘private case’, and thus remained uncatalogued, although another copy is now entered in the Catalogue of Printed Books.

In 1897, threat of another suit against the British Museum was posed by A. T. Crawford, formerly of the Bombay Civil Service, who, on 4 June, protested that two publications ‘reflecting on his character’ were in the Museum library. One of them had been printed in London, so it would have gone to the library under the Copyright Act, and Crawford’s course in regard to it, he acknowledged, was to sue its author and publisher. But the other work had been published in Bombay and therefore had been
he demands the fullest reparation and compensation from the Trustees for placing it in the
Library. He asks leave to appear before the Trustees and state his case. In default of an amicable
settlement before the first of July, he will commence legal proceedings against the Trustees. 33

The pamphlet in question was, according to Garnett, a reprint from an official
government publication ‘presented by command to both Houses of Parliament, upon Mr.
Crawford’s dismissal from the Service, which in turn repeats the Bombay Official
Gazette’. His report 34 continues:

The pamphlet therefore only repeats official information. It was ordered from one of the
quarterly lists of publications drawn up by the Bombay Government. This list was issued just
before the passing of the Indian Copyright Act of 1890.

If it had come to the Museum without cost, the officers in charge of acquisitions might not
have been considered guilty of intentionally spreading a libel.

Yet no matter how it had been received, the publication dealt with a cause célèbre, for
the ‘Crawford case’ had occupied many columns of newsprint in both India and England
during 1888 and 1889. Crawford, a long-time civil servant and Commissioner of Revenue
for the Central Division of the Bombay Presidency, had been accused of extorting bribes
through native magistrates in his administration. The Press had been sympathetic toward
Crawford because of his past record of good work in India and also because he was an
Englishman. The Times had shown scant respect for the Indian officials involved, who
were widely assumed to have been responsible for Crawford’s crimes, rather than he for
theirs. Two judges and a jury, however, had found Crawford guilty on thirty-two counts
of ‘corrupt receipt of money’, 35 and he had returned to England, his Indian career at
an end.

The Trustees of the British Museum, unwilling to take sides on a judicial question, or
to allow a plaintiff to appear before them, but determined to maintain their right to buy
government publications without fear of prosecution, referred Crawford’s three letters on
the subject to the Treasury solicitor, 36 who managed to arrange a settlement with the
plaintiff and thus avoided a trial; but it had been a close call.

In the same month when that complaint was considered by the Trustees, June 1897,
Garnett was confronted with another problem on which he reported to the Principal
Librarian, admitting to the practice of withholding issues of periodicals when the
offensive subject was allied to sex rather than personalities. A reader had requested certain
numbers of the Englishwoman’s Domestic Magazine. In 1890 Garnett had been told by
reading room employees that volumes seven to nine in the new series of this publication
contained letters about whipping girls, which ‘seemed to have acquired a sort of morbid
celebrity’; 37 these were the only volumes of the journal ever asked for, and they had
become dirty and dog-eared from wear. Garnett had decided at that time that ‘the
unrestricted use of such matter could serve no useful purpose and was wholly
discreditable', so he had 'directed that the volumes should be removed from the shelves of the General Library and placed in a private case'.

The reader of 1897 could give no good reason for wanting to see the issues which fell within the ban, and Garnett thought that permission to have them brought out should be refused. He conceded, however, that it would be preferable 'that the objectionable portions of the book be detached and sealed up, the remainder being returned to its original place in the General Library'. The storehouse of banned works kept in the Arch Room was in this way thinned by several periodical volumes. But two editions of a book called *Flagellation and the Flagellants*, which were well worn by eager readers, had been sent there by the assiduous Garnett along with the *Englishwoman's Domestic Magazine*, and there they remained.

Garnett retired from the British Museum at the end of March 1899, just before the conclusion of the only successful case for libel brought against a library in the decade. The defendant was Mudie's Select Library, an institution which sold as well as lent books. It was sued by Edward H. Vizetelly, a journalist who considered himself libelled in a biography of 'Emin Pasha', or Eduard Schnitzer, ruler of the Equatorial Province of Egypt. In 1889 Vizetelly had been sent to Africa by James Gordon Bennett, the younger, of the New York Herald, to cover the arrival in Zanzibar of an expedition led by the famed explorer, Henry Morton Stanley, to rescue Emin from rebellious natives. Emin recorded in his diary the joyous reunion of the expedition members with the welcoming party, who had brought champagne. Then he wrote that next morning Vizetelly, though 'not yet sober', had filed a story that must have been written in advance by Stanley and paid for by a goodly sum of Gordon Bennett's cash. The biographer of Emin printed the entire entry from the diary, and Vizetelly now tried to stop the sale and circulation of the book by Mudie's. The firm had ordered 130 copies. Vizetelly had given notice of the libel, first in *The Publisher's Circular* and then in *The Athenaeum*, asking cancellation of the one page in *Emin Pasha* that contained the offensive passage. Mudie's subscribed to both periodicals, but its staff claimed that the notice had 'escaped attention', and they had continued to circulate the book as published. Next, Vizetelly had sent a letter to Mudie's, and promptly when it was received, on 16 May 1899, the firm had withdrawn all their remaining copies and returned them to the publisher for the page to be cancelled. In the minds of the jury, however, this was not adequate action to avoid the publication of a libel, and the plaintiff was awarded the modest sum of £100.

This case was similar enough to that of the British Museum library when the Martins were suing to cause anxiety to Garnett and to George Knottesford Fortescue, who was to succeed him in April as Keeper of Printed Books. Both the original German version and the English translation of *Emin Pasha* were in the library, and when the publisher, in 1900, supplied a reprint of the latter, omitting the page in question, Fortescue suggested to the Trustees that this expurgated edition be shelved, and that the libellous page be cut out of the German version. This combination of suppression and mutilation only succeeded in making the British national library one of the few libraries where the whole text was not
available in either language, for many previously purchased copies containing the offending passage remained in circulation elsewhere. Fortescue, nevertheless, had acted properly, for the book had been adjudged libellous.

When, in 1900, the Public Libraries Act was being considered, one clause in the draft Bill before Parliament would have protected library boards from civil suits for having given out to readers allegedly libellous materials: relief from accusations of participation in a libel would have been provided, but librarians would still have had to suppress a publication when asked to through an action in the courts. The Act, however, was passed in 1901 without the clause, so Garnett’s hoped-for Parliamentary support failed to materialize. Fortunately, the situation that had caused him so much unpleasantness righted itself, for after the turn of the century, suits against libraries for libel went out of style as quickly as they had come in.

Garnett, in the nine years of his keepership, had had to resolve eleven unusual problems that thrust him into the role of censor. He managed to do so in a way that maintained the honour and the freedom of the British Museum library without antagonizing persons who felt maligned in print. He thus found a fair compromise among the conflicting interests of society, individuals, the library, and the law.
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