

The New Book Burning: Publishers Are Now Destroying 'Offensive' Books

[Via the New York Times:](#)

"Parents often turn to books to help them navigate complicated, and sometimes uncomfortable, conversations with their children about puberty. This week one such book, '[Growing Up for Boys](#),' by Alex Frith, became the topic of the type of conversation it is supposed to help people avoid.

On Aug. 27, Simon Ragoonanan, a British father who blogs at [Man vs. Pink](#), posted a passage on Facebook from Mr. Frith's book that claimed girls have breasts for two reasons: 'feeding babies and looking grown-up and attractive.'

Mr. Ragoonanan said that a follower of his blog alerted him to the book, which was originally published in 2013. "The context of this book is that it's aimed at boys, young boys, when they're forming their opinions about women. It was worrying that this kind of passage was out there," he said in an interview.

Usborne Children's Books, the book's United Kingdom-based publisher, quickly apologized for the passage and announced on Aug. 31 that it would destroy its remaining stock of '[Growing Up for Boys](#).'"

Based on this article, I can't say that [Growing Up For Boys](#) would be a book I'd be inclined to buy for my sons. But pulping books for being gender insensitive seems like a bit of an overreaction, no?

When we think of the destruction of books, we tend to think of Nazis and ISIS. It's a vulgar, unenlightened act.

Destroying a book is symbolic. It suggests the idea behind it is so repugnant that it must be destroyed.

The Arab philosopher Averroes, who in the 12th Century translated many of Aristotle's works, understood this. After he alienated local authorities, he was forced to watch many of his works cook in a book barbecue.

"Today I cry over our situation...but the ideas have wings," [he told](#) a weeping student.

The obvious question is this: Why do publishers feel it is necessary to destroy its own stock?

Do the purveyors of political correctness have people this spooked? Based on this and other [recent events](#), the answer appears to be yes.