

3/19
(51877) MICHAEL FREEMAN
HM Prison, Brixton
Tott Avenue
London SW5.

Dear David,

May 29th, 1992

Thank you for your letter of the 27th. And thank you so much for offering your services as an expert witness.

I should imagine that Oliver O'Hara will definitely call you. However I saw Ronnie, my solicitor, a few days ago, accompanied by Ted and he seemed reluctant to call any expert witnesses, in fact, all he wanted to do was call 'a dozen people' to say that they were Victor's customers and remained uncorrupted. To tell you the truth, he did not inspire confidence and seemed a bit unsettled when discussing the sexual act or bits of the body.

I instructed him that the defence I wanted to make, was that my work was art, and that it possessed an intrinsic merit so that, though made it different from the mass of sexually explicit material used by businessmen and porn artists. I also said that I felt that as most of the charges involved bits of law and were test cases that would create precedents, I ought to be represented by a Q.C. of some eminence. To my surprise he agreed and asked me who I wanted. I said, John Mortimer Q.C.

He said that he would write to the Law Society asking that I be given legal aid or have a Q.C. No doubt, the prosecution will

*MORTIMER

have someone of repute. I feel that justice ② would not be done, unless the defence had a person such as Mortimer who understands aesthetics, and ^{who} can see beyond the entire subject matter.

I don't think that there can be such a thing as a 'fair trial' under the Obscene Arts: The obscene and corrupt factor implies a causal relationship between pornography and social harm that could easily be disproved by empirical evidence, but ironically ^{it} isn't allowed to disprove the 'crime' that ^{it} is a cause of. The effects of pornography on a modern western society are there for all to see in Denmark. Imagine Beal Tutchinsky giving evidence of the relationship and the decrease in sexual crime in Denmark in relation to pornography; the prosecution wouldn't stand a chance.

And the defence I will be making is innocence of supervisor: I don't know whether you saw the article of Peter Chippindale in the Sunday Times on the 23rd about the phenomenon called 'nasties'? These are extremely sinister videos that offer an unrelieved depiction of realistic violence including, mutilation and murder usually against women. The Home Office refused to comment on why no-one had been prosecuted under the O.P.A when many pornographers depicting sexual matter had been arrested. It seems that one cannot view sexual things now, even when they are in the context of violence! This trend is yet more evidence of our ^{spread} in some ways than actually encourage men-makers to move into this lucrative and legitimate area. Derek Malcolm will be giving evidence on this theme. Look, forward to seeing you at the Old Bailey!
News Truly
Michael Meena