



New Printing House Square, London, WC1X 8EZ. Telephone: 01-837 1234

# THE PORNOGRAPHY OF HATRED

The jury may have been right to acquit *Inside Linda Lovelace*, but the consequences of their decision could well be very damaging to our society. *Inside Linda Lovelace* is indeed pornographic in that it is an erotic book about a vicious girl written in vulgar language, but the most obscene passages have the character of a manual of love making, though one which is anecdotal and very promiscuous. The advice given on sexual positions and practices may be bad, and certainly seems physically dangerous, but most people would consider that books even in part intended to help people to enjoy making love are not normally to be prohibited. The fact that *Linda Lovelace* is written in language a lorry driver would understand, rather than in pseudo-medical jargon, should not be decisive against it. Npr perhaps should its blatantly commercial character.

## Hostile to women

The book is written in an American girlie style which is, to use Miss Lovelace's euphemism for vomiting, "upchucking" in its effect. As the book is in any normal meaning obscene, and of very doubtful offsetting value, it seems wrong that the pornographic publishers should have their costs; they brought the prosecution on themselves by publishing such a book, and should accept prosecution as a natural risk of a dishonourable trade.

The threat is that this celebrated acquittal will encourage pornographic publishers to go ahead with other books which are not merely erotic, but have that deep underlying anti-human hostility, particularly hostility to women, which divides the dangerous book from the dirty book. There have already been acquittals of books much worse than *Linda Lovelace*, acquittals which were a genuine miscarriage of justice. There have also been hang juries. To give a better idea of the sort of evidence which is now being given, one may quote from the answers under cross examination given by Dr Brian Richards in a recent trial.

Dr Richards, who also gave evidence in the case of Linda Lovelace, is not a specialist in sexual matters, but a genial general practitioner, from Sandwich, the sort of doctor who is well liked by his patients. That makes him only too plausible a witness, in manner if not in matter.

In cross examination Dr Richards gave these answers:

"Counsel then showed witness several pictures in the magazines—  
1. This is a picture of a female in chains, tied up and a naked man

pointing a sword at the woman's genitals."

Dr Richards: This is for the public good because it produces a masturbatory situation. I would certainly prescribe this for a patient.

2. Picture of a naked man with cat of nine tails striking a woman on genitals.

Dr Richards: This can stimulate a man. It has great therapeutic value.

3. Woman inserting an instrument into back passage of a man.

Dr Richards: Yes, this has therapeutic value for that kind of man. I have patients who would be stimulated by this kind of thing.

4. Picture of man with rope round neck and rope round genitals. He is being caressed.

Dr Richards: Yes. This is highly therapeutic for masturbation. Making a man or woman masturbate is a highly beneficial process.

5. Girl, with distress in her face, arms manacled and has cuts. She is tied up. A man with a bayonet is inflicting cuts.

Dr Richards: I have known patients who could benefit by masturbating on this."

How are the acquittals achieved? There are a number of factors. The defence often uses its right to challenge the jury in order to try to get a number of sympathetic looking jurors, perhaps young men of radical appearance, and to remove unsympathetic jurors such as women. The defence employs the best counsel, as they are entitled to do. Mr John Mortimer, QC, has a particular gift for amusing irrelevance, which makes the proceedings appear absurd, combined with a passionate devotion to defence of the freedom of pornography. The defence calls their chosen experts, like Dr Richards; the prosecution hardly ever calls expert witnesses in rebuttal. In general a determined and zealous defence faces an inadequate and unconvincing prosecution.

## Defect of law

There is also a defect of law. It was best described by Lord Denning in his judgment of November 29, 1972:

"... Unfortunately this legislation against pornography seems to have misfired—at any rate so far as prosecutions are concerned. Experience has shown that much material—which at first sight would appear to be pornographic in the extreme—has "escaped the reach of the law."

"Why has the legislation misfired? I regret to say that it is in the wording of the Statute and in the way the Courts have applied it. In the first place, the test of obscenity is too restricted, or it has been interpreted too narrowly. It is defined as the "tendency to deprave and corrupt" persons who are likely to read it. That test can be used skilfully to obtain an acquittal by this piece of sophistry: If the likely readers are those who are already depraved and corrupt, this item will not make them more so; but if the likely readers are just ordinary sort of folk, they will be so revolted that they will be turned away from it. This argument is called in the cases the "aversion argument". It is so plausible that the Courts have held that, when raised by the defence, it

must be put to the jury. If it is not put, the conviction may be quashed.

"In the second place, the 'defence of the public good' argument has opened a door through which many a pornographer can escape. It says that publication can be justified, not only if it is in the interests of science, literature and art, but also if it is in the interests of other objects of general concern. Under cover of this defence, experts have been allowed to come forward and say that it is good for young people to read these magazines because it removes their feelings of guilt. Such evidence is equal to saying that pornography itself is for the public good—which is quite contrary to what Parliament intended."

We now of course have Dr Richards's standard defence that anything which tends to promote masturbation is for the public good. If that is accepted then even the cruellest pornography must be good, and should presumably be actively encouraged.

## It does deprave

The result is not only acquittals of marginal cases like that of Linda Lovelace, but acquittals of books which illustrate and glorify sadistic practices, which show on every page hatred of women, hatred of woman's sexuality (often illustrated by rape or a bayonet to women's genitals), general hatred of mankind. This is Nazi pornography, the pornography practised in the concentration camps; it is the pornography of sexual cruelty and degradation; it is very significantly the pornography of rape and the rapist. Such pornography does deprave; indeed we can see that pornographers themselves have been depraved by just such an exposure to the pornography of cruelty. (In last week's *Times Literary Supplement* Mr D. A. N. Jones analyzed the development of Mr Kenneth Tynan's acceptance of cruelty; the process of corruption in a talented writer was precisely that of pornography.) If one asks who is depraved or corrupted by pornography, one has only to point to the pornographers—who would wish to become like Frank Harris?

Against this pornography of cruelty we need a defence; otherwise we may be brainwashed into accepting it, not only in books or magazines, but, as already to a dangerous extent, in newspapers, films and on television. The sexual imagination of man is open to suggestion, and the sexual imagination of youth is particularly open to suggestion. The pornographers are sick-minded commercial men who sell images of hatred, and particularly of hatred of women, for vast profit. We need both a law and a law-enforcement which stops them.