



# The "Lady Chatterley's Lover" Case

*A legal left-wing softening of public morality*

by John Benedict

WHEN Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield lost the right in court to ban *Lady Chatterley's Lover* from the mails, the decent and law-abiding citizenry of this country suffered a defeat so far-reaching that its impact can scarcely be comprehended.

The publication of the unexpurgated edition of this 31-year-old novel is the latest in a long series of actions, undertaken by hidden forces whose identity carefully has been screened from the victimized public.

Moreover, as a result of the recent court rulings on obscenity, a sweeping tide of pornography will inevitably inundate every city, town and hamlet in our nation.

Any individual, genuinely desirous of protecting himself and his fellow-citizens from the deadly, poisonous effects of obscene literature

freely peddled to one and all, must by now be aware of the fact that the judge who interprets laws already on the books regarding obscenity is a key figure in the battle between propaganda agitators for immorality and the forces fighting for moral order. Once a judge has ruled in favor of the publication of obscene literature, what can be done?

How did the present disgraceful situation come about? Who brought this to pass? The Janus-faced nature of any "fight against censorship" must be ruthlessly exposed for what it is: a moral fraud in most cases; a conspiracy in part; a Communist-supported and oft-times initiated endeavor; and, above all, a legalized assault against morality brought about by "anti" censorship forces who themselves *secretly* practice the most

vicious and extra-legal suppressive tactics against publications that represent a danger to them.

“OUR COMMUNIST CLUB?” the gamekeeper says, “Ay! It’s something as I’ve laid hold of, an’ I can’t let go—like an electric thing. Ay, it’s a sure thing.”

The author of this revealing speech was D. H. Lawrence, in the first version of his controversial novel. The “gamekeeper” is none other than “Lady Chatterley’s lover,” currently of interest to readers afflicted with a penchant for the prurient and pornographic.

The text of the edition under current consideration is the third version of a novel written toward the end of Lawrence’s life. It was originally called *Tenderness*.

Mike Newberry, columnist on “The Arts” for the *Sunday Worker*, wrote in the September 6, 1959, issue of that paper (page 10) a tip-off to the faithful as to the “line” to be taken on Lawrence’s book.

He characterized Lawrence’s “first manuscript [published by Dial Press, 1944], known as ‘The First Lady Chatterley,’” as “a stringent and tense story of the social and moral crisis of the status quo. . . . The gamekeeper is here a Communist. Not only a Communist, but a Communist organizer; the ‘secretary of the Communist league.’ . . . Unlike the version now being circulated, in this first manuscript, it is this belief in Com-

munist and Lady Chatterley’s inability to accept or understand it that causes *him* to leave *her*. His words of parting are: ‘And perhaps if the Communists *did* smash the famous “system” there might emerge a new relationship between men: *really* not caring about money, *really* caring for life, and the life-flow with one another.’ (Newberry’s emphasis.)

“‘. . . there is considerably more class warfare in this edition,’ notes Moore in his *Life and Works of D. H. Lawrence*, ‘than in the final one, where the plangent erotic hum drips out all other themes.’”

Newberry feels that “socialism’s literature has often been as stodgy as socialism itself is vigorous.” For that reason Lawrence’s novel is particularly pleasing to him. It does not ignore “love . . . a vital part of the body of life.”

Grove Press published the first unexpurgated edition of this study in lechery, spent some \$35,000 for legal expenses incurred in fighting its case through the courts. When Federal Court Justice Frederick vanPelt Bryan of the Southern District of New York ruled last July 21 that this book wasailable, the effect was “calamitous legally as well as morally.”

The *Brooklyn Tablet* commented editorially on this “Crisis for Morality” on August 1, 1959, as follows:

“Regardless of education or literary experience, most men instantly recognize indecency, obscenity,

unchastity, immorality. . . . But the people did legally empower and direct the Postmaster General to exclude from the mail 'every obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile article.'

"It is obvious his judgment and discretion are essential to the functioning of the law. But Judge Bryan insists the Postmaster 'has no special weight in the courts.' . . .

"Obscenity in a book is its use of filthy terms and indecent suggestions. Its acclaim by well-known writers, and favorable newspaper comments and editorials cannot gild its lewdness or blot out its lascivious disgusting implications.

"Judge Bryan admits that the book 'contains a number of passages [written] with complete candor and realism. Four-letter Anglo-Saxon words are used with some frequency.'

"He insists, however, that United States taxpayers must help pay the bill for its distribution 'even if it be assumed that these passages and this language taken in isolation tend to arouse shameful, morbid and lustful sexual desires in the average reader.'

"When the courts insist that the arousing of [such] desires is protected by the constitutional guarantee of free speech, our beloved country has indeed reached a point of crisis."

WHEN JUDGE BRYAN's decision is read in full, one is imme-

diately struck by the tone of arrogance permeating the ruling. The Judge was "unable to ascertain" why the Postmaster General thought the book "offends contemporary community standards."

He stated: "The tests of obscenity are not whether the book or passages from it are in bad taste or shock or offend the sensibilities of an individual, or even of a substantial segment of the community."

He claimed that "the record . . . indicates general acceptance of the book" because "in one best-selling novel after another frank descriptions . . . and 'four letter' words appear with frequency. These trends appear in all media of public expression, in the kind of language used and the subjects discussed in polite society, in pictures, advertisements and dress, and in other ways familiar to all. Today such things are generally tolerated whether we approve or not."

It is readily apparent from his language that the Judge has either indicted "contemporary community standards" as being synonymous with those of the barracks room or the stag party, or he has been in contact with a "polite society"—to which he has ascribed the same low level of morals—unknown to most of us. If the "average person" in the United States can discuss the scarlet passages in this novel with any degree of equanimity, without gagging, then indeed the American citizenry has in truth sunk morally

to the level of the bordello and the bawdy house.

In denying the mails to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Postmaster General Summerfield had condemned the book as "an obscene and filthy work. . . . The book is replete with descriptions [which] utilize filthy, offensive and degrading words and terms. Any literary merit the book may have is far outweighed by the pornographic and smutty passages and words. . . ." This official condemnation by Summerfield is not that of a *self-appointed censor*, a favorite term of the purveyors and proponents of smut and smear for those individuals who wish to protect themselves and their children from the slime-flecked writings of pornographers.

Grove Press, Inc., and Readers' Subscription, Inc., as plaintiffs, promptly brought suit against the Postmaster of the City of New York. They sought to restrain the Postmaster from enforcing the postal ban against *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and circulars announcing its availability. They further sought a declaratory judgment to the effect "(1) that the novel is not 'obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent or filthy' in content or character, and is not non-mailable under the statute or, in the alternative, (2) that if the novel be held to fall within the purview of the statute, the statute is to that extent invalid and violates plaintiffs' rights in contraven-

tion of the First and Fifth Amendments."

The attorneys for Grove Press were Charles Rembar, Morton E. Yohalem and Sigmund Timberg of the firm of Levine, Rembar and Zolotar. The attorneys for Readers' Subscription were from the firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison. The attorneys for the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU), as *amicus curiae* in support of plaintiffs, were from the firm of Dickstein, Shapiro and Galligan.

JUDGE BRYAN, in his decision, tells us that "The Grove edition has a preface by Archibald MacLeish, former Librarian of Congress, Pulitzer Prize winner, and one of this country's most distinguished poets and literary figures, giving his appraisal of the novel." MacLeish, a Felix Frankfurter protege, according to Rosalie M. Gordon in her book, *Nine Men Against America* (Devin Adair, 1958), has 46 Communist-front citations listed under his name in the 1958 Florida Legislation Investigation Committee Hearings on the NAACP.

MacLeish's preface is accompanied by "an introduction by Mark Schorer, professor of English at the University of California, a leading scholar of D. H. Lawrence and his works." Mark Schorer, as a Harvard professor, was listed as having signed an open letter for the Communist-front National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. (House

Committee on Un-American Activities, Testimony of Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, page 3658.)

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), whose New York branch appeared as *amicus curiae* for Grove Press, was found to be "definitely classed as a Communist-front or 'transmission belt' organization. At least 90 per cent of its efforts are expended on behalf of Communists who come into conflict with the law. While it professes to stand for free speech, a free press and free assembly, it is quite obvious that its main function is to protect Communists in their activities of force and violence in their program to overthrow the government." (1943 Report by the California Legislative Committee Investigating un-American Activities, the finding of which were reiterated by the 1948 Committee in its Report.)

A genuine understanding of the ideological background of the principals in the Grove Press case is of prime importance to citizens who expect to achieve a *realistic* result in future moral crusades against obscene literature. First strip the veneer of liberalism from the forces working so diligently to secure "freedom of the press" (by which they mean freedom to corrupt the public morals); the battle can then be fought against *the real enemy*.

Lloyd K. Garrison, member of the firm cited earlier as attorneys for Readers' Subscription, Inc., is

the chairman of the National Legal Committee of the NAACP; was president of the National Urban League from 1947-52; member of the cited front National Lawyers' Guild in 1940; and signer of a statement approving the War Department's order permitting commissioning of Communist Party members—issued by the Communist-front National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. (See *The Daily Worker*, March 18, 1945, page 2.) He was attorney for Julius Robert Oppenheimer when the latter appeared before the United States Atomic Energy Commission's Personnel Security Board in proceedings held to determine his eligibility for clearance for access to restricted data.

GARRISON is *currently* a vice-chairman of the ACLU (*amicus curiae* for the Grove Press); he has been similarly listed as far back as 1938.

According to the House Committee on Un-American Activities' hearings on Unauthorized Use of United States Passports (Part 4, June, 1956, page 4657), Lloyd Garrison was Arthur Miller's attorney when Miller's passport was held up by the State Department.

Garrison wrote a letter to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board in which he stated, "Shortly after I was made chairman of the NLRB . . . I appointed Nathan Witt a

member of our legal staff. . . . We placed great confidence in him—a confidence which he amply deserved and fully repaid.” (Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, *Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments*, Part 10, May 26, 1953, page 638.)

Nathan Witt (Witkowsky), the object of so much praise, attended Harvard Law School in 1932 and was a Felix Frankfurter pupil. He was in the NLRB under Garrison in July, 1934, and its secretary 1938-40. He was a member of the original Hal Ware cell in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA) with Alger Hiss. “After Ware’s death in 1935, Nathan Witt became the leader of the Group. . . . The Ware Group was an integral (and highly important) unit of the underground section of the American Communist Party. . . . (Witness, by Whittaker Chambers, page 342).

The *Congressional Record* of February 23, 1956, pages 2832-3, cited Garrison’s record as including the Communist-front Second National Negro Congress, 1937, to which he sent greetings, and the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation, at which he spoke as dean of the University of Wisconsin Law School (reported in the *Daily Worker*, February 23, 1939, page 3). This Conference was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General.

Appendix IX to Volume 17, Spe-

cial Committee on Un-American Activities, 1944, entitled *Communist Front Organizations*, lists Garrison, along with Max Lowenthal and David K. Niles, as a member of the International Juridical Association (IJA), a cited Red front.

LET US DIG even deeper under the surface of the Grove Press case—described in the controlled press as a great victory for “liberals” who feel that an enormous boon has been conferred on Americans by Judge Bryan’s decision.

Louis S. Weiss, now deceased, was a member of the firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton and Garrison. His sister, Carol Weiss King, also deceased, appeared during the Whittaker Chambers-Alger Hiss hearings as counsel for J. Peters (Sander Goldberger), the head of the underground section of the American Communist Party. (He was permitted to leave the United States just before the Hiss trial began, although he had been under surveillance for years.) Carol Weiss King was secretary of the IJA. “The Communist control and policies of the IJA centered in the person of Mrs. King” (Appendix IX, pages 807-808). She was the attorney for Harry Bridges and Earl Browder. Maurice Malken swore that she was a member of the Communist Party (page 695, Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations hearings).

WITTAKER CHAMBERS' reference to Mrs. King in a footnote on page 718 of his book, *Witness*, stated:

"Carol King . . . received her early legal training in the office of Max Lowenthal, close friend of Justice Felix Frankfurter and author of a recent book attacking the FBI. . . . [Her brother's firm] had other . . . connections with the Hiss case. Not only was Weiss the brother of Carol King; *Garrison was the brother-in-law of Dr. Carl Binger*, the defense psychiatrist in both Hiss trials." (Our emphasis.)

Louis S. Weiss presented a "memorandum . . . prepared at the request of the International Labor Defense ['The Legal Arm of the Communist Party'] under the supervision of the IJA." (Appendix IX, page 811.)

Louis Budenz was asked during the Tax-Exempt Foundations hearings in 1952 (page 726), "Do you know anything of Louis S. Weiss?" He answered, "Yes, sir; I knew Louis Weiss. . . . *he was a member of the Communist Party.*" (Our emphasis.)

Simon Hirsch Rifkin, born in Meretz, Russia, was a U.S. District Judge, New York, until 1950, when he joined Garrison's firm. He is an official of the American Jewish Committee and advised Eisenhower on Jewish affairs in Europe in 1945-46. Westbrook Pegler wrote that Rifkind, on March 9, 1949, let one Irwin Schindler "walk out absolutely free [after he] had pleaded guilty to a

charge of shipping three B-17 bombers from Miami, Fla., to Zatec, Czechoslovakia, behind the Iron Curtain." Pegler also noted that "several members of [Rifkind's] law firm took a diligent but strangely unofficial part in the defense of Alger Hiss . . ." (*New York Journal-American*, December 15, 1953.)

Richard H. Paul, another member of the firm, was a law clerk to Jerome Frank, named in *The New Dealers* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1934) as a Felix Frankfurter recommended appointee to the post of General Counsel to the AAA. (John Abt of the Hal Ware Cell had practiced law in Frank's firm in Chicago; joined the AAA legal staff at Frank's request.)

John F. Wharton, one of the two original partners in the firm (the other was Weiss), is a power in the theatrical and publishing world. He is or has been director, counsel and president of the Playwrights Producing Company; director and vice-president of Pocket Books and of Simon and Schuster; general counsel of *Saturday Review Associates*; treasurer of Selznick International (motion pictures).

Vincent Hartnett testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in May, 1951, (Subversive Infiltration of Radio, Television and the Entertainment Industry, Part I, page 14) on Communist infiltration in the publishing world. He swore that "There is a certain group functioning, which I will

call the Jack Goodman Group. This group, my sources indicate, includes, among others . . . Jack Goodman, an editor of Simon and Schuster . . . Joseph Barnes . . . now an assistant to Jack Goodman. . . . This group of highly placed writers and publishers is in a position to exert a synchronized and powerful influence for Communist or pro-Communist causes throughout a large segment of the publishing field."

John Wharton was named in Appendix IX as having favored, in 1942, Presidential Clemency for the Release of Earl Browder. He was so listed by the Professional and Cultural Division of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder.

Adlai Stevenson of the Chicago branch of this firm appeared as a character witness for Alger Hiss.

JUDGE BRYAN, in his decision, also referred to the "expert testimony of two leading literary critics, Malcolm Cowley and Alfred Kazin, as to the literary stature of the work and its author, contemporary acceptance of literature dealing with sex . . . and their own opinions as to the effect of the book on its readers," testimony elicited before a Judicial Officer of the Post Office Department in a hearing held on May 14, 1959.

Who is Malcolm Cowley, one of the two "leading literary critics" called in by Grove Press to support its publication of Lawrence's study in obscenity? He was for many

years the editor of the *New Republic*, starting in 1931, but more than that, he is listed in Appendix IX as having 60 Communist-front citations! These included contributions in the *Daily Worker*; membership on the editorial council of *Soviet Russia Today*; his signature on a Call to a Congress of the American Revolutionary Writers; public endorsement of William Z. Foster, Communist candidate for the Presidency; and intervention by private letters in the case of the about-to-be deported life-time Communist revolutionary, Hanns Eisler, accused by his own sister of being a GPU agent for the Soviet Union. (See House Committee on Un-American Activities Hearings Regarding Hanns Eisler, 1947, pages 127-131, for last citation.)

Some insight into the background of the other literary critic, Alfred Kazin, can be gained by referring to a review of his book, *A Walker in the City*, by Irwin Edman in the *New York Times*, October 8, 1951, in which are these statements:

"He has now written a book on his own native grounds, the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, where he grew up in the midst of the poverty of an immigrant Jewish community. . . . His parents talked about [Russia and Poland] with a bitter-sweet remembrance. . . . [In] his chapter on Sabbath eve (Friday evening) in the kitchen of his family's home . . . one . . .



experiences the sense of oneness with Judaism, with socialism, with all mankind. . . . Kazin's father . . . looked forward to the brotherhood of man under socialism. . . . Kazin [was] intensely aware of his Jewish bonds and his American 'apartness.'"

Kazin's book has been reprinted by Grove Press as an Evergreen Book.

JUDGE BRYAN, in 12 separate paragraphs, resorts to *personal* literary criticism to support his reasoning that Chatterley should be published, using such terms as "a writer of great gifts and of undoubted artistic integrity. . . . This plot serves as a vehicle through which Lawrence develops his basic theme of contrast between his own philosophy and the sterile and debased society which he attacks [remember that the gamekeeper was a Communist]. . . . The plot and theme are meticulously worked out with honesty and sincerity. The book is replete with fine writing and with descriptive passages of rare beauty. . . . There is no question about Lawrence's honesty and sincerity of purpose, artistic integrity and lack of intention to appeal to prurient interest. . . . This is an honest and sincere novel of literary merit and its dominant theme and effect, taken as a whole, is not an appeal to the prurient interest of the average reader."

He also states twice that the book

met with "unanimous critical approval," citing the literary critics of the *New York Times*, the *New York Post*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, *Harpers* and *Time* as examples. These are all New York publications, and do not represent the entire United States.

Bryan admitted that he did "not personally find the book offensive."

Judge Bryan is a product of the New York public school system and of Columbia University Law School. From 1934 to 1942 he was an associate and then first assistant corporation counsel for the City of New York under the Red-fronting Fiorello La Guardia. In 1954 he was the personal counsel for H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. Hensel was accused of being the "mastermind" behind the smear of the McCarthy Committee which stopped its investigation of subversion in the U. S. Army. (See Special Senate investigation on the Charges and Countercharges involved in that case.) After Bryan performed mightily for Hensel, he became a U. S. District Judge in September, 1956.

The *Evergreen Review*, published quarterly by Grove Press, lists Ephraim London as secretary of Grove Press, Inc. This is a very interesting connection, for Mr. London, an attorney, is the counsel for the firm of (Walter) Beer, (Stewart W.) Richards, (Chester T.) Lane, (Hugh Kenneth) Haller,

and (Helen L.) Buttenwieser, at 150 Broadway, New York, New York. Beer and Lane are both from Harvard Law School, which, of course, means they were Felix Frankfurter pupils. More important than that is the fact that Chester T. Lane (now deceased) was a counsel for Alger Hiss during his second perjury trial! Also Helen L. Buttenwieser is Helen Lehman, niece of Herbert Lehman, and is married to Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, partner in Kuhn Loeb & Company. She lists herself as a member of the Board of Directors of the NYCLU in 1957. She sat many, many days in attendance at the Alger Hiss trial to be near her friend, Priscilla Hiss. The Buttenwiesers were hosts to the Hisses for several months after Alger Hiss was convicted.

PRINCIPALS in the Alger Hiss case are intimately involved in the background of the *Lady Chatterley's Lover* obscenity case. As for Ephraim London himself, he is also a member of the Board of Directors of the NYCLU and secretary and member of the Board of Simon and Schuster. Ephraim London was a scheduled speaker at the Conference on Self-Defense Against Unconstitutional Intrusions, held in the Biltmore Hotel, New York, January 30, 1957, under the auspices of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, cited by the Senate Internal Security Subcom-

mittee as a Communist-front devised to make "special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself."

A number of identified members of the Communist Party were co-speakers with London, who was introduced as the attorney who won "The Miracle" case (an Italian sacrilegious film) and who had defended Harry Slochower (a Brooklyn college professor who took the Fifth Amendment) up to the Supreme Court, which ruled 5-4 in Slochower's favor (Felix Frankfurter concurring). The Teachers Union of New York, a cited Communist-front, paid at least \$2,400 of Slochower's legal expenses in the case mentioned above (*N. Y. Teacher News*, April 21, 1956, page 4).

The *Evergreen Review* (Number 9) includes 16 pages of photographs of what it terms the "Erotic Sculpture of Konarak." Some of the pictures are of a dozen different sculptures representing pornographic acts in progress. That such obscenity can successfully be purveyed to the public under the guise of "art" is frightening proof of the lack of *intelligent militancy* on the part of community leaders who of necessity must lead any successful effort to curtail such filth.

*Evergreen Review's* listed distributors include the Olympia Press in Paris. Most of its publications are banned in the U. S. A. as pornographic. The DeGaulle Govern-

ment has attempted to curtail its publications. Significantly, the firm has a full page ad in the *Review* listing titles it has published with the accompanying statement, "None of the titles listed above may be sent to the U.S.A." Then why are they advertised?

The inescapable conclusion which must be drawn by the reader is that he is being informed of the availability of these titles in some fashion. Such a listing of banned books is calculated to create an allure for them. Henry Miller's *Sexus* and *Plexus* are Olympia Press books. Miller described Grove Press as a "firm . . . looked upon with great esteem by intelligent readers, especially by the young who are in search of something more than the usual manufactured article."

Henry Miller is described in *Pornography and the Law*, by Drs. Eberhard and Phyllis Kronhausen, as the "Apostle of Gory Detail." Even the Kronhausens wrote that "Sometimes it does take a rather healthy stomach to digest Henry Miller's realism. . . . It is true that much of what he discusses in his books strikes initially with the force of shock." Miller has preoccupations in his writing which take his material *beyond* pornography, make them utterly loathsome. Among his works are *Tropic of Cancer*, *The World of Sex*, *Quiet Days in Clichy?* and *Sexus—The Rosy Crucifixion* (a sacrilegious and occult title).

THE KRONHAUSENS state that "Henry Miller has informed the authors that in the present clarifying climate regarding censorship a renewed effort will be made to make his works legitimately available in the United States." Does the reader know what this means? It means that works which make "Chatterley" seem mild in comparison will be sold in this country in the near future—as was planned long ago by the forces exposed to the public gaze in this article. The courts will not interfere; they will aid the plan.

*Sexus* was confiscated by the Attorney General of Norway on May 10, 1957, on the grounds that it was "obscene writing," and the ban was upheld by the Norwegian Supreme Court. Miller wrote from Big Sur, California, to Trygve Hirsch, the attorney defending the book, a letter which *Evergreen Review* reproduced, in which he wrote, "I regard the entire world as my home. I inhabit the earth, not a particular section of it labeled America, France, Germany, Russia. . . . I owe allegiance to mankind, not to a particular country, race, or people. . . . I dissent from the current view of things, as regards murder, as regards religion, as regards society, as regards our well-being." Miller asks, "Does one refer to such authors as Petronius, Rabelais, Rousseau, Sade, to mention but a few, as 'diseased minds'?" Why, yes, *we* do.

*Pornography and the Law* has just been published as an original paper-back. This book followed closely on the heels of the "Chatterley" decision, and has a tremendous distribution throughout the U.S.A. The Kronhausens were long-time students of Theodore Reik, a personal disciple of Freud's, who has had four of his books published by Grove Press. Reik wrote the introduction to the Kronhausens' book. J. W. Ehrlich, an attorney in "censorship" cases, wrote the foreword in which he stated "Neither Phyllis nor Eberhard . . . are lawyers, and they have not approached their subject by a comparison of judicial decisions." Yet this book, with its misleading title, is clearly intended by the authors to be the authoritative source, as to the meaning of pornography and obscenity in legal terms, to be used by our courts in all future decisions relating to the subject.

Ehrlich predicts that "In the discussions that will be taking place all over the country, *Pornography and the Law* is certain to play an important part.

"The authors contend that there is no clinical evidence that anyone has ever been harmed psychologically by reading even the most 'obscene' publications, provided that the approach to such reading is healthy."

They divide obscene literature into two categories: "erotic realism" and "hard core" pornography,

and then proceed to quote copiously, verbatim, from both types of writings. The only concession made by the authors to what little law we have left against obscenity is to delete, in the section on "hard core" pornography, a few words by substituting bracketed statements such as [vernacular for ———] with a medical term used in lieu of the filthy word. This subterfuge is a transparent one, for the imagination immediately supplies the missing term. If it does not, the authors conveniently supply a "tabulation" of dirty words and phrases earlier in the volume, drawn from such books as *Peyton Place*, *Studs Lonigan* and *No Down Payment*. Following this list, the Kronhausens describe permissive therapy performed on children with fixations for certain words, and conclude that "Clinically, therefore, there is obvious therapeutic value in accepting the use of 'forbidden' words."

THE AUTHORS, in their section on the Supreme Court Definition of Obscenity, contend that works of "erotic realism" must be excluded from censorship, as *not* being obscene. From the "studies" of many of the authors quoted in the Bibliography to the book, and from their own researches, the Kronhausens conclude that "erotic" books may fulfill several eminently useful and therapeutic functions. . . . The ideal supplement to what the average en-

lightened home or school offers in the form of sex education would be books of erotic realism, such as Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Wilson's *Memoirs of Hecate County* or the autobiographical *The Life and Loves of Frank Harris*."

They confidently state that they "have no doubt that this will be the type of complete sex education which good homes and schools will offer in the not-so-distant future."

THE Kronhausens' recommendations to parents are, in our opinion, extremely shocking. It might be noted, however, that they view the reading of pornographic literature by sexual deviates and potential sex offenders as desirable. They also admit that the works named above "may momentarily have an erotically stimulating effect" but they regard this as "perfectly normal and healthy response" to such

stimuli. It is one of the filthiest books which could possibly have been printed and sold openly in this country up to this moment, and its publication could not have come about were it not for the "Chatterley" decision and prior rulings of like nature.

The appearance of this book and of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* mark a serious break-through in the promotion of obscenity. The inevitable results of the adult public's naive and passive acceptance of such material is an increased weakening of their moral fiber. Moreover, the effects of such a book as an unexpurgated *Lady Chatterley's Lover* on a non-critical, but nevertheless sensitive and naturally curious youth are incalculable. Lack of widespread resistance to such salacious works is a major victory in the hidden forces' campaign to destroy Christianity and enslave all humanity.

Two major organizations fighting obscenity in literature are the (Roman Catholic) National Office for Decent Literature and the Citizens for Decent Literature (in Cincinnati). Further details on *how* to fight the forces behind obscenity will be dealt with in Part II of this article.

---

### Socialist Soul of Liberalism

---

Some years ago Norman Thomas, often the Socialist Party candidate for President, said Americans would never knowingly accept socialism—but, he quickly added, under the guise of "liberalism," one by one they would accept socialistic measures until one day, without knowing how it had happened, America would have become a collectivist state.

How far along this road have we come? Part of the answer is to be found in the fact that today more than 40 million Americans receive some direct payment from the government.—*Life Line Quotes*.

# Southern Methodist University

## Pampers Leftism

*One World and leftist advocates entrench themselves at SMU in name of academic freedom*

by Harold Lord Varney

TO THE average American, the suggestion that there is a Leftist threat in Dallas will seem far-fetched, indeed.

Dallas enjoys the reputation of being one of America's citadels of conservatism. In a Texas where Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn represent the ultra-Left, Dallas is the opposite side of the political spectrum. Three times in a row it has elected Right Wing Republican, Bruce Alger, to represent it in Congress. "Dallas is the most dependable source of conservative votes in Texas," is the editorial opinion of its leading newspaper, the *Dallas News*, one of the few major American dailies which was on the right side of the Joe McCarthy fight in 1954. Radicalism in Dallas is news.

That the Leftist brethren should select such a formidable city for an apparently serious propaganda drive is a commentary on their resourcefulness and chameleon powers. And yet there are increasing signs that the accustomed conservatism of Dallas is approaching a real Leftist challenge.

That is not saying the potential trouble-makers wear any recognizable Communist label. The Leftism that manifests itself in Dallas is not easily identifiable as Communist, or even Socialist. It is a mealy mouthed radicalism which talks "anti-Communism" out of one side of its face, and complete "tolerance" of anti-American Communist activities out of the other. In Dallas, Leftism's most familiar masquerade is internationalism, in the seemingly innocuous guise of the Council on World Affairs. Its principal base of operations is the Southern Methodist University.

"I doubt if there are more than a hundred conscious Leftists in the city," one particularly well informed Dallasite told me, in discussing the mounting Communist threat. "The trouble is that they are concentrated at the choke points in our civic life where they can influence public discussion and public controversy. They are experts at fastening themselves onto some apparently idealistic cause which is certain to cause turmoil and division among our