davidwebb

01-730 9537

15, Sloane Court West,
Chelsea,
London, SW3 4TD.

7th November, 1985.

Ms. Mary Hayward,
Hon. Secretary,
Campaign Against Censorship,
25, Middleton Close,
Fareham,
Hants., PO14 1QN.

Dear Mary,

Thank you for your letter of 23rd October in response to mine to yourself of 8th October.

That the secretary of the Campaign Against Censorship should seek to 'censor' the views and opinions of one of its supporting members on an issue of such fundamental importance (or on any issue, for that matter!) is, frankly, astonishing. It was, indeed, quite a revelation for me to discover that the C.A.C. does not permit its supporters to participate in the running of that campaign or even to point out its defaulters. Neither was I aware that the C.A.C. National Committee is some kind of secret society whose deliberations are strictly confidential and whose members are faceless and anonymous.

I do not accept that the first sentence of the final paragraph of my letter to Neville was abusive and I do not retract a single word of it. Nor have I the slightest intention of resigning my membership of the C.A.C. On the contrary, I shall continue to do everything in my power to influence its supporters and expose to them those I see as traitors to its cause and obstacles to its flourishment.

Your assertion that I have derived "a certain satisfaction from the difficulties the Campaign has encountered" is at once petty and absurd. As someone who has devoted nearly all of his free time, a tremendous amount of energy and not inconsiderable financial backing throughout the past ten years to the anti-censorship cause in this ever increasingly repressive country, I take the greatest possible exception to your unpleasant little comment that you suspect it would cause me no great distess if my own (incidentally it isn't my own!) organisation became the only one in the field. That was a gross slur on both my motives and my integrity.

I fear there is confusion in your mind between 'difference of opinion' and 'conflict of interest'. The President of the National Secular Society, for example, would be quite justified in participating in a C.of E. Christian Seminar, in spite of her vastly differing opinions. She would not, however, be justified

...../continued

in accepting membership of the Church of England General Synod which would clearly conflict with her N.S.S. Presidency, and even, I would suggest, her membership of that Society. Neville's position as both Chairman of the Campaign Against Censorship and a member of the Video Appeals Committee, a committee which is an integral, working part of a State instrument for censorship, is similarly both irreconcilable and unjustifiable. In the interests of the credibility and, indeed, survival of the C.A.C., there is only one course open to him. He must either resign from the C.A.C., or resign from the V.A.C. I do hope he will have the integrity to make his own decision one way or the other and thus obviate the inevitable.

Yours sincerely,

David Webb.