CAMPAN

## CENSORSHIP

(THE DEFENCE OF LITERATURE AND THE ARTS SOCIETY) 18 Brewer Street, London W1R 4AS Telephone: 01-439 7827/8

PLEASE REPLY TO:-

25, Middleton Close,

Fareham.

Hants. P014 1QN

14th November, 1985

CHAIRMAN Dr. David Kerr SPONSORS

David Webb.

Lindsey Ander Dame Peggy As

,15, Sloane Court West.

rophy suchan MEP

Juchan MEP Norman Buchan MP Anthony Burges Lord Campbell of Eskan Julie Christin Dr. Alex Comfort Shirley Conrol Front Bernard Crick Arthur Davidson Bryan Davies Reunald Davins-Payntee

ichnel Kustow rthur Latham I. Hon. The Earl o ord Lovell-Davies Sward Lucie-Smith yan Magee nn Mallalleu sven Marcas reven Marcus rof. Lord McGregor

Dr. David Stafford Clark Tom Stopperd

London SW3 4TD

Dear David.

Thank you for your letter of 7th November.

I do not know why you think your opinions have been 'censored'. The fact that the National Council has not done as you wished does not prove that you have not had a hearing. Members' letters on any issue are always brought to the attention of the Council and your views have been considered.

Dr. Hunnings has tendered his resignation as Chairman. He has not resigned from the National Council or from membership of the Campaign. Am I to understand that you intend to examine all members of CAC known to you for connections with agencies which you regard as hostile? If so, may I remind you that it is not up to you to decide who is or is not fit to be a member of the Campaign. You Hutchington CE Earl of Hutchington are director of NCROPA. You are not director of CAC.

At the meeting where your letter to Dr. Hunnings was discussed one Council member expressed concern that our discussions were not as confidential as had been thought and another expressed strong resentment at your approach to him at his private address. My letter reflected their views.

I note that you do not retract your description of Dr. Hunnings. I note that you do not intend to resign. Also noted is your declared intention to influence the Campaign's membership against individuals with whose conduct you disagree.

Your suggested parallel is nonsense. The C.of E. elects delegates to the General Synod from its own active membership. The lady would have to become a practising Christian first. Dr. Hunnings has not abandoned his convictions. He has merely adopted a different approach on one issue to deal with different circumstances - it could be called infiltration rather than confrontation. At present the Video Appeals Committee is loaded in favour of the 'liberal' side. It would hardly be in the best interests of freedom of expression to have it loaded with Whitehouse supporters. If you intend to remain a Campaign member,

Enquiries to the Secretary, 25 Middleton Close, Fareham, Hants, Tel: 0329-284471

I must ask you to accept that censorship can be fought by methods other than the headon one that you prefer. Your dispute with Dr. Hunnings is a matter of tactics, not ethics. You do not have a monopoly of either, nor can you expect me to agree with someone apparently prepared to sacrifice the Campaign to his own principles.

I do not doubt either your sincerity or your total commitment to the anti-censorship cause. What I do doubt is your commitment to the survival of the Campaign. The concluding sentences of your letter can be construed as a threat to that survival. Given your dedication to the fight against censorship, you can hardly contemplate forcing CAC out of existence unless you have something in mind to replace it. I should be most interested to know what that something is.

Yours sincerely.

May Hayward