

## Decisions of the Indecent Publications Tribunal

Nos. 222-237

In the matter of the Indecent Publications Act 1963, and in the matter of an application by Murdoch Riley, of Wellington, company director, as agent for the publishers, for decisions in respect of the following books:

*Making Love in Living Colour,*  
*Love Positions,*  
*Black Lust,*  
*The Adventure of Father Silas/Flesh and Bone,*  
*The Devil's Brand,*  
*Mistress of Cuba,*  
*The Cherry Dance,*  
*Inga,*  
*The Lure of Leather,*  
*Flagellation,*  
*The Song of Songs,*  
*Friends and Lovers,*  
*The Leather, Latex and Rubber Scene,*  
*The Art and Science of Love Making,*  
*The Memoirs of a Russian Princess.*

## DECISIONS OF THE TRIBUNAL

THE application is made by leave of the Minister of Justice. Mr Downey appeared in support of the application.

In respect of each book the Tribunal decides as follows:

*Making Love in Living Colour*, by Gilbert Oakley, published by Bens Books, London.

*Love Positions*, by Anders Jorgens, published by Canova Press, London.

Since these two books are similar in subject matter to *Sexual Techniques*, by Morgens Toft, the judgment of the Tribunal on this book, published in the *New Zealand Gazette* of 21 May 1970, might be expected to obtain in the case of these two books also. As we said in the earlier judgment, books of this kind, although over-stimulating or inciting to some, could well be helpful to many; there is nothing indecent in nudity or the sexual act unless put in wrong context or treated salaciously. We commended the tone of the Toft book and said we should not wish to see any of an inferior standard on the market.

The two books now under consideration are inferior in several ways. The first, *Making Love in Living Colour*, by Gilbert Oakley, shows "fifty full-page coital positions all in full (not to say lurid) colour" involving some exaggerated posturing and with little sensitivity. These photographs are accompanied by a pert text, and the whole tone of the book throws doubts on its sincerity of purpose.

In the second book, *Love Positions* (in briefs), by Anders Jorgens, there is no text apart from captions to the photographs, the number of which has risen to 90, and when the actors in the game wear shorts the whole thing becomes faintly ridiculous and obscene. The distinction between straight enlightenment and pornography (where people are being got at) is often a nice one. Here it is largely a matter of tone and quality; the subject deserves an honest treatment and the proliferation of cheap and shallow manuals of this kind is in our opinion not in the public interest. The Tribunal classifies these books as indecent.

*Black Lust*, by Jean de Villiot, emanates from Canova Press Ltd., London. It is a novel dealing with the sack of Khartoum, not entirely without merit. It features, however, necrophilia, sadism, and unusual sexual torture, and although these do not occupy a great part of the book the positive merits which the publication displays are not, in our view, sufficient to outweigh them. The theme of a woman's sexual degradation and humiliation is capable of being so treated as to make a valuable and unexceptionable book, but taking *Black Lust* as a whole we do not accept that this is such an exercise—indeed, it tends to exploit the theme for sensational purposes. We declare the book to be indecent.

The Tribunal is called upon to consider two books bound together as a paperback: *The Adventures of Father Silas (Le Portier des Chartreux)*, by Beauregard do Farniente and *Flesh and Bone*, by Henry Crannach. These come from Holloway House Publishing Co. The first claims to be an exposure of the sexual lives of some of those dedicated to celibacy—sexual incontinence treated fictionally, not very kindly, but not notably indecently. By itself we would not have condemned it, but this volume includes also *Flesh and Bone*, which contains enough sexual cruelty and depravity for us to regard it as indecent. Taking this factor into account and regarding the books as one volume, we find that it is indecent within the meaning of the Act.

*The Devil's Brand*, is a Holloway House edition claimed to be the first complete and unexpurgated edition of an underground erotic novel better known, until an above-ground writer appropriated the title, as *The Devil's Advocate*. It is a carefully constructed account of a young girl's quest, through the orgies of a weekend party, for her sister who has disappeared. The detailed description of perverted sexual practices are so presented as to render the book indecent in our view. The publishers compare it to *The Story of O* and call it a "serious existentialist study of the swift degradation of an innocent young girl". This claim would be acceptable if the book were at a higher and more understanding level, but we find here nothing better than cynical virtuosity, and virtuosity harnessed not to a sociological or artistic objective, but rather to a sales objective. Within its genre the book is not sincere enough to be granted immunity, on grounds of public interest, from the consequences of the indecency which pervades it. We classify this book as indecent within the meaning of the Act.

*The Mistress of Cuba*, a paper-back book by authoress Rita Benuto. Published by Holloway House. This United States edition retails at \$1.15 in New Zealand.

In this apparently fictional autobiography of a Cuban girl, who used her feminine guile to become a spy for the Cuban Government, there is little espionage but a great deal of sexual promiscuity portrayed in detail plus similar descriptions of sexual violence and deviation in a manner which in our view is injurious to the public good. In the judgment of the Tribunal it is indecent within the meaning of section 2. Nothing in sections 10 and 11 militates in its favour. It is classified as indecent.

*The Cherry Dance*, authoress Tami Miyoshi. A United States edition published by Holloway House Publishing Co.

This paper-back novel is the "biography" of a young Japanese daughter of a wealthy pearl merchant.

Considerations of money or morality do not deter her. She is able to indulge all her sexual whims in whatever form they may take and this she does without inhibition. The description of some malpractices in the text in our view leads us to classify it as indecent in the hands of persons under the age of 18 years.

*Inga*, authoress Karen Lustig. A United States edition published by the Universal Publishing Corporation of New York.

This rather brittle novel deals with the seduction of a not unwilling young girl.

It is a time-honoured theme. The Tribunal classifies it as not indecent.

*The Lure of Leather*, author Desmond le Monde. Publishers K. and G. Publications (Herts.) Ltd.

This paper-back book deals with fetishism arising from the use of leather.

The plain, very matter-of-fact text is in a semi-scientific vein.

It is classified as not indecent.

*Flagellation*, author G. R. Scott. Published by Tallis Press. Price in New Zealand, \$1.40.

This paper-back book is really a thesis on corporal punishment. The text is factual with a semi-psychological approach.

The Tribunal classifies it as not indecent.

*Song of Songs*, "a photographers version of the *Song of Solomon*", by Noel Mayne. Published by Charles Skilton Ltd. Price in New Zealand, \$12.

This hard-back volume is well presented. On each left hand page appears a verse from the *Song of Solomon*. On each right hand page there is a photograph of posed nudes (some of the hero or heroine alone, and in others of the two together), not always entirely relevant to the text, but this work is presented as a work of art—and, in our view, achieves a measure of success.

It is classified as not indecent.

*Friends and Lovers*, author Liz Marsh. Publishers Universal Publishing Corporation of New York. The price of this U.S. edition in New Zealand is 95c.

The story in this paper-back book takes the form of an alleged confession by a wayward wife to a police inspector.

The "confession" involves a luridly detailed description of sex, wife-swapping, lesbianism, and flagellation in a manner which in our view is injurious to the public good and offends against the definition of indecency contained in section 2 of the Act.

The Tribunal classifies it as indecent.