The Listener

and

B.B.C. Television Review

Vol. LXIV. No. 1651. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1960 15e

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, a great philosopher of the last century: in the words of Professor Wind in his first Reith Lecture, 'the artistic life that he saw about him resembles ours in many ways'. A contemporary lithograph after a drawing by Ludwig Sebbers

The Listener

Vol. LXIV. No. 1651 Thursday November 17 1960 REGISTERED AT THE G.P.O. AS A NEWSPAPER

CONTENTS

What will be Mr. Kennedy's Foreign Policy?

By DOUGLAS STUART, B.B.C. Washington correspondent

RESTING in the sunshine of Florida after his arduous campaign, President-elect John Kennedy has at the same time been taking the opportunity to think out in detail his future policies*. He believes that the American people have given him a mandate for a great national effort, and that nowhere is this effort more needed than in the field of foreign policy. From his public statements and speeches it would appear that Senator Kennedy groups America's relations with the rest of the world under three heads.

First, there is the all-important question of America's relations with Russia and China. Secondly, there is the problem of America's relations with the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Thirdly, there is the question of America's relations with her allies in Western Europe, which might be summed up in the phrase 'the future of the Atlantic Alliance'.

There is nothing to suggest that the President-elect sees these three problems as separate one from the other. On the contrary, his is an organic mind which grasps the interdependence of personalities and circumstance. He realizes that what is done in one area reacts on another, but this realization does not make him hesitant. He prefers action to reaction; and in his presidential campaign Senator Kennedy has already defined certain actions which he proposes to take early in his new administration.

First, he has promised to make one last effort to secure agreement with Russia on the question of a nuclear test-ban treaty; this, he hopes, may lead to nuclear disarmament, a first step to general disarmament. Secondly, he has warned Mr. Khrushchev that as President of the United States he will not countenance the relinquishment of American or of allied rights in Berlin. Thirdly, while not downgrading the possible value of a summit conference, he has made it clear that he believes the President should work from Washington and not travel abroad unless there is clear proof of its being in the national interest.

As for China, the President-elect has promised a complete re-examination of American policy towards Peking. It is certain, however, that he will not abandon the United States alliance with Nationalist China, nor reverse America's policy of keeping People's Republic of China out of the United Nations. What his public speeches indicate, however, is a deep-seated desire to reduce tension between the two Chinas in the Strait of Formosa, possibly through a withdrawal of Nationalist troops from the offshore islands, and an equally strong desire to secure Peking's participation in international discussions on nuclear disarmament.

In his dealings with the leaders of the Communist world, however, President-elect Kennedy wishes to speak from strength; again and again he has said that America's foreign policy must be based on the strong foundation of military power. At the same time, he has emphasized that military power is not enough by itself. America, he feels, must win the hearts and minds of free men all over the world. This is why he proposes to launch a series of massive programmes in the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, designed to raise the living standards of the people. In his opinion, poverty is the breeding ground of communism. But Mr. Kennedy is aware that even the

* Broadcast on November 12

Letters to the Editor

The Editor welcomes letters on broadcasting subjects or topics arising out of articles printed in THE LISTENER but reserves the right to shorten letters for reasons of space

Thoughts on 'Lady Chatterley'

Sir,—The admirable talk by Sir Alan Herbert (THE LISTENER, November 10) reflects more than one aspect of the 'Lady Chatterley' prosecution, but the most deplorable feature needs, I suggest, special mention. To make a target of the dead Lawrence's thirty-two-year-old book, and to use such an attack as was heard from the prosecution, reveals that the official view of morality continues to be hinged on sex to such an extent that one might believe that no other sins beset society except those of the flesh. The effects of this weighting are far-reaching and morally indefensible. As one uninhibited theologian recently pointed out, 'probably more harm has been done in the world by people's vanity and selfishness than by the sins listed in the Commandments. The sins of the spirit are not so melodramatic as the sins of the flesh, but they are far more common and do more to spoil life'.

After reading the words of the prosecution—and even of the learned judge—in the recent trial, one is left with the impression that the Almighty committed an unpardonable solecism when he invented sex. It would seem that a tendency 'to deprave and corrupt' is exclusively reserved to sex.

When we contemplate, first in our private and business lives, and then in the world at large, the daily and deadly dosage of vanity, hate, suspicion, spite, revenge, arrogance, selfishness, aggression, meanness, destructive gossip, bearing false witness, and every other kind of uncharitableness, all the adultery, rape, sexual obscenity and perversion in existence becomes trivial by comparison—except, of course, in the eyes of the sexually repressed. Reduce the sins of the spirit, bring up children with honesty and realism, and nobody need worry about the sins of the flesh.

The spectacle of juvenile bowler-hatted officials, firmly grasping their umbrellas, chasing photographs of nude ladies and descriptions of sex—and having to run the gauntlet of cosmetic and corset advertisements, and the thousand seducing suggestions and invitations we hear daily in light music—is perhaps the most grotesque exhibition in British life today. Then, when they capture their quarries, the spectacle of these egregious schoolboys dressing up in all the panoply of the law and seriously prosecuting the poor nudes and four-letter words we know from childhood—realizing perfectly well that they are drawing public and commercial attention to both their antics and their sexy prisoners—is a performance in very poor taste. Whichever way the verdict goes, the benefit to morality is precisely nil.—Yours, etc.,

London, W.1 CHARLES H. GIBBS-SMITH

Sir,—The publication of Sir Alan Herbert's broadcast on the Chatterley case (THE LISTENER, November 10), inevitably calls for some comment.

First of all, let me agree with Sir Alan that this particular prosecution should never have been brought. It has led to a disastrous result, and the Home Office has now the difficult task of considering how to repair the damage which has been done. But my reasons for saying this are probably not Sir Alan's. I think there *could* have been a successful prosecution, if the case for the Crown had been differently managed. The flood of letters deploring the verdict (many of them from keen and responsible social workers in the cause of youth) which has since filled pages of the daily press, should be enough testimony that the prosecution could have called an overwhelmingly large mass of evidence, convincing evidence, in its support. As it didn't, and as a jury would hardly like to go against an earnest and idealistic bishop, it is not surprising that the matter should have ended as it did, though even the judge, in dealing with the episcopal evidence, remarked 'Where are we getting to?' And we can't help noticing that Lord Morrison, an ex-Home Secretary, with long years of experience behind him in public administration, and much seasoned wisdom, has declared that in his judgment the verdict was a wrong one.

Secondly, while I have no reason to dispute Lawrence's genius as an author—I imagine I must have read most of his books at some time or other—I think he was essentially a perverse genius. He certainly had (and it was no fault of his) what has been called 'the tuberculous temperament' (I suppose Katharine Mansfield and John Middleton Murry had it too). Some might go further, and say that he was a decadent. Excessive pre-occupation with the physical side of sex is common among primitives in an arrested stage of development. Only see what Verrier Elwin says about the Baigas, or Geoffrey Gorer about the Lepchas. Neither of these tribes has any hopeful outlook for the future. They are being left behind as 'museum pieces', in the advance of mankind. Similar excessive preoccupation among more advanced peoples may easily lead to their *deterioration*. This might happen in England, or in America, where a large percentage of the population is excessively sex-conscious. (It is no testimony to Americans that an unexpurgated 'Lady Chatterley' is circulating over there already.) Those who don't dam up and control the stream of life, and who don't learn to sublimate their instincts must take the consequences, and pay the penalty which Nature exacts.

Thirdly, Lawrence was a rebel against established morality. This of course need not be necessarily a bad thing. I suppose Josephine Butler in the nineteenth century was also a rebel, but of a different sort. It is beside the point to say that Lawrence was not a Christian. So long as English law, while permitting nullity and divorce in certain cases, continues to uphold the ideal of the permanence and normal indissolubility of marriage—as it still does in our registry offices, though this is too often forgotten—and so long as it continues to call adultery *misconduct*, it cannot but be an offence against the commonweal to treat it lightly; or to write stories condoning extra-marital relations.

Moreover, as several critics have been quick to point out, Mellors already had a wife, and Lady Chatterley seems to have had no compunction about breaking up *that* marriage, so long as she satisfied her own lusts (she wasn't chaste even before she married Chatterley), while she apparently had no pity for her unfortunate crippled husband. And Lawrence shows no interest in what might have been the fate of any illegitimate children that might have been born. Those of us who have had to deal pastorally with the unfortunate offspring of irregular unions or broken marriages know only too well how blighting can be the effect of such. They are among the commonest causes of what are called 'problem children' and of juvenile delinquency. Let Sir Alan Herbert devote more of his undoubted influence in support of preventive measures, preparatory instruction for persons intending marriage, and the extension and efficiency of marriage guidance councils.

Finally, there is this question of 'decent reticence'. When Lawrence said he had been trying in his writings to 'enlarge' the house of mankind, someone not unfairly retorted that his way of doing it had been 'to take the lavatory door off its hinges'. One need not impugn his honesty, but he had sometimes a perverse way of showing it. I am reminded, all through this unhappy case, and perhaps not least in reading the evidence of some of the defence witnesses, of the remark once made by Bishop Creighton that in the evolutionary process it had not been so difficult to get rid of the ape and tiger elements in human nature, but the *donkey* was a more intractable beast. Donkeys are not necessarily stupid—but they are cussed!—Yours, etc.,

Cambridge A. C. BOUQUET

'The Play's the Thing'

Sir,—The talk by Dr. Alex Comfort, published in THE LISTENER of November 10, is, no doubt, a serious attempt to deal with certain problems current in the modern theatre. It is regrettable, therefore, that he has allowed his fancy such free rein as to make statements of fact and value so completely wide of the mark that they cast serious doubts upon the more sober parts of his talk.

I should like to make but three points in connexion with his handling of these important matters.

(1) All animal activity is purposeful—the notion of purposeless play is a myth. Would Dr. Comfort care to give any reliable authority for his statement? Similarly, can he give any evidence whatsoever for his assertion that modern Europeans and Americans do not, in general, live in earnest? My experiences as a doctor in general practice completely contradict this statement.

(2) The dramatist is a member of society, and writes his plays for his society. If his characters exhibit neurotic traits, that is because these traits are found in society, and he makes use of these phenomena of human activity because he is criticizing and investigating society *on its own terms*. If Mr. Comfort prefers 'horse operas and comic books' to serious drama, let him confine