

THE HUDDERSFIELD DAILY EXAMINER
HUDDERSFIELD, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND
6 OCTOBER 1932
(page 5)

WOMAN'S BOOK ABOUT AUTHOR

INTERIM INJUNCTION REFUSED

EXTREMELY STRONG AFFIDAVIT

In the Vacation Court yesterday mention was made of the motion by Mr. Edward Alexander Crowley, the author, whose pen name is Aleister Crowley, living at Abermarle Court, Piccadilly, London, for an interim injunction to restrain the further sale or publication of a book entitled "Laughing Torso," written by Miss Nina Hamnett and printed and published respectively by Charles Whittingham and Griggs, Ltd., and Constable and Co., Ltd.

When the matter came before Mr. Justice Lawrence on September 22 the motion was allowed to stand over to enable Miss Hamnett and her advisors to consider the position.

Messrs. Constable gave an undertaking meanwhile there would be no further publication of the book.

"EVERY WORD TRUE"

Mr. Upjohn (for the publishers) said "There is a long and extremely strong affidavit by Miss Hamnett in regard to which Mr. O'Connor (for Miss Hamnett) is going to justify all the statements.

Mr. Martin O'Connor. My defence is that every word published in the book about Mr. Crowley is true, and will be justified at the trial.

"I think you may say," Mr. Justice Du Parcq said, "that there references to Sicily would suggest that Mr. Crowley was behaving in an odd and extraordinary way there, and in such a way that people who were superstitious might have thought he was doing all kinds of magical and extraordinary things, but I am not sure the affidavit does not go beyond that."

Mr. O'Connor: It does.

NO INJUNCTION

Mr. Gallop: I do not want the impression to go abroad that there is any shadow of truth in these statement.

Mr. Justice Du Parcq, giving judgment, said that in face of Miss Hamnett's sworn statement that the words were true, he thought it would be wrong to stop the publication of the book at present. If the words could be said to constitute an obscene libel there was a way to prevent their further publication.

The application for an injunction would be refused. The costs would be costs in the action.