

Since I have learned there is a warrant out for my arrest, I am turning myself in at noon today. I would like to make this statement to the public to explain why I said what I did at the "Fuck Defense Rally" on the Cal campus Friday noon.

There will be many people who will try to say that all free speech means to us is freedom to say "fuck". Since the press tends to be merchants of chaos, stories about this most recent controversy will probably be splashed all over front pages with no mention being made of the fact that this is only a small part of all the advocacy and activity.

I know the fellow who was first arrested to be one of the more gentle, sensitive people I have met, and I am certain that his motivation was not to gain attention to himself or to shock or outrage. I think he probably was trying to point out an illness of society.

At the rally Friday noon, I stood up on the chair (I had not come to campus to do this) to speak out on what I felt this illness was that would make a word so upsetting to people. The word comes from Gaelic, where it meant "to sow in the ground", and it was, a few hundred years ago, a respectable word, and a respectable descriptive term for the sexual act. Since that time, it has been made into a dirty word that strikes fear (be it ever so subconscious) into the hearts of people that hear it. In answer to this, then, I spoke, and what I said is contained essentially in the attached reprint of an essay I wrote a year ago, with a questionnaire I added recently.

I wish to make it clear, then, that I was not trying to outrage or upset anyone, but rather, that I was trying to honestly and frankly express my feelings on a subject I have long been concerned with. I have tried to speak the truth, and I can never take back the words I spoke, for they are as close to the truth as I can presently see. There are answers to many questions I have that I don't presently know, and I shall keep searching until I find them. In the meantime, I shall continue to express my views as truthfully and honestly as I can.

When I spoke at the rally, people thought what I said was funny--at least they sure laughed a lot. I think though, that underneath this laughter there was a sort of nervous release at hearing words they had known all along were true, or what they wanted to hear.

The question is: is language generally considered to be obscene, obscene when it is not used in an obscene way? Corrolary to this is the question, is language not generally considered to be obscene, not obscene if it is used in a suggestive way? "Pussy" is generally thought to be a nice clean word denoting a soft, warm, cuddly cat. It is known to most males to also denote sex with a female. When a candidate for the Ugly Man Contest chooses to call himself "Pussy Galore" and proceeds to have buttons saying "I like Pussy" hawked with cries of, "Get your 'I like Pussy' button here", is not this the height of obscenity, of hypocrisy, of filth and deicet? What is considered obscene today, in another time and place may be considered pure and sacred. Exposing the female body in a bikini would have been considered obscene years ago.

In regard to free love, Love is not free. With every freedom there is a need for responsibility. With a new sexual freedom we are gaining, we must learn to be responsible with it, to consider the other people involved, rather than trying to gratify our urges of the moment (tho I can see nothing wrong with such gratification if it is in company of responsibility and consideration).

In regard to my being a "non-student", I am a student--I quit the University here so I could study.

With Love,

Charlie (Brown) Artman

1965 03-05 circa

Since I have learned there is a warrant out for my arrest, I am turning myself in at noon today. I would like to make this statement to the public to explain why I said what I did at the "Fuck Defense Rally" on the Cal campus Friday noon.

There will be many people who will try to say that all free speech means to us is freedom to say "fuck". Since the press tends to be merchants of chaos, stories about this most recent controversy will probably be splashed all over front pages with no mention being made of the fact that this is only a small part of all the advocacy and activity.

I know the fellow who was first arrested to be one of the more gentle, sensitive people I have met, and I am certain that his motivation was not to gain attention to himself or to shock or outrage. I think he probably was trying to point out an illness of society.

At the rally Friday noon, I stood up on the chair (I had not come to campus to do this) to speak out on what I felt this illness was that would make a word so upsetting to people. The word comes from Gaelic, where it meant "to sow in the ground", and it was, a few hundred years ago, a respectable word, and a respectable descriptive term for the sexual act. Since; that time, it has been made into a dirty word that strikes fear (be it ever so subconscious) into the hearts of people that hear it. In answer to this, then, I spoke, and what I said is contained essentially in the attached reprint of an essay I wrote a year ago, with a questionnaire I added recently.

I wish to make it clear, then, that I was not trying to outrage or upset anyone) but rather, that I was trying to honestly and frankly express my feelings on a subject I have long been concerned with. I have tried to speak the truth, and I can never take back the words I spoke, for they are as close to the truth as I can presently see. There are answers to many questions I have that I don't presently know, and I shall keep searching until I find them. In the meantime, I shall continue to express my views as truthfully and honestly as I can.

When I spoke at the rally, people thought what I said was funny--at least they sure laughed a lot. I think though, that underneath this laughter there was a sort of nervous release at hearing words they had known all along were true, or what they wanted to hear.

The question is: is language generally considered to be obscene, obscene when it is not used in an obscene way? Corollary to this is the question; is language; not generally considered to be obscene, not obscene if -it is used in a suggestive way? "Pussy" is generally thought to be a nice clean word denoting a soft, warm, cuddly cat. It is known to most males to also denote sex with a female. When a candidate for the Ugly Man Contest chooses to call himself "Pussy Galore" and proceeds to have: buttons saying "I like Pussy" hawked with cries of, "Get your 'I like Pussy' button here", is not this the height of obscenity, of hypocrisy, of filth and deceit? What is considered obscene today, in another time and place may be considered pure and sacred. Exposing the female body in a bikini would have been considered obscene years ago.

In regard to free love) Love is not free. With every freedom there is a need for responsibility. With a new sexual freedom we are gaining we must learn to be responsible with it, to consider the other people involved, rather than trying to gratify our urges of the moment (though I can see nothing wrong with such gratification if it is in company of responsibility and consideration).

In regard to my being a "non-student", I am a student--I quit the University here so I could study.

With Love,
Charlie (Brown) Artman [signature]

For many years, I have disagreed with the mores of our culture that say we can love no more than one person of the opposite sex at one time, and have in fact, felt such limitation of love to be rather horrible.

I first became acquainted with ideas of living a Way of Love in what I now call Churchianity, since I was literally raised in the church, my father being a Methodist minister. Christ, at one point, had said that all the Law and the Prophets hang upon the commandments to love God, your neighbor--as yourself. Paul summed it up at one point by saying that he that has loved has fulfilled the law; and one of Judaism's leaders reiterated this idea. Of course, when you begin to talk about fulfilling or completing this love with the sexual embrace, or love-fucking, as I have heard it aptly termed (which is what I am writing this letter to talk about), then you are adding something else; but I still feel that whatever is done, as long as it is done with love and consideration, it cannot be wrong. I have felt, then, that one could love to the point of love-fucking more than one at the same time--even within one's own sex--and not do wrong.

Why then, is love so limited? Do not deceit, greed, anger, lust, treachery, (etc., etc., ad nauseum) flourish where love is lacking? What about Churchianity, the perpetrator of morals that say all sexual behavior except within a very narrow range is evil and blackly sinful; and which is, at the same time, so filled with greed and hypocrisy? So sex has been surrounded with all sorts of guilts and fucking has been made a dirty word. No wonder people are afraid or unable to have a good sex life. (Some of the early Christian sects incorporated the sex act in their living, and their living was a part of their Christian way, their worship.)

Here was one of the first observations I was able to make as I searched for some sort of answers to the questions of what was right and good and the way to live and love. This is a very sex-repressed culture. People seem to fear sex and love itself, and lack understanding of either. And people fear the unknown. So, to keep from being confronted with this monstrosity, sex, it has been made something to hide under the rug. And, if it is hidden, how can anyone ever come to understand it? So, it is understood less, and feared more, and so it goes.

Then why shouldn't love for more than one of the opposite sex, and just as many of one's own, be a good and a desirable thing? Why shouldn't this love be spread, and why shouldn't it be completed with love-fucking? Perhaps the morals are correct; it may not be right. Then how does one find out? Just what sort of sexual behavior is natural to the human animal before his mind felt it necessary to start placing taboos on it?

Since I have been studying Anthropology, I have found some answers to the last question. They are very incomplete answers at best, but they have helped me to understand some of the riddles better.

First, our closest relatives, evolution-wise, have been observed to engage in all types of sexual behaviour. Some, like the Gibbon, a close relative of ours physiologically, are monogamous, and mate for life. Others seemingly have incest taboos between parents and offspring. Still others are observed to be homosexual, heterosexual, incestuous, masturbators, promiscuous, polygamous, sometimes all at once. In fact, behaviour like the gibbons' is very much in the minority.

They, when you observe the human, you can find all these types of behaviour, except incest, quite prevalent, and you can find instances where there are lacks of incest taboos. (As, for instance, the Samoan upperclasses, where siblings could mate(?), and, as in Egypt, where a

reverse taboo--that the Pharaohs could marry only their closest relatives). Instances of all these types of behaviour can be found in our own culture, even incestuous relationships that are pleasing to those involved (except when the rest of the society enters the picture and puts the offending parents in prison--I met one such, in jail, who honestly felt he had done no wrong, and was a bit bewildered, finally deciding he must be sick because he had felt it to be good). So, since all this behavior occurs where I can observe it, I must conclude that it is natural to the human species.

However, you could not say that man is no longer acting natural when he represses his natural sexual tendencies, for man is by nature an irrational animal that places taboos upon his behaviour. So, since taboos also occur, they must also be natural. But this is conflicting. How can both be natural and be so opposite? Where does this conflict between the biology and the mind arise? Since the biology seems fairly certain, let us examine taboos. Why taboos?

The best answer I have been able to come up with is as follows: For some reason I have not quite been able to fathom, man seems to be a tremendously insecure animal. Perhaps he is the only creature with enuf intellectual ability to think of certain possibilities for a future that could leave him in doubt about his own well being, the "lower" animals being relatively incapable of being insecure. The "lower" animals don't have any idea how much they don't know about why the universe is here and why they are in it and how the whole damn machine runs, anyway, or they don't seem to. We seem to worry horribly because we don't know --but that's because we're insecure. Perhaps if we knew everything and could control everything, there would be no uncertainty, and, therefore, no insecurity. We fear only what we do not know, we build up about ourselves certain patterns of knowns that we live within, and are secure within, because we know and can predict accurately. Then when something comes along that is outside of these knowns, it strikes fear in us inasmuch as it contains possible threats to our existence, the possible threats being unknown to us. Until we come to know the unknown enuf to feel safe in its presence, we tend to protect ourselves by repressing, suppressing, or denying the existence of it. And, as humans, we are constantly confronted with new things, as man's knowledge and machinery grows and takes him more and more out of the environment of Nature that once was his--particularly in these chaotic times of terrifically fast and far reaching changes.

At any rate, there is this thing--insecurity, and man seems to try to compensate for it by maintaining that he is the "superior" animal, the end for which this universe was created. This seems to be a rather unrealistic and far-fetched position. If it is, then, unrealistic, then it can never be secure. A technique that could be used to try to give it some security, would be to maintain that there is some universal moral principle that only man with his mind is capable of knowing, that places certain restrictions upon his behaviour. The existence of such a moral principle would then prove the other animals are lower than men, because they don't understand or know this principle--they don't have the intelligence to--that is why we are "higher"; we have more intelligence. But, proving our superiority in this way has meant that we have placed many restrictions on what would otherwise be natural, free, enjoyable behavior, filled with love and beauty, perhaps. This has been turned away from, then, to being another of millions of sex frustrated, sick, frigid people.

Lately, I have been becoming part of a way of living and loving

with my friends that is freeing itself from these restrictions that are being seen as not only un-natural, but downright horrible at times, in the way love is denied in favor of sickness and trouble.

For a long time, I have thought of group marriage situations, of co-operating in our survival, social as well as physical. I have attempted twice now to get a house and a group of people together and have made several mistakes in trying to force a way of living upon people that didn't fit it; and I have seen mistakes of others. I have learned much, then, about group living.

Just lately I found myself becoming involved with several women in relationships full of love and love-fucking. I had not tried to create such a situation; it just happened, and here I was in the middle of it. I couldn't consider making any sort of a choice between them, saying "Yes, to one, and, "No, we can't," to the rest. So, I found myself in the position of being the trapped man. There was only one other way, and that was to love and love fuck with all at once.

I have seen now that the only really good way for some group marriage to come about would be if it just came about. And it does seem to be coming all about. I have recently been involved in several group love-fucking scenes that have been good because they happened in a good way. I don't think it would be a good idea to try to enforce these situations with any sort of marriage, group or otherwise. I have been involved in discussions that have debated the pros and cons of group living, and have seen the impasse where it seems there are two possibilities only, both unworkable--that of group marriage for life, to insure children are cared for, and that of freedom where people could leave if and when they wanted to. I think this is a mistake, that the best way is to do only what we feel like doing and are able to do. I'm all for the existing situation. I have never been as happy with people in my life. I have never been able to give and receive so much love. The consensus of opinion of those of us that have been so involved is that we are much better for it all, that we have gotten around many of our hang-ups about relating to other people. This is not to say, of course, that problems are non-existent with group love-fucking. The problems are many and painful. I think the most painful event is that of adjustment to a way of life that is so diametrically opposed to that in which we have been conditioned. But, once it has truly become a way of life for us, I think the peaks of frustration and pain and anxiety will have been significantly lowered. And besides that, it is so great to be free to love whomever you want and to feel free to talk about attraction you feel for someone else, without fearing upset with whomever you are "going-steady-with" at the moment. Again, this doesn't guarantee there will be no upset, but when both of you have agreed you should feel free to love fuck with whomever you desire, you can bring everything into the light of day and don't have to feel guilty about doing something behind his (or her) back, which is something sort of destructive to human relations. I have tried to make this agreement with all I have been involved with recently because I felt it as an ideal. It was hard to adjust to at first, but now I find it easier to live with, tho I haven't made all the adjustment I need to. This agreement led me to what was perhaps the most difficult adjustment for me to make. I have long been in the midst of a conflict as to whether I wanted to get married or not, first saying I wanted very much to find someone that would come along with me where I went and do things with me that I liked to do and love me, and then I would say it was too limiting--couldn't be done--things were pretty good now--I like the group marriage idea. But, there have

been too many insecurities in my unmarried life. I would like the security of knowing I had someone for sure to love and love fuck with for life. Then, I found someone who agreed with my ideas and ideals more closely than ever before, and this led me into a sublime sort of contradiction, for she was the very one I could never have forever, because she, too, thought we should be free to love-fuck with whomever we wanted and go when and where we wanted. This has been difficult to adjust to, but I think I have now.

Where did this all begin, and just where are we? This is a time in which the sex-repression is being lifted. In no other time and place would we be so free to turn against the mainstream of the culture to become a clot in it, an infection that could spread outward to the culture to transform it to a totally different way of life perhaps (No, I don't think my sights are set too high). Yes, here we are in the mainstream. You often hear of those co-operative ventures in the deserts or mountains somewhere, well founded in some religious principle; but, here we are in one of the largest metropolitan areas in the country, close to one of its best universities. But bodies fight infections--even universities as liberal as Cal. It might be interesting to carry some case thru the courts to try to show that we are not living in sin and irresponsibility, but in love and responsibility and consideration.

Since I wrote this a year ago, I have recalled another possible explanation for why sex repression. Recall the most painful moments of your life. Chances are they will have to do with failures of relationships with someone of the opposite sex. Perhaps it is out of fear of such pain that people repress sex in the hope they won't have to experience these pains.

Also since I wrote this, I found that relationship I had almost decided was only a dream and could not exist in reality. It was a perfect, beautiful, one-to-one for a lifetime sort of relationship. I considered my letter then, but I felt no need to change one word of what I said. Then something happened and all this ended, and I was alone again. Where, then, do the answers to relating to others lie? Are they in marriage, group-fucking, fun-fucking, love-fucking, singularity, or what? Since the end of that perfect love (what happened there, I don't know) I have talked to many of my friends about what sort of relationships they are seeking, and most of them have said they are seeking that one person. Yet, most of us have not been able to find that one, or at least for just a little while.

Since many of my friends are unmarried, I have recently raised the question as to where the answers lie and proposed a Round Robin discussion of it in a group of my friends. Most of those present seemed incapable of understanding the question to answer it. In considering how to get the answers I was seeking, it became apparent, from the answers that were being given, that I needed to ask several different questions. Following, then is a questionnaire I would like you to fill out and return to me at 2404 Dana St, Berkeley, Calif. I wish to have your own answer to the question I raised above, i.e., wherein do you think the answers lie to forming love and sexual relationships--in what forms, i.e., group marriage, single marriage, no marriage, celibacy, or what. As guidelines for your answers I am listing these questions (I would like specific answers to them so that I can find correlations between them).

1. Have you ever been married?
 - A. If so, is this marriage still going on?
 - B. If not, why did it end?
 - C. If so, what do you think of marriage now? (Also, if not).
 - D. If so, have you married more than once, and why?

1. If not, why not?
- F. Are you presently married, and why or why not?
2. Do you wish to marry in the future?
 - A. If not, why not?
 - B. If not, did you once wish to, and if you did, why have you changed your mind?
 - C. If so, why?
 - D. If so, how soon do you plan on marriage, and, do you think you actually will be getting married at this time?
3. Have you ever (fucked)
 - A. Have you ever with more than one of the opposite sex at the same time, and if so, how many times, with what numbers of what sexes? (Note that, due to the nature of these questions you are not requested to give your name. If you wish to do so, I would like you to, since, if I know you, this may help me to better understand your answers.)
 - B. Have you ever with any of your own sex, and if so, how many times with how many people?
 - C. If you have never carried on in the ways suggested by A and B, what has kept you from doing so?
 - D. How frequently do you? What keeps you from doing it more often?
 - E. How long have you been at this, or when do you think you will start?
 - F. What sexual attitudes do your parents exhibit?
 - G. What sexual attitudes do your friends exhibit, and, if different from your parents attitudes, how do you explain this?
4. How long does an average relationship last for you, and why don't they last longer?
5. How often do you strike up new relationships?
6. Are your relationships usually with people that are of your own circle of friends or that later become a part of your group?
7. In what percentage of your relationships is sex involved, and why isn't the percentage higher?
8. Do you often find that you are relating sexually to someone who has related sexually with friends of yours?
9. Do you feel free to tell someone you are sexually attracted to him/her? If you don't, what keeps you from doing so?
10. Do you feel free to tell a friend that you are attracted to his or her "mate" (?)? If you are afraid to, what makes you afraid?
11. Do you feel you have to be relating to someone all the time, or are you often content to be alone?
12. Do you find that most relationships "hang you up"? After having been "hung up" in a bad way in a relationship, do you usually avoid relationships for a while, or do you start seeking a new and a better one?
13. What percentage of your time are you alone, single? What keeps you from being otherwise?
14. Do you like to be alone or with people and how much of the time do you prefer one or the other?
15. Do you like to remain single or be relating to someone and how much of the time do you prefer one or the other?
16. After a relationship ends, are you usually a friend or an enemy or what of the person with whom it ended? Do you still show that person love?
17. What is your reaction or response to the ideas expressed in the love-fucking letter? Comment at length on them, on what you agree or disagree with, and why, and what your ideas are.

--Thank you, CB.