God and the State Revisited

The State became necessary when slavery was created and the human race took its first fatal step towards self-destruction—depicted imaginatively in the story of the Fall of Man—not because of humanity’s need for knowledge (as shown in the story of Adam laying the blame on Woman) but because of the urge to dominate (as shown in the story of Cain and Abel).

In the 18th Century, when Christians still believed that Cain and Abel were quite as much historical figures as Napoleon and Wellington, ascension had already begun. How could Cain and Abel preserve? They could Cain and Abel off and wander through the cities, an outcast? All of this was true enough but missed the point of the allegory of the conquest of the world over those who tended the herd, and of male conquest—in the form of Adam—over woman. The primitive State was needed to guard the subject people. A justification for faith in a divine will was also needed.

The warriors who had to be absent fighting or hunting needed to persuade the rest that their right to rule was not just the strength of the mailed fist, but a manifestation of something divine—and so they had to have an invisible prison guard, but this was not enough. Until people learned to accept invisibility as possible, the Church had been formed a church, a position it held for centuries.

Although the Roman church persecuted Galileo—a scientist as highly regarded as Isaac Newton—he spent his life trying to reconcile science and Anglican Christianity by mathematicians (and his writings on the universe are such bunk as shown in the story of the Fall of Man). In the 18th Century it was possible to accept that the universe had a deeper science behind it. Galileo had finally formed a church, a position it held for centuries.

The Church, alarmed, fell back on its old classical role of supporting the State. Both supported each other in an hour of need. The early years were full of terror of the unknown. Without scientific knowledge, people trembled at the vaticinations of the God they identified with the planets. Every natural religion had come down from planetary worship; the priesthood began with astronomers whose reading of the stars enabled them to predict events or at least give explanations based on hindsight.

The State as it exists now has been the subject of centuries of evolution: it has not ceased to be oppressive. The priesthood became organised religion, it also became Science. Magic—which is ossified superstition entering the scientific ranks as an impostor—was used by religion against Science and was so decisive that “wissenschaft (science), when it became a religion of its own and which we know now as witchcraft, was stigmatised as ‘magical’ by the magicians or priesthood who had finally formed a church, a position it held for centuries.

The State has become necessary when slavery was created and the human race took its first fatal step towards self-destruction—depicted imaginatively in the story of the Fall of Man—not because of humanity’s need for knowledge (as shown in the story of Adam laying the blame on Woman) but because of the urge to dominate (as shown in the story of Cain and Abel).

The State punished blasphemy. This dual role has been seen clearly today in extremist Islam, the Church preached submission. The State punished blasphemy. This dual role is the norm in Christianity last century.

First the ambition of a few individuals, then a few social classes, erected slavery and conquest into a vital principle, and implanted more than any other terrible idea of the divinity. Since then all society was impossible without those two institutions as a base, the Church and the State...of a sudden two castes were organised: that of the priests and the aristocracy, who without losing any time did the job of inculcating deeply into the enslaved people the indispensability, usefulness and sanctity of the Church and the State.

Bakunin
A DEBATE by prisoners at the Long Lartin top security jail was sabotaged by the prison authorities when they saw things weren’t going exactly their way. The event was organised by prisoner John Bowdery, but just days before he was ‘ghosted’ to Wisnom Green jail after being beaten up by screws.

This was the second such debate organised by Bowdery—the first was on prisoner unions—and things were going smoothly until the Governor, John Whitty, arrived to demand certain changes. It was then, using a minor argument over some toilets, that Bowdery was attacked by guards and moved out. For several days no one, including solicitors invited by Bowdery to the debate, had any idea which prison he had been moved to. Eventually the message came through that he was at Wisnom Green and that, despite what had happened, he wanted the debate to take place and the guest speakers and his other guests (including ourselves) to turn up for it. We then contacted Kate Akister, the solicitor from Birmingham who had been invited, to urge that some kind of protest be made at the debate on his behalf and on this basis we decided to respect his wishes and go along.

When we arrived at Long Lartin we found that the Governor had stacked the guests with an assortment of blue-rinsed Prison Visitants (liberal do-gooders), Prison Department officials and screws. Even the Governor’s wife, betting it around like Lady Muck, was there to sound off. Channel Four TV and Tariq Ali (usually being stood-off) were there, too, to film the proceedings, and there were reporters from The Guardian and The Observer. Scattered amongst the invited guests were the actual prisoners, who must have wondered what a farce the whole thing was turning in to.

The proceedings began with the guest speakers doing their bit and the audience (prisoners and guests) taking questions. Apart from Jimmy Boye (the ex-terror turned success-story) the speakers were all pretty predictable. Things got a bit lively though when the prisoners started to use the occasion to air their grievances, describing some of the worst excesses of the top security establishment. One prisoner, for example, a PFLP Palestinian, managed to bring a bit of reality into the debate when he graphically told of how his wife and five year old kid are routinely strip-searched each and every time they come to visit him. He was told they may be carrying explosives.

Boyce was clearly much respected by the prisoners because he’d been through the system himself (but his dapper appearance—looking like he was just off to some mafia wedding—only served to increase the impression that today he is simply a media star.) Stephen Shaw, in his designer suit, of the Prison Reform Trust, was constrained to make prison more liveable by ‘easing tensions’—i.e. by getting prisoners and the authorities working together (like wab unions collaborating with company managers). Kate Akister angrily spoke about what had happened with John Bowdery, and went on to raise some legal developments concerning prison reform. A polytechnic lecturer, a Mr Sim, was the only guest speaker to turn upon the question of prison abolition.

The debate then opened up and one prisoner spoke about the possibility of wages being increased if and when prisoners are privatised. He urged that wages be pegged according to outside rates and suggested that prisoners could then be given the opportunity to use some of the wages to save up for when they are released and some for funding their families or victims. Unfortunately this suggestion was not developed further.

A number of other issues were then raised. The Governor’s wife wanted to know about the ‘rights’ of victims and she was told by Boyce, to the general applause of the prisoners, that she had no moral monopoly on the question and that the prisoners themselves had a great case to make. But none had accepted. Boyce also added that it was all very well that politicians demanded a report of information, but prisoners needed this more than anyone and that the evidence and records ensured that prisoners were never able to get justice.

After Boyce’s debate there was the farce of the whole procedure being carried out for three hours while the routine of normal prison life proceeded. The prisoners were segregated and sent back to their cells while the whole of the extended interval hung up in a corridor. The only people we had an opportunity to socialise with were the bureaucrats from the Home Office, the press from the Media, and the screws. Inevitably we chose to keep to ourselves, although at one point one of us took the opportunity to harangue the Governor about what had happened to Bowdery and about the situation with Manchester Black Flag (who had been in Long Lartin). We also spoke briefly to Boyle, who confessed that he had not known anything about this meeting and spent most of the morning trying to set the debate aside until some day we might have wanted to hear from prisoners and guests. We told Boyle that he wasn’t allowed to have any more meetings. We really came to meet prisoners we’d been trying to contact for a very long time.

The afternoon session was structured to lead to the greatest degree of frustration all round. We all went into ‘workshops’—prisoners, screws, bureaucrats, media stars, etc.—and concentrated on pre-determined meaningless questions that only served to legitimize the prison system and to legitimize the big changes that were being made. As a result, we could see no particular direction in the lack of opposition from any sector of the afternoon. Again, as with the morning session, the most articulate participants were the prisoners themselves. But the very valuable points they raised—refusing to stick to the agenda—were later taken to a plenary session where inevitably they became abbreviated. The debate then ended, and the prison quickly got back to ‘normal.’

Afterwards we agreed that the event had been worthwhile because of the opportunity it gave us to inform, joke and mingle with prisoners, some of whom were old friends. There was Ronnie Lee, who was as chummy as ever. It was wonderful to see, amongst us, there were some old mates known from a previous stretch. It was good, too, to meet John Walker, one of the ‘Birmingham Six’, who recently had an interview with a prison newspaper. But it was the humanity of the prisoners—in spite of what they have to endure—that stood out sharply to us. They are emotionless captors who, apart from a few, are just in prisons because they have been presented the debate taking place at all. The prisoners demanded another debate for the future, but it will only be meaningful if organised directly by them.

John Bowdery meanwhile, is still in Wisnom Green. His fellow prisoners, on several occasions during the debate, protested vigorously on his behalf. While he was not physically present at the debate, his friends made it clear to us that it was his debate and that Whitty, whatever his career aspirations, can only be credited with trying to manipulate the proceedings. The invisible agenda—the real agenda—where the prisoners succeeded in getting their grievances aired and making contact of their own choice, went almost unnoticed. That is the face of the fact that Whitty turned the debate into.

What did not get raised was the ending of imprisonment altogether. One prisoner said some things that wanted to be said as if it might be just as well to kill all the prisoners now and get it over with as a short term solution. Another talked of liberal alternatives. Yet these were obviously not the answer either. For once, anarchism sounded more practical!
POLITICAL PROTEST EQUALS TERRORISM

A number of individuals and groups who have attempted to publicize the plight of political prisoners in West Germany, or who have simply taken part in political protests, have been labelled as "terrorists" and imprisoned under the Terrorism laws. Some months ago a group of people met in Munich to discuss the notion of political association for the Red Army Fraktion prisoners. The police raided the meeting and two people got charged under the notorious Statute 129 (Terrorism Law). The two got a year and several weeks ago four people involved in the anti-nuclear/anti-fascist and squatter movement in Duisburg got sentences of between 9 and 10 years for being "terrorists". Their "terrorism" was simply that they took part in anti-nuclear and anti-fascist actions (e.g., demonstrations that led to confrontations). It seems that the West German authorities now define political protest that leads to the usual confrontational actions as being part of the armed struggle actions of the Red Army Fraktion.

Almost every month there are more and more cases similar to the ones outlined above. Terrorism has become an all-embracing term that the State is using as a means of limiting all forms of political protest and resistance. It is the sort of strategy that is more associated with the German of the Third Reich. It is a strategy of defeat, whereby the authorities are admitting that they cannot accept dissension of any kind and that all challenges to the State, at whatever level, have to be outlawed and suppressed brutally.

The prisoners are asking for widespread publicity about the hunger strike. They would also like publicity spread about the sort of torture being practised inside West Germany's jails. When one person gets solitary for one year—then there would normally be an outcry. But here we are talking about a large number of political prisoners—convicted on varying charges relating from guerrilla actions to simple association-political association—being isolated for a year but as long as they are imprisoned. As the communiqué says, 18 year long torture must end now. For further information contact Initiativkreis für den Erhalt der 18jährigen.
THE VISION OF MEDJUGORIE

BLASPHEMY!

MIRALKAM RUSHDIE wrote The Satanic Verses as an attack on...
O VER A LARGE part of the world, God does not reign anymore. There is no visible kingdom, no visible church, no visible god—only a name, but that is that of Marx. The myth of the 20th century is not the divine right of kings, but the role of the revolutionary party. The theory derives from the (unwelcome) success of the Black Flag Party in making the Russian Revolution, since which it has dominated Marxian thinking. Since that time, however, as Marxian theory, like all the rest, is made by the victors, the myth of Marxism–Leninism has been propagated by a huge and growing body of Marxian ideologues and Communist state–sponsored countries and has overflowed into the remainder of the world. Soviet Communism or Marxism is the subject of these essays and comment and is being written about, as I have written here, within the time of students of sociology or economy.

In examining the basic tenets of Marxist–Leninism we must first note that the set of events on which these are based did not happen in the way they are interpreted at all. It is because of this we may compare the "old" and "new" testimonies of Marxism and Marxist–Leninism (they are not identical) with the difference between the old and new testimonies of Judaism and Christianity. Those who accept the new must accept the old but did not. Judaism, like Marxism, claims to be based on an infallible and authoritative Law (in the one divine; in the other scientific). The Law is immovable and has very little relationship to current problems. Because of this it encourages a vast degree of commitment and interpretation—Talmudic on the one hand, Marxist philosophy on the other. The Talmudists will endlessly argue as to what the Divine Will is. Claiming no direct line to the Almighty as Christianity does, they base themselves on what the Law is and how previous scholars have interpreted it. A pious Jew might be concerned if his son could play football on Friday night—the Lord omitted to say anything specific on the subject to Moses, whose knowledge of sport was confined to turning sticks into snakes. Work is prohibited after dark on the Sabbath which would exclude professional football but how does this affect games? Rabbi. This might argue it is work and Rabbi that it is pleasure; their arguments would be having great precedents, and the final word has totally changed. A rabbi (a teacher not a priest) would in a Jewish religious environment, such as from the desert to the city, come along with a whole tribe of rabbis, official and unofficial, to give advice, consider, argue, settle disputes.

Marx has always appealed to scholars of a Talmudic bent; Marx himself came from a line of Talmudic scholars, however much he hated Jews as such. The arguments for Marxism which he laid down—since he never established a party—established a Law reckoned to be scientific and irrefutable. Successive generations of Marxist scholars have tried to interpret all events—from beekeeping to trade unionism, from ping pong to war (as in China today) in the light of the Law. The Law proclaimed an inevitable transition from feudalism to capitalism, through monoply capitalism and finally to socialism. This Law is not necessarily wrong—at least, not all the time—though the Ten Commandments are not all they are cracked up to be either. How wofully they omit the main crime of the Mosic period—slavery—and so justify it through the centuries, and how inadequately they deal with murder and theft! Further without defining and so perpetuating! But they were a new start—as was Marx's analysis of the development of capitalism from feudalism, based on hindsight. His analysis of the steps forward are still being proved wrong by history.

Marx and Christianity

Then we come to the Christian revolution in religion we are liberated from the Law and asked to believe in a certain set of events, stated to be historically true, and judge from the first an apostate to the Church, then a new priesthood and finally a Church. Likewise, when we come to the Russian Revolution, Lenin "liberates" us from the Marxist Law (though China has grass grows again and sold the first new priest and so forth. A rabbi (a teacher not a priest) would in Jewish religious environment, such as from the desert to the city, come along with a whole tribe of rabbis, official and unofficial, to give advice, consider, argue, settle disputes.

Marxism and Christianity: the new true and was true but wasn't. Marx must have a Law. The myth of Judaism and Marxism. The discussions they are materially false. This is where the political and religious tenets of the rest of us get a spoonful? Marxist philosophy, and the Pharisees bad. To this day these divisions are parallel. The Church, are at least as much in the and a common faith, Both Christianity and Judaism have one o'clock. But those are not identitcal.

A number of scholars became attached to church—burning and—though the meaning of the word has totally changed. Minor Trotskyites, who have tried to use "anarchist masques" from their leaders—since Lenin said that too! Both Marx and Lenin have split into fragments but it is illuminating to see the black and white. The Old Testament—interpretation of a particular parable, for example, The New Testament—basings themselves on their enemy's enemy's enemy, was largely dictated by civil war—give the Deity replies as to how the Godhead would be that is not necessarily the same thing, as is proved by the whole history of liberation.
RACIALISM AS RELIGION

explains what makes the world tick, since it is racialist, it is said, so every group needs an establishment role and a
motive force (and thus neither capitalism, nor the State, nor other oppression), though it has been used as an alternative to socialism.

Both the term and the thing are of recent origin. It was in the late 19th century that the (inaccurate) term "anti-semitism" was coined. There was no such thing as "semitism", which would include Arabs, being female (something reiterated often by Leftists who want to combine nationalism with socialism). What the term was framed to mean is hostility to Jews or persons of Jewish origin whatever they did or said. This broke from previous hostility to Jews in Christian countries, where they might be burned for their beliefs, but were persuaded to the end (something reiterated often by Leftists who want to in the late 19th century that the (inaccurate) term an alternative to socialism.

"Anti-semitism « was coined, There is no such thing as "Aryanism « by a Germanophile Scot, Houston Black Flag

There is good historical record for supposing that the suppression of Jews goes back to ancient times, to the birth of religions, and Jews became a scapegoat for specific purposes, but modern political anti-semitism was invented by Wilhelm Marx, in Berlin 1879, in a book widely circulated with the help of the arch-reactionary Junker, Chancellor Bismarck, to counter certain who didn’t mean Indians). of Jewish origin such as Marx and many of his followers, lead, they equated with capitalism (but apparently of anti-semitic religion was played by Russian Tsarist police, l who recognised it as a way of deflecting socialist and one that challenges i religion’s sake, all understands that racialism is a rival

An important role in the development of the anti-semitic religion was played by Russian Tsarist police, and especially the race struggle rather than the class struggle and explaining why Tsarism was under attack from below (as a result of the Eiders of Zion) is still a textbook used by the right wing and an evergreen perennial in Catholic circles. Downward social evolution in Jewish Blood became a favourite theme of the Tsarist Black Hundreds who thought pogroms, with the attendant looting, would act as a substitute; this policy, adopted and adapted by Hitler, led to the Holocaust.

The Roman Church, never averse to persecution for religion’s sake, well understands that racialism is a rival (devolving its magic of baptism) and one that challenges it for supremacy in the State. It did so with marked effect in Nazi Germany, and it does so in South Africa, where a primitive "Cafam" is a reflex of the racialism of white supremacy. The Catholic Church may have compromised with nationalism, though the hierarchy sees that as a rival too. It can’t give way to racialism which contradicts its initial premise of salvation by baptism. Liberation theology owes much to the conflict between Christianity and Racialism, which gives its standing in the liberal camp and status within the Church.

The old racialism — Imperialist domination of entire nations — fitted in with Christian theology. The churches were anxious to go out and conquer and bring nations to Christianity, slavery was reckoned to be a minor hardship to suffer for that "benefit". Protestantism differed from Romanism in that it would not recognise that racial relationship was desirable (in theory — not that this was always observed: if the Dutch in South Africa had their way there would have been no Cape Coloured). But sustaining division between baptized peoples on grounds of a mystical belief in Race challenges the basic premise of Christian magic contained in baptism. To attack (unbaptised) Jews could continue for centuries and get Christian acquiescence; but Racialism today is a head-on affront to the Church and only political expediency has postponed it this long. It is strange to see in South Africa that God is, from a human point of view, "on the side of the angels" for once.

RACIALISM TODAY: A SECOND RUN

The six visionaries during an apparition of the Virgin Mary whom they describe as "slender, dark-haired, bluish-eyed". She wears a "translucentsilver-grey robe with a white veil extending to her feet and beyond..."

The Roman Church, never averse to persecution for religion’s sake, well understands that racialism is a rival (devolving its magic of baptism) and one that challenges it for supremacy in the State. It did so with marked effect in Nazi Germany, and it does so in South Africa, where a primitive "Cafam" is a reflex of the racialism of white supremacy. The Catholic Church may have compromised with nationalism, though the hierarchy sees that as a rival too. It can’t give way to racialism which contradicts its initial premise of salvation by baptism. Liberation theology owes much to the conflict between Christianity and Racialism, which gives its standing in the liberal camp and status within the Church.

The old racialism — Imperialist domination of entire nations — fitted in with Christian theology. The churches were anxious to go out and conquer and bring nations to Christianity, slavery was reckoned to be a minor hardship to suffer for that "benefit". Protestantism differed from Romanism in that it would not recognise that racial relationship was desirable (in theory — not that this was always observed: if the Dutch in South Africa had their way there would have been no Cape Coloured). But sustaining division between baptized peoples on grounds of a mystical belief in Race challenges the basic premise of Christian magic contained in baptism. To attack (unbaptised) Jews could continue for centuries and get Christian acquiescence; but Racialism today is a head-on affront to the Church and only political expediency has postponed it this long. It is strange to see in South Africa that God is, from a human point of view, "on the side of the angels" for once.

RACIALISM TODAY: A SECOND RUN

Racialism today has become a sort of schismatic religion — certainly so far as Britain is concerned. Ostensibly because of the Holocaust (but actually only because Nazis got associated with military defeat), anti-semitism has lost much of its populist appeal and is therefore valueless to the capitalist class. (When found to be valuable again, it will use it). Modern racialism here, with all the same irrationality and power, has been switched to the so-called "coloured" people, still assumed to be recent immigrants. It has changed from the old fashioned imperialist superstition complex to an inferiority complex ("they’ve got this or that, but I, if I blacked my face I’d get that") One is responsible for all, a new composite devil picture is created. The old canards about Jews are recognised as absurd, new ones are built up.

About those differing by colour Which startlingly resemble...
Stop Bugging Me

THE MOST common form of bugging device is the infinity transmitter which uses a telephone. There are two main types. The first is a thermally infinite one, but the second is a thermally finite one. The former is a thermally infinite one, but the latter is a thermally finite one.

Both the infinity transmitter and the "listenback" have limitations. When either is more than 75 feet away from the phone circuit, the voice may be indistinguishable because of noise in the line.

Adapted from: Nettoor Dug.
Q & A on Anarchism

Why do anarchists go so on much about Spain? Aren’t they supposed to be in England?

This echoes the famous Martyn Harris line about anarchists being a bit too much in the Spanish Civil War, which is often referred to as the Spanish Anarchist or Spanish Flag – a metaphor for the movement.

The post-war resistance, totally ignored by the English-speaking world until we can write a major book on the subject, was that which occurred in Spain from 1939 to 1950. This resistance was led by the CNT (the anarchist labour union) in Spain from its inception to the Civil War. It shows that a working-class movement can operate as a force in its own right, independent of the bourgeoisie as a whole taking the lead rather than the party as a vanguard upsets all Marxist theory. There are a few other examples but not to the same extent.

The internal betrayal of the revolution, leading to the loss of the war, had high levels of personal corruption which threatened the revolution. The political confusion of the time is reflected in the following pages. Their sources are from various ways: Rupert Allason (Nigel West), Andrew Best, Margaret McCormick (Richard Deacon), E Chapman Pincher, and others.

The mass extermination of workers by the Spanish police was totally ignored by all despite our efforts: we make no apology for still calling attention to this, however, in the end and the survivors of years of imprisonment and discrimination get their chance to speak.

The new threat of Forefathers by the ruling class, when extermination and information suppression have failed to stop the movement, has been tried out fairly successfully in Spain but is for immediate export.

The fact that in Spain there was the highest and most natural struggle for reconstruction, and thus capitalist reaction at its worst, has an effect on that during the World War. The Nazi and the capitalist powers clashed powerfully, and reconquered their gains after-wards, thus making it a centre for reaction: it is therefore impossible to ignore this in return to world alignments though this is now slightly dated by Russia joining the ‘club’, and the rise of Arab fundamentalism.

Sally, Ken Biddle, of Portsmouth, died, in a moving letter to his wife Joan says she is ‘locked forward to receiving the Flag each month’. He often remarked that he hoped you would never have to stop publishing through lack of funds’, and she enclosed £10 (‘really wish I could make it bigger’) as a last gesture of solidarity from Ken. She’s the most touching tribute we’ve had.

Dear Black Flag,

IT’S YOU, the producer of Attack and Flamebrother, is entirely justified in his anger at Lothar for accusing his magazine of being state-sponsored pay-off joke, or, to be more accurate, specializing that they probably would turn out to be such a bounty.

It was a piece of sloppy work on our part—mostly mine, in fact. After 16 issues without apparently making a sound, they had just got sloppy. I am speaking only for myself, not the other half of Lothar. Steve Davis, who had nothing to do with the piece. In fact, thanks to another copy-up on my part, he had lot’s to read before he found it on the paste-up board. Though I’d sent it, but he had’nt. (A hazard of co-producing something while living 70 miles apart)

Nothing extraordinary happened—certainly nothing as interesting as professional specialization as outlined in Attack’s program in your recent issue.

Do the same thing for a long time, you get sloppier, developing bad habits. They got the letters from the person who goes by (at least) three sets of initials and resides on ‘Attacker’s International’ note been have a satisfactory salutation

Sure nothing terrible happens if you tell the truth.

Robin Ramsay (Lobster International)

In Brief

DAM DISCUSSIONS
Sunday 26 March — Cancelled
Sunday 2nd April — Anarchism and town planning
Sunday 23rd April — Anarchism, Crime and the law
Sunday 7th April — Does the struggle against fascism start with the struggle against Leninism?

Womens Discussion
Sunday 9th April — Women only discussion for anarchists and sympathisers.

All meetings are at the 121 bookshop, 121 Railton Road, Brixton. Avenham. vegetarian meal is provided and a small donation is requested.

Shades in the Grass

The ANTI-ANARCHIST publication ‘Freedom’ (pretending to be the anti-anarchist publication) the Phony CNT, has recently exceeded itself in articles denouncing anarchists and where they work for a living. This latest trade was started by Nicolas Walter and followed his familiar pattern — first he provokes then, if answered, feels he has a God-given right to the last word and goading each reader into the victim of a ‘vendetta’ if responding (possibly a reflex from re-writing history and normally living in the past).

Nicolas Walter is joined by Philip Service, whose letter of bomb, his words of praise for Tony Jones, informant of Sir Maurice Oldfield of MI5, after he had been exposed by Black Flag (for spying on the Left) and his venom for Albert Meltzer, Stuart Christie and other anarchists. This has spread over to the duplicated Bulletin for Anarchists Research, with pages of David Stover, admitted associate of Colonel Montgomery Hyde, former MI5 and Ulster-enlisted. MI5 has unmissed reputation he defends and to whom he has acknowledged passing info.

It is not worth space to answer this vermin here. We have never said they ‘compromised’, as we do not think they’re anarchists — if one thinks they should be so called, it is an entirely different meaning from ours. Anyone interested in getting answers to specific lies can contact us by post.

Our readers are advised if using Freedom Bookshop postal services not to disclose personal details, in particular where they work, or of any actions for which they might be accountable.

In addition I wish to thank the following who have helped me in varied ways: Rupert Allason (Nigel West), Andrew Best, Margaret Duff, Nicholas Elliott, Lord Hutchinson QC, Sophie Lannes, Donald McCormick (Richard Deacon), H. Chapman Pincher, and Nicholas Walter. Finally to my wife, as with so many of my previous books, my gratitude is boundless for her invaluable work in typing and retyping the text.

From: George Blake: Spycatcher, the book that firmed CHD activists Putchke and Fishman. Writers contributed to the article; at the time it said to give information to Mr Hyde under aliases, and he said, over tea,

In addition May 1987

Harford Montgomery Hyde was born in Belfast in 1907 and is the author of more than forty books, mostly biographies and studies in criminology and society. He was educated at Sedbergh, Queen’s University, Belfast and Magdalen College, Oxford and — besides his secret intelligence work — has published as a historian and sociologist. He was University MP for North Belfast 1950-59, and was Professor of History at the University of the —