

Searchlight and Hate

Tony Shell

The 'Diseased' English

Searchlight's behaviour is a reflection of an extreme, institutionalised loathing of the native English people. It is a visceral (but well concealed) hatred against a people overwhelmingly resistant to demands for engagement in either 'class war' or racialist politics – and unwilling to be subjugated to either European, or global, fascism.

It is a part of a politically inspired process to 'disconnect' the native people from their land, and to destroy any sense of nationhood and sovereign identity. And, to frustrate any resistance, it is also seen as essential to convince the natives (especially the English) that they deserve to be hated. We see this in the relentless Searchlight demonising of the English in, for example, publications such as: '**White** Noise'¹; '**White** Riot'²; 'The **English** Disease'³; and 'A New **Ingerlund**'⁴. This racialist agenda is relentlessly expressed in the form of targeted, extreme hatemongering. The people to hate are white. The people to hate are English.

The choice of language and of imagery is both interesting and disturbing. The English (as an ethnic/racial group) are portrayed as uniquely having a race-specific "*disease*" of racism – an extremely negative attribution that is intended to bring down opprobrium upon the native people. Searchlight is only interested in directing its hatemongering against members of the indigenous population (the 'white' people).

Searchlight offers the opinion that "*white people in Britain are not discriminated against because they are white, they are not victims because they are white*".⁵ Searchlight knows this to be false, but promotes such provocative nonsense regardless. Searchlight is therefore entirely relaxed with a situation where racist discrimination against 'white' people (by such means as 'employment quota schemes', or of targeted help and assistance within the criminal justice system) is enforced throughout the whole UK.

It should be noted that when commenting on activities specifically involving members of the native, indigenous community, Searchlight will parenthesise the word 'indigenous' – as if the existence of a native population should be challenged and disputed⁶. People who are deemed not to exist (as 'a people') can be more easily eliminated (as 'a people').

Violence: Provocation and Lies

In the early 1970s an edition of Searchlight Magazine carried on its front cover a crude drawing of a young white man stabbing to death a defenceless black man. In the background images of Nazi atrocities had been added. This was published and widely distributed approximately ten years after the Notting Hill race riots in 1958, and ten years before the especially violent race riots in Brixton in 1981. This type of published material is clearly intended to be inflammatory – to incite feelings of hatred within the black community towards white people. There can be no other purpose for the particular content and style of the imagery and language.

Searchlight's *modus operandi* is based on the organisation's knowledge of state of mind of many of the individuals that form a large part of its readership. It knows the effect that its hatemongering material is likely to have. For many years the Searchlight organisation has not only had a supportive audience drawn from violent extremist groups, but has also nurtured close working links to those groups (such as the UAF, AFA and Red Action).

Searchlight's notoriety in publishing inflammatory and provocative material also needs to be seen in the knowledge of the true situation regarding racist violence within the UK.

It is therefore interesting to observe Searchlight's hatemongering when it is addressing the issue of interracial and racially motivated violence – and especially when commenting on particular cases of the racist or interracial murders of white people⁷. It is quite extraordinary to see the way in which Searchlight cynically refers to the “*tragic murders*” of white people, but then proceeds to smear the character of many of those white victims by making gratuitously derogatory (and often irrelevant) references to the victims' social circumstances or personal failings. In contrast to this, we see the assailants' lethal assaults being excused by the behaviour of the victims – in effect Searchlight appears to insinuate that those “*tragic*” white victims are to blame for their own murder.

Searchlight, in common with other far-left groups, applies double standards when commenting on racially motivated violence and racist murder. If the victim is from an ethnic minority community then a highly subjective, non-evidential test for a racial motivation is used (such as that stipulated by Macpherson⁸ or by the Institute of Race Relations⁹). However, if the victim is white then almost invariably Searchlight will demand a much more rigorous evidence-based test, before conceding (if at all) that the violence used against a white person was racist. This is simply dishonest. Fortunately determining an accurate picture of racist violence in the UK is available to anyone who is literate and numerate, and who takes the trouble to access the official (Home Office) crime data.

In regard to violence directed against the native population, an examination of crime figures for England and Wales shows a highly alarming situation. When taking into account population numbers, this information¹⁰ reveals: that there are approximately 30 times more white victims of racist murder than we should expect; 20 times more white victims of interracial homicide; and almost 48 times more white victims of racist assault (for example, in just one year, of over 20,000 white victims of racist ‘violence resulting in wounding’ – by assailants from the ethnic minority communities¹¹).

The question, then, is this: why is the white population (the native people) experiencing a hugely disproportionate (of very, many times greater) numbers of racially motivated violent assaults and killings? This is not to say that the ethnic minority communities are to blame for this situation – the evidence suggests that this is largely a consequence of State involvement, over a period of many decades, of engendering within the ethnic community a suspicion and fear of the majority ‘white’ population. However the fact that Searchlight attempts to suppress discussion of this problem, and instead resorts to lies and abuse, is felt to be most revealing.

Inevitably people will be drawn to the conclusion that Searchlight wishes for the violence against, and the killing of, English people to continue unabated.

Hate and Treason

A core part of Searchlight's aims and activities is to support the dissolution of the UK. It supports the incorporation of the land and people into an authoritarian, fascist European State. This is hardly surprising, given that Searchlight's ideological roots are that of Marxist-internationalism. The political ambitions are (and must inevitably be) that of supporting treason – of the *imposition* of republicanism and a surrender of sovereignty, contrary to Law and the Constitution¹².

Therefore Searchlight directs its venom at any individuals or groups (political, or non-political) that dare to express an intention to defend British sovereignty. With rather predictable absurdity, and certainly with no sense of irony, we find Searchlight declaring Euro-scepticism to be “*the defining characteristic*” of fascism in modern Britain¹³.

The vituperative attacks made by Searchlight on any individual, group, or enterprise that opposes the treason of EU membership frequently descends into gross nastiness and spite. A particular example is the behaviour directed against those ‘heritage’ magazines that quite understandably are opposed to the unlawful (treasonous) integration of the UK into a monstrous and repressive political EU. These

publications concentrate on celebrating the cultural traditions and history of the native people – by poetry, pictures and prose. They are highly nostalgic in content, patriotic, and provide a valuable means of contact between British ex-service personnel of the Second World War and later conflicts – including (and especially) elderly war veterans and war widows.

It is therefore to be expected that these publications tend to be anti-EU, critical of multiculturalism, pro-sovereignty, and opposed to the growing power of the State. Searchlight extends its hatemongering even to these publications – with attempts to have the publishers and editors arrested and imprisoned. Tactics employed by Searchlight include the encouragement of unjustified and vexatious complaints to the Director of Public Prosecutions and to the Commission for Racial Equality¹⁴.

We also see examples of extraordinary behaviour, that is highly abusive and implicitly threatening, against other non-political organisations such as the Campaign for an Independent Britain, and the British Weights and Measures Association. Members of these organisations are labelled as “*fascists, racists and Nazis*”¹⁵. Such comments would be laughable were it not for the fact that such extreme hatemongering can, and sometimes does, result in intimidation and violence against people being targeted in this very odious manner.

There is a profound irony here. The sickening use of the epithet ‘Nazi’ (or ‘Fascist’) against any that dare to contradict the de-nationalisation agenda of the far left (the Marxist internationalists) is, in the use of crude caricature to incite bigotry and hatred, reminiscent of Nazi propaganda directed against the Jews in 1930s Germany – the hate-inciting false stereotypes of those Britons (and especially English people) who choose to assert their right to a sense of identity, community and nationhood.

It seems very apparent that Searchlight and the far-left (Marxists) are attempting to do to the British people what Hitler and the Nazis could not do in 1940.

The key concern is seen to be the advancement of the Marxist internationalist (Trotskyite) class-conflict and racialist politics, and of supporting mass immigration, with the purpose of destabilising and destroying nation states. In terms of the UK, this can be examined in terms of communist front groups occupied in disseminating propaganda, gathering ‘intelligence’ on any opposition, and generating hatred against those who dare to oppose or show dissent.

Terrorism

It is recorded that one of the co-founders of the Searchlight organisation, Mr. Maurice Ludmer, was also on the steering committee set up in the late 1970s to organise Manchester-based Red Action ‘squads’. Those ‘squads’ could *not* operate without Mr. Ludmer’s backing.¹⁶ And members of those squads, based in England, are known to have worked in close collaboration with members and active supporters of the IRSP (the political wing of the INLA) in England – especially in Liverpool¹⁷.

The membership and supporters of the squads were recruited predominantly from the Irish Republican (nationalist) community and from the Black Afro-Caribbean community – a reflection (again) of the Marxist/Trotskyite tactic of introducing racialist politics to achieve the desired end result (the breakdown of the nation state).

There are therefore reports that Searchlight has had working links with the organisation Red Action and its squads (such as AFA) up until at least the mid 1990s. Searchlight magazine would regularly feature the AFA (in an ‘AFA in Action’ column), and would also carry features and adverts in support of Red Action/AFA activities. Searchlight’s appreciation of the activities of Red Action and the AFA was likewise reciprocated by articles appearing in ‘Red Action’ and ‘Fighting Talk’ respectively.

Given Searchlight’s ideological roots, the history of far-left political terrorism within Britain, the many decades of British mainland bombings by neo-Marxist Irish ‘republican’ terrorists (and the more recent bombings by radicalised Islamists) the relevance of this association between Searchlight and extremist groups such as Red Action/AFA needs to be set out. Groups such as the AFA are not shy in admitting to their use of fascist tactics to combat what they see as ‘fascism’: “*AFA is committed to physical and ideological opposition to fascism. We say no platform for fascists - no meetings, no marches, no paper sales, no leafleting - and we mean it, as the fascists know only too well.*”¹⁸

Again, we find with Red Action/AFA the link between extreme political violence (terrorism), hatred of *particular* ethno-nationalist groups (especially ethnic English people), and extremist neo-Marxist

ideology. And, unsurprisingly, we find this predilection for extreme violence being linked to the neo-Marxist cause: “Doesn’t this attract the wrong sort of member, head-cases who are only there for the fighting? Joe’s answer is pure pragmatism: ‘You don’t need to be a Marxist intellectual to hit someone over the head with a beer bottle.’ But it also follows, says Bill, that ‘the political have got to be the most committed of the street fighters. We’ve learnt from Ireland, it must be the political dog wagging the violent tail.’”¹⁹

The malign doctrine pursued by Searchlight cynically manipulates people and events. This is illustrated by the case of Mr. Steven Tilzey who, on the 7th December 1981, was sentenced at Manchester Crown Court to 15 months imprisonment for being in possession of offensive weapons²⁰. Mr. Tilzey had been arrested during a disturbance in Rochdale in December 1980. The Judge, in his summing up, referred to the clear evidence of a political purpose behind the fomenting of such extreme, premeditated violence.

Mr. Steven Tilzey, having been convicted of being in possession of offensive weapons during a violent affray, was subsequently rewarded with a staff position within the Searchlight organisation.

On the 16th December 1993 Mr. Liam Heffner, a member of the Irish National Liberation Army (INLA), was sentenced to 23 years imprisonment for plotting an extensive bombing campaign in Mainland Britain^{21 22}. Mr. Heffner was a member of a three-man gang found guilty of plotting to cause explosions, to steal explosives (PE) from a quarry in the West Country, and of being in possession of a .357 Sturm Ruger pistol. During the trial the court heard evidence of one of Heffner’s co-defendants expressing the desire to “blow the English bastards to pieces” and had described the killing of the Second World War hero, and Member of Parliament, Mr. Airey Neave as “a grand job” – and how another one like it was needed²³. **Notably the convicted terrorist, Liam Heffner, had previously been a member of one of the RA-based (and Searchlight-controlled) Manchester ‘squads’.**

In 1994 two leading members of Red Action, Patrick Hayes and Jan Taylor, were convicted of the Harrods Department Store bombing (on the 28th January 1993) and the Kent House Station train bombing (on the 3rd February 1993). These bombings were undertaken in collaboration with the Irish Republican Army. Hayes was also convicted of plotting in 1992 to cause explosions at Canary Wharf, Tottenham Court Road, and Woodside Park tube station. Both Hayes and Taylor are also reported to have been (at that time) prominent members of the London branch of AFA.

It is noted that the document ‘Organising Against Racism and Fascism Handbook’, jointly produced by the TUC and Searchlight in 2004, states that: “*Anti Fascist Action (AFA) still has active groups around the country*”.²⁴ This has to be of particular concern, given this group’s predilection for violence, and of Searchlight’s record of providing tacit support to such groups.

It is equally disturbing to see the growing evidence of the involvement of the State in the creation and/or operation of neo-Nazi groups (such as Combat 18 and the National Socialist Movement) – and of using those groups for the purpose of ‘grooming’ psychopathic killers such as David Copeland.^{25 26 27 28 29} This concern is justifiable on the basis of substantive evidence of the involvement of State security services (Special Branch, MI5) in the setting up and/or the running of these far-right groups, and of their extensive infiltration by Searchlight operatives.

Given this history, it must be of even greater concern that Searchlight receives such unconditional support from such institutions as the Metropolitan Police Service, the Association of London Government, the TUC and Members of Parliament. What should we conclude?

Incurring Searchlight’s Wrath

Being on the receiving end of some particular Searchlight nastiness is something of a surreal experience. Very quickly you realise you are dealing with an organisation that exists in some bizarre ‘alternative universe’. There is no common ground upon which rational debate or argument can take place.

It would seem that I upset the people at Searchlight on account of my investigations into two particular matters: of the true nature of racist violence; and of the operations of a number of various registered charities (including, especially, the Searchlight Educational Trust).

Therefore I shall address both of these issues, beginning first with my research into racist violence.

The native, indigenous people of this country are suffering from a hugely disproportionate number of violent racist attacks – including racially motivated murder. This is fact. It would seem, however, that Searchlight does not want this problem to be addressed. Why is that?

Instead of which, Searchlight makes *ad hominem* attacks on those, such as myself, whose work has revealed the true extent of this problem. Having published my work, I subsequently discovered that the Searchlight organisation had used its various websites to make malicious comment and false allegations against myself, in a crude attempt to discredit my work, to smear my reputation as a researcher, and to close down any debate on this subject. Searchlight claimed that I was a liar.

I've been involved in research long enough to know that if you claim (or imply) that a researcher is a liar, this requires that you provide irrefutable proof that the person you attack has deliberately falsified their work. If you cannot provide this proof, then you have effectively destroyed any credibility you might claim. Searchlight cannot provide this proof – for the simple reason that there is none.

Modest though it is, I do have experience of research work within industry spanning over 30 years. In that time I have had (peer-reviewed) research papers published internationally – including three papers in a science journal published by US company John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; two conference presentations published in conference proceedings (in Brighton, England; and at the Technische Universität München, Germany); and a chapter in a book published by Springer-Verlag, London (based on research presented at an international conference in Barga, Italy). I have also been invited to work as a peer-reviewer – for papers submitted by other researchers to the above-mentioned US science journal.

Not once did Searchlight make any effort to contact me and ask about my investigative work on racist crime. Searchlight judged my work to be a part of “*a pack of lies*”, whilst admitting they had not actually examined it. This is not the behaviour of a credible research organisation. Quite predictably Searchlight failed to produce the proof required to justify its ridiculous allegations. It would seem, instead, that Searchlight is very determined to dissuade and frustrate enquiry into the extraordinary levels of violence being directed against the native, indigenous population. Why?

Searchlight further claimed that my research was politically motivated. This was total rubbish – In fact my interest in this subject first arose from an article in The Times newspaper by Sean O’Neill, on the 2nd December 2005 (I still have the original newspaper cutting). In his article Mr. O’Neill drew attention to the hugely disproportionate number of *recorded* racist murders of white people (12 white, 10 BME, between 2001 and 2004). Most significantly he reported the CRE admitting there was “*little, if any, research on the issue*” – a truly astonishing situation that I was determined to try to rectify. However due to family commitments and pressure of other work, the analysis for the first report (‘Ethnicity and the Experience of Crime in England and Wales’) was not completed until the 31st October 2006 – with the document itself being completed on the 8th November 2006. The reports were therefore entirely my own work, published in my name and at my own expense, and carried my copyright.

Following the controversy surrounding comments by Dr. Bob Spink MP on crime and ethnicity, a copy of the first report was posted to this Member of Parliament on the 2nd December 2006. A personal letter from Dr. Spink from his Westminster office, acknowledging receipt of my communication, was received from him a few days later.³⁰ Therefore it is a matter of record that at my own volition I first attempted to raise this important issue with a prominent Member of Parliament some three and a half years ago.

The second matter is that of my research into the operations of registered charities.

As a result of the publication early in 2009 of reports on the activities of a number of registered charities – including that of the organisation Searchlight Educational Trust – I wrote to the Metropolitan Police on the 5th February 2009, asking them if they would carry out an investigation. I felt that the matters of concern were serious, but fundamentally very simple.

The registered charity Philip Green Memorial Trust (PGMT) solicits money from the public to “*help sick and disabled children*”. Clearly from PGMT advertising, this refers to very worthy activities such as hospital and hospice care, medication, remedial care, respite care, physiotherapy – etc. People who donate to the PGMT do so believing and trusting that this is the purpose to which their donations will be put.

Over a period of seven years it appeared that the organisation Searchlight Educational Trust (SET) had drawn on this PGMT funding to the total amount of some £14,700.

Therefore the obvious question to be asked was this: how this money has been used by SET to provide help for sick and disabled children? It would be entirely reasonable to have a list of recipients of the help provided by SET – for example Searchlight’s help with: hospital and hospice care; medication; remedial care; respite care; physiotherapy, et cetera. I felt sure SET would, as a registered charity, have this information readily to hand.

However it seems clear that SET does not like its activities being investigated. I was subsequently informed that just two weeks after my final confidential communications with the police a highly abusive attack, directed against myself, had appeared on one of Searchlight’s websites.³¹ The author of that abuse was Sonia Gable, the ‘charity correspondent’ of SET. This attack consisted of falsehoods, spiteful and juvenile name-calling, together with an apparent attempt to use the highly disreputable technique of ‘false juxtaposition’ to smear my reputation as a researcher. I also found this attack, given the content of the Searchlight posting in the context of past events, to be somewhat menacing. This behaviour was quite astonishing coming, as it did, from an official of a ‘charitable’ organisation.

Buried Text

A part of the research for this article has involved investigations into the formative years of the Searchlight organisation, at the start of the 1970s. Material originating from that era has therefore been examined because of its relevance to the particular topics addressed within this article.

On the 5th December 1972 a ‘Ms. Sonia Hochfelder’ had a letter published in ‘Felix’, the student newspaper at Imperial College, London.³² Ms. Hochfelder is believed to be Sonia Gable, the wife of Gerry Gable who had founded the Searchlight some 7 years previously. The content of Ms. Hochfelder’s letter included the following: of the drawing of parallels between a Zionist Israel and a Nazi Germany; and of the creation of the State of Israel as an example of the use of mass immigration to (in *effect*) instigate genocide against a native population.

The appropriate extracts are reproduced below.

“Nor did I anywhere state that the gassing of Jews in Germany by the Nazis was a propaganda exercise. I absolutely condemn the brutal acts of the Nazis against the Jews or anyone else, however, I equally condemn similar acts committed by others including the Israeli government. The daily acts of terrorism carried out by the Israeli army against the Arab people in Israel and the neighbouring countries, the burning of Arab homes, destruction of villages in South Lebanon and Syria, the bombing of refugee camps with napalm and splinter bombs may not be so well publicised as the Nazi gas chambers but the Nazis and their sympathisers too tried to hide their existence for as long as possible.”

And she later goes on to say:

“Zionism is in fact not in the interest of the Jewish people. The aim of Zionism, which began in the last century as a reaction to European antisemitism, was to gather all the Jews together in Palestine — the Chosen People in the Promised Land. This is a defeatist and escapist solution which never gained much support among Jews so that even today 90 per cent of Jews still live outside Israel. It did however win support from countries with an interest in the oil resources of the area. Zionism’s first success was when Balfour declared official British Government support for it in 1917. Subsequently the British mandate over Palestine opened the door to the refugees from Nazi persecution. When the numbers had swollen sufficiently, a short sharp military campaign established the state of Israel in 1948. The Palestinians, who had lived in Palestine for 1,500 years, were driven out by Zionist terror (the massacre of Deir Yassin, in which the total population of a village, men, women, and children were murdered and thrown down a well, will rank forever in the annals of barbarity).”

It is understood that at this time Ms. Hockfelder (Gable) was sympathetic to the politics of the far-left, and was also involved with Searchlight. The obvious question therefore is this: was this an expression of genuinely held belief, or was it an attempt to cause mischief and offence? Unfortunately, given the reputation that Searchlight has earned for itself for scurrilous behaviour, we will probably never know.

END

REFERENCES

- ¹ 'White Noise', by Nick Lowles, Searchlight Information Services
- ² 'White Riot', by Nick Lowles, Steve Silver, Searchlight Information Services
- ³ 'The English Disease', Searchlight Magazine, November 2005
- ⁴ 'A New Ingerlund', Searchlight Magazine, August 2006
- ⁵ In: <http://www.racismcutsbothways.org.uk/BNP-targets-youth-in-hate-drive.php>
- ⁶ See, for example <http://www.racismcutsbothways.org.uk> for the 23rd November 2008
- ⁷ <http://www.racismcutsbothways.org.uk/BNP-exploits-the-victims.php> 27th November 2008
- ⁸ The Sir William MacPherson Inquiry Report, 1999
- ⁹ See, for example: <http://www.irr.org.uk>
- ¹⁰ 'Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System – A Home Office Publication under Section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991', Edition 2000 (published 2000); Edition 2004 (published 2005); and Edition 2006/7 (published July 2008).
- ¹¹ Home Office report OLR 25-06
- ¹² From evidence contained within classified Foreign and Commonwealth Office documents produced in 1971 and 1972, and recently released under the 'thirty year rule'. See, in particular, the FCO document, marked 'Secret', reference FCO 30/1048
- ¹³ In the July 1999 issue of Searchlight Magazine, in an article by Gerry Gable.
- ¹⁴ In 'The Stain on St George's Flag', by Patrick Wright, The Guardian, 18th August 1993
- ¹⁵ In 'Answering the Asylum Myths – Keep the Extreme Right Out of the South West', published by the TUC South West, and endorsed by Searchlight. Much of the material within this booklet is believed to have originated from Searchlight.
- ¹⁶ As Dave Renton has pointed out in a paper presented at the New Socialist Approaches to History Seminar at the Institute of Historical Research on the 6th June 2005, and in 'When We Touched The Sky' by the same author
- ¹⁷ *Ibid*
- ¹⁸ AFA Web Link <http://hsg.cupboard.org/agitator/data/a/afa00120.html>
- ¹⁹ From an article by Matt Seaton, The Independent on Sunday, January 1995
- ²⁰ 'No Retreat', by Dave Hann and Steve Tizley, Milo Books, Lytham Lancashire 2003, pages 74 to 82
- ²¹ Liam Hefferman, a former member of the RA(AFA), was arrested on the 8th February 1993, in relation to charges of conspiring to steal explosives, cause explosions, and being in illegal possession of a handgun.
- ²² See: 'Terrorists Jailed For Bomb Campaign Plot', Terry Kirby, The Independent, Friday 17th December 1993. The identified (and convicted) terrorist is Liam Hefferman (generally known by his nickname of 'Hefty').
- ²³ See: 'Bombing Plot Foiled By MI5 Agent', Terry Kirby, The Independent, Tuesday 30th November 1993; and also 'MI5 Man Tells Jury of IRA Bomb Plots', Terry Kirby, Wednesday 1st December 1993.
- ²⁴ Organising Against Racism and Fascism Handbook, Steve Silver, Searchlight and TUC publication, 2004
- ²⁵ 'Hateland', by Bernard O'Mahoney, Mainstream Publishing, Edinburgh 2006, page 230
- ²⁶ 'No Retreat', Dave Hann and Steve Tizley, Milo Books, Lytham 2003, page 203
- ²⁷ *ibid.* page 234
- ²⁸ Searchlight Magazine, April 1995
- ²⁹ 'Behind enemy lines', Ken Hyder, The Independent, Saturday, 22 February 1997, regarding references to Special Branch, MI5 and Searchlight 'moles' (*agent provocateurs*) working as activists within far-right groups.
- ³⁰ Letter of Acknowledgement from the Rt. Hon. Mr. Bob Spink MP, 6th December 2006
- ³¹ The first response from the Charity Commission was on the 4th March 2009; the second response: on the 13th May 2009. The final Metropolitan Police Service response was on the 25th March 2009. The abusive article from SET Secretary Sonia Gable followed two weeks later on the 8th April 2009.
- ³² From the "Letters to The Editor" page, Felix magazine, Imperial College students union, 5th December 1972, edition N^o 321