

liberal currents of political parties generally.

“Thirdly, the injustices, both real and imagined, which are suffered under what most believe to be a system of industrial entrepreneurship, causes that entrepreneurship to be the target of hostility. So, as in the case of the mass-based social-democracies of Western Europe, the name of ‘socialist’ has been adopted by many ordinary folk because socialist organizations, or trade-unions linked to socialist parties are seen as the credible force available for negotiating with entrepreneurial and governmental forces.

“Nonetheless, many of those who come to regard themselves as socialist or pro-socialist in this way, are governed by personal moral beliefs not inconsistent with those governing a Hamiltonian sort of entrepreneurship. Some of these may even regard themselves as ‘Marxists,’ when they would abhor Marx if they really understood him clearly; they read into Marx that which they wish to see, and overlook what they do not wish to embrace.

“If a man tells me he is an ostrich, I am not obliged to accept this as a fact, although I must not overlook the significance of the fact that he appears to believe he is an ostrich. The same must be said of those who tell me either that they are ‘socialists’ or ‘capitalists,’ or who say, simply, that they are ‘left-wingers’ or ‘right-wingers.’

“For me, the practical fact is that the system of political-economy associated with Leibniz, Franklin, Hamilton, and List, is the best system of economy yet devised, and the one which best promotes both the general welfare and political freedom. I propose that we rescue it from today’s financial and economic catastrophe, for the sake of ourselves and our descendants. Let us get to production for human needs, and to the fostering of technological progress, on which depends our ability to meet the elementary needs of each nation, and of the human family as a whole.

“I propose we become less concerned with empty word-play with the ambiguous and confusing appellation, ‘capitalism,’ and think simply of the promotion of progress in agro-industrial entrepreneurship instead. Let us stop playing word-games on the subject of capitalist ‘chickens’ and socialist ‘foxes,’ and use instead terms which have a more sensible and real physical meaning than these two so-often misused and almost meaningless ones.

“Let us say that we are horrified by famine and other miseries abounding in today’s world, and that through proper forms of technological progressive entrepreneurship, and governments absolutely committed to the general welfare, we have the means at hand to remedy the evils about us.

“I concede that it is not inaccurate to describe me as the Soviet press has done, as an ‘ideologue of late-capitalism.’ However, I am disgusted by the widespread practice of using and repeating mere labels, in the usual thoughtless, gossipy way, as a substitute for knowing actually what one is talking about. Don’t fuss too much about which silly label to put on me. Simply understand, concretely, how I see the present situation, and what I propose we do about it.”

Homintern is under spotlight in Britain

by Mark Burdman

According to a news item in the April 21 edition of the British daily *The Independent*, British spy-thriller author John Le Carre, famous for his *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* and other fictional accounts of spy-master “George Smiley,” will be making his first trip to the Soviet Union in May 1987, at the invitation of the Soviet writers’ union. Informed rumor has it, notes *The Independent’s* “Diary” columnist, that Le Carre will meet Raisa Gorbachova, head of the Soviet Culture Foundation, and “apparently one of his most enthusiastic readers.”

The trip could not come at a more interesting time for Le Carre. On April 19, explosive revelations were made in the British press by espionage-affairs expert Chapman Pincher, claiming that the suspected real-life model for George Smiley, Sir Maurice Oldfield, head of Britain’s MI-6 intelligence service from 1973-78, had been a particularly degenerate homosexual, and a potential security risk. Sir Maurice’s obsession, claims Pincher, was what is referred to in Britain as “rough trade”: lower-class, down-and-out young males.

One could only guess what Madame Gorbachova could or would tell Mr. Le Carre about such matters. But one thing is certain. As already has emerged in the known cases of British spies like Anthony Blunt and Guy Burgess, both members of the secretive “Cambridge Apostles” set, Soviet penetration of British elites has been greatly expedited, over a period of decades, by the rampant homosexuality prevalent in leading British circles, by what one lover of Burgess has referred to as “a sort of gay intellectual freemasonry.”

And, in the “Age of AIDS,” such matters have become of British national security concern, way beyond just the matter of espionage.

We don’t know if, or how, Madame Gorbachova would want to comment on such matters. But, in Britain, it seems that some people want to clean up the British branch of “The Homintern.”

‘Disgusting behavior’

Pincher’s revelations about Sir Maurice Oldfield, are contained in a new book, soon to be released, entitled, *Traitors: The Labyrinths of Treason*. Introducing an analysis

piece by Pincher previewing the new book, the April 19 *The Mail on Sunday* weekly commented that Oldfield was evidently involved in the “desperately seamy side of homosexuality,” obsessed with “rough trade . . . rent boys and down-and-outs.” The revelations are all the more devastating because Oldfield, “unquestionably brilliant, . . . has always been presented as the modern father figure of British intelligence. And despite author John Le Carre’s denials, Sir Maurice was frequently described as the model for his famous fictional spymaster, George Smiley. . . . Now, he joins that long list of homosexuals whose scandals have haunted the intelligence community, involving men like Guy Burgess, Anthony Blunt, and others.”

Pincher himself then writes in *The Mail on Sunday*:

Oldfield’s “clearly compulsive homosexuality came to official notice after the Yard assumed responsibility for his protection in 1978. Detectives became worried by the number and types of men who frequently visited his flat.

“They included waiters of various nationalities and young men who obviously had no connection with intelligence matters. One was such a down-and-out that he was barred from the property after creating various scenes.

“Some of these men were followed and interviewed and turned out to be male prostitutes. . . .

“While alone in Oldfield’s flat, a police bodyguard found books and magazines on sexual perversions and photographs of nude young men. . . .

“His case highlighted the continuing danger of having homosexuals in such sensitive positions. . . .

“Precautions to prevent the accession of homosexuals to such sensitive positions have now been tightened. . . .”

Pincher’s claims caused a giant brouhaha. Labour Party member of parliament Ted Leadbitter, the man who had exposed Anthony Blunt as a Soviet agent, declared that an investigation should be carried out to determine if Oldfield’s alleged “disgusting behavior” were true; if so, Oldfield had been “a disgrace to this country.” Oldfield biographer Richard Deacon and former colleagues of Oldfield, however, stormed in anger that Pincher’s charges were a “load of rubbish.”

The rampancy of homosexual perversion in British leading circles in this century is notorious, however. One representative book on the matter, *Conspiracy of Silence: The Secret Life of Anthony Blunt*, authored by *London Sunday Times* writers Barrie Penrose and Simon Freeman, and published in 1986, presents the story in some detail. Of “rough trade,” practiced by Blunt, for example, the authors write, quoting former associates of the late Blunt:

“. . . Working-class trade. That was what Anthony really enjoyed. Scruffy, dirty things. He liked sailors the best of all. . . .

“. . . I know about the working-class men. For men of Blunt’s generation, that was the only way they were able to get satisfaction. These were not love affairs. The window-

cleaners, or the painters, the soldiers and the sailors. Men like this would agree to whatever was required because they were being paid. . . .”

But the Pincher revelations were not an isolated event by any means. As his story stirred up various hornets’ nests in Britain, other leaks in the British press shed light on “Hom-intern” activities:

- The same day’s *Mail on Sunday* reported that Scotland Yard had broken up a large “gay escort” prostitution ring, which worked by supplying black male homosexuals to leading personalities. “Well-known clients,” the paper noted, include a list of “politicians, showbiz personalities, and businessmen who will be interviewed in the next few weeks.” This ring is believed to be the biggest discovered to date in Europe, involving more than 120 male prostitutes, working for an agency called BABE, which stands for “Black and Beautiful Escorts.”

- “Childwatch,” a British organization investigating widespread homosexuality and child abuse in the Church of England, has made an appeal to meet with Archbishop Runcie, to discuss allegations that some clergymen are sexually abusing children. Childwatch founder Mrs. Dianne Core has compiled dossiers on 10 clergymen, and claims that the information gathered by her group is “very disturbing, although we believe it is only the tip of the iceberg. The clergy involved are in a position of trust and a lot of innocent young children are falling into the hands of these unscrupulous people.” She has charged that some church leaders are attempting to “cover up the scandal,” which is linked to a “severe problem of homosexuality in the Church.”

As of our going to print, primate Runcie had not given a public response to Mrs. Core. Certain British sources believe that the pro-Russian favorite of Queen Elizabeth II has personal reasons for not wanting a search under “the tip of the iceberg” on such matters.

- On April 22, the *Daily Mail*, under the banner headline, “Why do the upper classes dress their **boys as girls?**” displayed photos of Princess Diana and son Prince William, wearing lookalike dresses, and other bizarre photos of young male royals dressed up as girls. This practice, noted the *Mail*, has transformed babies into “unisex objects: a ‘child’ was a neuter, and little boys were dressed exactly like their sisters, as you can see from the picture of Diana’s forebears, Lavinia, Countess Spencer, with her little boy in a silly frock. . . . The English upper classes are monumentally slow to change. . . .”

A warning-shot aimed at Buckingham Palace? After all, the Blunt case involved such a degenerate and traitor working as art historian for the Queen. And, as the April 20 *Times of London* reminded its readers, the issue of homosexual behavior by higher-ups in Britain’s secret services “was given clear focus in 1982, when Commander Michael Trestrail, the Queen’s personal bodyguard, resigned after allegations that he had had a relationship with a male prostitute.”