

Lying to The Contemptible English – A Case Study

Tony Shell

This ‘case study’ is part of a wide-ranging investigation into State enforcement of ‘progressivism’. It is an investigation of the way in which that ‘progress’ requires the English (especially) to be deceived as to the intentions of the State, of lies to be told regarding present and past events, and of the concealment of the actual purpose of the State’s many and various ‘change agents’.

We begin with a look at the abuse of historical truth.

It has become common practice for people to invoke personal, family, or community history in order to ‘take ownership’ of a moral issue. This places a duty on those who employ such practice to be scrupulously honest when retelling that history. Unfortunately a dishonest historical narrative is sometimes used to make scepticism of a moral stance seem insensitive, cruel, or even hostile – and increasingly such deceit is used to ‘legitimise’ malevolent (perhaps violent) behaviour against others.

An example of the use of a *fabricated* history, for the purpose of seizing the moral ‘high ground’, is included in this report. This case study therefore begins with an investigation of an article, published in The Independent newspaper some thirteen years ago, in which the exploits of a supposedly ‘anti-fascist, anti-racist’ organisation (Searchlight) are recounted in a detailed piece of reporting¹. The article was presented as factual (current affairs) journalism – with an expectation of uncritical consumption.

The Independent article focused, in particular, on the two most prominent members of the Searchlight organisation – Mr. Gerry Gable (co-founder of the organisation and former chairman), and his wife Sonia (the current deputy editor of the magazine, researcher and writer). The article included a potted-biography of the family history of Sonia Gable (née Hochfelder) which stated: “*Her father [Herman Hochfelder], a Czech Jew, escaped to Britain in 1939, just one step ahead of the Gestapo squad who were searching for him in Prague. In Britain he joined the army, and as a commissioned officer was recruited into the Special Operations Executive. He posed as a Nazi businessman in neutral Turkey*”.

It is therefore instructive to examine this particular biographical ‘snippet’ in some detail.

Unfortunately the story of Mr. Hochfelder's extraordinary escape (from the Gestapo, in Prague) doesn't tally with his later, equally extraordinary show of preference for returning to that same Nazi-occupied city, reinforced by the argument: "*added to which he has a Czech fiancée (or ex-fiancée) waiting for him in Prague. This lady represents a very safe house ... as she does not know he has a wife over here.*"²

Some refugees, inducted into the SOE with Mr. Hochfelder, did not accept he was an anti-Nazi. It was claimed that his anti-Nazism was a sham, exhibited only for the purpose of self-advancement: "*There has been some strong criticism of Hochfelder by Lehniger and Opoczynski. They maintain he is purely an opportunist with no real allegiance to any party; that before he left Czechoslovakia he had a foot in both Nazi and anti-Nazi camps*"³ Feelings ran so high (regarding allegations of Hochfelder's duplicitous behaviour and past flirtations with Nazism) that a brawl ensued in which blood was spilled.

There certainly can be no doubting the anti-Nazi credentials of Lehniger and Opoczynski. Pte. Richard Lehniger was a Czech refugee from the German Sudetenland, whilst Sgt. Abraham Opoczynski was a Jewish refugee from Poland. Both were of exemplary character, possessed extraordinary courage and, as SOE commandoes, both were to sacrifice their lives in the fight against Nazi Germany.⁴

So, what then of the claim that: "*In Britain he [Herman Hochfelder] joined the army, and as a commissioned officer was recruited into the Special Operations Executive*"? That claim is false. In fact Mr. Hochfelder had no military experience whatsoever. In July 1941 Mr. Hochfelder was recruited into the SOE for training as a civilian 'organiser', because of his language skills and his wide-ranging political contacts in the German Sudetenland, in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary.

Mr. Hochfelder did not receive his (secret) commission until April 1943 – approximately a year after being sent to the Middle East⁵ – which was given only to indulge his wish: "*that after the war he can prove to his family and friends that he took an active part in the war and did not lead the life of an idle émigré*"⁶. That the British Army acquiesced to his almost constant demands (for a commission) is seen as very strange, given that the head of SOE Section X observed: "*If, after the war, he [Hochfelder] claimed to have been a Lt. in the British Army for 2/3 years, he would automatically blow himself completely to all who knew that in actual fact he had been buying and selling dried fruit in Turkey.*"⁷

The final claim that Herman Hochfelder "*posed as a Nazi businessman in neutral Turkey*" is also untrue. Herman Hochfelder (under the alias 'Heinrich Hillman') posed as a Jewish émigré, living in Istanbul, employed by a Jewish import/export business based in Palestine. It was recognised by SOE that "*... however slight his connection with us [the British] may appear, the fact of his Palestine passport will prevent him from touching any more than the edges of Axis circles here.*"⁸ An SOE officer was even more blunt: "*it is a pity that his appearance is so Jewish as this will undoubtedly hinder him in his relations with Axis nationals and will not endear him to the Turks.*"⁹

Therefore the claim that Mr. Hochfelder posed as a Nazi in wartime Turkey is a total fabrication. The reality was that he was acting under SOE instructions to use his cover, as a Czech (Jewish) émigré and businessman, to try to organise communications between Istanbul and Sudeten (Czech), Slovak and Hungarian anti-Nazi groups.¹⁰

The SOE assessment of Mr. Hochfelder's achievements, following his return to England, was scathing (and very forthright): "*I pointed to the fact that he had been unable to establish a single line of communications in over two years*" ... and she goes on to add: "*His great wish is to buy a service dress and parade as an officer before his friends. ... I must admit I am very disappointed by this man. When he left England he was a decent, simple fellow of the school master type. Now he is arrogant and terribly Jewish. I don't see him getting around much in Germany until he has reverted to pre-Turkey form.*"¹¹

Therefore the obvious question is – why so much invention, and absurd embellishment, with regard to Mr. Hochfelder's wartime activities? A part of the answer is undoubtedly a desire to seize advantage over others. Whether this is done for self-aggrandisement, or to assume an unchallengeable moral position, or to provide a platform for preaching hatred against others, depends very much on who is doing the lying.

There is also a rather interesting footnote to matters concerning Mr. Hochfelder.

Although SOE officers appeared not to doubt Herman Hochfelder's loyalty, they had considerable concerns regarding the amount of knowledge he had of the organisation – mostly acquired by skilful "*interrogation*" of other SOE personnel.¹² The head of SOE Section X pointedly remarked: "*AH/60 [Hochfelder] is a Sudeten German and it is scandalous that he should have been allowed to acquire all the information he now possesses about this organisation [the SOE].*"¹³ He was especially mortified to learn of the possibility that Herman Hochfelder knew the cover identity of the SOE London Headquarters: "*Please read, weep, and return for action ... This staggers me and makes me feel like giving up trying. It's like swimming against the current all the time.*"¹⁴ His incredulity and dismay is easy to understand.

Less than a month after returning to London (in January, 1945) Lt. Hochfelder was dismissed from SOE active service after refusing a mission to the German Sudetenland.¹⁵

Interestingly, in the early 1960s, the Czech authorities were obviously convinced that Mr. Hochfelder's loyalty was, in fact, to Germany: "*The West German intelligence service also have their agents located in other departments. Some of them even sit in important posts in the British central government. For example, their devoted agent Herman Hochfelder sits at the British ministry.*"¹⁶

Which takes us onto another important matter concerning observations based on historical facts.

In December 1972 a 'Ms. Sonia Hochfelder' had a letter published in 'Felix', the student newspaper at Imperial College London¹⁷. In that letter she stated the following: that Israel had murdered Jewish people in Arab states in order to encourage Jewish emigration to Israel; that it had been involved in assassinating people who were seen as obstacles to the creation, or the territorial expansion of an Israeli state; and that it was responsible for committing acts of genocide against the native Palestinian people. Ms. Hochfelder drew parallels between a Zionist Israel and a Nazi Germany, and cited 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. This letter was written around the time that Sonia Hochfelder was becoming actively involved with the Searchlight organisation (founded, and directed by her husband-to-be Mr. Gerry Gable).

This, therefore, is where the history of those times (the 1970s) becomes highly intriguing.

Despite Sonia Hochfelder having likened Israel's treatment of Palestinians to that of Nazi Germany's treatment of the Jews, a leaked London Weekend Television internal memorandum revealed that Searchlight had been secretly gathering surveillance information on UK-based political activists (especially those within the Young Liberals movement) who were supportive of the Palestinians.^{18 19}

That Searchlight-sourced information was being passed to senior representatives of the media (LWT senior management and producers); whilst cooperation in further surveillance work was being organised through contacts within the security services of Britain, France, and the Israeli Foreign Ministry – as well as with a right-wing organisation with links to the CIA and financed by apartheid South Africa.²⁰

The memo ends with the instruction: "*It goes without saying that I [Mr. Gerry Gable] would like this kept strictly secret.*" Quite obviously someone thought otherwise.

The intention of the memo appears to have been twofold: firstly to 'punish' those who had dared to give support to the Palestinian people; and, secondly, to intensify the surveillance. The New Statesman article that exposed the LWT/Searchlight memo also revealed evidence of other 'dirty tricks' (from as early as 1969) used against pro-Palestinian individuals and groups – including efforts by *agent provocateurs* to create an appearance of "*violent anti-Semitism*" within those groups.

Given all of the above facts, the obvious question is – in whose interests were (and are) State-sponsored organisations such as Searchlight (and many other, similar groups) acting? It is very obvious they are *not* acting in the interest of the English people. In an earlier investigation the Searchlight organisation was found to have engaged in hatemongering, directed at the English, for some forty years – and also to have been directly linked to violent extremist groups, including groups whose members had carried out acts of terrorism (including bombings) targeted specifically against the English community²¹.

One of the key characteristics of progressivism is the use of lying to foment hate (and possibly violence) against those individuals and groups who dissent from an imposition of State authority. The behaviour described in this report (the lying, the secret surveillance, infiltration, *agent provocateur* activities, and smears) requires the underpinning of a political culture based on hate and deceit. There is therefore a need not only for the activities of the State to be subject to scrutiny, but also a rigorous examination of those many and various 'change agencies' (such as Searchlight) that prosper under State patronage.

And, finally, some concluding comments are necessary.

This report is a part of the on-going research into a treasonous State (and its ancillary groups and 'change agencies'), and into the purpose and activities of a malfeasant 'progressive' ideology. It has been a difficult report to write – not least because we should not hold people to account for the behaviour of past generations. However nor should we allow history (especially where tampered with, or invented) to be used to assist in inciting hatred and violence against a native population (such as the English).

END

REFERENCES and NOTES

-
- ¹ 'Behind Enemy Lines', Ken Hyder, The Independent newspaper, 22nd February 1997
- ² Report from X/AUS to AD/X.1, based on an interview of Lt. Herman Hochfelder by Captain Joll (SOE), 13th January 1945 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/721, *image n° 95* [note: emphasis as per the original document]
- ³ 'Reports on Sudeten German, Herman Hochfelder', report from L/Sgt Gibbs, STS44, 20th November 1941 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *image n° 004*
- ⁴ Pte. Richard Lehniger (alias Pte. Leonard) was killed on the night of the 13th September 1942 during an SSFR raid (Operation Aquatint) on German coastal defences in Normandy. He had previously been a part of the commando raid on Dieppe. Sgt. Abraham Opoczynski (alias Sgt. Adam Orr) was captured by German troops in the same Aquatint raid and handed over to the Gestapo. Although a POW, he was executed by the Nazis on the 12th April 1945, just one month before the end of the war.
- ⁵ 'Reports on Sudeten German, Herman Hochfelder', 26th June 1945 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *images n° 003 and 009*
- ⁶ Report from X to D/MIL, ref. XF/A/215.B., 'Herman HOCHFELDER', 3rd April 1943 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *image n° 107*
- ⁷ Report from X to X/A and X/A.1, 21st March 1943 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/719, *image n° 75*
- ⁸ For example (and in particular) report from D/H60 to D/H98 (ref. 244/60/29), 'A/H60 – Security', 29th July 1942 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *image n° 78*.
- ⁹ Report from D/H60 to D.F.A. (b), ref. 221/60/29, 'Arrival of A/H60', 28th June 1942 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *image n° 85*
- ¹⁰ Agent's Record Sheet, 'Herman Hochfelder', ref. Appendix C to LIQ/G/15, marked: 'Top Secret', 7th December 1944 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/722, *images n° 37 to 39 inclusive*
- ¹¹ Report from X/AUS to AD/X.1, 'Hochfelder', 8th January 1945 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/721, *image n° 107* [note: emphasis as per the original document]
- ¹² Report from D/H60 to D/H98, 30th July 1942 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/719, *image n° 215*
- ¹³ Letter from X to D/CE (through M/X), 10th November 1942 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/719, *image n° 210*
- ¹⁴ Comment from X, as a hand-written annotation to a memo from X/A to X, (24th ?) August 1942 – retrieved from The National Archive, file HS/9/719, *image n° 299*
- ¹⁵ To X/AUS from AD/X.1, ref. ADX1/607, 17th January 1945 – retrieved from The National Archives, file HS/9/722, *image n° 15*
- ¹⁶ 'Securitas Imperii 8, Publication on State Security Structures Issues', Press conference with returned emigrant J. Hodáč, Rudé Právo, 3. 11. 1962, p. 2. - source: <http://aplikace.mvcr.cz/archiv2008/police/udv/securita/sbornik8/sesit8.doc>
- ¹⁷ From the 'Letters to The Editor' page, "Jews, Jowitt, and Jeneralisation" by Sonia Hochfelder, Felix magazine, Imperial College students union, 5th December 1972, edition N° 321
- ¹⁸ 'Destabilising the Decent People', Duncan Campbell, Bruce Page and Nick Anning, The New Statesman, 15th February 1980. Analysis of the 'LWT memorandum, 2nd May 1977' is based upon a London Library copy of the original New Statesman article.
- ¹⁹ Note: support for the Palestinians, from the Young Liberals section of the Liberal Party, began following a letter from a Young Liberal officer to the 'Free Palestine' journal in 1968. See 'Young Liberal – The Red Guard Era', by Peter Hellyer, Journal of Liberal Democratic History, Issue No 17, Winter 1997-1998.
- ²⁰ The "Geoffrey Stewart-Smith institute" in the memorandum refers to the Foreign Affairs Research Institute. Geoffrey Stewart-Smith was Director of FARI from 1976 to 1986. The financing of FARI by apartheid South Africa was not generally known, until revealed in bankruptcy proceedings in 1987.
- ²¹ 'Searchlight and Hate', issue b, ref. sah_01b, Tony Shell, April 2010