



CONFIDENTIAL

Ref. A0609

MR. WHITMORE

The Climate of Treason

Mr. Andrew Boyle's book has now been published. As expected he claims to have discovered that there were two further Soviet agents associated with Burgess, Maclean and Philby. They are code-named "Maurice" and "Basil". Inevitably they are described as the Fourth and Fifth Men. They are not identified in the book, but there has been widespread speculation in the Press about their identities and an article in Private Eye has drawn attention to the clues in the book which point to the identification of Sir Anthony Blunt with "Maurice". It concludes that it is clear, as far as Andrew Boyle and Fleet Street are concerned, the blunt truth is that "Maurice" = Sir Anthony Blunt.

2. This development clearly brings a long step nearer the situation when someone puts down a Question to the Prime Minister to which it may be difficult not to give a substantive Answer. As the Prime Minister knows, there has been much preparation for that situation and the material is all ready to hand.

3. There are, however, three points on which I have warned the Attorney General's Office that I think the Prime Minister will need advice, as she considers whether to make a statement:-

- (i) It seems unlikely that Blunt will take legal action against the author and publishers of the book. If he were doing so, it would presumably be wrong for the Prime Minister to make a substantive statement. Before deciding to make such a statement, should the Prime Minister take steps to find out whether Sir Anthony Blunt is in fact contemplating legal action? We know who Sir Anthony Blunt's legal adviser is and as he happens to be a friend of mine there would be no difficulty about getting in touch with him.
- (ii) Any questions about Blunt are likely to be accompanied or followed by questions about the identification of the Fifth Man suggested in Boyle's book. As the Prime Minister knows, we have no reason to think that that identification is right. Hitherto the proposal has been that, if she is



CONFIDENTIAL

asked about that suggestion, she should say that it is new to the Security authorities and there is no evidence in their possession to support it. We have reason to think that the man concerned is contemplating legal action. That being so, can the Prime Minister properly give such an answer?

- (iii) Given the likelihood of legal proceedings by the man alleged to be the Fifth Man, is there a danger that any substantive statement the Prime Minister might make about the Fourth Man could be held to prejudice those proceedings?

4. I am seeking early guidance on these questions. In the meantime the Prime Minister needs to be advised how she should deal with any supplementary Questions in the House of Commons this afternoon on these matters. It would clearly be wrong to make a substantive statement in response to a supplementary Question. Any such Questions could be turned by reference to the possibility of legal proceedings, on the lines of the draft forms of words attached. Any other form of temporising reply is almost bound either to invite someone to put down a Question or to commit the Prime Minister to a further statement. The reference to legal proceedings is colourable in the short term, because one of the Private Eye reports refers to the "cascade of writs" planned to descend on Andrew Boyle. But the Prime Minister should be aware that it is slightly disingenuous, because:

- (i) As far as we know, there have been no writs as yet, and none of these matters is technically sub judice;
- (ii) the Attorney General is likely to advise that, if Blunt was thought likely to contemplate legal proceedings against Boyle, Her Majesty's Government could not stand by and in effect be party to the possibility of injustice being done and would therefore have to take steps which would prevent Blunt taking proceedings.

So the "legal proceedings" line will not hold matters for very long. But it will probably just about do, for this afternoon.

RA

8th November, 1979

(Robert Armstrong)



Possible Supplementary Questions and Answers

Q. 1 Will the Prime Minister comment on a recent book which discloses the existence of a Fourth and Fifth Man who acted as Soviet agents during and after the war?

A. I understand that the author of the book to which the hon. Member refers claims to have discovered that there were two other men besides Burgess, Maclean and Philby, who were Russian agents during and after the war, but that neither is named in the book. I am also aware that there have been Press reports speculating on the identities of those concerned. I am not prepared to comment on these matters at this time. There is, of course the possibility that they may become the subject of legal proceedings.

Q. 2 Has the Government conducted any enquiries on its own account into the recently published reports that there were other people, beyond those already known, who were Soviet agents during and immediately after the war?

A. Yes. We have of course done so. I do not however propose to comment in any way at this time on these matters. There is, of course, the possibility that they may become the subject of legal proceedings.

Q. 3 Was Sir Anthony Blunt a Soviet agent?

A. I am aware of the publications and speculations which have no doubt given rise to this Question, but I am not prepared to comment on these matters at this time. There is, of course, the possibility that they may become the subject of legal proceedings.

London Diary

As Chairman Hua achieved lift-off amid tremendous salvos of acclaim and saliva, I was given the transcript of a recent trial in Peking. The defendant, Wei Jingsheng, drew a stiff sentence for conversing with foreigners during the Sino-Vietnamese war and thereby breaching China's version of the Official Secrets Act. He pointed out in his defence speech that mentioning the name of a Chinese general to a diplomat was hardly classified information, but Mr William Whitelaw and the Chinese judiciary are at one about what constitutes a secret. They also seem to agree about what Wei Jingsheng calls 'Democratic socialism'. Very dangerous stuff indeed, for the promulgation of which he and his paper were prosecuted. It really is intolerable that we on the Left, who have defended Rudolf Bahro and others almost alone, are accused by the Tories and the press of wanting 'an East European state', while the Thatchers and Carringtons cast their votes in favour of Pol Pot at the United Nations. Who dares to talk of double standards in this context? Not that the Conservatives are entirely inconsistent. Their policy of loving up to Chile, and of ending the aid programme for South American refugees, sits very well with their general line on the rights of man. Still, it must make some kind of foreign policy record to be grovelling to Pinochet and Pol Pot at the same time.

What's come over Roy Hattersley? His sense of proportion seems to have deserted him entirely. He oozes around the place calling for Labour's moderates to unite - you must have noticed him. But last week he made a terrible fuss about having to speak second to David Owen at the Cambridge Union. Alas for Ratters, somebody has to speak last, and the committee decided on Owen as having held the senior ministerial post. Hattersley, who had already agreed to be billed, complained a lot about this but did not actually withdraw until three hours before the debate was due to start. Two points here. One, it's really bad manners to treat student audiences in this way, when they have such a hard time getting front bench speakers. Royboy would not have relished the straw poll I took among Cambridge Fabians about his prospects, general bearing and so forth. Second, this sort of thing does great harm to the cause of Labour moderation. In desperation at the last minute, the Union asked me instead.

Talking of moderates (and who isn't these days?) I have a small suggestion for a realignment of the centre-Right. In Sir Cecil Parrott's fine biography of Jaroslav Hasek, creator of the Good Soldier Schweik, he tells some stories of Hasek's own political adventures. It seems that, in the Austro-Hungarian elections of 1911, Hasek and some cronies formed and registered the Party of Moderate Progress within the Bounds of Law. Its election platform was a flawless exercise in social democracy.

Article One. Moderate Progress within the Bounds of Law.

Article Two. Greater Strictness with the Poor.

Article Three. Nationalisation of House Porters and Sextons.

New Statesman 9 November 1979

Article Four. Down with Jay Creditors.

Article Five. Credit Banks to be placed in the hands of the clergy. This programme would need very little updating to get say, William Rodgers to meet the challenge of the Eighties. But if one is looking for a real Schweikian leader of all that is most base, chubby and opportunist in British affairs, I am afraid that the palm can only be awarded to one man. . . .

Scorning the charge of elitism, I have always regarded football as a reactionary sport, not to mention a boring one. The sight of Ian Smith in the Crystal Palace directors' box for the 'Big Match' last weekend did nothing to correct my deviation. Not only did the man earn himself a few flattering camera-angles during the game, but he was given the chance to deliver a short burst into the microphone afterwards. In the nature of these occasions it was possible for him to affect a certain 'good fellow' style as a result. So I found myself ringing Mr Raymond Bloye, chairman of Crystal Palace, on Monday. Whose idea had the invitation been? 'We get somebody every week . . . we're absolutely non-political . . . we just cater for football'. Yes, but who had invited him? 'He was at Tottenham last week . . . there's nothing unusual about this'. Mr Bloye, did he get invited or did he just come? 'I can't see what difference that makes.' I can. 'Well, as far as I know it was all arranged by the CID.' Oh I see.

Let us throw hypocrisy to the winds. In Andrew Boyle's *Climate of Treason*, which describes but does not name two senior 'moles', the real position is as follows. 'Maurice' is Sir Anthony Blunt, formerly Keeper of the Queen's Pictures and a distinguished art historian in his own right. 'Basil' is Dr Wilfred Mann, a modestly obscure physicist. Both men, as far as anybody can tell, are wholly innocent. The source for 'Maurice' is Goronwy Rees, who having written a book of his own on the affair is choosing an odd time to make this disclosure through a third party. The source for 'Basil' is James Angleton, the paranoid former head of the CIA who claims that he turned Wilfred Mann into a loyal double (or triple) agent for 'our side'. I can only add one small fragment to this mound of dead dogs and petty sneaking. Sir Anthony Blunt's entry in *Who's Who* comprises a fairly decent Foreign Office record, and a huge list of books published under his name. In amongst the volumes on Poussin and other painters is a work entitled *Picasso's Guernica*. If that doesn't prove it, I don't know what does.

It is not the policy of this column to print 'plugs' for anybody. But if you don't read *Fire Force Exposed* (Anti-Apartheid Movement £1.95) you will have a hard time understanding why the armed forces are such an issue in the Zimbabwe talks. And if you don't get *West Irian, East Timor and Indonesia* (Minority Rights Group 75p) you will go about thinking that Cambodia is the only current genocide in Asia. Reading what the 'moderates' can get up to when unobserved is an experience nobody should deny themselves. And had it occurred to you what sinister initials the Selous Scouts have?

Did the Americans know that the Shah had cancer all along? The answer, given the pre-

dominance of Americans in Middle East medicine, must be 'yes'. (The answer would of course mean that all that intelligence money was wasted.) So they let a dying iac shoot thousands of his own people streets. Fair enough. But did they, I would tell David Owen and the British Foreign Office? That tricky moment last spring, the Americans were edging away and the British were left holding the puking takes on a new reality in the light of the reaper. Who'd be a poodle?

I was in Ankara last week, surveying of the less-noticed tragedies of the European Left. There was the wreckage of Ecevit's government, after nearly four years of compromise and drift. There was the and gloating reactionary majority, unable to believe its luck. There was the population buffeted by inflation and shortage, and even to buy the traditional coffee because of the black market. There were the forces waiting in the wings, with all the gruesome panoply of violence and racial supremacy. There were the unions, still bruised from a mixture of 'restraint', 'loyalty' and shop steward revolt. There were the men from the East, applying the standard mixture of deflationary monetarism which is held to work for a country from Tanzania to Portugal. And there was Ecevit himself, faced with the resignation of his party executive, angrily denying the necessity for a special party congress to discuss the debacle, but forced into holding one against his will. Then I came home. I still think what it was reminding me of.

If asked for an opinion on liturgy and the glory of the language, among the last people who would consult would be Ted Short (moralistic), Michael Foot (verbal diarrhoea) and Lord Carrington (slippery usage) or William Whitelaw (flannelling fool). Yet all these things have been done by Glenda Jackson and Alan Bennett, have moved to defend the Book of Common Prayer and the Authorised Version of the Bible against the mealy-mouthed revisions imposed by the Canterbury. Many people feel instinctive support of this petition, because it purports to uphold the muscularity of English against the limp-wrists and lame-brains of the Continent. I'm sure they are wrong. Like those who mourn the Latin Mass, these people are admitting that religious belief is less convincing if not expressed in sonorous and admiring terms. Nothing can take Cranmer away from the formation of our usage. But 'the mediocrity of our native church' forfeited its right to it a very long time ago.

Christopher Hitchcock

This England

Prizes: £3 book token for first entry, £2 token for others printed. Paste entries on a postcard.

I should like to nominate Mr Ian Smith as the Man of the Year. Leaving aside the political involvement in Rhodesia, on which I am not content to comment, it is a pleasant change to find a man in political life today who will stand up for his beliefs. - Letter in *Daily Telegraph* (T. E. F.)

There are real live negro extras, economising on the universal black body market. - *Guardian* (A. J. Dunn)

FROM THE PRESS SECTION

Date..... 9. NOV. 1979..

PRIVATE EYE

AUBERON LAUGH'S DIARY

THE REFORM CLUB is full of excitement, with fat lawyers giggling nervously in every corner as they are consulted by elderly, highly scented M15 and M16 executives about the cascade of writs planned to descend on Andrew Boyle, following the publication of his book *The Climate of Treason*.

Boyle treats of the "fourth man" in the Burgess-Maclean-Philby affair, and although he does not name the fellow apart from the code name "Maurice", enterprising lawyers have suggested that the book could be misread to imply that "Maurice" was none other than Sir Anthony Blunt, the immensely distinguished 72-year-old art expert and authority on Poussin who is Surveyor of the Queen's Pictures.

The suggestion is of course laughable. Sir Anthony, apart from anything else, is an Old Marlburghian. This distinguished bachelor worked in M15 during the war, and is easily identifiable as the model for John Le Carré's George Smiley. Le Carré's "mole", cunningly disguised by Boyle as "Maurice", is unmistakably identified in Graham Greene's last novel *The Human Factor* as being Sir Maurice "Boris" Oldfield, the former M16 supremo recently appointed as Mrs Thatcher's Dzerzhinsky-Beria figure in Ulster.

Sir Fred Warner, newly elected Euro-MP for Somerset and former Ambassador to Japan, is 61.

FROM THE PRESS SECTION

- 9 NOV 1979
Date.....

PRIVATE EYE NO 467

Ever since the *Eye* two issues ago revealed the agitated interest of his lawyer Michael Rubinstein over the forthcoming publication of Andrew Boyle's book *The Climate of Treason*, squads of Fleet Street hacks have been pursuing an increasingly elusive Sir Anthony Blunt, adviser for the Queen's Pictures and Drawings. This hunt for Blunt intensified when, a week before publication day (5 November), the *Observer* ran a front-page story telling how Boyle's book revealed as part of the Burgess-Maclean-Philby story that there had been a Fourth and a Fifth Man who had provided information to Russia and who had been pardoned. Neither man is named in the book.

A team from the *News of the World* sought out Sir Anthony. So too did another from the *Daily Mail*. All without success. American newspapers too joined the hunt. For at least part of this time, ironically, Blunt was with his old friend Lord Hartwell, proprietor of the *Daily* and *Sunday Telegraph*, which had declined to serialise the book.

The reason for all this attention was the firm conviction on the part of the fearless news hounds that the Fourth Man, whom Boyle refers to by his code name of "Maurice" and whose tip-off enabled Burgess and Maclean to escape, was in fact this long-standing member of the Royal Household. One American correspondent even went so far as to say so in a story cabled from London, only to have his newspaper delete the name pending publication and/or confirmation in Britain. Such publication seems somewhat unlikely at present, given our draconian libel laws and the cloaking of the whole story by the Official Secrets Act.

But why should it be that so many eager spy hunters should have this idea about a prominent art historian honoured by his country? The answer can be found in the trail of clues left by Boyle's reference to "Maurice" in his book. Consider the following:

"Maurice" was an intimate associate of Guy Burgess at Cambridge.

So was Blunt.

"Maurice" was, according to Goronwy Rees, a man of "erudition", i.e. an Academic. Blunt was a Fellow of Trinity College Cambridge 1932-1936.

"Maurice" was a homosexual.

So is Blunt.

"Maurice" enlisted in the army in 1939.

So did Blunt.

"Maurice's" prosecution", says Boyle, "could have embroiled many eminent people, perhaps even the Royal Family itself." (*Eye italics.*)

Blunt is the only character in Boyle's story with Royal connections.

Appearing in BBC Radio's "The World At One" on 1 November, Boyle provided some further clues when pressed by Robin Day. He was asked whether "Maurice" was "a titled gentleman".

Answer - Yes.

He was asked whether he had been employed by the Royal Family.

Answer - Yes.

Finally, there is perhaps the biggest clue or red herring of all - the call from Michael Rubinstein to Boyle's publishers, indicating that Blunt understood he was about to be libelled.

Putting all these factors together, it is clear that, as far as Andrew Boyle and Fleet Street

are concerned, the Blunt truth is that "Maurice" = Sir Anthony Blunt.

And that would explain why, while lesser mortals received sentences of 10 to 20 years for handing over documents, and a key traitor such as George Blake was jailed for 42 years, "Maurice" was able to confess and walk away.

For at that time in the late 'fifties Blunt had recently been knighted (1956) and was employed as Surveyor of the Queen's Pictures. The scandal would have been even greater than that which had been caused by Burgess and Maclean's flight to Russia or was later caused by Philby's escape there. Furthermore, the news would not have been taken lightly at Buckingham Palace. For as the Queen Mother once declared, a remark relayed back to Blunt, when talking about Burgess and Maclean: "The one person I cannot stand is a traitor."

2 More Britons Spied With Philby, New Book Says

By James le Moyne

Special to The Washington Post

LONDON, Oct. 27—A new book about to be published here reopens the spy scandal involving Soviet agents inside the British government — Kim Philby, Guy Burgess and Donald MacLean — with new allegations that two other Britons spied for Russians in the case.

"The Climate of Treason," by the respected British biographer Andrew Boyle, says one of the hitherto unpublicized Soviet spies helped British diplomats Burgess and MacLean escape to Russia in 1951.

Boyle says the other Soviet agent was discovered and "turned" by the CIA, which used him to help uncover the other spies in the Philby case and to feed misinformation to the Soviets.

Burgess and MacLean both had worked in the British Embassy in Washington. Philby was head of British counterintelligence against the Soviet Union and also the British liaison with the CIA and FBI in Washington from 1949 to 1951.

After his defection in 1963, Philby was found to have been a Soviet agent for over 20 years. John le Carré's novel "Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy" is based in part on Philby's career.

Boyle, whose book is being serialized in the Sunday Observer newspaper, says he relied heavily on interviews with former CIA and British agents involved in the case. He also says he used FBI and CIA files gained under the U.S. Freedom of Information Act.

The book says one of the Soviet spies was a British physicist working on joint nuclear research in Washington in 1947. This spy, code-named "Basil," allegedly was discovered by the CIA acting on a tip from Israeli intelligence. After using "Basil" as a double agent against the Soviets, Boyle says, the CIA gave him American citizenship and he now lives in the United States.

Because of stringent British libel laws, Boyle does not name the two alleged agents except by their code names.

The other Soviet spy, Boyle says, was a British intelligence officer in London, code-named "Maurice," who warned Burgess and MacLean they were about to be arrested. The question of how they evaded arrest has long troubled students of the case.

Boyle's book says "Maurice" confessed two years after the defections. In return, and to avoid further public scandal, Boyle says, British authorities granted a pardon and "Maurice" holds a prominent place in British public life.

Although Boyle does not identify "Maurice," he describes him as a left-wing Cambridge University teacher in the 1930s who was a close friend of Burgess.

The only person mentioned in Boyle's book who could fit such a description is Sir Anthony Blunt, a former surveyor of the queen's paintings and former director of London's Courtauld Institute of Fine Art. Boyle describes Blunt as a close friend of Burgess and a former intelligence officer.

The British satire magazine *Private Eye* said in a recent issue that a libel lawyer representing Blunt called the publishers of Boyle's book, Hutchinsons, asking to see the book before it was published.

Because British libel laws prevent the naming of a person without corroborating evidence in a way that may harm his reputation, it will be hard for any British paper to name "Maurice."