



cc: C.O

Pps in Garden Room

10 DOWNING STREET

THE PRIME MINISTER

1 July 1980

From Mr. Leadbetter

Thank you for your letter of 6 June.

As I told the House of Commons on 21 November, I do not propose to confirm or deny or comment on further allegations and insinuations of the kind you mention in your letter. The offences alleged would, if the allegations were substantiated, be serious criminal offences. If those making the allegations have evidence to back them up, and they will produce that evidence to the proper authorities, it can be investigated and decisions can be taken on whether to prosecute by those whose business it is to take such decisions. If they do not have such evidence, then they are in my view acting irresponsibly and reprehensibly in publishing their allegations and insinuations and I should be acting no less irresponsibly if I gave them further currency in statements in the House or letters to Members of Parliament.

Mr. Blunt's case was entirely special. He had on his own admission committed serious offences; but I was in a position to say so in a statement to the House only because there was no possibility of prosecuting him, on account of the offer of immunity from prosecution on which his admission - the only available evidence - was based.

/ I

I would add only one other point. In the course of the prolonged and thorough investigations that followed the defection of Burgess, Maclean and Philby and the admission of Blunt, a great many people were interviewed sometimes to obtain any relevant information they could provide, sometimes to see if they could be eliminated from further enquiries. The fact that somebody was interviewed cannot and should not be assumed to mean that he was himself under suspicion, and it would be quite unfair to suggest that it did mean that.

As to the case of Miss Lamble, that involved quite different considerations from the case of Mr. Blunt. I explained in my speech to the House on 21 November the circumstances which in 1964 caused the Attorney General to authorise an offer of immunity from prosecution which led in due course to Mr. Blunt's confession. In the case of Miss Lamble, as the Attorney General explained to you in his letter of 18 January, the police investigation established a prima facie case against her which was thought to justify charges under the Official Secrets Act, and she was thus arrested and charged. Her subsequent statements indicated that she might not have intended to act in a manner prejudicial to the safety of the State. The Attorney General took that into account in deciding not to consent to a prosecution.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Thatcher

Ted Leadbitter, Esq., M.P.



10 DOWNING STREET

cc C.O.
Pr in G/L

THE PRIME MINISTER

1 July, 1980

Dear Mr. Hamilton,

Thank you for your letter of 10 June.

As I told the House of Commons on 21 November, I do not propose to confirm or deny or comment on further allegations and insinuations of the kind you mention in your letter. The offences alleged would, if the allegations were substantiated, be serious criminal offences. If those making the allegations have evidence to back them up, and they will produce that evidence to the proper authorities, it can be investigated and decisions can be taken on whether to prosecute by those whose business it is to take such decisions. If they do not have such evidence, then they are in my view acting irresponsibly and reprehensibly in publishing their allegations and insinuations, and I should be acting no less irresponsibly if I gave them further currency in statements in the House or letters to Members of Parliament.

Mr. Blunt's case was entirely special. He had on his own admission committed serious offences; but I was in a position to say so in a statement to the House only because there was no possibility of prosecuting him, on account of the offer of immunity from prosecution on which his admission - the only available evidence - was based.

I would add only one other point. In the course of the prolonged and thorough investigations that followed the defection of Burgess, Maclean and Philby and the admission of Blunt, a great many people were interviewed sometimes to obtain any relevant information they could provide, sometimes to see if they could be eliminated from further enquiries. The fact that somebody was interviewed cannot and should not be assumed to mean that he was himself under suspicion, and it would be quite unfair to suggest that it did mean that.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Thatcher

W.W. Hamilton, Esq., M.P.



10 DOWNING STREET

cc: C

ps in GAR

THE PRIME MINISTER

1 July, 1980

Dear Mr. George,

Thank you for your letter of 10 June.

As I told the House of Commons on 21 November, I do not propose to confirm or deny or comment on further allegations and insinuations of the kind you mention in your letter. The offences alleged would, if the allegations were substantiated, be serious criminal offences. If those making the allegations have evidence to back them up, and they will produce that evidence to the proper authorities, it can be investigated and decisions can be taken on whether to prosecute by those whose business it is to take such decisions. If they do not have such evidence, then they are in my view acting irresponsibly and reprehensibly in publishing their allegations and insinuations and I should be acting no less irresponsibly if I gave them further currency in statements in the House or letters to Members of Parliament.

Mr. Blunt's case was entirely special. He had on his own admission committed serious offences; but I was in a position to say so in a statement to the House only because there was no possibility of prosecuting him, on account of the offer of immunity from prosecution on which his admission - the only available evidence - was based.

I would add only one other point. In the course of the prolonged and thorough investigation that followed the defection of Burgess, Maclean and Philby and the admission of Blunt, a great many people were interviewed sometimes to obtain any relevant information they could provide, sometimes to see if they could be eliminated from further enquiries. The fact that somebody was interviewed cannot and should not be assumed to mean that he was himself under suspicion, and it would be quite unfair to suggest that it did mean that.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Thatcher

Bruce George, Esq., M.P.

Security



10 DOWNING STREET

CLIVE *MS*

The letters are being typed for the

PM

MS

30/6

A02446

MR SANDERS

With your letters of 10 and 11 June, you enclosed letters to the Prime Minister from Mr Ted Leadbitter MP, Mr Willie Hamilton MP and Mr Bruce George MP. All three letters asked the Prime Minister if she would comment or make a statement on allegations that the Government knows of other spies who were involved with Burgess, Maclean, Philby and Blunt, some of whom were allowed to continue working in Whitehall after their discovery and who went on to occupy positions of influence and importance. You asked for draft replies to all three.

2. These three letters are a result of the publication of the paperback edition of Andrew Boyle's book, The Climate of Treason, and of press accounts of statements allegedly made by Boyle after the book's appearance. The paperback edition of the book added very little to the original hardback version, beyond the definite identification of "Maurice" with Anthony Blunt. In his statements to the press, Boyle seems to have talked about "another 25 moles", and to have alleged that at least three titled men, one of whom is ^ahereditary peer and all of whom have since achieved prominent positions in public life, were investigated as possible spies following the defection of Burgess and Maclean in 1951, but that no action was taken against them because of a lack of evidence.

3. One can only speculate about the people to whom Boyle (and the three MPs who have written to the Prime Minister) is referring. The hereditary peer is widely believed - not least by himself - to be Lord Rothschild; another possible candidate is Lord Talbot de Malahide. The other people referred to could be Lord Llewelyn-Davies, Sir Michael Stewart, Sir Frederick Warner MEP, or Sir Dennis Proctor. All of them had links either through friendship or work with Burgess, Maclean or Blunt. All of them have been thoroughly investigated. Some, like Lord Rothschild have been investigated more than once and entirely cleared. Others may have been unconscious sources for Burgess, but no evidence has been found to show that they were agents of the Russian Intelligence Service.

4. Sir Robert Armstrong is sure that the Prime Minister should not be drawn into commenting on these allegations. They are quite unspecific and unsupported by any evidence. He recommends that the Prime Minister should reply to Mr Leadbitter along the lines of the attached draft, which includes a paragraph on the comparison Mr Leadbitter has drawn between the Blunt and Lamble cases and which follows closely the form of a reply which the Attorney General sent to Mr Leadbitter about Miss Lamble's case earlier this year. The Prime Minister might use the first few paragraphs of the same draft to reply to Mr Hamilton and Mr George; for them the final paragraph on Miss Lamble should be omitted.

5. The draft reply has been cleared with the Home Office, the Attorney General's Office and the Security Service.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D J Wright', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

D J WRIGHT

Cabinet Office

27 June 1980

DRAFT LETTER FROM THE PRIME MINISTER

Thank you for your letter of 6 June.

2. As I told the House of Commons on 21 November, I do not propose to confirm or deny or comment on further allegations and insinuations of the kind you mention in your letter. The offences alleged would, if the allegations were substantiated, be serious criminal offences. If those making the allegations have evidence to back them up, and they will produce that evidence to the proper authorities, it can be investigated and decisions can be taken on whether to prosecute by those whose business it is to take such decisions. If they do not have such evidence, then they are in my view acting irresponsibly and reprehensibly in publishing their allegations and insinuations and I should be acting no less irresponsibly if I gave them further currency in statements in the House or letters to Members of Parliament.

3. Mr Blunt's case was entirely special. He had on his own admission committed serious offences; but I was in a position to say so in a statement to the House only because there was no possibility of prosecuting him, on account of the offer of immunity from prosecution on which his admission - the only available evidence - was based.

4. I would add only one other point. In the course of the prolonged and thorough investigations that followed the defection of Burgess, Maclean and Philby and the admission of Blunt, a great many people were interviewed sometimes to obtain any relevant information they could provide, sometimes to see if they could be eliminated from further enquiries. The fact that somebody was interviewed cannot and should not be assumed to mean that he was himself under suspicion, and it would be quite unfair to suggest that it did mean that.

5. As to the case of Miss Lamble, that involved quite different considerations from the case of Mr Blunt. I explained in my speech to the House on 21 November the circumstances which in 1964 caused the Attorney General to authorise an offer of immunity from prosecution which led in due course to Mr Blunt's confession. In the case of Miss Lamble, as the Attorney General explained to you in his letter of 18 January, the police investigation established a prima facie case against her which was thought to justify charges under the Official Secrets Act, and she was thus arrested and charged. Her subsequent statements indicated that she might not have intended to act in a manner prejudicial to the safety of the State. The Attorney General took that into account in deciding not to consent to a prosecution.

Another voice

Lord Rothschild is innocent

Auberon Waugh

About ten years ago a man called James Cameron – no relation to the doyen of left-wing newspaper correspondents who sometimes rejoices in the witty if obscure nickname of Lunchtime O'Boccaccio's Decameron – was murdered in nasty circumstances in Islington. I had never met or even heard of this second James Cameron until that moment. His death was just another of those sad events recorded daily in the newspapers.

A few days later I was dining with some people in Wiltshire when one of the company said he had known this Cameron, who was employed by a well-known firm of pill manufacturers and made frequent trips behind the Iron Curtain. In fact these trips were of a frequency which made my informant doubt whether they could be entirely explained by his pill-pushing activities. Perhaps, like Harold Wilson's sorties behind the Iron Curtain on behalf of the timber firm of Montagu Meyer before his election as party leader, they were also of use in providing Mr Cameron with background information about conditions and attitudes in Eastern Europe, contacts with important people in the pill world and a rounding of his knowledge and experience in accordance with the general concept of Renaissance Man. But my informant was of the opinion that he probably worked for the FCO's Secret Intelligence Service.

If so, his murder became more interesting. Like so many others who worked in that dangerous trade, Cameron was an active homosexualist. Might he, perhaps, have been compromised in some way by the Moscow authorities and subjected to blackmail? Was he rather the victim of some lover's tiff within the hot-house atmosphere of MI6, or had he been murdered as a security risk by someone from the equally susceptible but opposed ranks of MI5? The possibilities seemed endless, but it was not a line of inquiry one could usefully pursue within the hysterically secretive corridors of our intelligence and security establishments so I contented myself with writing a concerned but not entirely serious paragraph in *Private Eye* urging our intelligence and security Services to concentrate on their jobs and stop wasting tax payers' money murdering each other in this way.

A few days later the telephone rang in the country and I found myself summoned to the Murder Inquiry Headquarters at Essex Road Police Station. A friendly exasperated Detective Chief Superintendent asked me if I had anything to add to my information: he had spent many hours of his time checking my allegations, he said. I had the uneasy impression that his inquiries may have taken him as far as the Head of the

Secret Intelligence Service whom I had rashly named as the Guilty Man in my article. No, I said I had nothing to add. I did not really know why I had written that paragraph: it seemed a good idea at the time.

I tell this anecdote at such enormous length because it seems to provide an important insight into Andrew Boyle's cryptic revelations of last week that among those questioned by MI5 after the defection of Burgess and Maclean was a hereditary peer who worked in Intelligence during the war and who later rose to great eminence. I am not in Mr Boyle's confidence, but nobody who has followed the Blunt case at all closely can be in any doubt that this refers to Lord Rothschild, the immensely distinguished spermatologist who sits as a Labour peer in the House of Lords – nothing wrong with that! – and who was appointed by Mr Heath as the first Director General of the Central Policy Review Staff when the august body was formed in the Cabinet Office in 1971. It would be most surprising if Lord Rothschild had not been asked by MI5 to help in their investigations into the disappearance of Burgess, since he was not only a colleague of Burgess's at Trinity College Cambridge, like everyone else, but also something of a personal friend, in whose London house Burgess lived at one time. It would be equally true to say that I was questioned by police investigating the murder of James Cameron, and there would be nothing untrue in the statement that police investigating the murder of James Cameron had found no evidence against me. Both these statements may fail to convey the full extent of my uninvolvedness, but where murder is concerned, in my experience, people generally give one the benefit of the doubt. It is only in the hysterical world of espionage that people are prepared to lose all sight of common sense.

Any suggestion which might be implied that Lord Rothschild could even have been under suspicion by MI5 as a Soviet agent or witting concealer of Soviet agents is so preposterous as to belong to the world of pulp fiction. Quite apart from anything else, Mr Heath would scarcely have been able to appoint him to a position in the Cabinet Office where he had instant access to any government information he required. It is true that Mr Heath was not always as careful in security matters as he might have been, as the sudden resignation of two Ministers in 1973 brought home. After the first 1974 election he offered Jeremy Thorpe a senior position in the Cabinet while in a position to suspect that Thorpe was being actively blackmailed by a former homosexual acquaintance. Although we may never know whether Thorpe was

offered the Home Office, as I heard at the time, or the Foreign Office, as the *Sunday Times* later claimed, both are highly sensitive posts, and it seems curious that Mr Heath was so concerned with his own continuation in office that he should have been prepared to take such an obvious risk. But no such consideration swayed his appointment of Lord Rothschild to the Cabinet Office, and as a civil servant, Rothschild would have been subject to a very thorough security vetting.

It is only within the conventions imposed by our murderous libel laws, where nothing may be discussed except obliquely, with a nudge and wink, that such absurd inferences are likely to be drawn. We should also, in my view, be on our guard against attempts to smear the hereditary peerage. Only this week, in the *Sunday Times*, there was an extraordinary reference to some human excrement found in a grave in the Valley of the Kings which dated from the 1920s, with the unmistakable suggestion that it had been left there by my august great-uncle, Lord Carnarvon. There was not so much as a title of evidence in support of this innuendo. Those who knew him and his extraordinarily scrupulous habits will affirm that the idea is preposterous, but there the smear remains in the *Sunday Times* Colour Magazine for any of its gutterish, proletarian readers to pick up if they choose.

My purpose in raising this matter was not simply to reaffirm what anybody who has given the matter any thought will have decided long ago, that Lord Rothschild is innocent. So is Lord Carnarvon, of defiling the Royal Tombs of Egypt. So am I, of murdering James Cameron, although it is true I am not a peer of the realm, so my innocence is of less importance. My real purpose is to appeal for a general amnesty on all Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Men who may still be lurking as venerable septuagenarians around the portals of the Athenaeum.

At one time socialism might have been a good idea. Its inspiration, in those days, was generous and humane. Nowadays, it can appeal only to those whose social maladjustment might otherwise push them into the criminal classes, or whose intellectual inadequacies make them hungry for a dogmatic system in which they can hide their inability to think for themselves. Socialism, as anyone can see, has turned out to be a thoroughly bad idea. Is it not time to allow those who made a mistake in their early years, when conditions were so different, to admit it quietly to themselves and quietly retire? Then we can concentrate on the sad rearguard of this intellectual movement, the intellectual runts of our universities and technical colleges, the rooting hogs of the trade union movement and the psychopathic opportunists of the Labour Party who still hope to impose – whether by trickery or brute force – a system they cannot hope to recommend by ordinary persuasion. There are Soviet agents still active in our cosy little world of make-believe.

BACKGROUND NOTE

Andrew Boyle has now published a paperback edition of his book The Climate of Treason, the publication of the hardback edition of which led to the disclosure that Anthony Blunt had been a Soviet agent.

2. The text of the original edition has been altered very little except in so far as Boyle is now able to proclaim openly Blunt's identity. There are additional passages in the new edition giving biographical information about Blunt, and the last part of the book is expanded by the inclusion of a new chapter entitled "Close of Play" which incorporates most of the original Epilogue, and a new Epilogue which relates events since the publication of the original edition.

3. There is very little new information of substance or significance, but Boyle does state in his new chapter (pages 475 and 476) that Blunt's confession in 1964 came after he had been told of new evidence of American origin. [According to The Times of 6 June Boyle identified the source of this new information as being a KGB defector, which we know to be incorrect].

4. The evening papers of 5 June and the daily papers of 6 June contained varying accounts of statements allegedly made by Boyle, but not reflected in the text of his book, at the launching of the paperback edition. According to these newspaper reports Boyle alleged that at least three titled men, one of whom is an hereditary peer and all of whom have since achieved positions of prominence in public life, were discovered to be spies following the defection of Burgess and Maclean in 1951, but no action was taken against them because of lack of evidence. There is disagreement in the Press as to whether the two apart from the hereditary peer were a life peer and a knight or two knights, but all three are alleged to have been interrogated and The Times reports Boyle as having said that one of the three was a peer who served in "the intelligence services" during the Second World War. Several papers (The Daily Star and the Daily Express) report Boyle as saying that one of the three was a homosexual.

5. One can only speculate about the names of the people to whom Boyle is referring. The hereditary peer might be either Lord Rothschild or Lord Talbot de Malahide. Lord Rothschild was in MI5 from 1940 until 1964, was a member of the Apostles at Cambridge before the War, and was responsible for introducing Blunt to MI5. He has been very thoroughly investigated, in particular when he became Head of the CPRS in 1971, and has been cleared.

6. Lord Talbot de Malahide was a contemporary and friend of Burgess at Cambridge, and a homosexual associate. He was Head of the Security Department at the Foreign Office at the time when Burgess and Maclean defected, only having joined that day. He resigned from the Foreign Office in 1958 for personal reasons and died in 1973. He may well have been an unconscious source for Burgess, but there is no evidence to believe that he was actively and deliberately an agent of the Russian Intelligence Service.

7. The other people referred to might be any one of:

- (a) Lord Llewelyn-Davies, a fellow member of the Apostles at Cambridge with Blunt and Burgess before the War, who shared the Rothschild flat with them during the War: a Communist at the university, whose views probably remain unchanged; but no evidence that he has ever been an agent of the RIS.
- (b) Sir Frederick Warner, MEP, worked with Burgess in Hector McNeil's private office after the War: a close friend and possibly a homosexual associate of Burgess; probably an unconscious source, but he has been intensively investigated, and there is no evidence to connect him with the RIS.
- (c) Sir Dennis Proctor, a lifelong and self-confessed Marxist, who was a friend of Burgess and Blunt before the War and is still a very close friend of Blunt: joined the Civil Service in 1929, and worked in the Treasury and Ministry of Transport, finishing his career in 1965 as Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Power. Has admitted to being very indiscreet in what he said to Burgess, but no reason to suppose that he was actively and deliberately an RIS agent.

8. I attach a line to take, if this matter is raised in Questions. I do not think that the Prime Minister ought to be drawn beyond this, in the face of these very unspecific allegations.

COVERING TOP SECRET

Security

C/W

10.6.80.

DRAFT ANSWER

I am aware of the allegations to which the hon. Gentleman refers. As I made clear to the House in answer to a Question by the Hon. Gentleman the Member for Oldham, West on 29 November last, I do not propose to comment further on suggestions of this kind.

MR WHITMORE

WJ

1986



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON S.W.1.A. 0.A.A.

*Correspondence
in ER*

The Prime Minister,
10, Downing Street,
London S.W.1.

6th. Jun'80.

Dear Mrs. Thatcher,

On the 15th. Nov'79 I tabled a question in the House referring to Anthony Blunt asking if you would make a statement. You provided an answer far more forthcoming than any previous Prime Minister. I make this comparison because history has shown that with one exception other Prime Ministers were informed but took no steps either to inform the House or have Blunt removed from the Palace.

I had every reason to suppose I and the House received a full statement. Indeed the positive steps you took, followed by a Parliamentary debate, and the withdrawal of the Protection of Information Bill, led me to consider that all that need to be said had been said.

However, this does not appear to be the case. While it may be considered that there is no Prime Ministerial responsibility for what is published in the press recent revelations open up, nevertheless, the vexing question of 'people in high places' deliberately covering up matters involving national security. I recall Blunt himself in a television interview brazenly stating without any sense of remorse that he felt a loyalty to his friends rather than his country. This was his excuse for silence as the fourth man in the Mclean, Philby and Burgess scandal.

That people do exist who consider themselves above the law and even not accountable to Governments can no more be in doubt. We now learn if reports are correct, and so far the sources of these reports have been profoundly correct, there were three more spies working for Russia - a Peer and two knights - who subsequently went on to distinguished Whitehall careers. It is also alleged that there were 25 'moles'. Some were turfed out of office. Some were not.

So we have it that there are people who hitherto have had knowledges of this serious breach in our national security, but apparently have also had the power to get rid of some, yet promote the interests of others. Were previous Prime Ministers informed of this? Have you been informed?

I do not believe the country will accept a plea that has been made in the House that, in the case of the Blunt debate, the passing of time, the age of people, can be a reason for not pursuing this matter officially.

Blunt himself, according to reports, is stated as saying so far as his activities were concerned ' he has no blood on his hands'. But an account has been given that a lot of Poles and others died as a result of information he gave to his masters in Russia.

This raises another important question. When Blunt was exposed he was allowed to make public comment, and comment of the kind calculated to mitigate the enormity of his betrayal, appear to have not involved the loss of life, and to suggest reasons for treachery. Miss Lambie was arrested, charged and put in Holloway prison for some weeks before Xmas of last year. At that time there were suggestions more names of Moles might be revealed. Was her release in connection with that? Was the instruction that she had to make no public comment the condition of her sudden release? In any case why was she treated so differently from Blunt? The one has been favoured, but the less influential lady was not. I would appreciate your comments on these serious matters.

Ted Leadbitter