

The Searchlight organisation runs six main operations:

- Searchlight Magazine
- Searchlight Information Services (SIS)
- Searchlight Educational Trust (SET)
- Operation Wedge
- Stop The BNP
- Hope Not Hate



Searchlight Director Gerry Gable

The Director of Searchlight, Gerry Gable, is the vice chair of the Independent Advisory Group to the Diversity Directorate of the **Metropolitan Police Service** at Scotland Yard. The Searchlight organisation also claims to be 'sponsored' by **The Crown Prosecution Service** and **The Prison Service**. Searchlight also provides formal training programmes for officers of the **Criminal Justice System**.

Searchlight: The Business Of Hate

[1] Introduction

Even a cursory look at the current social, economic and political scene will show that vast numbers of people, and staggering quantities of money, are now being consumed by the race relations industry. To put it bluntly, an institutionalised culture of discrimination and hate, directed against (and to the disadvantage) of the native British population, has become big business. There is both money and 'a living' to be made in promoting the notion of native Britons being an obstacle to 'progress' – or, better still, of being portrayed as racists and fascists, when objecting to the loss of their homeland and the denial of their native entitlements.

So, within this context, what does an examination of the financing – and the individuals and groups behind that financing – tell us about this 'industry' – and of the Searchlight organisation in particular? How does Searchlight fit within this State sponsored enterprise? The question is: is Searchlight conducting its 'business' to address the genuine problems within society, or is it simply a cynical self-serving collaboration with a rich and powerful elite – and with a treasonous State?

[2] The Charities Connection

The charities of today are very different from those of 50 years ago. There is now a vast charity 'industry' – with full-time salaried staff, 'public relations' executives, marketing experts, slick advertising campaigns and huge annual turnovers.

One of the major charities is **The Philip Green Memorial Trust** (PGMT, Reg. Charity 293156). The 'charitable purpose' of PGMT is listed as follows:

The objectives of the Charity are raising money to help young people, the elderly, the disabled, and the needy in the community at large¹.

and the:

Generation Of Donations For The Purpose Of Charitable Causes In Respect Of Sick And Disabled Children².

This is a clear and unambiguous statement in terms of identifying a charitable 'need', and describing (in general) the way in which PGMT will operate to meet that need. On the face of it, these seem to be admirable aims for a charity.

In terms of its 'public face' the charitable purpose that PMGT wish to be identified with is clear and totally unambiguous. On the home (index) page of their website³ they have stated:

The Philip Green Memorial Trust is a charitable organisation which helps sick and disabled children all over the UK and overseas. It supports welfare, medical and educational projects as well as helping individual children to lead a normal life. ... The Philip Green Memorial Trust needs your support to help improve the lives of sick and disabled children. Please give whatever you can so that we can continue our work.

And on the 'donations' page⁴ they go on to say:

The Philip Green Memorial Trust relies on the generosity of its supporters to help sick and disabled children all over Britain. As a registered charity, we are dependent on voluntary income. Please help us to continue our work by donating whatever you can afford.

Clearly the intention is to promote a public perception of the charitable purpose of PGMT is to help "sick and disabled children".

However there are, we believe, some grounds for serious public concern.

It is also noted that property tycoon **Gerald Ronson** is listed as one of the patrons of PGMT. Born in 1939, Gerald Ronson is a contemporary of **Gerry Gable** (the Director of the Searchlight organisation). And, like many of his contemporaries, was also heavily involved in the inter-ethnic political activism of fifty years ago – activism that led to the formation of The 62 Group, with Ronson describing his actions at that time as that of a "street fighter"⁵. In March of last year it was revealed that Ronson made a secret donation to **Ken Livingstone**, shortly before Livingstone won the June 2004 London Mayoral election⁶. Ken Livingstone is chairman of the hate group UAF. The UAF was formed in 2004. Although the UAF was initially an affiliate to the Searchlight organisation, Searchlight split from UAF early in 2005 – in an acrimonious dispute which saw members of rivals factions hurling accusations of 'racism' against members of the opposing group.

The PGMT accounts show that, incongruously listed among the donations to obviously worthy causes, are regular donations to a number of organisations for which it is difficult to see how their activities are consistent with the charitable purpose for

which PGMt publicly campaigns. There are therefore grounds for concern that money is being 'siphoned off' for other purposes - and, in one case at least, for activities may actually be in breach of charity law. Two of these charity organisations therefore merit particular attention: the **Community Security Trust (CST)**; and the **Searchlight Educational Trust (SET)**. An overview of each of these charities (beneficiaries of PGMt) is given below. This overview includes concerns with regard to the particular activities of each of these charities (including their activities in the context of Charity Law and the requirements of the Charity Commission), and with the relationship with PGMt.

In each case the question that must be put is: in what way is this helping "sick and disabled children"?

The British public have a long tradition of altruism and volunteerism – especially when it concerns charitable work and looking after the wellbeing of children. They do not take kindly to that concern being cynically exploited, or of the trust between the public and charitable organisations being abused. We hope that this is not one of those cases.

Community Security Trust (CST) is a registered charity N° 1042391. The 'charitable purpose' of CST is not given on the 'overview' page of the Charity Commission website – however it is specified within the CST accounts⁷ as follows:

(1) To promote good race relations between the Jewish Community and other members of society by working towards the elimination of racism in the form of anti-Semitism. (2) To promote the efficiency of the police within the community at large and the promotion of good citizenship and greater public participation in the prevention of crime with particular reference to the maintenance of public order and racially motivated, especially, anti-Semitic crime. (3) To relieve the victims of racial or religious harassment, and especially anti-Semitic harassment, who are in need or who have suffered hardship or distress. (4) To promote research into racism and anti-Semitism, and to publish the useful results of such research and otherwise to promote public education about racism and anti-Semitism. (5) To promote and support such other charitable purposes or institutions as the Trustee may from time to time think fit.

The property tycoon **Gerald Ronson** (see previous comments) has been listed as a trustee of CST⁸. He describes his involvement with the CST organisation as both seminal and significant. Gerald Ronson is identified as the founder and national chairman of the CST.

The CST is, in effect, a self-appointed ethnic 'self defence' organisation. In a recent newspaper interview⁹ we find the reporter, following an interview with Mark Gardner, CST Director of Communications, describing the CST role and operational methods in the following terms: "The CST is a task force committed to protecting the Jewish community in Britain; it's a charity, manned by volunteers trained in street-fighting and surveillance, and according to the Met and the Home Office, it's a role-model, in these uneasy times, for all Britain's communities", and she goes on to say: "They [the CST] keep their eyes peeled for shady characters, and terrorists. Instead of sitting round complaining that there's never a policeman or woman when you need one, they're trained by them and, in exchange, share information". This working relationship between the CST and the law enforcement agencies (training, information sharing) is, if true, quite extraordinary.



Again, the question needs to be asked: in what way does the work of the CST organisation help "sick and disabled children"?

Searchlight Educational Trust (SET) is a registered charity N° 1013880. Its purpose is defined as:

The advancement of education of the public and in particular but not so as to limit the generality of the foregoing: (A) Provision of education and training of members of the public and in particular children and young people, in relation to racial and religious prejudice; (B) research into the causes and effects of racial and religious prejudice and disharmony and the dissemination of the useful results of such research.

The general benefit of the public in such a manner as may be charitable including but not so as to limit the generality of the foregoing the promotion of good relations between people of different races and religions.

There have been numerous complaints regarding the political activities of SET. The Charity Commission seems extraordinarily reluctant to inquire into the activities of Searchlight – they simply accept Searchlight's explanation that there are only "links between the charity [SET] and these other organisation [Searchlight Information Services (SIS) and Searchlight Magazine (SM)]". The concession by SET to get a separate office telephone number from SIS, and SM (the number has been changed from 020 7681 8660 to 020 7681 8846 – although SET is still using the former number) appears, quite astonishingly, to be good enough for the Charity Commission. This is a totally puzzling response from a regulatory authority that has a prime legal duty is to thoroughly investigate all complaints. Notably Searchlight Educational Trust has not agreed to change its PO Box – it is still using PO Box 1576 Ilford, Essex IG5 0NG – the same address as SIS and SM.

The original registrant's name for the Searchlight Educational Trust web site (searchlighteducationaltrust.org) is a Mr **Gerry Gable**, and the registrant's organisation is listed as Searchlight Magazine, PO Box 1576 Ilford. The administrator's name for the Searchlight Educational Trust web site is a Mr **Gerry Gable**, and the administrator's organisation is listed as **Searchlight Magazine**, PO Box 1576 Ilford. [sponsoring registrar Easyspace Limited (R36-LROR), and the Registrant/Administrator ID 4703503037593239].

On documents supplied to the Charity Commission (for charity No 1013880) the 'Charity Correspondent' for Searchlight Educational Trust is listed as a 'Ms **Sonia Gable**'. Presumably this is Sonia Gable, wife of Mr Gerry Gable – who between them effectively run Searchlight.

It seems obvious that fund providers to Searchlight Educational Trust (SET) have the clear understanding that Searchlight Educational Trust is a part of the Searchlight organisation - and that money going to SET will/may be used for political purpose (interference in the electoral process, political propaganda, etc.). For example, in the report by Barrow Cadbury Trust for 2003 this charity states:

By contrast Searchlight focuses on tackling far right activity ... Their infiltration of the BNP helped counter the image of respectability that the BNP have tried to establish.

Some may think that a clear admission of the use of lying, deceit, deception, and *agent provocateur* efforts to destabilise a legitimate political party, to be a rather odd 'charitable purpose'. Clearly (from the above statement) the objective of this 'infiltration' was to make the British National Party look 'un-respectable'. This appears to be a clear breach of Charity Commission rules - a charity cannot give support to such activities. BCTrust donated £28750 to Searchlight Educational Trust in 2003. It is difficult not to conclude that BCTrust may, itself, be complicit in a serious breach of Charity Commission rules.

The following statements are given by Searchlight Education Trust in their audited statement of accounts submitted to The Charity Commission (for year ending 31st December 2003, submitted on the 11th November 2004).

During this year SET [Searchlight Education Trust] has researched how fascists have used different methods in different areas to secure electoral success and into the effectiveness of various methods of combating racism and fascism in these areas. SET has particularly focused on the issue of asylum and the way in which the fascists exploit it to win support. In addition SET obtained a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust to commission a quantitative and qualitative study into voters' views, experiences and perceptions of fascist and other parties during the three by-election campaigns. The study was completed during 2004 with further grant payments from the same source. Its findings are being used to inform community groups about the nature of fascist electoral support.

Two grants were received from the Joseph Rowntree Trust Ltd. One was for the purpose of commissioning a quantitative and qualitative study into voters' views, experiences and perceptions of fascist and other parties during three by-election campaigns [of £9,500]. The other was to establish a working group on asylum in order to combat the myths that racist organisations are promoting and trying to exploit [of £3,500].

Again, we feel compelled to ask: in what way is this compatible with SET drawing on PGMT funds – funds donated by members of the public for the purpose of helping “sick and disabled children”?

The Searchlight Educational Trust continued with its political activities despite the fact that in 2003 the SET was formally censured by the Charities Commission; that it: “encouraged members of the public to not only vote against what it saw as far right political parties, **but also to carry out direct action by, for example, disrupting political meetings.**”¹⁰ There can be no possible doubt, given statements to be found in this charity's own publications together with the outcome of Charity Commission inquiry, that the Searchlight Education Trust is primarily committed to political work (research to support hate mongering, propaganda, political campaigning, and political ‘direct action’).

In the last 6 years PGMT has provided grants of £64,000 to the CST, and £11,700 to SET.

It has been previously revealed that over the period 2003 to 2005 PGMT provided a grant totalling only £10,300 to the Children With Leukaemia charity (leukaemia is Britain's biggest child killer disease) – with a zero grant in 2005, and the removal of the Children With Leukaemia charity from their list of beneficiaries in 2006. We are therefore very pleased to see that the Children With Leukaemia charity has now been reinstated as a beneficiary by PGMT, receiving a grant of £10,500 over the last year alone¹¹. However this is *still* less than the grant given by PGMT to CST.

We will probably never know to what extent PGMT's reinstatement of the Children With Leukaemia charity to its list of beneficiaries was the result of concerns raised in February 2008 – especially given that it was the British National Party that was first to bring this matter to the attention of the public. However it would seem that the PGMT still consider the CST to be a more worthy cause than that of helping little children suffering from leukaemia.

The basic question is: in what way is the funding of projects such as the two listed above (the CST and SET – an ethno-nationalist ‘self defence’ organisation, and an organisation involved in political propaganda and campaigning) compatible with the charitable purpose of helping “sick and disabled children”. It is this question that still needs to be put to the trustees of the Philip Green Memorial Trust. Perhaps this is a question that the trustees of Philip Green Memorial Trust should be required to provide a response.

[3] Slush Funding

Searchlight Educational Trust failed to submit accounts to the Charity Commission for over 3 years (2004, 2005 and 2006), and was listed by the Charity Commission as a ‘defaulter’. Despite this, the Charity Commission allowed SET to continue to operate. This serious breach of Charity Commission rules was only rectified by Searchlight following the very public exposure of this lamentable situation in February 2008.

An overview of the recent history of Searchlight's non-compliance with its obligation to supply the Charity Commission with financial statements of account is shown opposite¹².

It is extremely difficult to understand the attitude of the Charity Commission. The Charity Commission is the regulatory authority for registered charities within the UK. So why does there seem to be such an extraordinary reluctance by the Charity Commission when it comes to the ensuring that Searchlight Educational Trust complies with the necessary regulations and statutory requirements?

Financial year end (FYE)	Income	Spending	Accounts received	Annual Return/Annual Update received
31 Dec 2007	£166,383	£186,776	30 Oct 2008	30 Oct 2008
31 Dec 2006	£192,312	£138,816	06 Mar 2008 (127 days late)	06 Mar 2008 (127 days late)
31 Dec 2005	£174,833	£149,682	05 Mar 2008 (491 days late)	05 Mar 2008 (491 days late)
31 Dec 2004	£179,191	£172,043	07 Mar 2008 (858 days late)	07 Mar 2008 (858 days late)
31 Dec 2003	£181,801	£158,165	11 Nov 2004 (11 days late)	11 Nov 2004 (11 days late)

Searchlight Education Trust is *not* a charitable trust. It is *not* constituted by means of a charitable trust deed (which is required by the Charity Commission) and it quite explicitly declares, in its submitted statement of accounts, that: “*The company does not make any grants.*” The regulations stipulated by the Charity Commission are completely unambiguous – that the purpose of a charitable trust is “*to be a grant-making body only*”¹³. SET is a private company, limited by guarantee. However, quite clearly, SET presents itself as a ‘Trust’ with registered charitable status.

Based on its most recent set of accounts, Searchlight Education Trust currently receives each year some £160,000 in grants and donations – of which almost £117,000 is used to cover staff costs (equivalent to three, full time workers), plus a further £26,000 to cover the rent and rates of the premises Searchlight uses for its work.

When Searchlight’s expenditure on direct political campaigning is examined, further interesting facts are revealed.

It would be a mistake to believe that Searchlight’s campaigning efforts are minor. Searchlight receives, and also spends, large amounts of cash on its hatemongering activities – particularly at times of Parliamentary elections. For example, in the campaigns leading up to the last General Election on the 5th May 2005, the Searchlight organisation (using its SIS identity) received donations totalling £65,275. This was more than any other ‘third party’ campaign group (the UAF came second with a total of £43,045). In terms of actual campaign expenditure, Searchlight spent a total of £42,761 – more than the total amounts spent by the political parties Plaid Cymru or Sinn Féin.

These expenditures do not (of course) include the political campaigning carried out by Searchlight via its other subsidiary groups (SM and SET). And (equally obviously) these other campaigning activities are not declared to the Electoral Commission.

[4] Many Hats, One Head

Searchlight undertakes at least 6 distinct operations. The organisation is itself composed of no less than three, formally constituted businesses – with each business separately registered at Companies House as a ‘Private Limited Company’. For each of these businesses the directors are therefore entitled to claim limited liability and to prepare separate financial statements of account (each of which can claim special exemption).

It seems apparent that these three business entities, Searchlight Information Services, Searchlight Magazine, and Searchlight Education Trust all operate using the same premises (same office phone number, same fax, same PO Box address) – and, we believe, with essentially the same directors and managerial staff.

The co-founder of Searchlight Magazine, Gerry Gable, writes regular articles for the magazine and has been listed as its editor. He has also been listed as a director of Searchlight Information Services. Sonia Gable (Gerry Gable’s wife) also writes articles for Searchlight Magazine and is also listed as both the Charity Correspondent and Secretary of Searchlight Educational Trust. The journalist Nick Lowles is employed to write articles for Searchlight Magazine – however it is a matter of record that he has also been involved in direct political activism (campaigning and canvassing)¹⁴. It is noted that members of Searchlight staff habitually use the generic term ‘Searchlight’ when communicating with members of the public, the trade unions, law enforcement agencies, political pressure groups, political parties, Government agencies and Members of Parliament.

There is (of course) a purpose behind this arrangement. By presenting its organisation as three separate business enterprises Searchlight is able to maximise the opportunities for both the funding, and for the dissemination, of its hatemongering efforts. Searchlight has therefore adopted three very different ‘persona’ for its operations: a research, investigative and consultative organisation (SIS); a journalistic and publishing organisation (SM); and a charity (SET). We therefore find that not only is Searchlight Information Services a separately registered limited liability company, but that it is also registered with the Electoral Commission as a ‘third party’ political campaigning organisation. Searchlight Magazine is registered as a limited liability company. Searchlight Educational Trust, a registered limited liability company, is also registered as a charity with the Charity Commission.

Therefore Searchlight is able to adopt a different persona according to who it is attempting to get money from, or who it is attempting to convince with its hate propaganda. If it is dealing with members of the public, then the persona is that of the magazine publisher (SM). If it is dealing with Government or law enforcement agencies then the persona is that of an independent research and consultative institution (SIS). And if it is dealing with charities (especially charitable trusts, such as the Barrow Cadbury Trust or the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust) then the persona is that of a registered charity (SET).

All three ‘companies’ are essentially involved in the same type of work (research, journalism, publication, consultation) and with a single objective – to manufacture and disseminate extreme hatred towards targeted members of the native, indigenous (white) population. The idea, therefore, that these are the activities of three distinct and separate organisations is ludicrous.

[5] Summary

An examination of the ‘business of hate’ reveals the strange world that Searchlight inhabits – the bizarre juxtaposition of the super-rich, the political aristocracy, criminals, and neo-Marxists ‘internationalists’. It is the collaboration of these disparate groups, especially in terms of financing Searchlight, that reveals the true target for the hatemongering - independently minded Britons who value a sense of nationhood and native entitlement, who dissent from (and wish to resist) the exploitative agenda of political, economic and cultural ‘internationalism’.

This, then, is one of the key findings of this investigation: that Searchlight is essentially a catalyst (albeit a very willing and forceful one) for these different groups, for generating an institutionalised hatred towards self-assertive and stubbornly independent native Britons.

Therefore there are, within this report, numerous grounds for concern. However, in terms of specific issues, three matters of special concern need to be highlighted:

- 1) That money, donated (out of charitable concern) by members of the public to “*help sick and disabled children*” is being used to finance charities (such as SET and CST) that not only do not have this purpose (with no such declared ‘charitable purpose’) but which are heavily involved in political activities – in the politics of hate.
- 2) That the charity Searchlight Educational Trust (SET) is neither legally constituted as a Trust, nor does it act as one. The use by SET of the term ‘Trust’ is therefore fundamentally misleading.
- 3) That there are good reasons for believing that Searchlight Educational Trust is using its donations for, and engaging with, activities that do not have (or are not in support of) a charitable purpose. This would be contrary to Charity Commission rules and statutory regulations.

These matters (especially) raise serious questions – not only in regard to the morality of the activities of groups such as Searchlight, but also the legality of their actions. No doubt these are matters that others, more familiar with criminal law, may wish to pursue.

¹ From the PGMt Statement of Accounts, for year ending 30th June 2007

² <http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/ShowCharity/RegisterOfCharities/CharityWithPartB.aspx?RegisteredCharityNumber=293156&SubsidiaryNumber=0>

³ <http://www.pgmt.org.uk/> downloaded on the 3rd January 2009

⁴ <http://www.pgmt.org.uk/donate.php> downloaded on the 3rd January 2009

⁵ In 'Street Fighting Man', by Jenni Frazer, The Jewish Chronicle, 23rd November 2007

⁶ see: 'Developer gave secret donation to Livingstone', Jonathan Oliver, The Times, 16th March 2008. The amount given was £4,990 - £10 below the threshold at which donations have to be publicly registered with the Electoral Commission.

⁷ From the CST Statement of Accounts, for year ending 31st December 2007

⁸ From the CST Statement of Accounts, for year ending 31st December 2003.

⁹ 'On The Street, Someone Is Standing Tall', by Mary Wakefield, The Telegraph, 13th August 2006

¹⁰ <http://web.archive.org/web/20030630145537/www.charitycommission.gov.uk/investigations/inquiryreports/search.asp>

¹¹ From the PGMt Statement of Accounts, for year ending 30th June 2007

¹² <http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/ShowCharity/RegisterOfCharities/CharityWithoutPartB.aspx?RegisteredCharityNumber=1013880&SubsidiaryNumber=0>

¹³ The Charity Commission, document CC21, Annex A

¹⁴ See, for example: The Independent newspaper, 22nd April 2006, page 2