

# WHAT A LOAD OF CODSWALLOP

## John Freedom blasts apart Tim Tate's book 'CHILDREN FOR THE DEVIL'

Tim Tate, the brains behind the discredited Cook Report's *The Devil's Work* which tried to tell us that the U.K. was being overrun with Satanic Child Abusers (remember all the fuss?) has spent the last two years working hard to seek out cases to try and convince us that his original assertions were correct. To the casual observer the sheer weight of Tate's research is impressive, but to those who know, his book is a conglomeration of half-truths and misleading statements which cannot have arisen simply from ignorance.

Again Tate contributes nothing really new to the controversy. He has discovered nothing extra which will offer conclusive proof that Satanic Ritual Abuse exists. The book itself is not the first. It has been attempted before by more able historians, from Bodin, through Scott, Summers and Rhodes.

**CHILDREN FOR THE DEVIL, Ritualised Abuse and Satanic Crime (1991)** is nothing but a fourth-hand re-run of information which was already third-hand and suspect when it was first collated. In an attempt to convince the reader of the existence of Satanic Ritualised Abuse Tate delves into ancient history and asserts that Satanism has been alive and well for over 600 years! Will the media and the public fall for it?

Those who hoped for a clarification and simplification of Tate's allegations will be bitterly disappointed. After four years Tate is still unable to produce factual evidence of even one case of supposed ritualised child abuse which will stand on its own merits. Inevitably, Tate continues to blend a cocktail of different cases, each of which may have some heinous aspect, but none of which display the entirety of his claims that a Worldwide Satanic Cult is abusing and sacrificing hundreds children as part of its belief system.

Yes folks, it's more of the same intolerant and inconclusive drivel from Mr Tate but this time he has taken so many liberties with the truth that the knowledgeable observer can only conclude that his compulsion to publicise Satanic Ritual Abuse has become an obsession.

The twisted collection of misguided, inaccurate, selectively edited snippets from a variety of sources is cobbled together in an attempt to convince Joe Public that Tate was right all along about the dire threat from Satanic Ritual Abuse.

If this man had his way there would be a nationwide hunt for unorthodox beliefs backed up by special SWAT squads seeking indications of Satanic Ritualised Abuse using medieval superstition. Exactly the kind of ignorance which caused the Rochdale and Orkney false cases.

As usual there are lots of words, but there is not one jot of proof. The S.A.F.F. have exposed the fragility of Tate's cases in all instances and despite Tate's clever weaving of narrative in his new book, the facts are again inconclusive.

In descending to using 'evidence' gained through torture during the Witch Trials of the 15th and 16th centuries Tate takes on the mantle of the New Witch finder General. Like Witch finder Generals before him he intends to

make you believe him by peddling medieval superstition. Hitching a ride on one of the most reprehensible periods of history at a time when millions of innocent people went to their deaths in Europe because of a hysteria not dissimilar to the one Tate helped to promote during 1989, he incorporates confessions gained under torture in complete disrespect for the dignity of the innocent people murdered in such a barbarous and uncivilised fashion.

It is essential for the freedom of belief in this country that Tate is not allowed to mislead the people of this country. The whole of Tate's book is replete with innuendo, inference and inaccuracies which would take another volume of twice the size to reveal. We have chosen a few of the more pertinent cases and highlighted Mr Tate's errors in order to reveal the inconclusive and biased writing. It makes shocking reading, whichever way you look at it.

**GILES DE RAIS:** Giles de Rais did not admit to the slaughter of a thousand children as Tate insists. History clearly shows that he was the richest man in France at the time with extensive lands in his possession. He was framed for political reasons and tried for heresy on the pretext that he had struck a priest. His supposed child murders were a corollary charge. His Inquisitors selected two of Rais' 500 servants and tortured them until they confessed all manner of atrocities which Rais had supposedly committed hence the astronomical number of claimed child murders. These two servants claimed to be involved in the carrying out of the crimes and Tate uses their testimony as trustworthy, but after testifying against their master they were both set free.

The facts are that there was no concrete evidence of any crimes given to the hearing. No bodies or bones were ever produced. The 'confession' by his servants made it inevitable that Rais would be burned alive at the stake. His Inquisitors offered Rais death by burning alive or, if he confessed to the put up crimes, the 'mercy' of being strangled beforehand which, faced with the inevitability of it all Rais is supposed to have accepted. The put up nature of the confession was evident in the fact that included in it was a plea that the court records be published in the vernacular. A strategic design by his Inquisitors to gain public condemnation and support.

Inquisitors who tried people who were accused of witchcraft were not usually paid by the state but were permitted to charge the estate of their victim for their services and in principle the estate of the guilty person was split between the prosecutors. Fifteen days BEFORE the trial of Rais began Duke John V (who took part in the prosecution) disposed of his anticipated share of the Rais lands. And yet Tate would ignore this travesty of justice in order to tell you that it was certain that Rais killed hundreds of children. There 2

is not a shred of reliable evidence that this was the case but Tate would have you believe otherwise, just like he would have believe that Francesco Prelati was a 'fellow Satanist' when in fact he was an ordained priest who, after testifying against Rais, was also set free.

**CATHERINE DE MEDICI:**

*"The first formalised ritual child sacrifice within the Black Mass is credited to Catherine Medici"*

How Tate can make such a bald statement as though fact is beyond our comprehension. Firstly De Medici was not a Satanist, and although, like many of her day, she consulted with soothsayers and in particular Nostradamus the famous astrologer, this was always for a political or personal purpose, never to exalt evil or Satanism. The source reference to the supposed 'Black Mass' is in the writings of Bodin and was conducted, again, by a Catholic Priest, not a Satanist. There was only one such ritual held ( for

the purpose of saving the life of her gravely ill son). According to historian Henry Rhodes's **The Satanic Mass**

*"This was no Sabbat or offering to Satan".*

In accrediting Catherine de Medici with being the first exponent of satanic ritual child murder Tate completely omits to mention that she was an ardent Catholic who personally initiated the assassination of Admiral Coligny and the horrendous St Bartholomew Massacre where over FIFTY THOUSAND Huguenots were murdered simply because they were Protestants. Rather than being the first example of Satanic Ritualised Murder this lady could easily be accused of being the first Christian Ritualised Mass Murderer if it were not for the fact that there are literally hundreds of precedents to that title throughout history.

**FLORIN DE RAEMOND & URBAIN GRANDIER:** Giles de Rais was yet another unfortunate victim of the Witch Hysteria which tore through 15/16 century Europe. It is amazing though how the superstition of the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth tends to perpetuate itself even unto modern times. Tate insists that his quoted cases are cases of Satanism, yet Rais' helper in his supposed crimes was a Priest and the trustworthy evidence shows that Rais was involved in alchemical experiments not Satanism.

In the Loudun Nuns case everyone involved was either a nun, priest or Bishop, yet, my readers, remember that Mr Tate is attempting to tell you that these were DREAD SATANISTS. We ask Mr Tate to define at what point a Priest becomes a Satanist and a Satanist becomes a priest?

In fact the clergy then contained an even higher proportion of licentious perverts than it does now. Becoming a Cleric was one way of avoiding penury and starvation, especially for disenfranchised bastard sons of the nobility. During this period there are very many instances on record of priests who had no Satanic connections whatsoever but who had mistresses and illegitimate families by various concubines. It is naive of Tate to over moralise his tales of indiscretions whilst pretending that the French Church and its officiators were paragons of virtue whose word could be trusted.

Urbain Grandier was a parish priest who fell foul of Cardinal Richelieu. He openly made a mistress of one of his young penitents and was suspected of having made pregnant the daughter of the public prosecutor of Loudun. Not good form for one in Grandier's position. Firstly accused of immorality, not heresy, he was found guilty and suspended from clerical duties. Within a year Grandier's political friends had engineered his release and a conspiracy was begun to incriminate him. Tate fails to mention any of this.

3

Grandier's enemy Father Mignon, confessor to the nuns of Loudun, persuaded a few sisters to swear that Father Grandier had bewitched them. The nuns went into 'victim imposter' mode started feigning convulsions and began talking in strange voices. The plot misfired and resulted merely in a warning to Grandier by his Archbishop.

The convent quietened but the conspiracy continued. Laubardemont, a close friend of the powerful Richelieu was told that Grandier had published a satire which had enraged the Cardinal. One of the nuns was related to Richelieu. This cocktail of circumstance resulted in Richelieu ordering Laubardemont to form a kangaroo commission to convict Grandier as a witch. The Old allegations resurfaced and, under exorcism the nuns continued their fantastic allegations

about adultery, incest, sacrileges and other crimes. Acting as though possessed the nuns became celebrities and were repeatedly exorcised in public.

Grandier was thrown into jail and searched for 'devil's marks' (skin blemishes) which were, of course, quickly discovered. The despicable Inquisitors whom Tate would have you trust, found these devil's marks by subterfuge. Using a small needle they would stab one part of his body whilst drawing the onlookers attention to the pressing of another part. This would have worked had not an apothecary from Poitiers witnessed the hoax and grabbing the concealed barb revealed that Grandier's body was ordinarily sensitive to pain at any point.

The trial was a complete travesty of justice. Some nuns who, realising their part in Grandier's serious predicament, wanted to retract their statements were refused permission to do so. They claimed that their allegations had been dictated to them by the parish priest. The 'Pact with the devil' supposedly written by Grandier is not thought by any historians to be anything other than a complete forgery. The Mother superior of the convent, herself a main player in the framing of Grandier, appeared in court with a noose around her neck and threatened to hang herself to expiate her false witness against Grandiers, but she was ignored.

Villagers and people who wanted to appear in defence of Grandiers were forcibly kept from testifying and in some cases told that if they did so they would also be tried for witchcraft. Dr Claud Quillet of Chinon had detected impostures at the public exorcisms and wanted to give testimony to that effect. Laubardemont immediately ordered his arrest and Dr Quillet only saved himself by fleeing across the Italian border.

A public meeting supporting Grandier organised by the Bail! of Loudun complained about the procedure in the trial and Laubardemont accused all present of Treason to scotch any resistance. On 18 August 1634 Grandier was sentenced to torture of the 2nd degree and burning alive. Even under torture so severe that the marrow of his bones oozed out of his broken limbs Grandier maintained his innocence and refused to bear false witness by naming imaginary accomplices (the sole purpose of 2nd degree torture). Grandier's dignity and honour under such terrible institutionalised violence make him a giant amongst martyrs to the cause of human integrity and make Tim Tate's misappropriation and misinterpretation of his trial seem rather irresponsible. Proof of Satanic Ritualised Abuse? I think not.

**THE SATANIST NUN:** Again Witch finder General Tate confuses the issue. When does a Nun become a Satanist? Why do all the historic cases he quotes involve Christian priests and Christian nuns. When does Christian ritualised abuse

4

become Satanic ritualised abuse? None of the historical confessions or transcripts which Mr Tate uses contain any references to any person being called or admitting to being a Satanist. Tate can produce no definitive evidence to show that those accused were Satanists. We only have Mr Tate's own assurance that this is the case.

The people in Tate's cases may have done awful things, but the S.A.F.F. has just produced the result of 8 years analysis of over 100 child sex abuse cases from the last decade which prove that clergymen and Christian religious fanatics can perpetrate the same and worse things without any form of Satanism being involved. If they can do it now, they could have done it then. The facts show that the depth of horror of the crime cannot be used as an incontrovertible indicator of Satanic involvement and without this 'guilt by association' Tate's book and his allegations are meaningless.

Magdalein Bavent became a Nun in an attempt to escape the repercussions of being deflowered by a Franciscan monk who was a customer at the shop where she worked. Her highly detailed and fantastic confessions were published in her autobiography and from its innocent Early Victim Imposter style and details of her confessions during trial various commentators, including Tate, have extracted the more reasonable allegations which seem to confirm their prejudices.

Tate did not bother telling his readers that Bavent also claimed that she had sex with the ghost of a dead priest, was raped a number of times by the devil in the form of a black Cat which had a huge penis, saw blood trickling from a holy wafer, and consorted with half-human demons. Neither did he mention that in her autobiography Bavent herself wrote that her testimony had been "based upon nothing else than the vivid suggestion she retained from the questioning". A tremendously important insight when related to the misuse of interrogation techniques in the Rochdale and Orkney cases and one that Tate cannot have overlooked.

Bavent's allegations concerned the activities of priest Father Picard who had died some time previously from natural causes. So lunatic were the Satan Hunters of the time at being thwarted that they dug up Picard's corpse and publicly incinerated it on the same pyre upon which they burned alive the poor priest who had taken over from him after he died.

Bavent's allegations regarding eating children were never corroborated. One of the witnesses at the trials confessed before being burned that he had prompted Bavent about the Sabbath orgies and that the details of liturgy supposedly recited at the 'Black Mass' had been dictated to him by his interrogator who had bribed him with six sous to give evidence against Bavent. What do you mean, Tate didn't mention any of this?

**CHAMBRE ARDENTE** : This is perhaps the most real of Tate's cases. The Chambre Ardente was convened by Louis XIV due to the widespread poisoning murders which were occurring amongst the French nobility. Unfortunately most of the evidence regarding the 'Black Mass' was obtained under torture and so the details which Tate relies upon for his 'proof are unreliable.

There is no doubt that a large number of poisonings took place but the poisonings had nothing to do with Satanism. Poison was much in demand by women who wanted to bring the lives of their husbands to a premature end

5

either to obtain their wealth or to free them for a further marriage, a common occurrence in the corrupt French nobility because of the church prohibition against divorce. The network which made available the poison was ran by several noblemen including the son of the Attorney general of Aix, himself a lawyer. The motive was, as always money.

The licentiousness and intrigue of the French Court is well known and much money was to be had by poison suppliers who also catered for the libidinous indulgences of the French aristocracy of the time. Several fortune-Tellers including the notorious La Voisin were used to distribute the poisons which were nearly always used by leading French celebrities and nobility. It is more than possible that a blackmail racket was being worked as a sideline on those who asked for supplies of poison. The proportion of occult involvement in all of this is minor but was blown up by the police chief for political reasons in order to scapegoat a few guilty people and allow the nobles involved to go free.

Tate misleads his readers woefully in attributing 2,500 children's deaths to this affair. In fact this quotation came from a witness who claimed that La Voisin HAD TERMINATED 2,500 PREGNANCIES. At that time abortion was both illegal and due to the depravity of the court, much in demand. Drugs would be given to stupefy the patient, many of the drugs which stupefied were also poisonous in larger doses. It was natural that women willing to perform abortions and who also had access to such drugs, would be in demand. La Voisin denied being an abortionist but her friend La Lepere more or less admitted it. It seems that somewhere down the line a crossover occurred in all this criminal activity where a catholic Abbot (Guiborg) employed the aborted fetuses in a parody of the Catholic Mass. At the trial La Lepere was accused of providing Guiborg with aborted fetuses for the 'black masses', not of killing children, an important legal distinction which Tate fudged.

At this point the trial had become a witch-hunt and eventually under torture various admissions and allegations were obtained. It is from these admissions that details of the abominations which make up the so called Satanic Black Mass were synthesised. It is important to note that most of the people tortured were Priests and that each priest gave separate details of the Black Mass which were later cobbled into a whole. The homologated result produced an overall impression suitable to their persecutors. Abbe Guiborg, confessed that in one ritual he had murdered a child.

In contradiction of Tate's assertions there was no evidence to confirm that any of these people were part of an organised Satanic Group or that what they were doing was part of an existing cult. The whole thing appeared to be spontaneous extemporisation of things diametrically opposed to Christianity done for the natural obscenity of depraved and indulgent people who were pillars of the establishment and who therefore felt themselves free from prosecution. As things turned out they were quite right. The corrupt nature of Louis XIV's court ensured that the nobility escaped prosecution and blame whilst others took the wrap.

La Vigoreux and La Bosse were burned alive and Francois Bosse was hanged. However La Voisin and the other fortune-tellers were more cunning and began implicating the nobility to the embarrassment of the prosecution. Sensing his delicate political position the Police Commissioner Reynie resorted to torturing the accused in order to gain 'confessions'. La Voisin was put in the

6

torture chair and then her legs were crushed in the 'boots'. La Voisin still denied all charges of poisoning. The verbatim accounts of the torture record her shrieks at each successive crushing of her legs, but she still admitted nothing.

The Attorney general demanded her tongue be cut out and her hands chopped off, but the court instead sentenced her to burning alive. An eye witness reported.

*" She was forced to the stake, tied and bound with iron. Cursing all the time she was covered with straw which five or six times she threw off her, but at last the flames grew fiercer and she was lost to sight."*

Such perceptions of the barbarity of the time are important lest Tate's readers are lead to judge the happenings one-sidedly by assuming that the authorities at the time were compassionate and uncorrupted people who used similar yardsticks of morality and behaviour which we can identify with. The activities of all concerned could easily be described as 'satanic' but with Mr Tate's version you only get part of the story.

After continued investigation Madame de Montespan, a former mistress of Louis XIV was found to be a key player in the scandal and in order to avoid further embarrassment the king ordered the investigation to continue in secret. Tate's recording of the extent of the trial is misleading. He states that 104 people were sentenced in the case. In all 319 people were arrested, 36 were put to death, 4 were sent as slaves to the galleys and another 34 were banished. The missing 30 were actually acquitted. Seventy four people sentenced for poisoning and involvement in the scandal is a great number but not all of the 70 were sentenced for Satanic involvement of course.

Additionally the 'forensic proof which Mr Tate makes much of is not as clear-cut as the impression Mr Tate gives and the evidence he provides whilst sounding authoritative is wrong. Firstly in La Filastre's testimony about the sacrifice of her baby it was not Guiborg who did it but herself aided by two other officiating priests Abbe Deshayes and Abbey Cotton.

Secondly whilst it is quite probable that Voisins' daughter saw aborted fetuses incinerated in an oven and that 'forensic evidence' of human remains was found it is quite another thing to suggest that this proves that children were murdered in Satanic Rituals. These are emotive issues which it is difficult to talk about in a matter of fact way, but it is the facts we seek. In order for the reader to make up their minds they should have been given the full story for although Tate calls Voisins' daughter's evidence

'the first reliable testimony'

and quotes from it in great detail he omits to tell his readers that she withdrew it all later in the trial.

Of course if police chief Reynie, ( who is obviously held in high esteem by Mr Tate going by his lauding of him in the book) , was willing to resort to inhuman tortures in order to force confessions then it is quite possible that he would think nothing of also planting evidence. We cannot be sure of any of these things of course, AND THAT IS EXACTLY THE POINT.

**ISABEL GOWDIE:** An indication of the weaknesses of Tate's allegations is his deployment of the pathetic Isabel Gowdie case. Firstly in an inverted volte-face Tate quickly gets over the problem that all historians consider Gowdie a

7

Pagan and not a Satanist, by trying to confuse the reader into thinking that the authorities at that time had not got round to making the distinction between Paganism and Satanism. Of course we only have Tate's word for this. In reality it could be exactly the other way round. The authorities didn't use the term Satanist because Satanists didn't exist. That puts Tate into a real quandary for he is very well aware that the Old Religion of Paganism has nothing whatsoever to do with evil practices or child abuse and he admits this elsewhere in his book.

Gowdie's confessions show her to be clearly unstable. She gave four voluntary confessions from which Tate extracts those bits he wants you to see and leaves behind the bits that tell the full story. As well as admitting to sacrificing 2 children the poor woman also said that she could turn herself into a jackdaw or a cat and could fly through the air on a bit of straw. She said that she could 'shoot down' any Christian who saw her and did not bless himself. But no Christian who had seen her and blessed himself could be found to corroborate the matter. Gowdie said that she shot people with Elf Arrows which she had seen little Elf boys sharpening. Her coven were so abominable that they spent most of their time raising storms by hitting a stone with a wet rag. Hardly the stuff of Satanic Horror. So uncelebrated was Gowdie's imbecility that the

court scribe forgot to record her sentence and no-one knows what happened to her. This is proof of Satanic Child Abuse?

**THE HELLFIRE CLUB / THE MONKS OF MEDMENHAM:** In his curious documentary-cum-novelette style Tate activates our imagination and prepares a detailed description of people and circumstance, peppering his narrative with snippets of facts and the names of real people he leads the reader to believe that in his attention to detail he will portray the whole story. But Tate's mission is not to portray the WHOLE story, but to prepare a biased version which preys upon existing prejudices in the reader's minds. Passing off the licentious indulgences of the privileged classes as Satanism, Tate adopts his self-righteous Victorian morality mode and ignores the fact that few people who have researched the scandal other than himself think that Dashwood and the other Hellfire Clubs were anything other than debauchery.

He quickly polishes over the fact that there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that any satanic rituals were held by Dashwood. 'No detailed accounts of the Hell-Fire Club's rituals survive' He says and goes on to complain about child prostitution and obscenities which have been a disgusting but ever present part of human society in privileged circles where people consider themselves above the law, for thousands of years.

In an attempt to mitigate the danger of readers discovering that Dashwood was a Christian and NOT a Satanist Tate tries to cobble together a convenient sociological theory that those involved in Satanism will always swing towards Christianity for repentance because this fits in with fundamentalist victim imposters, whom he terms Satanic Survivors.

The assertion of this totally untested and highly improbable idea brings into question Tate's willingness to accept crackpot theories in order to pursue his obsession. The committedness with which Dashwood pursued his licentiousness had nothing whatsoever to do with a belief in Satanism and Tate well knows this. Still it avoids him having to explain why Arch satanist Dashwood would voluntarily collaborate with Benjamin Franklin to publish The Book of Common Prayer. Rather than prove the existence of Satanic Ritualised Abuse Tate's historical cases reveal a higher, incidence of indicators which

8

prove a connection with Christian Ritualised Abuse.

**DR BATAILLE:** Ah, the mysterious Dr Bataille. After telling us that Dr Bataille probably didn't exist and that the book was most likely written by a collection of 19th century fundamentalists Tate goes on to tell us that nevertheless we must believe that it was written by people with first hand experience of the Black Mass. In fact the two people associated with authoring the sensational **Le Diable Au XIX Siecle** were one Gabriel Jogaud-Pages (who also used the pseudonym Leo Taxil) and one Dr Hecks (which may have been another pseudonym of Pages).

According to historian Wade Baskin

" In 1897 Leo Taxil admitted publicly that he had fabricated all of Dr Bataille's sensational revelations".

In his Encyclopaedia of Occultism (1920) the learned Lewis Spence mentions the book so:



*"He purports to have witnessed the secret rites and orgies of many diabolic societies, but a merely perfunctory examination of his work is sufficient to brand it as wholly an effort of the imagination."*

In the case of the mysterious Dr Bataille there is obviously more evidence to suggest that the contents of his book are bunkum. Is (it right to include bunkum in a serious analysis of Satanic Ritualised Abuse of Children?

**ALEISTER CROWLEY WICKEDEST MAN IN THE WORLD?:** Tate spends a great deal of time impressing the reader with his research on Crowley and constructing a case to 'prove' that Crowley was the 'father of modern Satanism' but this is a lie. Crowley was not a Satanist. Now that we have escaped Tate's historical cases we don't have to rely upon suspect third hand information and the glaring technical inaccuracies in Tate's potted biography are revealing.

Tate claims that Crowley invoked the Satan God Horus to convince the reader that Crowley was a nasty piece of work. But Horus is not a Satan God. Horus is the Egyptian Sun God whose mythological purpose was to help mankind to enlightenment by combating the forces of darkness which in Egyptian mythology are controlled by the God Set. This is a very strange mistake for Tate, a theology graduate, to make for the American based Temple of Set who take their name from this god, have been a continual target for Tate's accusations. Of course Crowley DID NOT traffick with Satan and his invocation of Horus was an attempt to bring enlightenment and knowledge for the benefit of mankind, a completely different perspective to that which Tate has given his reader.

The main weakness in Tate's attack on Crowley is simply that he was one of the most prolific occult writers and over 200 of his books available today show that despite his tongue in cheek manipulation of fools who hung on his every word, he had nothing whatsoever to do with Satanism and actually ejected one famous occultist from his order because he believed he was a black magician.

By using the unfair device of searching Crowley's extensive writings and correspondence to discover a quotation which, out of context, seems damning Tate hopes to convince you of another fundamentalist hobby horse and a necessary piece in the jigsaw of convincing you that a Global Satan conspiracy exists. Of course we could very quickly find hundreds of references from Crowley's writings which showed that he only had the best interests of mankind at heart and his philosophy, which presaged women's rights and pluralism, is very pertinent to our society. We have not space to contradict all of Tate's pronouncements on Crowley but we have picked a few examples for comparison.

Although bi-sexual Crowley favoured homosexuality but his liasons always

9

involved mature men. Tate assiduously avoids using the term homosexual and instead cleverly substitutes Sodomy which has both a biblical and legal inference. Of course at that time homosexuality was still a crime punishable with harsh penalties. Does Mr Tate want to outlaw homosexuality again, like the fundamentalists? Or is he just playing to a captured audience?

Tate goes to great lengths to besmirch Crowley's teachings by trying to assert that his method '*released the demonic inside the individual Satanist*' In fact Crowley's magical method did exactly the reverse and Tate very well knows this. It released what, in his own words, he termed man's Holy Guardian Angel NOT demons or devils, and his approach to demonology his thinking seems a lot less medieval than Mr Tate, as can be gleaned from Crowley's forward to the magical book The Goetia

'What is the cause of my illusion of seeing a spirit in the Triangle of Art... The Spirits are portions of the human brain and their seals represent methods of stimulating or regulating those particular areas through the eye'

*Crowley never sacrificed any human and it is despicable of Tate to assert that he did.* - In a lifetime of occult study his magical diaries show that he experimented with a few birds and couple of cats. Hardly what one would call ultimate evil and a lot less than the thousands of Frankenstein experiments conducted on animals by the medical establishment.

The sole proof of Tate's allegations is the chapter on the **BLOODY SACRIFICE** in Crowley's book *MAGICK*. This provides the 'link' which Tate makes to the supposed criminal activities of today's O.T.O. This link is false. It does not take into account the fact that, unlike Mr Tate it would seem, Crowley had a very definite sense of humour.

Crowley couldn't write a definitive work on magick, historical and modern, without including a chapter on THE BLOODY SACRIFICE for human sacrifice was (and animal sacrifice still is) a component part of most religions. The best way of dealing with this was the way he did it. Leaving it to the intellect of the reader (or the lack of it) to discover the truth.

Tate would have you believe that Crowley wrote a very impressive and technically brilliant piece of literature on hermetic theurgy for public consumption and included in it a bland confession that he had sacrificed 2,400 children. Who shall we take seriously, Mr Tate or Mr Crowley? If common-sense be not your guide then an extract from R A Wilson's *Cosmic Trigger* provides us with the answer:

"The Satirist even more appreciated Crowley's boffo one-liner in "Magick" where he speaks of sexual yoga (in code as usual) as a form of sacrifice and says that he thus sacrificed "a male child of perfect innocence and high intelligence" 150 times a year since 1912. The sacrifice in sexual yoga is the semen, which is indeed a "male child" and does indeed contain within the DNA code a very high intelligence, the genetic blueprint of planet Earth. "

Crowley's allegory therefore refers to auto-eroticism. He was not admitting killing over 2000 children as Tate maintains. He was presenting the information subtly beyond the range of the profane for those who had the awareness and the wit. He was setting a trap for the narrow-minded, the unvisionary, and the ignorant. Tim Tate has set himself up to unjustly

10

persecute and dishonour Crowley. A dead man who cannot argue his case. But in his wisdom and intelligence Crowley has had the last laugh on those who would misrepresent him. Crowley's trap has caused virtually the whole of the fundamentalist movement, many very unwise Social Workers and in this instance Mr Tate, to stick their necks out and reveal the lack of proportion of those who jump at the obvious if it fits their own prejudices.

Apart from this 'confession' in Crowley's "Magick" Tate has absolutely no other evidence whatsoever that Crowley harmed children. The joke is from the grave, and it is at the expense of Tate.

**THE FIRST SUCCESSFUL PROSECUTION FOR A SATANIC KILLING?** : Tate refers to the Andrew Newell case in 1987. This was nothing of the sort and Tate very well knows that Newell has always denied being a Satanist. Newell made a confession to the police under duress but later retracted it. (sound familiar?) Whilst he

had an interest in general occultism he was a beginner and had no connections with any Satanic group. His original trial was a travesty of justice and the appeal court eventually overturned the life-sentence for murder, commuting it to manslaughter. The trial had not taken account of Newell's claim of self-defence. He contended that the murder was the result of an argument which got out of hand.

Tate would have you believe that Newell was a killer who sacrificed someone in pursuit of Satanic philosophy. The reality is that Newell got into a fight with his friend and flat-mate after coming home dead drunk and in the process he killed his mate.

No ritual.

No trappings.

No Satanist.

No group of Satanists.

No Satanic connection.

No Sacrifice.

Nothing but an obsessive anti- occult prejudice from Tim Tate.

We have challenged Tate before on these points. Tate is very well aware of the fact that Newell's father made a formal complaint to Central Television about claims in the Tate researched Cook Report (The Devil's Work) about Newell being a Satanist when he knew that his son was not and had never claimed to be a Satanist. That he had no connections with any other Satanist and still maintains that he is not a Satanist. Additionally to further sensationalise Newell's supposed evil inclinations the Cook Report inferred that Newell slept in a grave. In reality Newell had once crashed out in a graveyard after walking home blind drunk and the situation was a one-off.

Tate makes great play over the down-to-earth detective superintendent who brought Newell's case to court and relies upon his statements to convince the reader of the 'ritual' aspects of the killing. His readers should know that the S.A.F.F. disagree with Det. Inspector Cole's scenario of the case and we told him so when he sent a couple of detectives to ask for our advice on the ritual aspects of the case before it came to court.

His assertion that the knife wounds were specially placed is speculation and do not relate to any historical or known method of sacrificing anything, particularly human beings. We did point out that in cultures where Human Sacrifice (Aztec civilisation) or execution was undertaken it was usual to tie the victim's hands and legs together, in which case Booth would not have had 'defence wounds' on his wrist.

After showing us Newell's 'magical diary' we told the detective that Newell was obviously a beginner and his studies into occultism had nothing to do with Satanism. Other confidential information they gave us lead us to categorically insist that Newell was not a Satanist and the death was not a premeditated ritual. The detectives made extensive secret investigations into Occult and New Age groups and personalities in and around the Telford area in an attempt

11

to find a connection that would fit in with their Satanic conspiracy theory. They failed for there was no such conspiracy and the death was not sacrificial.

We offered to stand up and give evidence in court. The detectives were not happy with all this and left saying they would be back in touch. We did not hear from them again. Later the appeal court reviewed the facts and came to a

conclusion nearer our own. Tate has used this case before to try and convince the public about Satanic Killings. It is a major plank in his armoury of cases yet he continually misrepresents it. In the Cook Report it was billed as a Satanic Murder when it was in fact manslaughter. Tate is well aware of our views on this case yet still insists on using it as 'proof of satanic killing. As an aside, we found his telling of the tale using pulp-fiction epithets ('The words made Cole sit up') an insult to his reader's intelligence.

**DAVID AUSTEN:** As if to provide 'conclusive' proof of the fact that Satanists do abuse children Tate employs a quotation from a British Satanist and member of the U.S. *Temple of Set Satanic Order*. "*There are people who claim to be Satanists who are abusing children*" Says Austen. Ah! That's all right then. The reader might be forgiven for asking why we are having to trust to Austen for this information instead of having Tate relate how the police have already banged up these child molesters using Austen's testimony.

Of course both Tate and most others conversant with the scene know that David Austen has a chequered history of trafficking with the media and has made many unsubstantiated claims including confessing to have been present when a child was sacrificed at a Black Mass. When the police investigated this, Austen said that the journalist had misinterpreted what he had said and that he had never seen such a thing. Their investigations resulted in 'no case to answer' but the journalist was adamant that she had quoted Austen word for word. Tate ought to know Austen's penchant for larger than life stories because Austen not only helped Tate with his research on Satanism for the Cook Report but he also appeared on the programme in an initiation ritual using paraphernalia which Tate bought for the ritual and which were later given to Austen.

Austen was the rotund person wearing spectacles about which Cook went out of his way to declare to viewers that he *'had not been involved in any crime'* shortly after Cook had accused Austen's Satanic teacher (Michael Aquino) of being a child molester. Of course Aquino was afterwards officially cleared of any such involvement and recently Austen has written to Private Eye magazine claiming that Tate's campaign about Satanic Ritual Abuse is 'nonsense', that its conclusions are 'fantasies and outright lies' and issuing veiled threats against Tate for the unauthorised use of Temple of Set documents which he obtained during his research for the Cook Report.

What are readers of Tate's book to think? Is Austen a liar? If so why is Tate quoting him? If he is not why haven't prosecutions ensued? All part of the colourful circus surrounding claims of Satanic abuse attached to Tate. None of which proves that Satanic child abuse exists. Why Tate should descend to using Austen's suspect testimony, without verification, on such a serious subject is best left to Mr Tate to answer.

**SO WHAT IS TATE ACTUALLY SAYING:** Tate collects an impressive selection of cases which one after the other stun and confuse the reader's consciousness into accepting that this is collective 'proof that Satanic Ritualised Abuse Exists. But that is not the case.

Tate's argument is not singular, it is a hydra composed of a number of

different heads none of which, alone, prove anything. The author's intent and aim is as unspecified as his argument. His writing is replete with emotional and sensational statements designed to shock-horror the reader into belief, yet overall the book fails in producing any meaningful solution or recommendation. Mr Tate has spent the last three years setting himself up as the UK's foremost researcher in Satanic Ritualised Abuse. He has had access to pro-SRAMist circles and social worker's cases. He is now lecturing on ritualised abuse and satanic crime. Mr Tate tells us on one hand that we must listen to what he says because he knows, and on the other cannot provide any incontrovertible evidence that Satanic Abuse exists. It seems that Mr Tate is content to stoke the fire of prejudice and intolerance, letting others handle the real questions which he leaves un-asked.

Tate castigates Satanism as ultimate evil yet admits that many Satanists are perfectly law abiding and do not sacrifice children. Of what consequence therefore is the philosophy of Satanism to the motivations of supposed child abusing Satanists? If we ban Satanism can Mr Tate guarantee that those people will not perpetrate 'regular' child abuse? If he cannot do this, why go to all the trouble of bringing in the Satanic aspect? Mr Tate is well aware that Christian Ritualised Abuse is a much bigger problem in our society than Satanic Ritualised Abuse and that definite prosecutions have revealed that many clergy and religious fanatics who have no satanic or occult connection whatsoever have committed crimes far more terrible and heinous than those Mr Tate relies upon to discredit Satanism. In short Satanic Ritual Abuse (if it exists at all) is no worse than existing cases of child abuse which are on record. What does it matter therefore how child-abusers justify themselves, surely it is the crime which matters and the care of the children which is paramount not the philosophical bent of the perpetrator?

Tate tilts at Heavy Metal Rock Music and asserts that it incites young people to get involved in Satanism. What about the millions of Heavy Metal Fans who avidly listen to Metal Music without succumbing to an interest in Satanism? Is it the music or the person's nature which is the trigger? Would that person have become involved in researching satanic philosophy even if Heavy Metal Music did not exist? Could it not simply be that the type of person whose curiosity leads them towards investigating satanic philosophy also just happens to be interested in Heavy Metal Music and the two have no direct connection? Has Mr Tate considered that all Satanists may also use Red toothbrushes and if they did what difference would it make? If we ban Heavy Metal Rock Music will Mr Tate also want us to ban black leather jackets, T-shirts with occult symbols and studded belts as well? How far must we go to restrict the freedom of teenagers in order to safeguard them from unproven risks? If we banned Heavy Metal Music can Mr Tate guarantee us that teenagers would not get involved in Satanism?

Of course there IS one reason why Mr Tate may rush to identify Heavy Metal Music as a direct cause of Satanism (apart from the fact that it is a ready made piece of propaganda already promoted by fundamentalist agitators in the U.S.A.) and that is that the very professional people whom he hopes to convince of that are likely to be the parents of rebel sons and daughters who enjoy Metal music which they cannot understand. Isn't the reality of the situation that Mr Tate is simply a mega-stick-in-the-mud who is so far removed from his own youth that he can't credit teenagers with the intelligence to decide for themselves what they want to do with their lives and instead wishes to impose restrictions and mores upon them from his exalted position as an

adult?

Mr Tate criticises the publication of Occult Books & Magazines. Is Mr Tate really trying to tell us that if all genuine occult books & Magazines were censored that the TV and Media from which he makes his living would also agree not to publish occult fiction, occult programmes, horror movies about witchcraft and historical articles on Occultism which might also interest teenagers and provide information for budding satanists?

Could an argument not be made out, using Tate's own criteria, that his obsession with researching and publishing the methodology and the minute details of Satanic Rituals and supposed Black Masses has actually done more to promote Satanism than anything any of the authors he condemns in his books and TV programmes?

In his book *Children For The Devil* Tim Tate states that Occult Bookshops and mail-order retailers of ritual equipment have sprung up and proved highly profitable. What kind of slur is this? Should an Occult Bookshop NOT be profitable? Do the proprietors not pay taxes like Mr Tate? Is Mr Tate trying to infer that there is something unscrupulous or illegal about the way that Occult Bookshops make their money? Please let us not have any more of Mr Tate's Humbug. He has himself achieved a considerable income from Newspaper and Magazine articles, TV programmes. Books, Serialisations, Radio programmes and now is being paid to attend Seminars on the subject of Satanic Ritual Abuse.

The amount of money occult bookshop owners make is irrelevant unless Mr Tate is trying to assert 'that this is a major motive for the 'organisation of evil'. In his clever phrasing Mr Tate has not said any such thing; he just inferred it. To balance the issue I am sure we can find many occult bookshops whose owners make less money than Mr Tate and to our knowledge there are only half a dozen such businesses in the U.K. (all entirely legal) which can remotely be described as successful. We should not allow the pot to call the kettle black and let Mr Tate get away with hypocritical inferences about the motivations of bookshop owners and the beliefs of occultists when Mr Tate has never in all his writings bothered to mention the colour of his own religious beliefs and affiliations. When chided by Private Eye magazine over his motivations Mr Tate wrote that he *'did not belong to or attend any church of any denomination'*. This is not the same thing as saying that one is an atheist. Before Mr Tate continues to slander and question other people's beliefs we feel it only fair that he should reveal his OWN.

Despite a chapter devoted to the excesses of Christian fundamentalism Tate continually reverts to using fundamentalist scenarios in his book. In fact his whole book is replete with scaled down arguments derived from fundamentalists paranoia. He knocks Heavy Metal Records and quotes supposed American cases which were hyped by the fundamentalists; but does not mention the key fundamentalist off-the-wall theory of Backward Masking which is supposed to take over the minds of the young and get them to commit satanic crimes. He uses the 'black mass' testimony of Born Again Victim Imposter Michelle Pazder and others comparing it with historical records as some supposed proof of accuracy. Then he omits to tell his readers that all the facts in her book which could be checked (location, people etc.) have been shown to be bogus and she has been discredited in the U.S.A.

Tate goes to great pains in the *Chambre Ardent* affair to establish the idea that Satanists adopt the practice of using aborted fetuses for rituals. The anti-abortion issue is a very powerful and emotive one and is one of the main planks of the reform of the Christian right. Tate uses the Natalie case

14

testimony to try and show that teenagers are at risk from being sexually abused and made pregnant in order to obtain fetuses for sacrifice. This is his only case, it is inconclusive and the allegation is different from that which occurred in the *Chambre Ardent* affair in that Guiborg used fetuses from women who came voluntarily for abortions. The one does not prove the other.

Tate cannot produce incontrovertible evidence to show what he and the fundamentalists claim on this issue; that women and children are kidnapped sexually abused and used as 'breeders' to produce fetuses which are aborted for Satanic sacrifice. In this one sentence we have perhaps the most vivid example of inhuman action which can only be termed ultimate evil. It is an , emotional stun-grenade which rolls together everything which any right-thinking Christian Cultured, person would find absolutely abominable. Yet independently its component parts occur on a repetitive basis within our society without any connection with Satanism (child sexual abuse / child physical abuse / child murder / kidnapping / adult sexual abuse / rape / murder / legal and back street abortions etc.).

This collection of terrible things is if you like a cultural and religious *Icon of the Most Evil* within our society and demands moral support from any decent individual. The fundamentalists fight to change the moral structure of our society on many fronts but this is the biggest bogeyman of the lot. The kind of mind which would perpetrate such a combined crime is so abnormal that it could only be described as evil and it is natural for ordinary people to be too ready to believe in that stereotype even though there has never been any evidence to corroborate the fears and Tate's book still fails to provide anything but 'proof by association of ideas'. When all the huff and puff has gone the Icon reveals itself as being SYMBOLIC and not real.

Continuing his interpretation of fundamentalist scenarios Tate clearly forges the link between Satanism and World -Domination inferring that Freemasonry is a pit of Satanic activity. He doesn't go so far as to accuse them of controlling the banking system and gaining pan-global economic control as the fundamentalists do but there are continuous references to powerful and influential international cartels the leaders of which are too powerful to be brought to book. The sole evidence for this is that the O.T.O has a freemasonic grade structure and a some of the members of the Magical Order of the Golden Dawn were Freemasons. The magnitude of such assertions based completely on circumstantial evidence and supposition is beyond all sane comment as exemplified by the fundamentalists firmly held belief that Procter and Gamble's Man in the Moon logo is proof that the firm is part of this freemasonic plot to control world economies.

Is Tim Tate really trying to assert that the majority of Freemasons are Satanic Child Abusers? Then he is patently wrong and should be told so. If he is asserting that only a small minority of them are supposedly abusing children then why bother with the ludicrous conspiracy theories? Does Mr Tate want to outlaw Freemasonry? If he doesn't other people who have helped him with his research do. Like Dianne Core of Childwatch and Maureen Davies

of Reachout. Both these leading promoters of Satanic Ritual Abuse are on record as holding far-out Freemasonic Conspiracy views; like the fundamentalists.

TATE REFORMER OR PERSECUTOR? : Tim Tate has become a pivotal force in the promotion of Satanic Ritualised Abuse ever since he began research for the

15

*Cook Report* Special, the **Devil's Work** in 1987. The first victim of his allegations and inferences was Mr Chris Bray proprietor of the Sorcerer's Apprentice Bookshop in Leeds. Tate became convinced that Mr Bray was somehow involved in Organising the promotion of Satanism and despite being proven wrong on countless numbers of occasions and being found to have been unfair to Mr Bray by a hearing of the *Broadcasting Complaints Commission* Tate has become obsessed with pressing his point, witness the inclusion of Mr Bray's name and background under Tate's chapter **THE ORGANISATION OF EVIL**. The way that Tim Tate has victimised Mr Bray and attempted to besmirch the name of an honest businessman with good relationships in his local community and with good liasons with the police and local authorities, is nothing short of despicable and the trail of that victimisation is not only illustrative of that obsession but throws great light upon the way that Tate manipulates evidence to convince the public of his own prejudices.

After the Cook Report, which specifically 'doorstepped' Mr Bray and accused him of promoting criminal acts (of which he was entirely innocent) Tate back-tracked at the BCC hearing and admitted that he knew that Mr Bray was not a Satanist and was not involved in any way with child abuse. He restates that fact clearly in his new book

*'Christopher Bray is not himself a Satanist and has no personal involvement in any of the practices described in this book.'*

Then why include his name at all? In fact Mr Bray's legitimate business activities are mentioned three times in Tate's book. A book solely concerned with Satanic Ritualised Abuse and Satanic Crime.

Let's re-run this again. Tate has already been castigated professionally for unfairly and incorrectly victimising Mr Bray in the Cook Report, and is well aware that Mr Bray's bookshop was subsequently fire-bombed and his living destroyed by Christian fundamentalists shortly after the Cook Report was broadcast, yet 2 years later Tate is again trying to involve Mr Bray in something which has nothing to do with him, using exactly the same arguments and 'evidence' which failed in the first instance. Is there not something else going on behind the scenes which the reader cannot see?

There is indeed. Following the lies and unethical manipulation of filmed material in the Cook Report, Mr Bray, unlike most of Cook's victims, fought back and made it a matter of principle to ensure that the people of this country were informed about the Truth surrounding the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth and the fact that it stemmed from fundamentalist lies. The people of this country should be eternally grateful to him for doing this for it is due to Mr



Bray's determination and perseverance that the tragedies of Rochdale and Orkney were brought to public light and dawn-swoops on families were halted.

As Mr Bray's research began to take shape it became clear that many of the people involved in supplying Tim Tate with information on Ritualised Abuse for the Cook Report or who had helped or appeared in the programme, were fundamentalists who had specifically set out to hype the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth and wished to cripple Mr Bray's business. Rev Kevin Logan the Vicar who was shown in the Cook Report 'exorcising' children supposedly suffering from occult oppression and who had been a major player in the promotion of the Satanic Abuse Myth actually sent Mr Bray a letter following the fire-bombing of his shop saying

*'I notice the bookshop is back in business... I shall continue to point out the dangers of such establishments of yours as long as I am able'*

16

Dianne Core secretly asked the Police to investigate Mr Bray and denounced him at a fundie conference in Rome. Geoffrey Dickens (a Childwatch trustee) named Mr Bray's shop in parliament under the protection of parliamentary privilege. When Mr Bray's own MP collared Dickens in the House of Commons to complain on Mr Bray's behalf about his inclusion of his business in such a despicable statement Dickens tried to wash his hands of it admitting that 'he knew very little about the shop and had been given details of it by someone else'

Tate's Cook Report had got it badly wrong but has stubbornly refused to admit it. At first Tate denied that any of the people involved in the Cook Report were fundamentalists but first Maureen Davies' fundamentalist connections were revealed, then Audrey Harper's fundamentalist connections were exposed and lastly Dianne Core's fundamentalist connections and beliefs were aired in a recent newspaper article.

The BCC hearing, the only one the Cook Report had ever had to attend in their many years of broadcasting, vindicated Mr Bray and he then set up the S.A.F.F. (Sub culture Alternatives Freedom Foundation) in order to collate information to protect other occultists and New Age people from unjust victimisation such as he had suffered from the intolerance that people like Tate were generating with their sensational approach to the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth.

In the process of attempting to publicise the truth Mr Bray inevitably and unavoidably came into direct conflict with those leading the promotion of the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth. Realising that Mr Bray's success at publicising the truth would of necessity direct aspersions onto his own professional conduct and personal judgement Mr Tate resisted the new evidence and has continued to include Mr Bray in his campaign to promote Ritualised Abuse. In linking Mr Bray, who you will remember is totally innocent of any personal connection with child abuse or Satanism, the stigma of the Cook Report still works to discredit Mr Bray's information in the eyes of the professionals even though the programme itself was in error. Since the programme Mr Tate has variously termed Mr Bray an Occult Evangelist, (a contradictory and meaningless phrase) and has misrepresented Mr Bray's attempt to get at the truth as being a 'Holy Jihad'. Both of these phrases are obviously an attempt to convince outsiders that Mr Bray is some kind of extremist fanatic whose

information is suspect. And to the eternal discredit of the professionals in child care in this country that strategy has worked on many occasions to bar them from valuable information which would help them greatly in their protection of children at risk.

In a similar vein, although Tate is aware that Mr Bray is a member of the *United Nations Association*, is the founder of an ecological charity and has many other altruistic connections with conservation organisations, he classes him as '*Britain's foremost Occult Businessman*'. Even though there are larger occult bookshops and more 'foremost' occult businessmen elsewhere. In the same chapter Mr Tate demeans Mr Bray's work for universal human rights and freedoms of belief by insisting that he is a

*'self-appointed spokesman for the British Pagan Movement.'*

Another of Mr Tate's compound errors. Actually Mr Bray has the loyal support of over six hundred members of the S.A.F.F. so the phrase 'self-appointed' is obviously misleading. Secondly Mr Bray has never claimed to be the spokesman for the British Pagan Movement for that is the job of the *Pagan Federation* which has been established since 1974 and which specifically cares for the Pagan religion within its affiliation to the S.A.F.F. The S.A.F.F. works for the protection of ALL minority religions including Sikhism, Buddhism, Shintoism, Taoism, Moslems, Hindus and Jews in this country.

Mr Bray is not alone in being at the butt of such treatment from Mr Tate for

17

journalist Rosie Waterhouse, ( who writes for the Independent and who was the first British journalist to pierce the propaganda and misinformation which the fundamentalists were putting out about Satanic Ritualised Abuse), has also suffered continuous attention from Mr Tate who has accused her of bias and complained to her newspapers' ombudsman about her excellent exposes of the Rochdale and Nottinghamshire cases. Readers will note that Ms Waterhouse is also slighted in Tate's book where her work for the independent is criticised, and the reader is told that she has appeared on chat shows, when she has not. Ms Waterhouse's articles have always been factually correct and perfectly balanced to the benefit of the public. Like Mr Bray, she has found out that 'balance' to Mr Tate is all one sided.

The inclusion of Mr Bray in Tate's latest book is in relation to ***The Occult Census*** from which Tate extracts statistics to suit himself in his usual approximate and arbitrary fashion. Sneering that Chris Bray '*hoped*' it would find evidence to disprove the existence of Satanic Ritualised Abuse. Of course the ***Occult Census*** did exactly that but you wouldn't know it by the way that Tate juggles with the statistics.

He tells his readers that 41 people out of a 1000 were practising satanists and, in order to support his inference that 'dabbling is dangerous' adds together those with a serious interest and those with a 'curiosity' about Satanism to come up with a figure of 200 per 1000 which seems to support his theory of many beginners flocking to investigate satanic philosophy. What Tate omits to tell his readers is that those who entered their details into the *Occult Census* were not dabblers. They were all serious and experienced occultists and whilst some may have reported a curiosity about Satanism their main interest and commitment was in other quite legal and acceptable occult

interests which certainly have nothing to do with Satanism or child sacrifice. For Tate to misconstrue the statistics of a very important document in this way to further his obsession with Satanic Ritualised Abuse shows either a complete disregard for the truth or a lack of intelligence.

Contrary to Tate's inferences **The Occult Census** DID show that Satanic Ritualised Abuse was a Myth because

(1) Satanism is the smallest belief within occultism (there is no pan-global threat)

(2) Satanists don't commit child sacrifice or child abuse.

**The Occult Census** was one of the first incontrovertible indicators that the wave of Satanic Ritualised Abuse which Tate is claiming did not exist but who would know that from Tate's review of the Occult Census?

You can see it for yourself and make up your own mind for the S.A.F.F. distribute the Occult Census for 2.25 a copy including postage. (Or you can now download a full copy instantly from here: <http://saff.nfshost.com/census.htm> )

The conflict between Tate, thwarted in his prejudices about Mr Bray is clearly underlined in insults contained in correspondence between the two. Tate, like a dog with a bone it will not give up, dare not make outright accusations against Mr Bray because he knows that Mr Bray is entirely innocent and has already said he will sue without hesitation. Unless Tate can silence Mr Bray using implication his professional integrity will continue to be called into question. Unless Mr Bray pursues the issue, the public will not see the whole truth and justice will not be done.

Again in an attempt to misrepresent Chris Bray, Tate misleads the reader with his choice of language in relation to Mr Bray's magazine **THE LAMP OF THOTH**, on page 193 of his book Tate says that the Process Church 'resurfaced' in the Lamp of Thoth. This is Mr Tate's little dig. Tate is fully aware that there

18

is no connection between Mr Bray or his magazine and the Process Church because this was fully covered in the BCC hearing. The truth about the 'resurfacing' is entirely un-mysterious. During 1988 a cheaply duplicated 'announcement' about *Process Church* doctrine was sent to all occult magazines in the U.K. There has been no further announcement and there is no way of knowing whether it was a spoof. Looking back it could just as easily have been written by those who wanted to discredit the Process Church for in four years there has been no other evidence of Process Church existence.

The **Lamp of Thoth** printed the announcement to inform its readers, along with a warning. Had the **Lamp of Thoth** not done its important job of informing its readers of what was happening in occultism, then Mr Tate would not have known about the Process Church either. What surprises us is that Mr Tate has several times referred to this announcement and to it having been published in the **Lamp of Thoth** but does not seem to have investigated further even though a U.K. address for the Process Church was given. It seems for all the world that Mr Tate is intending to try and make readers believe that the buck stops with Mr Bray, when the facts shown that it does not. Mr Tate is attempting to do what all the other Witch finder Generals have done

throughout the centuries, scapegoat an innocent person to throw people off the scent.

[Ed: Today you can actually download an unexpurgated copy of the Lamp of Thoth and read it in its entirety here:

<http://www.sorcerers-apprentice.co.uk/lotmag.htm> ]

The way that Mr Tate continually defames Mr Bray is important to an overall understanding of Mr Tate's motivations. We cannot compare arguments with victims of 15c witch-hunts but we can provide the facts in Mr Bray's case.

In chapter five of ***Children For The Devil*** Tate tells the reader that Chris Bray published an announcement by the Temple of Set Satanic group and infers that under aged children read his magazine. Mr Tate knows full well that this is not the case. He knows Mr Bray does not sell anything to anyone under the age of 18 and has voluntarily adopted this code throughout the 17 years he has been in business in order to avoid exactly the type of victimisation which Mr Tate is perpetrating. Additionally the Lamp of Thoth is distributed directly by Mr Bray by subscription and is not sold out to general members of the public. It is interesting to note therefore that Mr Bray's responsibility in respect of the controversial articles he publishes is more apparent than Mr Tate's whose book will soon be available in every bookshop and news-stall for anyone to buy who happens to have seventeen pounds in their pocket.

Mr Tate knows of the voluntary restrictions Mr Bray applies because it was a crux of the Broadcasting Complaints Commissions hearing and it is printed on every order form Mr Bray sends out. But Tate never mentioned it in his book.

***The Lamp of Thoth*** magazine deals with ALL aspects of occultism and the New Age, also including folklore, folk history, alternative healing and little known religions. It is often controversial, but it is not illegal. The coverage of Satanism has always been a MINOR component and only a small proportion of his readership are Satanists. It should be noted that many occultists and particularly pagans (the largest section of Mr Bray's readership) are actively antagonistic towards Satanists and it is highly unlikely that Mr Bray would 'promote' a belief which would drive the majority of his readers away.

In order to hype the conspiracy level Mr Tate has insisted that there is some established special relationship between the Temple of Set and Mr Bray and he continues that inference in his book. In fact Mr Bray had had no previous contact whatsoever with the T.O.S. until 6 October 1988 when its leader

19

spontaneously wrote him a letter, at the urging of David Austen, and requested that Mr Bray publish details about TOS doctrines.

The ensuing TOS article did not contain illegal claims or incitements to criminal acts and specifically said that no murder or sacrifice was conducted therefore Mr Bray was perfectly in order in deciding to publish the piece for discussion & debate. Again Tate's unfairness shows through. It is perfectly

permissible for him to stand on 'rights and principles of investigative journalism' to ferret out information about Satanism, but he then denies other people the facility of doing the same thing.

Indeed Tate appears to ignore the long-term antics of David Austen whom Tate and Cook wined and Dined for *The Devil's Work*. Any amateur researcher would have found a mountain of newspaper cuttings relating to Austen which DIRECTLY have import for Tate's book but which are not mentioned. Why not? Why didn't Tate stumble across these references?

Not only has Austen confessed to being present at a baby sacrifice, attending numerous orgies and killing a 13 year old schoolgirl with a Satanic curse, but in 1982, when Austen was a member of The Church of Satan, he told the News of the World about an homosexual orgy cum black mass which he held in Exeter Cathedral which involved 20 gays. In one of these cuttings Austen claims that to gain admittance to the Temple of Set the applicant "has to go through a homosexual experience in front of the High Priest". In yet another expose of Austen & The Temple of Set one John Widger admits that he joined the group when he was a 16 year old schoolboy.

Such information would directly confirm the conclusion in Tate's book yet he ignores all this and the stacks of similar material to hand about David Austen in order to berate Mr Bray, an unconnected magazine editor, for publishing one article which in its effect and its content was completely harmless. Why?

Now we are not going to descend into the type of false witness which is at the root of most of Mr Tate's Inquisitional cases because frankly we don't believe a word that Mr David Austen utters, but to be sure Mr Tate is fully aware that there is an open public vendetta between Mr Bray and Mr Austen who Chris Bray has publicly accused of aiding and abetting Tate with unreliable information to unjustly implicate him in the Satanic Child Abuse controversy.

It is relevant that, when Mr Bray formally refused to be interviewed by Tate for the Cook Report, Austen telephoned Mr Bray and tried to persuade him that it would be in his interests to co-operate. Mr Bray refused to get involved.

Immediately after the screening of the programme Austen faxed a message to Tim Tate saying how pleased he was with it and adding

*"I see what you mean about Chris Bray, he did not do himself any favours did he".*

What we have here sounds like a conspiracy to frame an innocent man.

20

During the *Broadcasting Complaints Commission* hearing Tate said that Austen had given him some letters which showed that minors were obtaining and reading the Lamp of Thoth. Mr Bray denied that this was possible as all sales were by mail-order and customers age authenticated. Bray demanded to see the letters but they were never produced.

During early 1990 the altercation between David Austen and Mr Bray grew to a crisis point and Mr Bray informed Austen that he would expose his media-provocation and lies in the next issue of the Lamp of Thoth in order to stop the skulduggery. On 16 February 1990 Austen sent a handwritten letter

denying that he had given Tate any such letters but ended by threatening to make a list of 25 young people and send it to the newspapers. Subsequently Austen distributed a defamatory letter to other occult magazine editors in an attempt to discredit the accounting procedures of the S.A.F.F. Presumably these skirmishes were to attenuate Mr Bray's campaign towards the truth. This last action resulted in a legal confrontation which is still ongoing.

Knowing of this situation and the heated disagreement between Austen and Bray it was EXTREMELY unethical of Tate to use any information provided by Austen without having it corroborated.

Tate cannot pretend not to know that Mr Bray intensely dislikes both Austen and Michael Aquino of the Temple of set and has trod a fine line campaigning to discredit them both, without demeaning their rights as individuals to -pursue their chosen belief under the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. Chris Bray has made his low opinion of them both abundantly clear in two years of bitter correspondence. Bray blames Austin and Aquino for the whole farrago accusing them of being exhibitionists who cannot refuse media interest lest they miss an opportunity to expand their infamy.

On 7 August 1991 whilst *Children For The Devil* was at the printers, Tim Tate wrote a letter to Austen which read:

"I think you'll agree on reflection that your old sparring partner Chris Bray is aptly described..."

The background to Tate's continuing attacks on Mr Bray is MOST valuable to an understanding of how the Mediaeval Witch Hunt has been time-warped into the 1990s by Tate.

The Situation is a classic example of unjust victimisation of an Innocent person based upon the missionary zeal of a self-appointed Witch finder General backed up by a hysterical reaction of the populace which lowers the credibility threshold and allows lies and hearsay to circulate as 'fact'.

All the major psychological and sociological structures are there. Bray is presented as a successful business man (a robber baron like Rais? ) who, it is imagined, is a key contact in an international conspiracy of wealthy Satanists who secretly promote their heinous crimes. The only proof for such things is a renegade quisling from the occult who, under inducements (publicity not torture in this instance), produces bogus evidence and 'confessions' to confirm the prejudices in the Witch finder General Tate. Bray is persecuted by a kangaroo court which will not listen to any of the facts of the matter (The **Cook Report**) which fixes the evidence and then finds him guilty. Mr Bray is subsequently burned ( bookshop fire-bombing). Later the fictitious 'evidence' is raked up in the case, in a continuous attempt to justify the authorities who brought the 'prosecution' and to confuse and confound the public in order to incriminate others on an entirely false proposition.

21

It STINKS and the most terrible thing about it all is that even when faced with the truth, the media of this country have given it space because they know that the uninformed public of today, like the mediaeval peasantry, are

all too willing to enter into a spectacle which denigrates humanity, providing their self-righteous morality is pacified.

The police and the Social Services have chosen the path of least resistance and allowed the Witch finder Generals into seats of power where they continue to spread their obsessive poison, not realising the extensive damage and ramification it has for our pluralist society.

One thing is for sure, if Tate is willing to take such liberties with Mr Bray who can answer back, it is no surprise that the image of Crowley and others that Tate presents is entirely unknown to genuine occultists.

There are MANY other assertions and allegations in Mr Tate's book. We find page after page of biased misinterpretation which we would like to contradict and challenge and we will do so in due course. It is obvious from this review that anyone who accepts Mr Tate's evidence without obtaining corroborating proof is likely to be getting a very biased partial view of the whole. (Ed. It is Fake News 30 years before Fake News was coined.) Anyone who is interested in our response on specific cases or allegations in the book which we have not covered here should contact the S.A.F.F. at saffmail@zoho.com

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Does CHILDREN FOR THE DEVIL contribute in any way to a proper understanding of the Satanic Ritual Abuse Myth? I am afraid it does not. It simply confuses the issue further with more wild goose chases. It is certainly not a document which will help professional social workers or the police get at the truth for its many inaccuracies, biased misinterpretations and fudged conclusions make it virtually worthless in our opinion.

**Question:** How many times can the truth be ignored before its misinterpretation becomes a lie?

In order to draw comparisons of the 'validity' of component parts of Black Masses, Tate could have produced a graph which would have given us that information explicitly. Instead he chooses to relate the sickening details in narrative form. His intention is to excite our passions and dehumanise the alleged perpetrators, alienating them from our human sympathies.

It is a journalistically polished synthesis of aspects of the phenomenon which have been dealt with separately in better detail elsewhere. A blend of advocacy and argument written in a style which is neither academic nor popular. The sine-wave of Tate's writing style rises and falls through complex layers of historical fact, theory, supposition, superstition and disinformation. Perhaps only Tate knows where one begins and the other leaves off. He weaves a thread of impressions which only have one thing in common, they are designed to impact upon our sensibilities by exacerbating prejudices and stereotypes which already exist within us in order to convince us that these horrible things are happening. In legal terms it is called 'guilt by association'. It works, but it is unjust and it is untrue.

With Tate everything is clear. There's the goodies and there's the baddies. The Baddies are the ones that do this and this. The goodies are the ones that do this and that.

Is it that simple?

Of course not and that is why, thank goodness, the efforts of people like Tim Tate have been buffered by the common-sense and experience of the police in this country. Tate has a go at them too (can anyone disagree with him?) and mutely asserts another fundamentalist hobby-horse, that today's police are complicit in ignoring the evidence because it would involve people in high places. In a typical piece of Tateese hypocrisy he commends Louis XIVs police chief Nicholas de La Reynie for his professionalism. Tate writes:

*' that so much reliable detail of French satanic ritual crime was recorded is both a tribute to his professionalism and an eloquent condemnation of the shoddy amateurism of many modern law-enforcement departments '.*

Self righteous stuff indeed. I wonder if Tate would also recommend our police forces to adopt La Reynie's methods of obtaining evidence through torture, including smashing the accused's legs to pulp with mallets? (Ed. Well in fact **Children For The Devil** did include a defamatory attack on one honourable policemen and shortly after it was published, Det. Insp. Peter Cole took Tate to court over libel. Tate's publishers capitulated. paid Cole damages, and Tate's disgustingly untruthful book was recalled and pulped. Full details here: <http://saff.nfshost.com/coles.htm> }

Ultimately reader's of Tate's book will believe what they want to believe, but they won't believe it because they have been shown proof.

**www.SAFF.ORG.UK SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF BELIEF AGAINST CULTURAL IGNORANCE** [saffmail@zoho.com](mailto:saffmail@zoho.com)

23

*(This SAFF pamphlet was first published in 1991.)*