

CHAPTER VI

Israel

18.v.1948. *London*

The Zionists have proclaimed a Jewish State in Palestine with Shertok as Foreign Minister and Weizmann as President. Our Mandate terminated on the 15th, which was the signal for the invasion of Palestine by Egypt, Iraq, Transjordan, Lebanon and Syria. The Transjordan Frontier Force, officered by British officers, is in action on the Judaeon Highlands accompanied by a special correspondent of *The Times*, whilst Cadogan tells the Security Council that he doubts whether there is a threat to international peace, that he would find difficulty in pointing out the aggressor and that the Transjordan Frontier Force is in Transjordan.

Never in the history of England has there been such a shameful abdication after years of shilly-shallying, no policy and no decision beyond those prompted by anti-Jewish sentiment. Our Mandate over Palestine was something more than other mandates. Palestine is a unique country with unique problems. The Palestine Mandate was unique. We have missed a chance which will never recur and have earned the eternal hatred of Jewry when we might have won their eternal respect. We have lost the strategic value of Palestine which will cost us dear. The whole of Palestine and Jewry have been hopelessly bungled and I am thoroughly ashamed of our Government, our Press, our people and my religion.

Since 1918 I have continually pressed for Jewish Sovereignty in Palestine. Both Balfour and Lloyd George intended it. A

Jewish State could have been erected in Palestine in 1919 or 1920 without any difficulty. But after that, officials in Palestine and Whitehall, poisoned by anti-Jewish feeling, never gave Zionism a chance. Britain and her officials sided with the Arabs and now throws over the Mandate, telling the Jews and Arabs they can fight it out, in the belief that the Arabs will win. Whilst placing every obstacle in the way of the Jews, no obstacles have been placed in the way of the Arabs. On the contrary, Egypt, Transjordan, Iraq and Saudi Arabia have received arms from the British Government and their troops have been trained by British officers.

Our Government now hide their shame under the excuse that they could not get the Jews and Arabs to agree on a just settlement. In the early days of Zionism such a settlement could easily have been reached but the British Government would not have it, knowing that the Arabs might get the worst of the bargain. Now, having fanned Arab nationalism into flame and exasperated the Jews, they complain that the two parties cannot agree. No, we have abandoned the Mandate because we were too weak to impose on Palestine any form of partition; further we were unwilling to give the Jews the slightest chance of establishing a Jewish State. In abandoning the Mandate, British Officials have at last come out into the open, siding with the Arabs and exposing their bitter hatred of Jewry. We scuttled out of Palestine because we thought it a certainty that the Arabs were sufficiently strong to achieve what successive weak British Governments and Palestine Administrations have been trying to do for over twenty-five years, namely, liquidate Zionism.

Britain is now the champion of the Arab League and is prepared to carry on the vile policy which Hitler initiated against the Jews.

To-day the Security Council, sitting in America, is bewildered and impotent. They have asked both sides in Palestine what is happening. Just an excuse to gain time. Cadogan finds it difficult to find an aggressor. Surely invasion is the essence and proof of aggression. Just another excuse to support the Arab League and obstruct the Jews.

This has been written in great haste. It is too disconnected and

muddled. But I am very angry at the injustice of it all and have a temperature of 101 with an attack of glandular fever; so now to bed.

In The Times of May 22nd, 1948, appeared this letter:

Sir,

Major-General Sir Edward Spears, in stating that Zionism has endangered British bases in the Mediterranean and represents a threat to British strategic interests, surely conveniently forgets not only that many of the present Arab political and military leaders, including Fawzi El Kawukji and the Mufti, either spent the war in Germany working for Hitler or had to be interned by us, but forgets also what happened in the Middle East between 1939 and 1945.

In 1944, Brigadier Glubb (now leading the Arab Legion in its assault against Jerusalem, and no pro-Zionist surely), writing when the Arab war effort was still close enough to defy even Foreign Office attempts to romanticize it, said:

‘At the time of these operations every Arab was perfectly convinced that Britain was finished for ever and that it would only be a question of weeks before Germany took over Arabia. The Iraqis were perfectly sure of this or they would not have declared war on us . . . in brief, during the six weeks before the fall of Baghdad every Arab was convinced that we were done for. Every Arab force previously organized by us, mutinied, and refused to fight for us or faded away in desertions.’ (Pages 214–215 of Somerset de Chair’s *The Golden Carpet*.)

No doubt when Glubb wrote this he would remember (what General Spears has forgotten) that, although the Jewish population in Palestine was only half that of the Arab, more than twice the number of Jews volunteered for service to protect our Mediterranean position; and that at the time when Iraq declared war against us, and British tanks had to be driven into the Abdin Palace yard to compel King Farouk’s consent to the appointment of a Pro-British Government under Nahas Pasha, Hagana men were being dropped as British agents in enemy territory, that Hagana was recognized by

G.H.Q. as the one reliable local defence force and Palestine the one base whose loyalty was never in doubt for a moment.

And what now? No doubt if British officers and British supplied tanks and aeroplanes continue the destruction of Jewish settlements and life we shall earn the bitter hatred of the Jews of Palestine. Is that however surprising—a symptom of Zionist original sin? It is a policy choice for the British Government which will determine whether Israel becomes once more an ally, as in the war, or an enemy beleaguered by British arms and equipment who must look elsewhere for aid for sheer survival. And may I say that our attitude—that Israel must show itself capable of functioning before being recognized by us—would sound more honest if it were not troops trained and equipped by British military missions, and the British officered and subsidized Arab Legion, which were at war with Israel to prevent precisely that functioning?

Does public opinion at home appreciate (as it does abroad) that every tank and aeroplane now being used by the Arabs has been supplied by the United Kingdom; that the British air mission is still functioning in Iraq; that British missions are now working, training and re-equipping Arab armies in Saudi Arabia and Iraq; that between 1945 and 1947 we supplied Egypt alone with forty military aircraft, thirty-eight scout cars, and 298 carriers, apart from a great quantity of small arms and light equipment; that the Arab Legion now waging war is wholly subsidized by us with £2,000,000 a year and is commanded by thirty-eight British officers; that Transjordan, under the March 1948 treaty, is bound to 'undertake not to adopt in regard to foreign countries an attitude which is inconsistent with the alliance or might create difficulties for the other party thereto'; that no word of protest has come from the British Government at the Arab invasions, but that the Jews within the boundaries given them by the United Nations partition decision (which still stands) are denied arms by the British?

Finally, the Foreign Office viewpoint conveyed by your Diplomatic Correspondent on May 20th that 'it should not be assumed that Transjordan is acting as an aggressor until it can be shown that she has acted aggressively towards another State' (obviously meaning a State recognized by us) smacks a

little too much of the legalistic chicanery of the 'thirties which reduced Japan's war on Manchuria to the status of an 'incident' and in so doing destroyed the League of Nations. Will we never learn that we cannot subsidize aggression in the Middle East and oppose it in Greece or Persia—that to climb now into the grandstand and attempt to wash our hands of responsibility of the slaughter perpetrated by our Spitfires and British trained and officered Arab troops is conduct utterly unworthy of the traditions of a great nation and indicates a moral degeneration within the political leadership of this country far more alarming than any signs of a merely materialistic or economic decline?

I am, Sir, yours, etc.

Lyall Wilkes.

House of Commons, May 20th, 1948.

21.v.1948. *London*

I cannot throw off this glandular fever which makes me feel depressed and miserable. However the news that the R.A.F. had shot down five Egyptian planes in Israel did, I think, reduce my temperature. The British Press is full of Arab invasion and Arab victories. Any Jewish successes are printed very small. But all that has happened is that Arab armies have invaded Arab Palestine unopposed whereas the Jews have captured Acre. I doubt much whether there will be any co-ordination in Arab policy or invasion. Iraq and Transjordan may pull together but both Syria and the Lebanon and above all Saudi Arabia mistrust Abdullah; Egypt has quite enough on her hands without invading Palestine but she has done so, I suppose, to keep an eye on Abdullah and to distract public attention from acute domestic issues in the Delta.

Every day favours the Jews and I really believe I shall live to see Israel established in Palestine; it has for long been one of my ambitions.

Meanwhile Russia, the U.S.A. and South Africa have recognized Israel. We should do so at once but still fear the Arabs. This recognition has shaken the Arab League, probably ruined it if there was ever much to ruin. It has also exploded the wild dreams of the Jerusalem Mufti. One thing seems certain now; the Jews will retain what partition has given them

and if the Arabs persist on invasion, then Israel will dominate a greater Palestine which will surely embrace Transjordan and possibly parts of Syria and Sinai.

26.v.1948. *London*

Weizmann has seen Truman and has asked for the lifting of the embargo on arms to the Middle East and for a dollar loan. It seems he may get both. Meanwhile the Arabs have refused to agree to a truce in Palestine, thereby defying the Security Council. There are thirty-seven British officers serving with the Arab Legion in Palestine against the Jews and Bevin is lying in the House when he says none of them are directing artillery against Jerusalem. I happen to know that four are doing so. And Alexander, our Minister of Defence, has the impertinence to say in the House that our evacuation of Palestine does not affect our strategic interest in the security and stability of the Middle East. The Jews are being blamed for everything and the supporters of the Arabs, realizing they are riding a losing horse, are becoming frantic. The fact is, the Jews have won. Israel is established and thank God I have lived to see it. Wrote to Weizmann who is in Washington.

1.vii.1948. *London*

The most shameful chapter of Britain's history closed yesterday when the last British troops left. The Jews are now free and except for the backing in money, equipment and men which we are giving the Arabs, the ring is clear for a straight fight. Bernadotte, the mediator, with the best intentions in the world, is trying to solve the problem in Rhodes; but the truce is but a sham and fighting will break out next week. The Palestine problem can only be decided by blood. The Jews, at the last moment, stole two Churchill tanks from the army. How could that happen without collusion. I'm delighted they got them. I wish they could get a destroyer.

What have we left behind in Palestine? A Transjordan king and government which would collapse if British support were withdrawn, an Arab army under the command of British officers and equipped by Britain and a heritage of complications the end of which cannot be visualized. Worse, much worse, we

have left behind a hatred which will not die for generations.

We allowed our machinery of Government to dissolve without making provision for the continuance of essential services and we left without any regret whatsoever on the part of any section of the community. We slink out hated and despised by all. It is a condemnation unparalleled in British history.

And for this we must thank Ernest Bevin and his advisers in the Foreign Office. Whatever good qualities Bevin may have, this conniving at driving the Jews from Palestine is a grievous blot on his record.

And this same Foreign Secretary said publicly just before the Second World War 'We detest the Franco regime'. Who is We? And why detest a regime which stopped communism gaining control in south-west Europe and which refused Hitler entry into Spain to attack Gibraltar. Bevin might equally well have said 'We detest the Jews'.

5.vii.1948. *London*

Count Bernadotte's much advertised plan is federation, a suggestion made frequently in the past but unworkable, unacceptable and showing an utter ignorance of Zionism. Bernadotte's mission was doomed to failure from the start. There can be no mediation in Palestine.

9.vii.1948. *London*

The truce is finished and fighting has broken out again, the Egyptians being the aggressors. I am sure that a solution achieved by war will be territorially a much better solution for Israel than the partition offered by the United Nations last November.

Bernadotte has failed to grasp the meaning of Zionism or that Palestine is already a sovereign state without any intention of abandoning her sovereignty. Bernadotte's plan, an amazingly stupid and ill-advised plan, probably suggested to him by some British officer, includes the giving of Jerusalem to the Arabs and depriving the Jews of Haifa. These are the two keys of Israel, fundamental and vital. To abandon Haifa and Jerusalem makes nonsense of Zionism. The idea of Jerusalem becoming an Arab city revolts me, arousing the old fire of crusader. With Arab intolerance of religion and the Holy City, the Holy

Christian City, in the hands of intolerant fanatics, the Middle East goes back to the dark ages.

And both Bernadotte and the United Nations still appeal for peace. How can they expect either Jew or Arab to listen when these armchair pundits, oozing resolutions, plans, vetos, etc., do not understand the meaning of the Arab-Jew conflict and only the U.S.A. and Britain care. Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, China, Abyssinia! Good God! What utter tomfoolery it is.

15.VII.1948. *London*

Bernadotte flew to America and stated his case and that of the Jews and Arabs to the Security Council advocating an extension of the truce under threat of sanctions. Cadogan, who when Transjordan, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Lebanon invaded Palestine, could not see any sign of aggression, now when Jewish military successes indicate that they will soon dominate the situation and capture Jerusalem, denounces the Jews as aggressors. Bernadotte is no less pro-Arab. He advocates an indefinite truce during which Jewish immigration would be brought to a standstill and the arms embargo would be maintained. It looks as though our Foreign Office, having backed the Arabs to over-run Palestine and wipe out Zionism and having by now been disillusioned by Arab weakness and incompetence, are accusing the Jews of doing the very thing which our F.O. encouraged the Arabs to do.

It is my earnest prayer that Jewish military successes during the next few days will place them in a position where they can snap their fingers at the United Nations, Bernadotte and the Arab League.

Bernadotte runs a grave risk of assassination.

16.VII.1948. *London*

After weeks of fighting in Palestine it looks as though the Security Council is going to treat it as a breach of the peace and to invoke sanctions. When this was first proposed during the Arab Legion's assault last May against Jerusalem, it was vigorously opposed by the British Government. But last Tuesday we accepted the American Line and in doing so tacitly admitted the utter bankruptcy of Bevin's disastrous policy. For

nearly three years Bevin has done his utmost to assist the Arab League in preventing a Jewish State. Confidently the Arab armies prepared for the knock-out blow as soon as our Mandate ceased. Confidently the British Government expected and hoped that the Jews would be driven out of Palestine and Zionism destroyed once and for all. But what happened. By a series of dramatic military victories the Jews have conquered the areas allotted to them; and after 15th May, the Arab armies which had been expected to enter Haifa within ten days failed utterly to achieve their objective, despite British money, British equipment, British training and the active participation of British officers.

28.VII.1948. *London*

A quarter of a million pounds has been paid to Transjordan this week as a subsidy for their invasion of Palestine. Without this subsidy Abdullah could not possibly maintain the Arab Legion in Palestine; the payment of the subsidy therefore amounts to a breach of the truce. I hope the Israel Government will make such a representation to the Security Council. But it is such a waste of money. No matter what equipment one gives the Arab, they run no chance against the Jews. It is the man behind the gun who counts, not the gun.

I have been having several conversations with the Zionists at Great Russell Street; most informative and I hope I have been able to help a little.

7.VIII.1948. *London*

On August 6th, 1948, King Abdullah reviewed the Arab Legion in Amman, congratulating Glubb Pasha and his officers and men, saying they had defeated the enemy and preserved the holiness of Jerusalem. Abdullah ends up 'We and the others went into this fight jointly; where are the others? We have fought and progressed, but we have not seen this progress made by others.'

Yes, indeed, where are 'the others'? Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iraq? Just like a lot of pariah dogs, the one slightly in advance of the others and always looking back to see if the 'others' are coming.

10.VIII.1948. *London*

Israel would have loyally adhered to U.N.O. decision on partition including restricted boundaries, but the Arab States refused to accept U.N.O. decision and invaded Palestine. Nobody had the pluck to acclaim them aggressors. Why?

We still continue to subsidize Transjordan who is at war with Israel and it is not considered to be an unneutral act. Why?

On July 27th, the British Middle East Command handed over to the Egyptian Army considerable quantities of military equipment. Why is this not a breach of the truce?

The British Government are solicitous for the welfare of 300,000 Arabs who fled from Israel for no reason at all. The Jews never molested them nor compelled them to leave. Arab invasion compelled them to leave. The Arab States, who have repeatedly stated that they are invading Palestine to save the Arabs from Jewish terror, now want to return the refugees to Israel. Neither do the British Government show the same anxiety for 11,000 Jews illegally detained in Cyprus or the thousands of displaced Jews, some still in concentration camps in Germany. Why?

The Mediator suggests that Jerusalem be handed over to the Arabs. It is a Jewish and a Christian Holy City also. Nobody in this country raised any objection, forgetting the Crusades. Why?

No State has yet been born except by its own unilateral assertion. No State has been born by permission of an organized international community. Except Israel. Its origin was ordained by the community of nations. She possesses an international birth certificate such as no other country possesses. Why then is Britain hostile to her? Why?

Cadogan states that the entry into Palestine of the Cyprus detainees would give a military advantage to the Jews—and yet he continues to pay British taxpayers' money to maintain the Arab Legion which has committed an act of aggression against Palestine and he sanctions the handing over of war equipment to the Egyptian Army on July 27th. Do these unneutral acts not give a military advantage to the Arabs?

2.IX.1948. *London*

Despite superiority in arms, equipment and numbers the Arab

armies of six States have failed to carry out their boast that they would drive the Jews out of Palestine. On the contrary, the Jews are well on their way to drive the Arabs not only out of Palestine but out of Transjordan and Sinai. Both parties have agreed to a truce which is not a truce as fighting continues. The atmosphere is tense and cannot continue. It is clear that the British Government have overestimated the fighting qualities of the Arab and underestimated those of the Jew. And the strength and determination behind Zionism has never been appreciated. Politically there is no unity within the Arab League. The British Government still refuse to recognize Israel. Anti-British feeling increases among the Arabs and could not be worse among the Jews. Anglo-Jewish friendship has been completely ruptured. H.M.G. have not yet realized that a Jewish State in Palestine is a fact.

Bernadotte, the Swedish Mediator, must be a fine fellow but he has made one gigantic error from which his own prestige will never recover. He tried to give Jerusalem to the Arabs. Christianity should have been deeply shocked. I was, but no single voice in Britain expressed horror. Jerusalem is the core of Zionism. To give it to the Arabs stamps Bernadotte at once as a partisan and completely out of touch with the meaning of Zionism. In formulating this horrible proposal he has signed his own death warrant. They will have no use for him and the terrorists will get him sooner or later and everyone else who stands between Israel and Jerusalem. I'm terribly sorry that Bernadotte made such an error for he has both moral and physical courage and might have succeeded if he had understood Zionism better.

As it is, the Jews will get him.

17.IX.1948. *London*

Count Bernadotte has been shot dead in Jerusalem by members of the Stern Gang; it is a shocking and unforgivable crime but was inevitable after trying to give Jerusalem to the Arabs. Such a proposal showed a complete lack of understanding of Zionism and he signed his death warrant when he suggested it. But the real culprits and responsible instigators of the crime are generally the United Nations and in particular the British

Government. The British reduced Palestine to chaos and violence from order and prosperity and then, having made as much mess of the country as they could do in thirty years, cleared out and left Jews and Arabs to fight it out. No Mediator runs a chance of settling after such mismanagement. And then the United Nations come along, talk a great deal, decide nothing, refuse Bernadotte any kind of material backing, sway one way and another and increase exasperation on both sides; it is not surprising that such a horrible crime is perpetrated. Bernadotte was a man who has worked all his life for mankind, his mission in life has been governed by mercy; it is hideous and abominable that he should have been struck down in the city where Christ preached what Bernadotte practised.

But I do not blame the Jews. I blame those few extremists driven to exasperation and any form of violence by procrastination and lack of policy and understanding by the British Governments since 1918.

The virus of anti-semitism—or, better, hebraphobia—will increase in vigour, turning the whole world against the Jew, turning sour the souls of men and converting them into little Hitlers, the prototypes of the species we fought for six years because of their soured, poisoned souls. Fanaticism and unbridled nationalism go hand in hand. Naked nationalism knows no law except necessity. It is despair and disillusion forced on Jewry by successive British Governments which has turned nationalism stark, staring mad; under such conditions any crime is possible.

The Jews are not naturally a violent race, their characteristics are piety, gentleness and kindness. There is no excuse for the murder of Bernadotte but there are many and potent reasons.

The malignant growth of terrorism in Palestine is the direct outcome of the recent years of indescribable suffering of the Jews in Europe and the frustration of their efforts to achieve peace, security and justice from, in the first place, Great Britain and, secondly, from the United Nations. I do not blame the Jews for the murder of Bernadotte; I am intensely sorry for them in this critical hour.

19.IX.1948. *London*

I lunched with Vansittart last week and tried to get him in-

terested in a solution I have in mind for the security of Israel and a permanent settlement in the Middle East. There is no doubt that for years to come all Arab States will strive to drive the Jews into the sea and destroy the State of Israel and there will be little sympathy with Israel among the nations of the world, partly because of anti-semitism and partly because of expediency, namely oil. But it will take more than Arabs to destroy Israel; the civilized world may destroy Israel by neglecting her and encouraging the Arabs with arms and propaganda. I therefore want to make Israel doubly secure from attack by preventing combined attack by the Arab States.

1948

When I was in Sinai during the First War, I discovered that the sovereign boundary between Egypt and Turkey runs from Rafa to Suez and that Egypt was granted an administrative frontier by Turkey, running from Rafa to the north end of the Gulf of Aqaba. Britain conquered eastern Sinai and can claim it. The Egyptians have no right to it. If we were to occupy eastern Sinai, we could establish a strategic base there, secure the Canal and separate Egypt from other Arab States. With this in view I lunched with Vansittart and I think he was impressed; I told him I should like to place the scheme before Bevin and he agreed; a meeting was arranged and this afternoon I met Bevin at the Foreign Office. I had never met the man before.

I had maps with me and placed the whole scheme before Bevin; he was clearly bored and uninterested. I went into the whole thing: the strategic importance of Israel, the port of Haifa—the best in the Eastern Mediterranean—the fighting qualities of the Jews and the impotence of the Arabs, the vital importance of the Suez Canal to us, the stupid policy of appeasing the Arabs because they have oil when they can prevent us having it by closing the Canal—moreover we could shift our huge strategic base from the Canal to Sinai and if necessary cut another Canal from the Gulf of Aqaba to the Mediterranean—and the vital importance of separating Egypt from other Arab States. I stressed the fact that the Jews are the finest fighting material and we should do all we can to help them; I thought Bevin would explode when I stressed the superb qualities of the Jews—gratitude, reliability and courage; Bevin cleared his

throat, puffed out his cheeks and closely resembled an inflated toad. I hinted that anti-semitism was poisoning the minds of Ministers, at which he became very indignant, in fact so indignant that it was clearly a correct assumption.

I was with Bevin for over half an hour and I doubt if I had any effect on his intellect. By throwing up the Palestine Mandate and abandoning the Jews to their fate, which he hoped would be annihilation, Bevin has done more harm to Britain than most men; it is tragic that a man of his calibre should be Foreign Secretary and bring such discredit on our country.

The following letter from Glubb Pasha appeared in *The Times*, September 18th, 1948:

Sir,

The failure of the Arab League to overthrow the State of Israel has produced in the Press a number of letters and articles suggesting that Great Britain has 'backed the wrong horse'. The Arab armies, it is alleged, would be of little value as allies against Russia or any other hostile great Power, if they have been unable to defeat even the Jewish forces.

I venture to submit, however, that this appreciation is entirely erroneous. However efficient the armies of small States may be, the experience of the late war has proved that they can barely stand up for a few days against a great Power. It is not the armies of the Arabs or of Israel which are important—it is the geographical situation of their territories.

The Arab countries lie across the main line of communications from west to east. They also form the only land bridge between Asia and Africa. They contain vast reserves of oil. An alliance with Israel, however efficient that State may be, would not compensate Britain for the loss of Arab friendship. Strategy is built primarily on the inescapable facts of geography.

I am, Sir, yours truly,
J. B. Glubb.

Royal Hashemite Transjordan Legation,
Office of the Military Attaché,
6 Upper Phillimore Gardens, W.8.
September 16th.

What muddled thinking. The strategic position of Israel is even more important, with its superb port of Haifa. The Jews have proved their fighting qualities, the Arabs have proved themselves to be militarily inefficient. And what is the use of a good strategic position without troops?

No Russian army could march across the Syrian Desert or penetrate far into Saudi Arabia; but they could press down through Damascus and Palestine to the Suez Canal. It is the Jews which hold the strategic position not the Arabs.

24.x.1948. *London*

In spite of every effort to enforce a truce in Palestine, fighting continues. Anyone with the slightest knowledge of Zionism and the Arabs should know that there can be no mediation between Zionism and Islam until Israel has occupied what is her right in Palestine. To think or act otherwise shows ignorance of the situation and a refusal to face realities. Meanwhile the Egyptian Army has been reduced to impotence and the fighting spirit of the Egyptian soldier has been exposed. And so it will continue until Israel gets what she wants. I have written to Weizmann, congratulating him.

Just think what the situation is and what it might have been if we had backed the right horse. We might have had a strong, healthy Jewish Sovereign State in Palestine in close union with the British Commonwealth and a bulwark in the Middle East which would have been unshakeable. Look what we have got. A bitterly hostile Jewish State and equally hostile Arab States. They would have been hostile in any case. Look at them: Abdullah and his Arab Legion, quite useless in spite of British arms and financial assistance, Egypt bitterly hostile and with her armed forces discredited in spite of British equipment, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Iraq and Lebanon impotent.

People talk much about injustice to the Arabs. What about the Baltic States, Finland, Poland and every other State behind the Iron Curtain; all raped by Russia and ruled by puppet Communist Governments contrary to the wishes of the majority. We never hear of injustices in Eastern Europe, only in Palestine and only because the nation Israel is composed of Jews.

The acting Mediator in Palestine has ordered Israel to with-

draw from the position she has won during the last week. I am glad to say Israel has refused to consider such a one-sided arrangement. It would be unfair to regard this refusal as disregard of the will of the United Nations. The present situation is the direct result of the failure of the Mediator to react quickly when Egyptian Forces attacked an Israeli convoy which initiated the present campaign in the Negev. Little attention was given to the Egyptian attack and it is unfair and unrealistic to demand the withdrawal of troops from positions which were occupied at the cost of heavy losses to secure Jewish settlements which were illegally blockaded.

8.XI.1948. *London*

Before leaving England I am going to enjoy a real good hate directed against Communism and Socialism and a real good satisfaction at Jewish successes against the Arab League and the collapse of the Egyptian army. I am conforming to man's duality of nature—amity and enmity. As I have always foretold, no Arab combination would ever withstand the unity and force of militant Zionism. Right will always triumph over might though this never existed in the Arab camp but only in the minds of the Foreign Office and that crazy band of Arabphils, Philby, Storrs, Spears, Newcombe, Glubb and a host of minor fry. The total collapse of the Egyptian army in the Negev has created a military situation in southern Palestine which is entirely dominated by the armed forces of Israel who could, if they wished, occupy the whole of Sinai. In Galilee a Jewish offensive has given to Israel the whole of northern Palestine. All that remains to the Arabs is the Judaeon Highlands and the Jordan valley where the Arab Legion, still financed by Britain in flagrant breach of neutrality, are in command. Meanwhile the Mediator's machinery and the Security Council have been overtaken and swamped by Jewish successes and the reality of events. Slow deliberation will never catch up with military successes.

Israel will not now give up territory won by force of arms. The United Nations are faced with a *fait accompli*. The prolonged failures of the Mediator and lack of agreement in the Security Council have deserved the contempt of Israel and the

Arabs. One could scarcely expect Israel to hold back and do nothing when surrounded by enemies; and when Britain was known to be behind her enemies.

No Mediator or decision of a remote Security Council could hope for respect without a backing of force. The Mediator has demanded innumerable truces without defining the period during which the truce must be maintained. Truces of indefinite duration must collapse unless there is a real hope and desire for peace. A point has now been reached in Palestine where the imposition of a truce is both dangerous and negative. Both parties now realize that they can ignore the United Nations with impunity; and so far as Israel is concerned, with advantage. Nothing short of a major military operation in Palestine could now control the situation and this is out of the question.

It must surely be obvious to all that no power on earth can confine or suppress the nationalistic and racial impetus of Israel. Zionism must expand to its natural boundaries. Those who still hope to check Zionism might as well hope to check the explosion of an atom bomb.

The sensible solution is to encourage direct negotiation between Jew and Arab, immediate recognition of Israel by Britain and the offering of friendly advice by the United Nations. Otherwise the Jews will rely on their own strength and regain the whole of Biblical Palestine and the Arabs will disintegrate under the weight of incompetence and disunity. Both parties will emerge bitterly hostile to Britain, for which we have to thank Bevin. And with so little foresight we might have had a strong, healthy Jewish State, for ever grateful to Britain and a bulwark in the Middle East which would have more than made up for our crumbling position in Egypt.

But thank God I have lived to see the birth of Israel. It is one of the greatest historical events of the last 2,000 years and thank God I have been privileged to assist in a small way this great event which, I am convinced, will bring benefit to mankind.

The only constructive element which emerged from the wreckage of 1914-18 was the conceded principle of a Home for the Jews in Palestine; and the only worthwhile dividend of 1939-45 is Israel.

19.xi.1948. *Port Said*

Arrived Port Said at 11 a.m. and anchored in the harbour. I devoted my time to talking to various Egyptian officials on Palestine. After a bit they opened up and gave me some astonishing facts. They could have annihilated the Jews but for three excuses. They were most anxious to obey the United Nations and had stopped fighting when told to do so whereas the Jews had continued to fight when told to stop. Second, Abdullah of Transjordan had refused to co-operate; and third, as 25 per cent of Englishmen are Jews and 50 per cent of Americans are Jews, Palestine got all the help it needed in money and equipment.

As regards the first excuse I told them that Egypt had been the aggressor by invading Palestine and they must not mind the Jews defending themselves. Their advance into Palestine had been rapid and successful until they had met the Jews; why did they stop? Oh, they did not like to go against the advice of UNO. Regarding the second they explained that Abdullah was jealous of Egyptian victories and wanted the whole of Palestine for himself, so he refused to co-operate. They admitted that the Arab League was dissolving through jealousies and they now hoped the Jews would take Transjordan. 'And Sinai?' I asked. No, never, the gallant Egyptian army would defend Sinai to the last man. Third: British and American help to the Jews. I told them that the Arab States had better opportunities to acquire equipment than the Jews and that the six Arab States now attacking Palestine all had standing armies largely equipped by Britain and in the case of Transjordan officered by British officers; also that the strength of the combined armies of the Arab States outnumbered the Jewish forces by at least five to one. This they flatly denied, claiming that the Jews had 100,000 men trained and equipped by Britain and America.

'Then to what do you ascribe your failures?' I asked. That produced a storm; they had not failed, they had not even begun; just wait till they get going and the world will be shocked. I told them the world was already shocked to see the Egyptian army routed by a handful of Jews.

One Egyptian, a police inspector, an enlightened man and educated in England, thought the best solution would be a

round-table conference between Jews and Arabs without outside interference. He had no faith in UNO. The Arabs would have to recognize not only the State of Israel but her conquests; otherwise there was nothing to stop them occupying every Arab State one after another. I heartily agreed.

2.XII.1948. *Dhala, Aden Protectorate*

I visited a Yemeni Jew, a most intelligent old patriarch. He showed me with great pride an ancient manuscript on leather of the Old Testament. Every evening he read a bit of it to his family. In these parts the Jews are despised by the Arabs but not persecuted; this old gentleman told me the Arabs did not like him because he was more intelligent and worked harder than they did; perhaps that is at the root of hebraphobia. Maybe in the remote future the Jews will be the dominant race of mankind. It would certainly be an improvement on other types of domination in our modern world.

On this trip I visited Yemen and made frequent contacts with Yemeni Jews, all asking when they could return to Palestine, all slightly boycotted by their Arab hosts, all devoutly religious and possessing ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament and all hard working craftsmen, doing all the skilled work of the community.

From Aden, I proceeded to British Somaliland, Italian Somaliland, Kenya and thence to South Africa.

7.XII.1948. *Aden*

Palestine drags on without decision and can only result in worse confusion and more violence. But what remains is the infant Israel, firm in the saddle and quite determined to take her place among the great Nations of the world. Thank God I have lived to see it.

23.IV.1949. *Cape Town*

After dinner I called on Smuts at the Mount Nelson Hotel. It was most refreshing to be greeted with so much warmth and we sat talking for over two hours. Though almost eighty he still walks up hills every Saturday and Sunday and looked

terribly fit in his old flannel trousers and grey pull-over. What a wise old man he is and how stupid are the Union electorate to have displaced him just at a moment when the world is upside down, lacking leadership and wisdom. Every part of the world is afraid of something. Here, in the Union, the bogey is the African who is going to rise and turn the white man out of South Africa. Smuts assures me the whole question is utter nonsense, which is what I imagined, and has been largely used for political purposes.

He thought the new State of Israel was one of the wonders of the world and the only good outcome of two world wars. The irony of its birth was that our throwing up of the Palestine Mandate was prompted by the belief that the Arabs would drive the Jews into the sea and squash Zionism once and for all; it had, in fact, enabled Israel to be born and weaned by its own strength.

I pointed out to Smuts the many nations who had sunk low after persecution of the Jews. Egypt suffered because she would not 'let My people go'. In the late Middle Ages Spain persecuted the Jews and has never recovered from the great nation she once was. Before the First World War and during that war France and Russia persecuted the Jews and were reduced to ruin. We befriended the Jews in 1818-19 and were strong and prosperous. Our deterioration coincides with an increasing determination 'not to let My people go' and a general sabotage of Zionism. German persecution of the Jews has met with its reward. America has befriended the Jews and is now the greatest Power in the world. That cannot be all coincidence.

Smuts thought Weizmann a great leader and a far-seeing statesman, but it was the terrorists—the Jabotinsky Revisionists whose core was the Stern Gang—who compelled Britain to admit defeat and gave Weizmann his opportunity. Weizmann, who disliked Jabotinsky, owes him a great deal and when history comes to be written the latter will be the patriot who made it possible to bring Israel into the world.

I left Smuts at 11 p.m., highly gratified to find that my views on these matters were coincident with the views of one of the wisest men of our times.

4.VII.1949. *London*

I have to-day finished reading Weizmann's book on his leadership of Zionism culminating in the recognition of Israel by the U.S.A. It is a remarkable piece of writing, moderate, modest and records what will go down to history as one of the great achievements of the seventy years which I have seen, if not of the past thousand years. He has shown up and castigated not only the rich assimilationist Jews but the many British politicians and officials who have during the past thirty years done their best to torpedo Zionism. The birth of Israel, despite frantic and disgraceful opposition by Britain, gives me more pleasure than any event which has ever come my way and I rejoice that I should have lived to see it and that I should have played a small part in the drama.

One fact stands out in the book. Opposition to Zionism has come from men of small calibre, the second-rates. Sympathy and encouragement has come from the big men, Roosevelt, Truman, Balfour, Lloyd George, Churchill, Plumer, etc. But the driving force and statesmanship have been Weizmann's and only his. The great Jewish Nation will, in the fullness of time, bless his name as the one man who gave them freedom and security. And the world will honour him as the man who has fulfilled God's promise of over two thousand years ago.

10.XII.1949. *London*

The United Nations have approved an international administration over Jerusalem by thirty-eight votes to fourteen. The vote on the whole resolution was as follows:

For: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, White Russia, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Persia, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Philippines, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, the Ukraine, Venezuela, the U.S.S.R. and the Yemen.

Against: Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, Guatemala, Iceland, Israel, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, South Africa, Britain, the United States, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

Abstentions: Chile, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, and Thailand.

The Jews will never accept it and the United Nations can never enforce it, so what is the sense of a resolution which can only bring UNO into contempt and ridicule. And look at the list of nations who voted for the resolution. What do they know or care about Palestine. It is all wrong that these small nations should have an equal vote with those nations who are most interested. There should be a weighted form of voting giving each member State a voting strength in the Assembly consonant with its real influence and knowledge of world affairs. When it is a question of making decisions on frontiers or the government of peoples, they should be left preferably to those nations who have the power to enforce them and are most interested in them by reason of geography or political association. What have Burma and the South American Republics to do with Palestine?

I hope that Israel's reply will be to move the seat of Government to Jerusalem at once. The resolution will either be ridiculed or if enforced will be met by bloodshed. The Jews will never surrender Jerusalem. Why should they?

Leaving England late in 1949, I took a ship to Kuwait in the Persian Gulf, then to Bahrein whence I crossed Arabia to Jedda via Riyadh. I met many Arabs, including the old King Ib'n Saud, and conversation often drifted to Arab hatred of Israel. I found that all Arabs when discussing Israel presumed that one disapproved of Jews and their home in Palestine, therefore freely expressing their opinions.

14.I.1951. *Kuwait, Persian Gulf*

[It is remarkable how many British eccentrics are attracted to Arabia or is it that a certain type becomes an eccentric after contact with the Arab? From the earliest days—Gordon, Lady Elphinstone, Doughty, Burton—down to the host of modern eccentrics such as Lawrence, Philby, Glubb. I suppose a slightly unbalanced mind and a craving for romance or solitude is attracted by the dirt, squalor, dishonesty, inefficiency, laziness, intolerance and unreliability of the Arab, and no doubt the

romance of the desert and the nomad has its attractions; it certainly attracts me. Perhaps Islam and the almost childishness of Moslem hypocrisy and the false holiness of Islam's Holy Cities all contribute.

I suppose the truth is that a man slightly abnormal is in search of something abnormal and in the Arab and the desert he finds just what he wants, people and places out of the ordinary and an atmosphere where his eccentricities find full scope and expansion and where he can with ease become a whale among the smaller fry.

15.I.1951. *Kuwait*

Dined with Jordan and his wife. A Lebanese contractor was also there with his wife, wearing a four-row diamond necklace. How the oriental loves to display his wealth through his women, a not uncommon vice in a certain type in Europe. I got him on to Israel without disclosing my views. He thought the economic boycott exercised by the Arab States would eventually kill Israel in about fifty years, by which time the Arab States would be firmly united, well armed and efficient. The Jews would then be driven into the sea but would be allowed a small Jewish enclave in coastal Palestine but without a Jewish Government. He placed no reliance on Iraq, Yemen or Saudi Arabia, but was confident that Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt could defeat the Jews in fifty years time. I suggested that in fifty years the Jews also would be much stronger than at present. He said they would be bankrupt, rotten with communism and devoid of economic or political stability.

I remarked 'Why do not you Arabs, with all your resources from oil, do something for those wretched refugees from Palestine.' 'Good God,' he said 'do you really think we are going to destroy the finest propaganda we possess; it's a gold mine.' I suggested that such a view is both unkind and immoral. 'Bah,' he said. 'They are just human rubbish but a political gold mine.' In slightly different language I received identical views from other Arabs.

1.II.1951. *Hufoof, Saudi Arabia*

The Emir Saud, a cousin of the King's, admitted that the Jews

were too strong for the Arabs and that they had come to stay and he regretted the support given to Israel by Britain and the United States. I denied that Britain had given support to Israel. On the contrary we had done our best to destroy Zionism and had abandoned the country to its fate, hoping and expecting that the Arabs would drive the Jews into the sea. The Emir was very disappointed with the Egyptian Army and thought the Egyptians were soft.

10.v.1951. *London*

I attended a reception at the Israel Legation at 6 Stanhope Gate, on the occasion of Israel Independence Day. Spent all my time talking to Herbert Samuel, now over eighty, and Norman Bentwich, both just back from Palestine. They tell me that Weizmann is rapidly declining, though his mind is still clear. I must try to see him again. We discussed the future, in which they had complete confidence. On my asking if Israel was going to become a communist state, they both gave me the same answer—yes, but not on the Russian model; it would be a communist state where private enterprise is encouraged and where freedom of the individual is supreme: they both thought that Israel could more than hold her own against any combination of Arab States. All very satisfactory.

19.vi.1951. *London*

Bound up with the Persian Crisis is Egypt and her illegal attitude over the Suez Canal in preventing cargoes of any description passing through if destined for Israel. For over two years this has been going on and we have done nothing beyond protest. It would be so easy to tell Egypt that we intend to stand up for our rights and that in future all ships passing through the Canal will be under naval escort and not subject to interference. The East understands strength; they despise weakness and will always take advantage of it.

This brings up the whole question of the defence of the Middle East. In *The Times* a few days ago appeared a letter by my friend Colonel Garsia, the essence of which was that the defence of the Middle East is on the Rhine. Another letter by de Chair in to-day's *Times* deplores Garsia's view and adds:

‘There are only two places where the British Empire can be irretrievably lost; one is on the shores of the English Channel and the other is the Middle East; to abandon the latter at the outset would be three parts of the way to losing the war.’

There is truth in both Garsia’s and de Chair’s letters; the fundamental trouble is the Kremlin and that can be dealt with in Moscow or on the Rhine; but to abandon the Middle East as suggested by Garsia is of course deplorable. The Middle East must be defended, but how? De Chair suggests we can block the Caucasus passes but the Caucasus can be by-passed.

There is nothing to stop Russia invading the Middle East to-morrow; she could reach the Suez Canal and the head of the Persian Gulf in a month; there is nothing to stop her beyond air action, the climate and large stretches of waterless country. De Chair suggests guerrilla tactics by men like Glubb and Fawzi Kawukji would inconvenience Russia’s lines of communication. The history of guerrilla tactics in comparatively open country against a heavily armed mobile modern army shows that any effort made by Glubb and his like would have no more effect than would a mosquito on a charging elephant. A poorly armed Turkey is on Russia’s flank but she would not assume an offensive now any more than in 1941. The Iraq Army is utterly unfit for war and the other Arab States have neither the means nor the will nor the heart to resist. Our little force on the Canal is anchored. Air action is our only offensive weapon and Korea has taught us that even command of the air cannot check a determined enemy.

We have missed our great opportunity. Many years ago when I was Chief Political Officer in Palestine I approached Weizmann regarding the future of Zionism, suggesting that sooner or later we should have to abandon Egypt as a military base and would he agree, after the establishment of a sovereign Israel, to British bases leased for ninety-nine years. He agreed. Later on (1922) when I was Military Adviser to the Middle East Department, I stressed the importance of Palestine as our Middle East base and put forward the suggestion of transferring the core of our Middle East defence from Egypt to Palestine where excellent naval, army and air facilities exist. But pro-Arab policy was too strong, anti-semitism was rampant and to

be under any obligation to the Jews was anathema. The proposition fell through and a great opportunity was lost. Having incurred the hatred of the Jews after abandoning Palestine to anarchy in the hopes that the Arabs would drive them into the sea, such an opportunity will never recur.

That brings me back to the ways and means of defending the Middle East. We cannot defend it except by the limited use of sea power as already suggested, or by having the Kremlin by the heels, a question I am not competent to discuss.

Written in huge letters over Downing Street should be 'We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done.' It is a tragedy that at the moment we have a man as Foreign Secretary who neither knows nor cares, who carries no weight either at home or abroad and who is a complete nonentity.

Socialist foreign policy has been one of retreat. They dislike imperial connections or colonial expansions. Bevin could never shake off his provincial socialist orthodoxy; his policy was the history of hesitation, retreat and surrender.

22.VII.1951. *Mottisfont, Hampshire*

Jowitt and I discussed Israel for over an hour. I found him at first antagonistic and favouring our support of the Arab States in preference to Israel. He thought Israel were aggressors, they had no right to Palestine, that their behaviour had been abominable and that the Zionist experiment would inevitably fail. I put all the usual arguments before him—the Biblical aspect, the persecution and dispersal for 2,000 years, Hitler's persecution, the 'nation-without-a-home' aspect, the debt we owe the Jews in religion, music, art and science and finally the strategic and military aspect; whilst speaking to the Chancellor I felt I was just making a fool of myself and was immensely relieved when he said with great seriousness, 'It is not many men who have convinced me of my erroneous convictions in such a short time; I believe you are right and I shall in future support Israel.' I liked that.

13.XI.1951. *London*

Elath and his wife dined this evening and we had a long talk

about the future and how Egypt's attitude over the Suez Canal might affect Israel. Elath told me that with Egypt's new, aggressive, military regime, Israel's security might be seriously undermined, were Nasser to start making use of the new situation to increase his hostile activities in the Gaza Strip.

There is much talk now of Middle East Defence. And a desire to include all countries of the Arab League whilst ignoring Israel. What can we expect from the Arab League? Yemen—nothing. Saudi Arabia—a phantom army, untrained and non-existent as a fighting force. Iraq, an undisciplined mob incapable of serious fighting. Egypt—an army which has already been beaten by the youngest army in the world. Syria and Lebanon—nothing but scallywags. And in Israel we have a highly efficient army, well trained, modern weapons and already tried in battle; their morale is of the highest order. And the silly guinea-pigs of Whitehall continue to back and appease the Arabs.

It would be so easy to come to an arrangement with Israel which would stabilize our position in the Middle East and secure the Suez Canal for all time.

20.v.1952. *London*

We are drifting from bad to worse. Israel recently asked for a loan of five million to maintain her oil supplies; H.M.G. have refused and once again hebraphobia has triumphed regardless of realities. The refusal comes at a moment which may prove crucial in the Middle East and will join the ranks of lost opportunities. We eagerly repaid Egypt her sterling balances, hoping to appease, and we turn down in churlish fashion a modest request from the strongest power in the Middle East and from one who might help us considerably if we would hold out the hand of friendship. Israel must look elsewhere—Russia or the U.S.A.? Politicians, especially Churchill, talk complacently about the goodwill between Israel and Britain. A practical gesture is vital and now we have once again missed the bus. It is all a most clumsy piece of ineptitude.

28.ix.1952. *London*

The prospect is an unhappy one. Moussadiq, with his crazy

logic, not content with having closed down Abadan, now threatens to break off diplomatic relations with Britain. The harm was in letting ourselves be pushed out of Abadan, when a strong policy would have succeeded. Since then we have been in retreat and the Persians, no doubt drunk with success (to their great surprise), go on pushing and demanding. The only flaw in the policy of our Foreign Office and our diplomats is that it invariably fails. It is always plausible and it always collapses.

Egypt continues on her course of internal chaos and uncertainty and Neguib has failed to fill the vacuum he created.

There are rumours that Iraq intends to follow Persia and nationalize her oil; Saudi Arabia will no doubt take note and squeeze further royalties out of her oil companies; and all because we failed in Persia and no doubt Persia took her cue from India whence we scuttled without settling many outstanding questions. Retreat from Empire is a sad sight.

There is an uneasy tranquillity in Transjordan which only keeps her head above revolutionary water by the help of an enormous subsidy and British bayonets. India, Iraq and Jordan are now ruled by Harrow school boys about whom we know little.

And Whitehall still appeases and supports these rotting heaps of Arab instability whilst scarcely recognizing little Israel. I wish Israel and Turkey would get together for they represent the only stable factor in the Middle East. Both the Turk and the Jew have proved their worth on the battlefield. A close liaison, or better a loose alliance between the Turk and the Jew, would have a tremendous influence in the Middle East, it would deflate the Arab League and might influence Whitehall in the right direction. Also, a strong Turkey and Israel offer the best security should Russia make an attempt on the Suez Canal. The Turks know the Arabs. During the First World War they were never employed as combatant troops, only as labour battalions. They now regard the Arabs as extremely poor security risks and our continued wooing of Arab countries as sheer folly. The Middle East Defence system is only weakened by the Arabs; it would be enormously strengthened by Turkish and Israeli adherence.

I must add a further note. British policy, just one hundred years ago, still regarded Turkey, well on the road to dissolution, as the best insurance against Russian aggression and a better guardian of the strategically vital Middle East than any Arab Empire. It has been proved that the Arabic-speaking peoples are no substitute for Turkey in the face of an aggressive Russia. The present muddle in the Middle East is the result of short-sightedness and mutual rivalries among Western Powers. The present situation is infinitely complex and has been deliberately made so by anti-semitism. After the First World War the creation of a strong Arab Empire was the policy of our Foreign Office, at the cost of abandoning the encouragement of Zionism to which we were pledged by the Balfour Declaration.

The recent history of the Arab States, their corruption, dishonesty and instability, should show the most stupid Whitehall official how unreliable and useless they are. Palestine, after twenty years of British administration, was one of the best run countries in the world and with a high standard of living. An Arab-Jewish State is just an impossible dream. On realizing this, our Socialist Government, in a fit of bad temper, abandoned the Mandate, hoping the combined strength of six Arab States would drive the Jews into the sea and complete what the British Government had failed to do. But the result of a war for which Egypt and Transjordan must take the major responsibility was a resounding defeat of the Arabs by an ill-armed and isolated handful of Jews. But even now the British Government refuse to face realities. We are allowing the Arabs to buy modern war equipment, provided they do not use it for aggression. What a provision, and who is going to stop the Arabs embarking on a second round with Israel when they think they can succeed? It is true that Israel can also re-arm under the same conditions, but her economic position makes expenditure on defence almost impossible.

10.XI.1952. *London*

My dear friend Chaim Weizmann died yesterday at his home in Palestine. I am deeply grieved. There is little shock in his death for he had been ailing for many months; but there is immense recognition of the magnitude of his achievement. He alone,

among men, possessed the greatness to fulfil God's Promise to lead the Jews back to Palestine after 2,000 years dispersal—and this alone is perhaps one of the greatest achievements in history since the days of Christ.

He was a major prophet, towering above his colleagues, never faltering in his conviction that Sovereign Israel could be born in his lifetime. He is one of the few who actually achieved a great mission in the course of half a century and established a sovereign state surrounded by enemies and deserted by his sponsors. He devoted his life to Zionism and more than any other man deserves the credit for sovereign Israel which is his everlasting monument.

He alone was responsible for the Balfour Declaration, a document without meaning, but nevertheless a charter for the Jews. After that event, his constant conflict was with the British Government and British officials in Palestine whose policy was to whittle down Zionism to a meaningless movement. From 1918 until the birth of Israel, Weizmann was fighting two battles at once—the one with his own people who were impatient of his patience, and the other with Whitehall who did their best to strangle Zionism. But in spite of this he remained to the end convinced that friendship with Britain was the foundation stone of Zionism. And even when Britain shamefully gave up the Mandate, abandoning Palestine and the Jews to their fate, hoping the Jews would be driven into the sea by the Arabs, Weizmann still had faith in the country which had betrayed him. That showed greatness; but he never forgave Ernest Bevin.

Chaim was a great chemist, a great Jew, a great man and a Prince of Israel. He and Smuts are the two outstanding figures of my generation and I am proud to have worked with them. Chaim was a Russian by birth; I have often speculated as to what might have happened if he and many of his extremely able fellow Zionists had devoted their lives and talent to the reconstruction of Russia after 1917. There would have been no Stalin, no slave state, no persecution. There certainly would have been a co-operative, peaceful, prosperous Russia.

As a man, I had no better or more loyal friend than Chaim

Weizmann. I remember spending a weekend at Helouan with him in 1918; it was then I got to know and love him; he poured out his dreams till long past midnight; thank God they came true during his lifetime; he must have died a happy man.

18.XI.1952. *London*

I attended a memorial service for Chaim Weizmann at the Synagogue in Abbey Road. I arrived without a hat and was lent a small black felt contraption by an usher. It soon gave me a headache, so I removed it but was at once pounced on by a large usher who told me to replace it, which I did. This is the first occasion on which I have attended a service in a Synagogue. I was much impressed by the simplicity and sincerity of the service: I am not surprised the Jewish religion has lasted 2,000 years in spite of persecution. The Queen was represented and the whole Diplomatic Corps were there except the representatives of the Arab States. I was given a place of honour all among the big wigs.

1.I.1953. *London*

Britain continues to supply modern arms to the Arab States, far in excess of what is required for internal use. Our Foreign Office is well aware that no amount of modern arms are any use in the hands of Arabs for the protection of the Middle East; the arms are required solely for the purpose of aggressive action against Israel, whose economy prevents her from purchasing modern arms for protection. Foreign Office policy for the past thirty years has never wavered from the policy of trying to drive the Jews out of Palestine and this latest action is most distressing. A good description of our Foreign Office is 'Stalin's Secret Weapon'.

The destruction of Israel is the supreme aim of Arab policy, coupled with the complete elimination of Britain from the Middle East from Syria to Aden, Sudan and Somaliland and from the Persian Gulf to Morocco; and in this elimination they have the support of the United States foreign policy.

Since 1948 the Arab countries have refused to discuss peace with Israel; they have opposed her politically and economically

wherever they could, they have done their utmost to strangle her trade; in short they have shown a vindictive, vengeful spirit, trying to obtain by spite what they cannot obtain by force of arms; even in such matters as the control of malaria and locusts they have opposed regional arrangements. Is that the correct spirit for members of the United Nations? Could we expect otherwise when one remembers that in two—Saudi Arabia and Yemen—slaves can still be bought and sold.

Attempts to strengthen national unity crush political liberty. In all the Arab States we shall see dictatorships arise and all opposition suppressed. Every effort will be made for a final war of extermination against Israel. The Arab League will develop into an Arab Axis. And with it will arise all the slavery and miseries of dictatorship; moral erosion will become as great as soil erosion in Arabic-speaking countries. When the British and United States Governments bolster up the Arab States, they think they are supplying a remedy whereas they are stimulating the disease of nationalism whose sole policy is the destruction of Israel.

6.I.1953. *London*

There seems to be no end to the amount of appeasement we proffer to the Arabs at the expense of the Jews. Our Foreign Office policy is based on fallacies which are known to be fallacies. First, that friendship and co-operation exist between the Arabs, especially Egypt, and ourselves, and if for the time being these are strained, then it is the fault of Zionist intrigue; second, that in order to gain Arab friendship every concession, economic military, moral and political must be made. These methods have failed and will continue to fail when dealing with Arabs. A most recent example is the release of £10 m. sterling to Egypt, following a violent outburst of hatred and threat by highly placed Egyptian Ministers and the murder of a British civilian in the Canal Zone. Also we are allowing Egypt to purchase arms far in excess of her genuine requirements; these can only be used against us or against Israel. The truth is, there is no trust and no friendship between Britain and Egypt and no degree of appeasement can improve our relationship. The lessons Hitler taught us have been forgotten.

In March 1953 I visited Israel.

10.IV.1953. *Tel Aviv*

Hotels in Israel have two menus, the one for Israelis and the other for visitors. To-day's lunch for the former was soup or entrée, fish and stewed fruit. For visitors and tourists it was soup, entrée, four different meat dishes and pudding. I am not sure whether I approve of that. I think it would be good for visitors to appreciate Israel austerity.

Tel Aviv is a mushroom city, starting from nothing but sand-dunes in 1918 to 300,000 souls to-day. It is a model of austerity and utility, a city of outraged aesthetics, hideous in detail and yet not unpleasant in bulk. Houses are built of glaring white concrete on rather the tenement plan, but all up-to-date and nothing wasted on external decoration. The streets are well planted with trees which in a few years time will greatly improve what is now undisguised ugliness.

Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister, asked me to come and see him this morning and this I did at nine o'clock. We had a long talk commencing on the new regime in Russia: he was not optimistic about the future and thought that only internal pressure would change the aggressive policy of Stalin.

I told him about my admiration for Israel and the wonderful progress she had achieved under most trying conditions. I told him that I thought the religious tradition of the Jews might weaken now that an in-gathering had taken place. He disagreed, thinking that the Jewish religion was much too deep-rooted to fade away.

I told him I was distressed by the many injustices I had observed towards Israel. He asked me to explain, which I did, and he took them all down as I spoke:

- (1) The severing of the Hebrew University from Israel.
- (2) The severing of the Beisan hydro-electric station.
- (3) The severing of the North Dead Sea potash works and hotel.
- (4) The closing of the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli ships and ships destined for Israel.

(5) The cutting of the oil pipe-line to Haifa and neutralizing the refinery at that place.

(6) The failure of United Nations to compel the Arab States to make peace with Israel.

(7) The attempt to make Israel responsible for the Arab refugees.

(8) The burden of defence, Britain is arming Egypt with modern equipment which can only be necessary for a second campaign against Israel.

(9) The refusal of a loan to Israel by Britain when she readily grants a loan to Jordan.

(10) The continued presence of both Egyptian and Jordan troops on Israeli territory.

Ben-Gurion agreed and said that so long as Britain pursued an appeasement policy towards the Arab States, these injustices were insoluble. He could not understand the workings of the minds of the officials in Whitehall. I told him that oil and hebraphobia explained Britain's attitude and that expediency had been allowed to over-ride justice and common sense.

He insisted that I stay in Israel for Independence Day on the 20th. The parade is being held at Haifa. He is a thick-set, tough, robust and yet untidy type of man, determined but of great humour and wild rages. His eyes sparkle with excitement and fun. He is a man of single purpose, rather secretive, ruthless and preferring action to talk. He organized a Jewish battalion in the First World War and regards the Bible as a source of inspiration and guidance rather than as a religious doctrine.

I am proud to find that both the President and Prime Minister of Israel were in my regiment—the Royal Fusiliers—during the First World War.

18.iv.1953. *Allonim Kibbutz*

In the evening I had a long talk with Colonel Allon, who is a member of this Kibbutz; he is a first class type of man, a keen soldier and went through the North African, Italian and Dutch campaigns with the British Army; he also took a prominent part in the Israeli War of Independence when he was com-

manding the artillery in the offensive against the Egyptians in Sinai in January 1949.

He told me the story of British interference during a major and decisive operation, when Israeli forces had surrounded the whole Egyptian army and there would have been no resistance by Egypt if Israel had chosen to occupy the Canal and even Cairo. It is conceivable that, if Israel had been allowed to reap the fruits of her victory, there would be no Suez Canal problem. Allon gave me Ambassador McDonald's book, *My Mission in Israel, 1951*, to read.

'p. 116. On December 31st, 1948, Truman instructed me to deliver immediately to the Israel Authorities a threat by Great Britain to invoke its obligations under the treaty of 1936 with Egypt to come to her aid (though Cairo has not requested it) and to enter the war against Israel unless Israel withdrew her troops from Egyptian territory. McDonald informed Sharrett at once and then drove to Tiberias where he informed Ben-Gurion that evening.'

'p. 121. Ben-Gurion pointed out that Israel was in friendly touch with the Security Council and not in conflict with it: Britain cannot make herself sole judge of an alleged violation of Security Council recommendations; only the Security Council can be the judge. Israel is engaged only in self-defence. She has been attacked by six Arab States whose troops are still on Palestine soil. As a small country, Israel must reserve the right of self-defence even if she goes down fighting.'

'p. 122. On January 2nd, 1949, an Egyptian plane dropped bombs on Jerusalem, injuring five persons, the first occasion on which bombs had been dropped on the Holy City. On the same day all Israeli troops had retired from Egyptian territory, though Egyptian troops still remained in the Gaza salient, an integral part of Palestine.

On January 7th, British aircraft flew over the battle area in South Palestine and the Israelis shot down five.

British troops moved to Aqaba. President Truman thought that the British aircraft incident and the move of British troops to Aqaba were unwarranted and badly conceived.

On January 18th, H.M.G. released all Jewish internees from Cyprus.'

The whole incident is illuminating and an example of spiteful interference by H.M.G. Israel was too young and inexperienced to stand up to Britain; but a pity Allon, who was commanding Israeli troops in Sinai, did not do what Nelson did at Copenhagen. And I firmly believe that Britain was bluffing. She had but one Brigade on the Canal; she would not dare to have used aircraft against Israel; and what would she have achieved by a naval blockade with the whole of world opinion against her. The whole incident was one of Bevin's most brutal and stupid moves.

Risks must be taken in war; and this was an occasion when the risk was worth taking; the advantages outweighed the risk of active intervention by Britain.

20.IV.1953. *Tel Aviv*

I had a long talk with Allon about the cease-fire in Sinai in January 1949. He admitted that a great error had been made in submitting to the British threat of intervention at a moment when the destruction of the Egyptian army was imminent. He told me that he himself would have taken the risk of ignoring the threat but that he had to obey orders; not only Egypt but Transjordan would have been compelled to sue for peace; Ben-Gurion's decision to give way was psychological due to the youth and inexperience of young Israel. As it was, Israel won the war but lost the peace due to the spite of Britain, who, not content with abandoning Israel to the Arabs in 1948, stepped in under the wing of the United States and deprived Israel of complete victory. If Israel had been allowed to destroy the Egyptian Army, we should never have all this trouble over the Suez Canal and the Sudan. And Jordan also would have had its bubble burst and the Arab League would have been exploded for ever.

18.x.1953. *Wiltshire*

On the night of the 14th, some Israeli troops raided into Jordan and beat up the villages of Qibya and Shuqba, about fifteen miles north of Jerusalem; forty-two men, women and children were killed and some forty houses destroyed. This is most deplorable but I can quite understand the factors which had led Israel to take such drastic action. Raids by Arabs from Jordan into Israel during the past four years have led to the murder of nearly 500 Jews and the theft of much valuable property. Neither the Jordan Government nor the Mixed Armistice Commission have been able to control or check these raids into Israel who was left no other course but to teach the Arabs a lesson and compel the Arabs to behave themselves which neither the Jordan Government nor the Armistice Commission were capable of doing.

The incident has, of course, fanned into flames anti-semitism, has led to protests by the United States and, as a piece of pure hypocrisy, Her Majesty's Government have expressed their horror at Israel's action. Let us compare Israel's position in face of Arab aggression and Great Britain's position in face of Kikuyu aggression.

The Jews are in Palestine by rights granted them by the Great Powers in 1920. The establishment of the National Home was expressly agreed by the Arab delegation in Paris in 1920.

The Jews have not occupied any Arab land except by purchase or, more recently, by taking advantage of absentee landlords.

The Jews were in 1948 a Nation without a home.

The British are in Kenya by right of conquest and Imperial expansion and without any agreement or permission of the Kikuyu peoples.

In Kenya, despite the Carter Report, we have occupied vast areas of Kikuyu grazing and hunting land, mostly without compensation and we have confined the tribe to an inadequate reserve.

The British were, until the retreat from Empire, spread over the best part of the world.

In 1948, the Jews were abandoned to their fate by the Mandatory Power and were laid open to attack by six Arab States, whom they defeated by force of arms.

When Arabs, out of hatred and jealousy, kill Jews, little notice is taken of it. Britain, in her paramount position in Jordan, could easily have stopped Arab aggression but has refrained from doing so. When Arab leaders come to Europe they are entertained by Her Majesty's Government.

When the Jews retaliate and attack Arab villages, H.M.G. express their horror.

Since 1900 we have steadily consolidated our position in Kenya and have colonized the White Highlands—Kikuyu Country—without any opposition whatever.

When the Kikuyu, smarting under injustice, attack the British, it is called murder. When Kikuyu leaders come to Europe to enlist British sympathy, they are tried and sentenced for sedition.

When the British retaliate, hunt and kill thousands of Kikuyu, it is a military operation, punitive columns vying with each other and boasting in competitive fashion of the numbers of Africans killed and captured.

26.x.1953. *London*

I presided at a meeting of the Paladin Club in the House of Commons this evening. It was an interesting meeting and Elath spoke well though with restraint and caution, outlining the economic position of Israel, the causes of the recent Israeli raid into Jordan, which had resulted from continual and repeated attacks from Jordan upon Israeli settlements situated along the Jordan-Israel frontier, the vital question of the Suez Canal and the preparedness of Israel to meet further Arab aggression. The meeting went on until almost midnight. Shinwell gave us a parliamentary speech blaming the United Nations for Arab-Israeli tension and when he embarked on all kinds of irrelevant matter concerning the United Nations, I

had much pleasure in asking him to stick to the point. Richard Greaves made a stupid attack on Israel, holding her responsible for 'acts of aggression' against Jordan and emphasizing the senseless killing of forty innocent Arabs. I had to point out to him that in warfare both the armed forces and civilians are 'innocent' and that the real guilty persons are the politicians, the diplomats, the Mixed Armistice Commission and the United Nations, especially the British Government. General Yadin made an excellent speech, pointing out the unfairness of the present Jordan-Israel frontier, the many acts of aggression committed by Jordan against Israel, the futility of the Mixed Armistice Commission and the exasperation felt in Israel at the failure of the British Government to compel Jordan to keep the peace.

All speakers agreed that the control of the Suez Canal must on no account be handed over to Egypt but nobody offered a solution of the problem.

My summing up as Chairman took twenty-five minutes. I was not impartial and was very outspoken which induced several members, after the meeting, to congratulate me on making the best contribution of the evening and on being so frank.

I thought the greatest assets of the Jews in Israel were first the enthusiasm and modesty of the people and their determination to make good, secondly the efficiency of the armed forces which have been recently described as the 'most efficient army outside the Iron Curtain' and thirdly that the State of Israel was the only educated democracy in the world and by that I meant that the common people were so well educated that they could recognize the lies told by politicians at elections.

I then compared the Arab-Israel conflict with the British-Kikuyu conflict in Kenya, outlining the factors which I mentioned in my diary under October 18th. I remarked that reprisals against aggression are tolerated when undertaken by a Great Power with colonial possessions but that when small nations adopt the same policy, people are horror-struck. I said that the British Policy in Kenya was a good example of power without responsibility which was once described by Baldwin as the prerogative of harlots throughout the ages.

As regards responsibility, I blamed the United Nations for not translating the armistice agreements into a final peace settlement. Their failure to do this was governed by a policy of appeasement towards the Arab States, expediency and vested interests overriding common sense and justice. That there was evidence that we and the United States were not working together for peace in the Middle East, the latter constantly trying to undermine our position in view of oil. As regards the recent Qibya incident when fifty-three Arabs were killed it was no doubt the result of exasperation felt over the Mixed Armistice Commission's failure to prevent incidents and the immediate cause of the raid was a grenade thrown into a Jewish house at Yahude only forty-eight hours previously, killing a mother and her two small children. I thought that good might come of these deplorable incidents if the United Nations were at last forced to compel the Arab States to make peace with Israel. I particularly blamed the British Government who finance Jordan to the tune of over six million pounds a year, for not using their influence in telling Glubb and his minions that if Jordan aggression does not stop, the subsidy will cease. United Nations authority has dwindled, resulting in increased tension with the danger of explosion. The only chance of re-establishing security in the Middle East rests in bringing about normal relations between Israel and her Arab neighbours, especially Jordan and Egypt.

I then dealt with the Suez Canal which I thought was much too dangerous a weapon to remain in Egyptian hands. Egypt has closed it, illegally, to Israeli shipping and would do the same to us if we withdrew our troops or to any other country with whom she found herself in disagreement. I thought it was a thousand pities that the British Government had interrupted in the Israel-Egypt military operation in 1948. If Israel had been allowed to occupy Sinai we should have had no further trouble with Egypt. I reiterated my solution of the Suez Canal problem, namely that Egypt should be told now that in 1966, when the Canal is due to be handed over to her, it would become an international waterway under the United Nations and that until 1966 we intended to retain our troops and military base on the Canal.

One speaker brought up the Arab refugees and claimed that they were at the root of the trouble. I pointed out that these refugees had left Palestine on the advice of the Mufti and some British officials and that their flight had been assisted by the British Army then in Palestine; that if they returned they would constitute a Fifth Column in Israel owing to Arab hostility and that whereas the Arab States received an annual income from oil of almost twenty-five million pounds, Israel, owing to Arab hostility, had no spare funds to do anything about it.

1.I.1954. *London*

I am not at all happy about our negotiations with Egypt on the Suez Canal; the only solution is to make it an international waterway in 1966 when it should revert to Egypt and be controlled by and defended by those Powers who are most interested. Egypt could never hope to defend the Canal even in the remote future and, in any case, it is much too powerful a weapon to place in the hands of any one nation and that one of the most decadent and unscrupulous in the world.

I am also much concerned about Israel and Jordan's persistence in refusing to make peace. The British Government could compel Jordan to do so under the threat of withdrawal of the subsidy; but H.M.G. appear to be content to let this festering sore persist with the danger of war breaking out again between Israel and the Arab States. At the root of the matter is appeasement of the Arab States and appeasement in any form, especially when applied to Arabs, never pays. How quickly we have forgotten Munich.

2.III.1954. *London*

On February 25th, Neguib, the military dictator of Egypt, was placed under house arrest by Nasser and Salem; the mob intervened and on February 27th he was released and reinstated. On February 26th, there was a revolution in Syria followed by riots in Damascus. On March 2nd, Neguib, accompanied by Salem, who only a few days previously had said 'We should have killed Neguib', flew to Khartoum for the opening of the Sudan Parliament. Riots, in which a British Chief of Police and many

others were killed, broke out in Khartoum and Neguib with his dancing Major, who had been staying at the Palace in Khartoum, flew back to Cairo and the Sudan Parliament was not opened.

The ramshackle Arab League is of no use to anyone. Leaders of revolution who do not hang together will hang separately. So long as Army rule is the ultimate authority there can be no stability in Egypt or anywhere else; and so long as a dictator's power rests on either the mob or the army, the hangman's noose and the assassin's weapon is just round the corner. And as mobs go, an Egyptian mob is at the bottom of the scale.

In Egypt and Syria, violence has replaced order. In the Sudan political riots, fostered by Egypt, have shaken the shaky foundations of the new State. There is unrest in Tunis and the Lebanon; these are the culminating proofs of unreliability in the Arab world and cause much anxiety in Israel who fears that she may be attacked by Arab States as a screen for Arab rottenness. Mob violence seems to be the ultimate arbiter in the Arab world.

And this is all due to the policy of scuttle and appeasement commencing with India, then Palestine and then Abadan, accompanied by a blind policy of appeasement towards the Arab States. What a hopeless mess we have made of the Middle East which was so stable when our politicians had 'guts' and real men sat in the Foreign Office.

30.III.1954. *London*

No Israeli ship has ever been allowed to pass through the Suez Canal. The Constantinople Convention of 1888 is quite explicit; passage must be allowed freely at all times, in war and peace, to ships of every nation. Any exercise of the right of blockade is expressly ruled out.

New Zealand now proposes a draft resolution to the Security Council calling for an end to Egyptian restrictions on Suez Canal shipping. In 1951 the Security Council told Egypt that her action in holding up cargoes destined for Israel was illegal and called on her to remove restrictions, but Egypt paid no attention, and now the new New Zealand resolution has been vetoed by Russia, though eight of the Council's eleven members supported New Zealand. This makes the Security Council a

laughing stock and utterly impotent. Why cannot we stand up to Russia and if necessary act without her? In other words, if she refuses to co-operate in establishing law and order in the world, outlaw her. It could easily be done without risk of war and would bring Russia to her senses. Russia's action allows Egypt to continue her illegal blockade of Israel and continue the tension which is now paralysing the Middle East.

I am quite sure that events of great moment will occur shortly in the Middle East. I know the Nasser-type of Dictator, ruthless, dishonest and for ever expanding, striving after greater and greater deeds, with boundless ambition and in fact the Hitler-Mussolini-Stalin type. But Nasser is a vulgar little upstart and not so clever as either Hitler or Stalin. His policy is based on five points—a pan-Arab Republic with him at the helm, immediate possession of the Suez Canal, elimination of Britain from the Middle East, inviting Russia to come on the scene with arms and money, and lastly the destruction of Israel. Nasser saw what happened at Abadan—Persia, encouraged by America, throwing us out, and Britain, threatened by America, declining to retaliate. Nasser will play the same game with the Suez Canal and I am convinced that fairly soon he will proclaim its nationalization, at the same time encouraging Russia to give him tanks, aircraft and submarines. And with Eden at the head of affairs, Nasser will probably get away with it; the answer to Nasser should be the immediate occupation of the Canal Zone by Britain and proclaim it to be an international waterway, and remain in occupation until a United Nations Force can take it over; British occupation of Sinai east of the Rafa-Suez line and to Hell with the Security Council and John Foster Dulles. Any strong action by us would have world support but I fear our politicians are no more capable of strong firm action than is a camel capable of wriggling through the eye of a needle. And, if necessary, in the initial stages, I should invite Israel to co-operate; I believe we should have French sympathy and support, for Nasser's dream of empire means the loss to France of her North African territories. Dulles and Eisenhower would scream, but the majority of United States citizens would say 'Thank God, Britain has found herself again'.

2.IV.1954. *London*

Frontier incidents are increasing on the Israel-Jordan border, each claiming to be a reprisal for the other and both sides denying responsibility. The armistice agreement between these two countries was signed five years ago and was only intended as a temporary arrangement. The Armistice Commission and the multi-nation Observer Corps have been a complete failure. Israel has repeatedly asked for a top level conference between Jordan and Israel: Jordan has thrice refused the United Nations call for such a meeting. The whole problem could be solved in a few days by Britain who finances and maintains Jordan's Arab Legion besides subsidizing Jordan to the extent of many millions of pounds annually. If Britain wished, she could compel Jordan to come to terms with Israel but our inept Foreign Office just sits back and does nothing, carrying out her appeasement policy towards the Arabs which is based on *oil*. If open hostilities break out, which might happen at any moment and involve the whole of the Middle East in war, Britain alone is responsible, biased against Israel on anti-semitic grounds and favouring the Arab States on anxiety for *oil*.

20.VII.1954. *London*

I understand the Government propose lifting the ban on the sale of arms to Egypt, thereby wantonly jeopardizing the state of truce—uneasy though it be—between Israel and the Arab States. We have consistently shirked the obvious task of promoting a permanent peace in the Muddled East. We know Egypt is a potential enemy and yet we appease her by selling her arms. Against whom are these arms to be used? They can only be used against us on the Canal, against Sudan in an effort to annex her or against Israel. It makes me vomit. Another Munich! As Bevin will go down to history as the man who tried to kill Israel, so Eden will go down to history as the man who encouraged the Arab States to embark on a second attempt to destroy Israel. It is typical of our hebraphobe Foreign Office. Israel is bound to be with us in any East-West conflict; she has proclaimed it. She has the only efficient army in the Muddled East and holds a strategic position of vital importance to us. And yet we prefer being friends with a rotted garbage heap such as Egypt is.

These arms will be sold to Egypt on her assurance that they will not be used against Israel and the Foreign Office have complete faith in Egyptian assurances after their conduct in the Sudan where assurances were repeatedly and flagrantly broken. Wait until the last British soldier leaves the Canal; then Egypt will act not only against the Sudan but against Israel with these very arms we are giving her. Britain's policy in the Middle East is indeed contemptible.

20.x.1954. *London*

The text of the Suez Canal Agreement was published to-day. How can we possibly trust the Egyptians to play fair? They are already breaking Article 8 by refusing Israeli shipping the use of the Canal, under the pretext that they are still technically at war with Israel. If that were the case, why do they make such a fuss when an Israeli patrol fires on one of their posts on the frontier. I am convinced that Egypt has no intention of keeping this agreement, that she is arming to attack Israel as soon as we leave and that our un-uniformed technicians are going to have a horrible time.

I saw Elath at the Israeli Embassy. He agrees with me and is very concerned with Egypt's intentions. I was able to give him some confirmatory evidence, which is not in the possession of H.M.G., namely that Jordan and Egypt have already planned their campaign against Israel as soon as we are quit of the Canal. But now that Israel knows the plan, there should not be much difficulty in defeating it much to Egypt's disadvantage.

1.xii.1954. *London*

This evening I attended a meeting of the Paladin Club at the National Liberal Club. Tony Greenwood spoke on the foreign policy of Israel. He spoke well and I agreed with every word he said. I took part in the discussion later. I thought the Arab States were using the refugees as a weapon and they did not want the matter solved; they preferred having the grievance at the expense of 700,000 destitute people of their own race; I also pointed out that the Arab States with an oil-bonus revenue of a hundred million pounds were doing nothing to help. I also pointed out that all the Arab States were relying on an

economic collapse in Israel. This I personally did not believe in. I also pointed out the difficulties in Israel for importing English books whereas they could import as many American and German books as they wished. I asked Greenwood two questions—Why are we arming the Arab States and why do we not insist on Egypt complying with the decision of the Security Council to cease blockading Israel? He said he did not know the answers; he wished he did. I also disagreed that the internationalization of Jerusalem was vital for peace. Jerusalem is the heart of Israel and must form part of it. Also, internationalization has been as much a failure as partition and corridors: compromises never succeed.

31.XII.1954. *London*

I understand that when we evacuate the Suez Canal, the base will be transferred to Cyprus and we shall tell the Greeks in Cyprus that self-determination does not apply to Cyprus; that will mean trouble. The Greeks are not Egyptians and if we get their backs up in Cyprus we shall have very serious trouble—sabotage, murder. The Greeks are very good at irregular warfare. Cyprus is not a Greek Island despite the fact that the majority of its inhabitants are Greek, these being all fairly recent immigrants from Greece. Cyprus is a Turkish island; it always had been Turkish until the end of the First World War when it became a British Crown Colony; if we have trouble with the Greeks we should tell them that if they cannot behave themselves, we shall hand the island back to the Turk, retaining our base. The Turk knows how to manage the Greek.

But it is quite unnecessary for us to go to Cyprus at all. We should have told Egypt that if they insist on our evacuating the Canal, we shall occupy that part of Sinai which formerly belonged to Turkey and which Allenby conquered in 1917 and over which Egypt had only administrative rights. Whoever sits in Sinai commands the Middle East; and it is ideally situated for a base—splendid natural aerodromes, insignificant local inhabitants, barrier between Egypt and Israel, so close to the Canal that if Egypt misbehaves we could occupy the Canal Zone, opportunity to make a second canal across Sinai to the Gulf of Aqaba and ample fresh water if developed.

7.1.1955. London

On January 4th, *The Times* published a letter from General Spears which made me angry. I penned a reply, commencing by pointing out the partisan and misleading nature of the letter. He says, 'Both Jordan and Libya are important to us from the point of view of defence'. How can either of those backward and badly governed countries be of the slightest use for the defence of either Britain or the Commonwealth except that they lie on our lines of communication with the East? But then so do Egypt, Cyrenaica, Israel, Yemen and many others.

Spears then goes on to say that Kuwait and Saudi Arabia could do nothing to help the Arab refugees. These two states receive £100 million in oil royalties. Surely if they had any feeling for their own people in distress, some of that fortune could be spared? The Jews have their own refugee problem and cannot be expected to help people who became refugees from Palestine because they took the advice of their own leaders; these refugees were not kicked out of Palestine by the Jews; Israel implored them to stay. Moreover this refugee problem has become an asset to the Arab League; it is being used as a weapon against Israel to incite sympathy from the U.S.A. and ourselves; I often heard that point of view in both Syria and Saudi Arabia.

Then Spears goes on to talk of Britain opening the doors of Palestine to the Jews when in fact we were constantly closing them and even slamming them. Israel was born following our scuttling and had nothing to do with American support.

Furthermore, it was the Arabs who attacked the Jews in 1944, and it is the Arabs who have refused to make peace with Israel. If a million Arab refugees, all with complaints against Israel, were to return to Israel they would constitute such a strong Fifth Column that Israel would be utterly incapable of dealing with the situation. One million saboteurs and enemy agents! Impossible.

A Note on Arab Refugees

At the outbreak of hostilities in 1948, Israel implored the Arabs of Palestine to stay where they were; a few did so and are now prosperous and contented communities. But the Mufti of Jerusa-

lem broadcast from Gaza advice to the Arabs of Palestine to 'clear out' and leave the field open for the expulsion of the Jews from Palestine. On at least two occasions British Administrative Officers advised the Arabs to go so that military invasion forces could have a clear field. In both cases Arabs were told that they would return within a week and not only get their own property back but also the property of the Jews they had evicted.

Every country is responsible for its own refugees—Greece in 1920, India and Pakistan, all of whom had more refugees than the Arabs. The Arab States demand that Israel must be responsible for Arab refugees only because they know it to be impossible and constitutes such a splendid political weapon and ideal propaganda; they do not want the problem solved; I had ample evidence of this when travelling in Arabia; the problem is a gift to Arab propaganda. The sufferings of the refugees mean nothing to the politicians of the Arab States.

The Arab States have always asked that this problem should never be discussed without reference to its original causes. One of these causes was the invasion of Israel by the armed forces of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Jordan in order to frustrate a United Nations recommendation to establish a sovereign state of Israel. The original responsibility is therefore Arab. If one admits that the Arabs started the 1948 campaign and if you admit that the refugee problem arose from that campaign and would not have arisen without it, then the Arab Governments bear prime responsibility for the creation of the refugee problem.

Israel has her own refugee problem. With her limited resources she has absorbed nearly a million Jews from every part of the world. Arab Governments, with unearned royalties of over £100 million from oil, spend practically nothing on the destitution of their own people. Moreover, if Israel were to attempt to absorb even a few refugees she would create a Fifth Column which might well help to destroy her.

If the Arabs, in their craze for destruction, had not destroyed Jewish property—the large luxury hotel and the potash works at the north end of the Dead Sea—they could have housed and found work for many thousands of refugees.

2.III.1955. *London*

Serious fighting broke out near Gaza on February 28th, between Israeli and Egyptian troops, the latter suffering over sixty casualties. It started with an Egyptian attack on Israeli troops, the latter repulsing the attack and counter-attacking the aggressors on to Egyptian soil. Like all these recent frontier incidents it is quite impossible to apportion blame; should the original aggressors be blamed or should the counter-attackers involving crossing the frontier be blamed? Like other recent incidents, the Israelis are determined to teach raiders a lesson; they are also exasperated by the Egyptian policy of open hostility. In January last, that silly little Major Salem said 'Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war even if Israel should fulfil the U.N. resolutions. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel-Aviv, we should never put up with that.' Egypt continues to proclaim that a state of war exists between herself and Israel—a claim repudiated by the United Nations Authority; Egypt has been continually censured by the Armistice Commission for acts of sabotage, espionage and raiding based on the Gaza enclave, she has seized Israeli shipping in the Gulf of Suez and is constantly interfering with Israeli-bound traffic in the Canal, she has executed two Israelis for very doubtful cases of espionage and Israel is exasperated by the continued arming of the Arab States whose avowed intention it is to drive the Jews out of Palestine.

Britain and the United States could stop all this nonsense at once, compel the Arab States to accept Israel, but anti-semitism and oil are vested interests which we allow to interfere with common justice and common sense. Moreover, if our politicians would see it, Israel is a much more valuable friend than all the Arab States put together.

I have never understood the passionate devotion exhibited by our Foreign Office towards Egypt and everything Egyptian. Whatever happens, no matter what humiliation we suffer, Egypt must be appeased. Eden has recently been touring the East. He never visited Baghdad or Jerusalem but spends an evening with Nasser who governs the rottenest country in the Middle East. Why does he not visit Athens, Ankara or the Jews? Why Egypt of all places? Of what value is Egyptian friendship

when they hate us like poison and intend to exemplify this hate actively against us in both the Suez Canal and the Sudan? Never before was a new British policy in the Middle East required more urgently than to-day. Our present policy, based on peoples who hate us and mistrust us, is disastrous. Turkey and Israel are the two countries with whom we should and might co-operate and whom we should woo; instead we woo a prostitute among nations.

30.x.1955. *Wiltshire*

The fruits of that masterpiece of stupidity and abject surrender to Egypt—the recent agreement on the Suez Canal Zone—are now being reaped. The whole policy of a strategic defence umbrella for NATO from Greece to Pakistan is crumbling. The Soviet offer to arm the Arab States is just another communist move, aimed at creating chaos in the Middle East and threatening the West's largest supply of oil.

Our Foreign Office still hold that we only have to appease the Egyptians and other Arab States long enough, and they will love us. But the exact opposite is the case—the more we appease, the more they hate and despise us.

If the Russians can put their technicians, advisers and experts into Suez, Ismailia, Port Said and Alexandria, we are faced with a very dangerous situation.

Cyprus, which we have chosen as an alternative to the Canal Base, has been told that she is for all time to remain the slave of British Imperialism and is up in arms, chaos and terrorism reminding one of India before we left, of Palestine in 1947, and Kenya to-day; Greece is bitterly hostile, Turkey suspicious and the Kremlin laughs.

A note on Cyprus.—The island was leased to Britain by the Sultan of Turkey in 1878 as a base against possible Russian aggression. After the First World War the island became a British Crown Colony. Within historical times the island never has been Greek, always Turkish; geographically it is Turkish; the Greeks have no claim on the island beyond the claim that they constitute the majority of its inhabitants.

Tripartite condominiums or any form of partition constitute no

solution to racial claims; compromises do not lead to solutions. The Turk, though in the minority, is a better man than the Greek. My solution would be to tell the Greeks that if they cannot behave themselves, we shall hand the island back to the Turk, retaining our base and saddle the Greek Government with another refugee problem. I am quite aware that all Cypriots, including the blood-stained Makarios, are British subjects but if the island becomes Turkish, its people also become Turkish and those who dislike becoming Turkish can clear out.

And for all this sliding down hill, we must thank the United States. Their basic policy is to ruin Britain and wrest from us the superiority in trade and raw material. The whole American administration is saturated with big business and it is big business which dominates their foreign policy. It was the United States which got us thrown out of Persia and then barged in to take our place; it was the United States who compelled us to abandon the Suez Canal Base, it was the United States who encouraged Saudi Arabia to claim the Buraimi Oasis which has estranged us with an old ally and it is the United States who are doing their utmost to undermine our influence in the Middle East.

2.XI.1955. *London*

The danger of war in the Middle East becomes more acute following the collapse of Western diplomacy. It is all very well to blame the Russians for stepping in and encouraging the Arab States with arms; it is due just as much to our preference for chaos to order as it is to Russian desire to create chaos. Renewed conflict between Egypt and Israel seems imminent. We encourage Egypt with arms and appeasement but we say to Israel 'Don't have a preventive war, don't buy arms from Russia, don't expect arms from Britain or the U.S.A., in fact, don't do anything but wait and be over-run by the Arab States.'

None of these things would have happened if the Americans had not interfered and if we had not been so weak as to listen to that immature race of big business men. We should still have been on the Suez Canal if we had moved into Cairo in 1952 when British subjects were being killed by the dozen. The Sudan would not be rent in two by mutinies and civil war,

Russian arms would never have been offered to Egypt, Cyprus would be peaceful and there would be no danger of war between Israel and Egypt. We have deliberately made ourselves impotent in the Middle East, due entirely to our subservience to America and a policy of appeasement which goes much further than Munich.

I have formulated the following memorandum for Israel on the situation as I see it:

Egypt must realize that she cannot reduce Israel by economic blockade alone. Her own declarations make it abundantly clear that she intends to attack Israel at the first favourable opportunity. She will do this with or without co-operation from other Arab States. It is also clear that neither Britain nor America will lift a little finger to prevent Egypt attacking Israel in spite of guarantees if these actually exist. There will be protests and much talk before the Security Council, but no action. If this is agreed, then Israel, by her own action, must put a stop to a disastrous arms race and the risk of eventually being swamped by sheer weight as Germany, with her superior military machine, was overcome by the sheer weight of Russian numbers in the Second World War.

I shall not deal with the strength and efficiency of the Israeli armed forces as these are sufficiently well known to your own people. You are also probably well aware of the numbers and efficiency of the armed forces of the Arab States.

My own experience and knowledge of Arab armed forces is that those of Yemen, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon and Iraq can be ruled out as unfit for active service. Syria is not likely to make much impression on Israel and can be regarded as of a nuisance value only.

There remains Egypt and Jordan.

Military equipment, unless overwhelming and of the most modern quality, is of little avail by itself. The man behind the gun is more important than the gun. The man behind the gun depends on morale for his military efficiency. The Egyptian army was utterly defeated in 1948, and so recent a disaster will be constantly in the minds of all Egyptians in a second campaign. Moreover, a morale based on fear, hatred and revenge is

unlikely to prevail over a morale based on patriotism, justice and self-preservation. No amount of German officers in the Egyptian army can improve morale, though they can improve discipline and drill. Also, Egypt is politically rotten as France was in 1940 and would collapse under an initial military defeat.

I am aware of the fatal error of underestimating an enemy, but, in this case, I consider the Egyptian army to be a vastly inferior machine to that of Israel.

In the following outline of a plan, I am assuming that the bulk of the Egyptian army is east of the Canal and is more or less dispersed. I suggest the following plan:

(1) Make Egypt the aggressor. Pass a small ship through the straits at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, warning Egypt that you intend to do so and that any interference will be regarded as an act of aggression. Warning not to exceed twenty-four hours.

(2) Egyptian batteries would no doubt fire on and sink the ship.

(3) Have bomber aircraft in readiness to take off so soon as the ship wirelessly that she is being fired on. The Egyptian batteries will be fully occupied sinking the ship and would not notice low-flying aircraft approaching. Smother the Egyptian batteries with bombs. Israeli bombers should be based for this attack within 150 miles of the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba.

(4) Egypt would then have two courses open to her:

(a) Refer the matter to the Security Council.

(b) Resume open hostilities; in which case, by masking the Gaza salient, I believe you can be on the Suez Canal within fifty-six hours. Northern Sinai is admirably adapted for rapid movement and by reaching the Canal, all Egyptian communication in Sinai would be cut. Rapidity and blitz tactics are vital.

With Israel on the Canal, I believe Egypt would collapse. The morale of their army would deteriorate in proportion to the high morale which such a victory would instil into your army and your people.

(5) On reaching the Canal, *at once proclaim it to be an*

International Waterway under International Control with a neutral zone of suitable depth on either bank of the Canal.

The usual protests would pour in from Britain and the United States, with threats of Intervention; but if the operation is carried out quickly and your intentions regarding the future of the Suez Canal made public at once, much of the alarm and surprise would be allayed, for you would have accomplished what we should have done long ago.

It is unthinkable that the United States would sanction any action against Israel and Britain is much too busy in Cyprus to take any effective action. But I believe Britain to be your worst enemy. Our Foreign Office is so steeped in appeasement of the Arab States, so impotent now that the Canal Base has been abandoned and so blind to American intrigue against the Commonwealth, that they would make an effort to interfere; but I doubt if it would get beyond words. I trust Israel would show more resolution against interference than she did in 1948.

There remains Jordan and the Arab Legion, the latter financed and officered by the United Kingdom. It is inconceivable that Britain should encourage Jordan to attack Israel and start a general conflagration; Britain would be more likely to try to localize hostilities. Moreover, whatever Jordan felt, a sudden defeat of Egypt would not encourage them to attack.

My main points are:

- (1) Make Egypt the *aggressor*.
- (2) Reach the Canal in *fifty-six hours*, and at once
- (3) Proclaim it to be an *International Waterway* under *International control*, with a *neutral zone on either side* so as to isolate Egypt from Israel for all time.
- (4) Proclaim *Israeli sovereignty over Sinai*.

I see Jimmy Rothschild at a dinner of the Anglo-Israel Club has suggested that Israel become a member of the British Commonwealth. Very desirable and would solve Israel's problem and give mortal offence to all Arab States. Moreover I doubt if feeling in this country would accept such a drastic step; our Foreign Office would certainly oppose it. But I should like to see Israel apply for membership and see what reply would be given to her.

25.XI.1955. *Sussex*

We are now reaping the harvest of our maddening policy in the Middle East which has all hinged on our abandonment of the Suez Canal, continued appeasement of the Arab States and cold-shouldering Israel.

Israel believes that Egypt is unappeasable and is intent on destroying her. Eden thinks Egypt is appeasable, just as Chamberlain thought Hitler appeasable.

Britain agreed to abandon the Sudan, handing thousands of Sudanese over to misery and Egyptian mis-rule and intrigue, thinking that if we gave way over the Sudan, Egypt would be reasonable over the Suez Canal; then we abandoned the Canal under the most humiliating circumstances; then we try to impose our will on Cyprus and alienate an old ally, Greece; we continue to supply arms to Egypt and Jordan; in fact, we have done everything possible to produce chaos in the Middle East and accelerate the outbreak of hostilities between Israel and the Arab States. And now the Russians have stepped in and are arming the Arab States and down falls our policy with a crash; the policy has been wrong in its first premises, wrong in its working out and disastrous in its conclusions.

And the Americans, bent on the destruction of British influence in the Middle East, rejoice.

I am particularly concerned with our behaviour to Cyprus. Having abandoned the Suez Canal base we re-erect it in Cyprus, though we might have done so at Haifa some years ago. We start the trouble by telling Cyprus that we do not regard the right of self-determination as applicable to Cyprus. That produces nationalism in its worst form—sabotage, murder, bombs and a resistance which is out of control. We offend our old friend Greece. There is no need for it all to have happened. It is the story of blundering and complacency. From being a peaceful colony, Cyprus is now the scene of rebellion and civil war. Our position there is untenable; we ourselves have made it so.

We leave the Canal because the Egyptians made it too hot for us and go to Cyprus which is going to make it still hotter.

22.XII.1955. *London*

In a leading article in to-day's *Times*, it is said 'Britain's object

is now, as it has been since 1918, to keep the peace and to maintain friendly relations with most of the Arab States, and in this she has been as successful as conditions have allowed'. And again 'If those who demand a new Middle East policy could explain what sort of policy it should be, their criticism would carry much more weight'.

These reflections prompted me to send a letter to the Editor; of course it will not be published;* serious letters on policy are seldom published unless they emanate from a titled or distinguished person or a member of either House.

After referring to these two statements I said:

Was the Foreign Office policy of abandoning Palestine in 1948 aimed at keeping the peace when it was patent to the whole world that the Arab States would attempt to drive the Jews into the sea by force? Has our connivance at Egypt's closing the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping helped to keep the peace; has our policy in Cyprus been guided by peaceful motives or our retreat from the Sudan; have we ever seriously made an effort to enforce peace between the Arab States and Israel? Does the pouring of arms into Arab States help to keep the peace?

You ask for an alternative policy in the Middle East. Surely it has been shouted from the housetops. Our present policy is based on appeasement of the Arab States whose basic policy is to drive the Jews into the sea, at the same time we guarantee the integrity of Israel, a guarantee as futile as the one we gave Poland in 1939.

May I suggest the obvious alternative policy based on friendship with Israel. What can Israel offer us? A base in a friendly country, the best harbour in the Mediterranean, the best army this side of the Iron Curtain, the most highly cultured and best educated population in or out of Europe, a tradition and history much older than ours, a policy based on peace and friendship instead of on hate, and absolute integrity and reliability instead of the incompetence and untrustworthiness which characterizes the Arab States.

6.1.1956 *Nairobi*

What a mess Eden and the Foreign Office have made of the Middle East.

* The letter was not published.

Nasser is a dictator in Egypt and all dictators are dangerous, losing their heads, thirsting for power and usually ending up their careers in war. Nasser is no exception. In many ways he is like Hitler. He is the product of political revolution, deep social disquiet and military defeat. As Hitler wished to unite all German peoples under him, so Nasser wishes to unite all Arab countries under Egyptian leadership and his first step is the liquidation of Israel. But before he embarks on another war with Israel he must get Arab unity and he must get arms. These he is getting from Russia. Arab unity he will never get except that they are all united in wishing to drive the Jews into the sea. And neither we nor the U.S.A. do anything. The appalling ineffectiveness of our policy, blundering from one expedient to another, abandoning the Suez Canal, trying to transfer our base to Cyprus and making enemies of old friends, is manifest in the present crisis.

Neither we nor America has dared look the real truth in the face, namely, that Russia is eager to exploit and foment trouble in the Middle East, in the hope that she can introduce her poison as successfully into Africa as she did in eastern Asia. Nasser is the minor threat, Russia the major.

Appeasement has utterly failed; it has been both inept and discreditable.

The two stable influences in western Asia are Turkey and Israel. Though Israel is prepared to throw in her lot with us, we deny her arms. I have been working for a long time to try to get Israel to offer us a base at Haifa. It would check-mate Nasser, for he would not dare attack Israel with our base there and we should be surrounded by friends who possess 'the best army this side of the Iron Curtain' and they would fight to the death to protect Palestine. Moreover we should have been spared the stupidity of basing ourselves on Cyprus. I hope, before it is too late, Israel will make this offer, but I fear our Foreign Office is too steeped in anti-semitism and Eden too ill to grasp this simple solution.

No doubt Russia will encourage the Arab States to attack Israel. In that event I can see all sorts of complications arising, of futile efforts by us and the U.S.A. to stop hostilities and of Russia actively helping the Arabs. There are all the seeds of

a Third World War; and that would be the end of Britain.

25.iv.1956. *London*

The Russian undertaking to support the United Nations efforts to secure peace in the Middle East is really an undertaking to make it as uncomfortable as they can the moment they see the chance. Why should Russia help? They are now in the very centre of the Middle East stage and they intend to remain there and just bide their time to become the paramount power in the Middle East; all due to our bungling diplomacy presided over by Eden. He is no more fit to be Prime Minister than is Bevin or Shinwell.

Meanwhile the Saudi-Arabian Government have turned out the British Locust Control Unit from Jeddah and Philby has returned to Riyadh. Both moves fairly ominous.

20.vii.1956. *London*

I can see the embryo of a Third World War. Russia is slowly gaining the upper hand in the Middle East. She is using the Arab hatred of the West and the Arab avowed intention to destroy Israel in order to oust the West from the Arab World. Her influence would be paramount from the Persian Gulf to Morocco, control of Arabian oil and a strangle-hold over the Suez Canal and the Eastern Mediterranean. The Arab States by themselves are incapable of combined action and if it comes to a fight between Israel and the Arab States, Israel would win hands down. Now I learned to-day that Russia is supplying hundreds of technicians, hundreds of tanks and planes (about 300 of the former and 200 of the latter), besides millions of pounds worth of other material, to Egypt, Syria and Jordan. Israel knows it and so must our Foreign Office. Why is it not published? It is also clear that within the next six months a combined Arab attack on Israel will develop and no doubt at the last moment Russian pilots and Russian tank personnel will come in and take part in the fighting. *The material already supplied by Russia is far in excess of that required by Egypt; it includes such supplies as blankets, sheets, boots, socks and much other material which could only be for use by Russians.* This would mean the destruction of Israel who surely should

attack before an Arab offensive develops. It is her only chance. She should reach the Canal in forty-eight hours and at once proclaim it to be an International Waterway under International Control. Egypt would collapse, the United Nations, who would be hopelessly disunited, would pass resolutions and talk for weeks. Nobody would have the guts to act. But I think it would compel the United Nations to accept Israel's invitation to send an international police force to take over the Canal. That would knock out Egypt and it is doubtful if Russia could do much with Egypt off the board. The fighting qualities of the Arabs are only too well known and a combination of Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Iraq, if such a combination were possible, would be impotent. Would Russia then risk a Third World War and send troops to the Middle East? I don't know, but if she did, and attacked Israel, the risk of a major conflagration is very great.

I have little faith in Eden, still less in the United States who are obsessed with undermining British influence in the Middle East which blinds them to the Russian danger. But if their oil were threatened they might act—all too late.

27.VII.1956. *London*

The United States and ourselves have refused to finance a High Dam in Egypt. Nasser is howling his wrath and is at his nastiest; he has become the Hitler of the Nile valley, a marsh-frog uttering his loathsome croak. Israel is naturally alarmed as they think Nasser in his madness might attack. It is an odd fact that the Arabs can utter on platforms, in their Press and on the radio, the wildest, most savage threats of annihilating every Jew on the soil of what they continue to call Palestine; but if an Israeli says that his people intend to defend themselves, screams of shocked protest come from our Foreign Office and the world in general.

And now Nasser, in revenge, has announced that he has seized the Suez Canal in defiance of all international agreements; it is blatant piracy and robbery, but the inevitable result of the scuttling from Abadan, Palestine and the Suez Canal and the persistent policy of appeasement which both Churchill and Eden, in their criminal folly, have pursued towards the Arabs.

Disraeli gave us the key to the Canal. Eden and Churchill hand it back. I should not be surprised if, once again, the Jews returned us the key.

I have repeatedly preached that the only solution of the Suez Canal question is that it be made an International Waterway under International Control. My diary is ample evidence and also the two letters (unpublished) I wrote to *The Times* on May 18, 1953, and on March 18, 1954. I am amazed that our Government should have been shocked and surprised at Nasser's action. It should have foreseen his obvious next move.

Eden's first reaction is to talk; no action. He asks the United States, whose policy is to undermine our influence in the Middle East, to help and our friend Dulles is coming over. More talk. And the outcome will be further delay, more talk and interminable conferences and discussions.

The right course would have been for Eden to tell Nasser that we did not recognize his seizure of the Canal, that his seizure must be cancelled in default of which we should march in and occupy the Canal Zone and proclaim the International Waterway; at the same time asking Israel to co-operate from the Sinai side. But Eden is utterly unfit to govern this country, preferring talk to action, seeped in appeasement and completely under the thumb of the Americans.

Egypt has been stopping Israeli ships using the Canal for years but as soon as there is a threat to British shipping, we wake up and protest. This gives Israel a right to take part in internationalizing the Canal.

In August 1882, Arabi Pasha seized the dictatorship of Egypt and said 'The defence of Egypt requires the temporary destruction of the Canal'. Gladstone in the House of Commons replied:

'We feel that we should not fully discharge our duty if we did not endeavour to convert the present interior state of Egypt from anarchy and conflict to peace and order.'

Gladstone called a conference, as Eden did, but in Constantinople. In the House, Gladstone said:

'We should look for the co-operation of the Powers of civilized Europe, but if every chance of obtaining that co-

operation is exhausted, the work will be under the single power of England.'

Meanwhile the International Conference in Constantinople yawned away, but Britain acted and Wolseley was placed in command of an expeditionary force. France and Italy refused to co-operate. Wolseley landed at Ismailia and with the battle of Tel el Kebir began our occupation of Egypt and the security of the Canal.

To-day we have France solidly behind us. But unfortunately we have Eden at the helm and he will continue to talk until the Canal Crisis is a matter of history and Nasser will continue to snap his fingers at us.

Nasser, Egypt and the Canal are apt to conceal the real issue, which is paramount influence in the Middle East. America has successfully undermined our influence, hoping to establish her own; but Russia comes along and in a few months has established herself firmly throughout the Middle East, ousting both Britain and the U.S.A—a remarkable achievement.

Russia will establish an Arab Empire from Morocco to Iraq, monopolize the oil to our disadvantage and will almost certainly destroy Israel. And our silly politicians have let it happen and now find themselves unable to extricate themselves from the quagmire which they deliberately stepped into.

14.VIII.1956. *Austria*

Eden has convened an International Conference of the principal maritime Nations; it will meet in London on the 16th. Calling a conference solves nothing and has been the graveyard of the clearest policies and the firmest of resolutions. It spells delay—Russia and India will see to that. Of the twenty-one countries invited, nineteen have accepted. Egypt will never accept; Russia and India will obstruct. And why ask Abyssinia, India, Ceylon, Indonesia. Nehru is an inconsistent dreamer. A rabid anti-colonialist whilst trying to drive the Portuguese from their century-old colony of Goa, holding down thousands of Moslems in Kashmir against their wishes and behaving abominably to many local tribes such as the Nagas of Assam. And now the dreamer claims to speak for all Asia.

And why has Israel not been asked to the Conference? She has suffered more from Nasser's illegal stoppage of her Canal traffic than any other Nation. The British Government have never learned to accept the existence of Israel who is regarded as an irritating inconvenience instead of a potential support. Israel, in spite of repeated pin-pricks from the Arab States, is behaving with commendable restraint. Why not try to understand a Nation whom we helped to bring into existence and then did our best to kill. They want to be our friends, they are the only stable force in the Middle East and they have proved themselves in war to be second to none. And we ignore them: stupendous folly!

Meanwhile Eden has been speaking a lot. If he had acted at once he might have regained that prestige and respect which our politicians have thrown away in the Middle East; and we should have regained the respect of the whole world. Eden's failure only increases the contempt of not only the Arabs but the whole world. We do not want the friendship and admiration of the Arabs; nothing we did would gain us that. But we do demand respect, honest dealing and adherence to treaties and our rights.

Eden's first reaction is to consult the United States, then call a conference of twenty-one nations excluding the one—Israel—most vitally interested. That will be followed by more talk until the crisis peters out in a victory for the dictator of Egypt. Most depressing.

The Panama Canal has a five mile strip on either side which is in the absolute ownership of the United States and this strip is a military reservation. In return for the Canal, the United States guarantees the independence of Panama which seceded from Colombia under circumstances not too creditable to America. The United States is under an obligation to keep the Canal open during a war to which she is not a party.

Now if Panama had suddenly nationalized the Panama Canal, what would have been America's reaction? Would she have discussed the matter with Eden and then called a conference of maritime nations? No, she would at once have used force without taking anyone's advice, as Gladstone did in 1882 in Egypt.

19.VIII.1956. *Austria*

Talk continues and there is now small mention of military action. In fact we are now returning to appeasement. We are evading our own prime responsibility and our strong rights; it will only goad Nasser into fresh successes. Very little strength and determination would bring the whole of his paste-board regime toppling down; it would entail the re-occupation of the Canal Zone, the settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute and permanent security for one of the great waterways of the world, vital to our existence. There are, of course, risks, but the risk of doing nothing is infinitely greater. We should take the lead, no matter what India, Russia, etc. think or do. And, for God's sake, let us stop fawning on the United States.

Whatever settlement is reached, at least a mile on each bank of the Canal must be internationalized and unfortified, but with an international garrison. If not, then Egypt is in precisely the same threatening position to the Canal as she is to-day.

24.VIII.1956. *London*

I appear to be writing a lot about Suez. It is because I feel so strongly that it is a crisis which is being badly handled and if we fail to make the Canal an international Waterway under international control with a neutral zone on either side protected by an international garrison, the whole of Britain's livelihood and prosperity is at stake and to a lesser degree, the strength and prosperity of the world. Egyptian control of the Canal would be a deadly injury to Britain and the Commonwealth.

Nasser has said that the Suez Canal involved the death of 120,000 Egyptians. As a matter of fact it was a little over 200. Nasser's figures belong to Necho's Canal, built some 2,000 years ago. Again, he says that in the last war the Egyptian army defended the Canal. An Egyptian memorial on the Canal banks records this lie. As a matter of fact no Egyptian soldiers defended the Canal in either the First or Second World Wars; but we had to maintain considerable forces in metropolitan Egypt during both wars to prevent Egyptians sabotaging the Canal and other military installations.

24.VIII.1956. *London*

I understand that Israel's attempts to be represented at the Suez Conference did not find support within the Foreign Office. More fear of hurting Nasser's feelings and appeasement of the Arab States. Such is the hatred and mistrust of our Foreign Office for the only stable country in the Middle East and a people who are only too anxious to be our friends, and moreover some of the best and most efficient soldiers in the world.

There is still a small section of the British public and several Left-wing Members of Parliament and of course the Trade Unions, who advocate appeasement of the Arab States, who regard any use of force as immoral and futile, just as they did when Hitler entered the Rhineland. They say 'Drop one paratrooper in the Canal Zone, and Britain is finished.' And the Christian view is that by sacrifice and service in the interest of others, we may gain what we want without resort to force. These views condemn force to defend vital interests or resist aggression, some going so far as to think that by attacking Egypt, we are undertaking an impossible task. Others say that we abandoned the Suez Canal because of Egyptian sabotage and that any re-occupation would entail further sabotage. As a fact, we could have stopped all sabotage and crime in the Canal Zone if we had adopted sterner methods; but we failed to do so for fear of offending the Egyptians.

Let us examine the facts. A military dictator has seized power in Egypt; he has established a police state; he has established close relations with Russia who urges him to further excesses; he is in a state of war with Israel whom he has sworn to destroy; he has flouted the United Nations and still stops Israeli shipping from using the Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. He has proclaimed his intention to establish an Arab Empire from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, including the Sudan and no doubt Uganda, and now he challenges our very existence by seizing the Canal knowing full well the meaning of such action. In doing this he has broken all treaties, all promises and is in a position to ruin us.

We are now told by a small body of pacifists, conscientious objectors and fanatics that it is immoral to call a halt to Nasser's actions. We are also told that force must never be employed, because it is morally wrong; it solves nothing and is un-

Christian; in other words we are asked to turn the other cheek and admit that we have not the guts to defend ourselves; why not disband our armed forces and adopt Denmark's attitude of permanent neutrality, allowing anyone to kick us around whenever they will, even to occupying and exploiting Britain.

To refuse to use force because it is too dangerous is just an appeal to cowardice; we are told that to compel Nasser to call a halt might inflame the whole Arab world and perhaps start a Third World War. I am quite sure that Russia is in no state to embark on a war. Instead we are invited to produce a worse degree of economic inflammation and the well-deserved scorn of the world. It would mean that we had sunk so low that we can no longer defend ourselves or our vital interests; and we would lose whatever self-respect we still retain.

Anything worth having and vital to our existence is worth fighting for.

The U.S.A. continue to condemn the use of force and carry out their old policy of undermining our influence everywhere. Eisenhower has openly agreed with Nasser. If the U.S.A. had decided to use force at the start and come down heavily on our side, it would all have been over by now; but they prefer their old policy of sabotaging our interests everywhere in the world to slake their thirst for world power.

It has now been decided to send a deputation to Nasser informing him of the Conference's proposals; Menzies of Australia heads this futile deputation. Nasser will play for time and eventually say No; and then what? More talk, reference to U.N.O., Russian veto and we are where we were when it started. What imbecile ineptitude and criminal weakness on Eden's part.

6.IX.1956. *South Uist*

Nasser having said No to the Conference, Eden is now proposing to refer the matter to U.N.O. I cannot imagine a more stupid move, for whatever is decided will be vetoed by Russia. And Eden also proposes to form a Users' Association and have a test run through the Suez Canal; just asking for another snub; it is all very depressing.

23.IX.1956. *London*

Eighteen nations from all over the world have failed to agree on what procedure to adopt towards an aggressor. Such is the inevitable result of conferences and talk. We are no nearer to ending an intolerable situation; Nasser wants time and we present him with it; America is playing for time, intent on defeating any chance of Britain regaining her influence and prestige in the Middle East. Why do we continue to play America's game?

The new idea of a Users' Association is a silly dream; it is no solution even if successful; and if a ship was sent to test this silly solution, Nasser would just refuse entry to the Canal unless it conformed to his own rules.

And now we want to take the question to the United Nations, America does not and France is all for military action. What a mess! Every time these nations meet, solutions are watered down until finally nothing will be done and Nasser will roar with laughter. It has been ten days of utter confusion and a useless waste of time and a continual watering down of Eden's first pronouncement.

The Labour Party has not come out of it well. In his first speech, Gaitskell denounced Nasser, comparing him with Hitler, approved the troop movements and agreed that Nasser must not get away with it. But he then surrendered to the pacifists, the friends of every country but their own, the men to whom Britain is always wrong. Gaitskell has shown that he has no moral courage; he now says that the Users' Association is an act of provocation. If a man steals something from another man and that man tries to recover his property, it is 'an act of provocation'.

The big question is lost sight of—Russia's bid for control of all the Arab States, the subversion of the Sudan and Somalia, then Uganda and so on. And of course the destruction of Israel.

I have read that in the play 'Hassan', there is a discussion on the wonders performed by a Jewish magician. Selim says 'And strangest of all, at Cairo, for the amusement of the Sultan, he turned the whole population into apes for half an hour.' 'A very trifling change,' replies Hassan.

The Labour Party have divided the country in two making

political capital out of a national issue. I should like to ask Gaitskell these questions:

(1) Do you acknowledge that in the Suez Canal issue a vital national interest is at stake?

(2) Do you stand by the rule of law and the sanctity of engagements between nations?

(3) Do you agree with the plan worked out by eighteen nations for an international authority as the constructive basis of British policy? Or are you going to sacrifice the interests of your country for partisan purposes?

4.x.1956. *London*

Dulles continues to dilute the plan of the London Conference, to ruin united action and undermine our influence in the Middle East. On September 27th, he held a Press Conference in Washington. His words deliberately undermine united action and by further delays play into Nasser's hands. In Dulles' view, Nasser can safely be left to the consequences of his own action. And after all, American interest in the Canal is very small, for most of her ships fly the Panama or Liberian flag and, even including them, American shipping is only 8 per cent of all ships using the Canal.

Moreover Dulles is distorting the issues. His action must be bitterly resented by his friends over here. On October 2nd he taunts us with that beloved expression 'colonialism', trying to make out that the Suez dispute is the result of British Colonialism. It deliberately misrepresents the Suez issue. With the Security Debate imminent, his words are a gross misrepresentation of the facts and a grave disservice to Anglo-American unity.

Nobody appears to recognize the big issue behind the Suez dispute, which is Russian domination of the Middle East and all countries from Morocco to the Persian Gulf.

It is quite clear that Egypt's aim after securing the Canal—and this she will do thanks to the Americans and the blundering of our politicians—is to attack Israel with the help of Russian arms. I have to-day seen an order issued by the Commander of Egypt's 3rd Infantry Division deployed near El Arish. It was issued on February 15th and reads:

'Every commander must prepare himself and his soldiers for the important battle with Israel in which we are fully immersed, with the aim of realizing our lofty tradition, that is to overpower and destroy Israel in the shortest possible time and with the greatest brutality and bestiality in battle.'

There is no doubt that this attack on Israel is imminent. But I have no fear. The Jews are second to none in fighting qualities; their equipment is varied and of many types and they are capable of defeating any Arab army or combination of armies which can be put into the field. They could be on the Suez Canal in two days and in Damascus in less than that time.

But what the Israelis possess is fanatical determination, great skill and the technique of a rapid mobilization which enables them to put in the field a quarter of a million men and women in forty-eight hours. Israel has also the immense advantage of a highly educated population, technically skilled, to whom modern military equipment presents no great mysteries.

5.x.1956. *London*

Copy of a letter to the Editor, *Time and Tide*.*

Editor: *Time and Tide*.

Can somebody give me the answers to the following questions?

(1) Why are not the culprits who handed the key to the Canal back to Egypt, blamed for the present crisis?

(2) Why were we told that our position on the Canal was rendered impossible by Egyptian sabotage and murder, and then we chose Cyprus where conditions are even worse?

(3) What would the United States have done if Panama had nationalized the Panama Canal? Would they have sent for Eden, then arrange a conference, then a deputation to the President of Panama and then refer the matter to U.N.O.? The simile is not exact, but the crime is similar.

(4) Why was not Israel asked to the London Conference? She has suffered more than other nations from Nasser's illegal practices. Why do we continue to ignore our only friend in the Middle East, and a nation possessing the 'best army this side of the Iron Curtain'?

* Needless to say, this was not published.

(5) Why were Abyssinia and Indonesia asked to the London Conference? Why not ask Nicaragua, Formosa and other states whose interest in the Canal is negligible?

(6) Why have we not been told that from the fiasco of Abadan to the present day, the United States policy has centred around the undermining of British influence in the Middle East? And that our continual abdication from responsibility, sponsored by America, is at the root of the trouble?

(7) Why, when Nasser tears up a treaty, do we not do likewise and nationalize the River Nile? We have this weapon against Egypt; why do we not use it?

R. M.

7.x.1956. *London*

Some of the speeches on Suez are almost beyond belief, giving comfort to Nasser and making it as difficult as possible for Lloyd who is putting our case to the Security Council. One speaker, referring to talk of appeasement, said it was 'damnable balderdash'; another speaker said that the Labour Party stood 'on the side of the Egyptian people struggling for their national aspirations'; another said 'we must recognize the right of Arab States to nationalize their oil wells'. Thus have the socialists destroyed national unity in the Suez issue and have sacrificed the nation's interests to a transient Party advantage, making it impossible for Britain to negotiate from strength before the Security Council and in talks with Nasser.

8.x.1956. *London*

Many persons regard Britain and the United States as a single force with identical interests and as aloof from continental Europe; this is largely due to economic dependence and linguistic equality. I believe this to be dangerously false. British interests and British security are European, not American, and often in conflict with American policy. The United States is concerned with American interests and is only concerned with European interests in so far as they affect American interests; Europe, or rather Free Europe, is a single international entity. We should not blame America for this outstanding fact for she is in-

experienced in the wicked ways of the world, she is saturated with isolationism and idealistic as only immaturity can be. American leadership cannot be directed at anything other than American interests. The Atlantic Alliance is no answer to all Europe's troubles; we must stand on our own feet and free ourselves from control of others merely because they are bigger and richer. Western Europe should become a moral, economic and political bloc, subject neither to American domination nor leadership, nor to threats and taunts from Russia or from Asian-Arab so-called anti-colonial Powers. The United States, obsessed with undermining British prestige throughout the world and clinging to that call of hypocrisy 'anti-colonialism', has gone full speed in reverse and is rapidly reaching the stage of turning a blind eye to the burglar having the run of the house, because it is not an American house. So far as America is concerned, Britain is just an island in the Atlantic, a recipient of charity and a convenient outpost.

The Atlantic Alliance is not Britain's key for the future; it is a dangerous and false hope; we and the Americans are not true companions, our only common factor being language. Free Europe, despite language, has much more in common with Britain. America is trying to make us realize that we are no longer a great nation; that utterly false doctrine must be fought and exploded. I believe Europe is once more awakening, France is on her feet again and I believe that we British should now assume leadership of Free Europe in all matters resulting from aggression in Europe and in all matters which vitally affect Free Europe's safety or economy.

We should remember that America's dollar greatness has accrued through selfish neutrality in two world wars, in which she only took part after two years' hesitation at the expense of suffering humanity. We have no guarantee that this might not recur. In the event of a Russian-sponsored invasion of Western Germany by East Germany, America might still hesitate as she has done on two occasions and only risk herself when the tide begins to turn. An American-controlled United Nations is no answer to Europe's problems.

Under British leadership, a Union of Free Europe should be set up. If possible this Union should be within the framework

of the United Nations Organization, but that is not vital. All Free Europe should be invited to join, and Turkey and Israel. No doubt, members of the British Commonwealth, who consider their safety and economy to be wrapped up with Western Europe, would wish to join.

If Europe wishes to survive we must form a common front based on mutual obligations; we must arm to sustain those obligations and be ready to use force against aggression if necessary. Fear of using force encourages aggression.

British retreat from the Middle East is directly attributable to American intrigue, and creates a vacuum which the Americans with their primitive methods of arms and dollars cannot fill. In fact, the Arabs filled the vacuum, not the Russians. And it soon emerged that neither we nor the Americans had any definite policy for the Middle East. Arms and dollars are no policy and could not stand up to professional propagandists, sociologists, economists and diplomats such as the Kremlin employed in their cold war, all ingredients of successful communist penetration. The Kremlin made common cause with Arab nationalism; both we and the Americans assumed a paternal interest in the Arab States, appeasing them with dollars and weapons. The Western blunders have been the Kremlin's greatest asset; and petty jealousies and rivalries between the United States, France and Britain made Russian infiltration all the easier.

9.x.1956. *London*

To-day I attended a meeting at Chatham House when a Conservative Member—Gilbert Longden—and a Labour Member—Denis Healey—each gave their party's view on the Suez Crisis. It largely dealt with events leading up to the present crisis and scarcely touched on remedial measures, though there were a few references to the initial threat of using force. There was little discussion on what will happen if Nasser 'gets away with it'.

I posed my seven questions (on pp. 292-3) and got no satisfactory answers. In fact, the word Israel was scarcely mentioned from start to finish.

I thought that, important though the Suez issue is, it is

insignificant beside the larger issues:

(a) Is Russia going to dominate the Middle East and the whole Arab World from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, urging Arab States to nationalize their oil, oust the Americans and replace them with Russian technicians? We shall then only get what oil Russia chooses to give us and at their own prices. Longden thought it would be a good thing if Arabian oil was nationalized but did not appreciate the result.

(b) If the United Nations fail to act on the Suez issue and allow it to peter out in talk, then the organization will perish as did the League of Nations when they failed to act when Mussolini invaded Abyssinia.

(c) Nasser wants money. I would not put it above the United States to offer to buy the Canal and run it, together with a strip of Americanized territory on either bank. That surely would make Britain look extremely stupid and close for all time our prestige in the Middle East. And throughout the world.

Abadan was built up by a British Company which was illegally ousted with American encouragement. Its substitute is a tangled American arrangement with no benefit to anyone except America but has done permanent damage to British prestige and interests not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. We are now reaping the fruits of American intrigue and British weakness.

14.x.1956. *London*

The hopeless tangle into which the Government have drifted owing to a policy of compromise and appeasement, allowing themselves to be undermined by the United States and kicked about by Russia, shows how utterly unfit they are to govern. We are drifting to disaster through weakness and indecision. There is no leadership, faith or policy, everything hinging on electoral expediency. I can see no hope for the country under Eden. Out, vile jelly. If there was an election tomorrow the Conservatives would be defeated, they have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Our only hope would be if the Left-wing conservatives joined the Liberal Party and the

Right-wing of Labour did likewise. But that is impossible.

In the Middle East there is an amazing mess of inconsistencies. Let me go back. The Balfour Declaration grants to the Jews a right to establish their national home in Palestine. Every obstacle has been placed in their way by successive British Governments. Then Churchill in 1921 hands over Transjordan, an integral part of Palestine, to an Arab sheikh who is made a 'king'. Then Bevin, unable to keep order in Palestine and influenced by anti-semitism in his office, scuttles out of Palestine leaving the Jews at the mercy of six Arab States who promptly invade Palestine and attempt what Bevin wished, to drive the Jews into the sea. Israel had to fight for her life in 1948, and lost much land including the whole of eastern Palestine, Old Jerusalem and the Gaza strip. Britain stands by and does nothing, though when Egypt gets a thrashing and Israel is about to overrun Sinai and march on the Suez Canal (which she would have internationalized) Britain, through the United States (for we were not then on speaking terms with Israel), tells Israel to stop. Israel, being young and a bit nervous, stops. Then Egypt stops Israeli shipping passing through the Canal and up the Gulf of Aqaba. She is condemned by the Security Council who are impotent and unwilling to go beyond a reprimand.

Jordan is heavily subsidized by Britain and British officers are with the Jordan forces; and yet this country is bitterly hostile to Britain and in thorough sympathy with Egypt. We have poured arms into Jordan, whilst refusing arms to Israel. Jordan, at the instigation of Egypt, conducts a campaign of frontier raids into Israel and Israel retaliates with success. Jordan gets frightened and asks for aid from Iraq who sends troops towards Jordan. Israel says that if Iraq troops enter Jordan a very serious situation will arise. Britain warns Israel, that if she crosses the Jordan frontier, she will come to Jordan's aid. Israel is our only friend in the Middle East and we not only ignore her but quarrel with her. Jordan loathes us and is supporting Egypt and we support her with arms and money.

29.x.1956. *Norfolk*

The appeasement of Arab States continues. Jordan continues

to receive an enormous subsidy from Britain though she is bitterly hostile. And now, when the avowed intention of the Arab States is to destroy Israel and when Iraq troops are massing on the Jordan-Iraq frontier and Egypt is making nightly raids into Israel territory, both H.M.G. and the United States warn Israel not to mobilize or take any precautions to fend off an attack by Arab States which is clearly imminent. Such action by us and the United States is worse than stupid, it is grossly unjust and an encouragement to the Arab States to attack Israel. But I trust Israel will pay no attention to such a warning and will forestall the Arabs by launching a crushing blow against Egypt, the main enemy; this she can easily do and in forty-eight hours she will be on the Suez Canal, which she will proclaim to be an international waterway.

And what can the United Nations do if either Israel or the Arabs are the aggressor. They will talk and pass innumerable resolutions, Russia vetoing any with which she disagrees, and nothing will happen. She is powerless to enforce any resolution for lack of an international police force; this should have been done long ago; such a police force cannot hope to stop a major war but small wars, which might set the whole world ablaze, could be checked by an international force of about 10,000 men with aircraft and other accessories.

(same day: evening)

Israel has launched an offensive against Egypt, penetrating far into Sinai, reaching Nekhl and is now within easy striking distance of the Suez Canal. Well done, Israel! I am delighted and thrilled. At last the talk has stopped and action has stepped in. We and the U.S.A. will protest and threaten intervention. But I hope Israel will go forward, occupy the Canal Zone, internationalize the Canal and not desist until some form of international police can take over the Canal Zone.

Very few people in this country realize Israel's peril in being surrounded by heavily-armed Arab States, who might attack her at any moment and consider it wrong that she should forestall such an attack. And the loss of the Suez Canal to Western Europe is little understood in America, or, if understood, is ignored and perhaps welcomed.

30.x.1956. *Norfolk*

Eden has sent a note to Egypt and Israel, announcing his intention to send British and French troops to occupy the Canal Zone and asking both countries to withdraw to ten miles from both banks of the Canal. That is a pity; Israel should have been allowed to do this. Meanwhile Israel has occupied almost the whole of Sinai and the Egyptian army, in spite of Russian tanks and personnel, has just cleared out without a fight.

Israel will certainly conform to Eden's wishes, but Nasser will refuse. So we shall prevent Nasser from being annihilated by Israel and at the same time we shall be fighting Nasser on the Canal—a ridiculous situation. Speed is now essential. I trust we shall subject Egyptian troops on the Canal and aerodromes to an intense bombardment from the air and then, at once, drop paratroops. From what I know of Egyptian troops, opposition will be negligible and surrenders will be wholesale.

How I wish I were out there instead of sitting in North Norfolk with a gale blowing from the north.

This written immediately after the six o'clock news. We shall listen in again at 9 p.m.

Nine o'clock news. Egypt has said No and Israel has said Yes to Eden's ultimatum. Splendid, but I should have preferred to let Israel occupy the Canal. I cannot help feeling that Eden has acted quickly for fear that Israel should occupy the Canal Zone. In any case, Israel's quick victory over the Egyptians has made it very easy for us and Eden should be duly grateful to Ben-Gurion.

And I am delighted that for once we have not consulted the Americans who at any cost are determined that we shall not regain our prestige in the Middle East. The Americans are furious and they will now try to generate a hatred for us throughout the world. There is still no suggestion of forming an international police force to take over the Canal.

In the House of Commons this afternoon Eden stressed the value of our shipping passing through the Canal and the danger it runs if Israel and Egypt are fighting in the Canal Zone; that argument is a red herring for there is as much danger to the Canal if we and the Egyptians start fighting in the Canal Zone. But in any case Nasser will sink as many ships as he can

in the Canal and render it useless for many months. The real issues are—shall we compel Egypt to internationalize the Canal, thereby regaining our prestige in the Middle East and halt Russian and American influence in an area which is peculiarly our own? It looks as though Israel, by her protective action brought on by repeated threats from Egypt, has compelled Britain to find herself and at last take action and stop talking.

A fearful outburst in the House of Commons, the Labour Party, furious at Eden's action, all for purely party purposes. Such action by a lot of ill-informed, narrow-minded and stupid politicians, divides the country in two and might have a disastrous effect on our troops.

Egyptian threats to Israel

The following threats by Egypt are taken mainly from *Voice of the Arabs*:

June 4th, 1955:

The Egyptian, Syrian, and Saudi Arabian armies will fight with determination to exterminate Zionism in the second round of the Palestine war.

June 6th, 1955:

We emphasize once more that Israel will not exist long in the land of Arabism, and that there will be no negotiations between the robbers and their victims.

June 17th, 1955:

We have sworn an oath—which we will never break—before Almighty God that we will fight to drive you out, that we will fight you across every inch of Palestine.

August 31st, 1955:

Egypt is preparing millions of Commandos to be used against you.

October 29th, 1955:

There will be no stability until this small but evil State is stifled.

In face of these threats, the United Nations fail to see the seeds of armed aggression and appear to think that if a man advances on you with an axe, you must not defend yourself until he actually strikes. Israel is accused of an act of aggression.

Is warding-off a long-advertised attack an act of aggression?
Is defence an act of aggression?

Egypt claims that one member of the United Nations can maintain a state of war against another member, that the Arab-Israel war has never ended and that Egypt can pursue it by any means and at any time; at the same time she complains if Israel defends herself. And the United Nations take no action—lots of words but no action. Impotence reigns over justice.

31.x.1956. *Norfolk*

This morning came the news that an Egyptian destroyer has been captured by the Israelis at Haifa, that Israeli forces have reached to within ten miles of the Canal where they have halted but that Nasser has said No. The nine o'clock news announced our bombing of airfields in Egypt.

America is furious and impotent, Gaitskell and the Labour Party continue to try to split the country in two when our soldiers are fighting, Russia is slaughtering Hungarians and actively supporting Egypt and the Arab States and the Security Council is floundering in a welter of resolutions, deliberations and protests but is powerless and utterly impotent for lack of any instrument with which to enforce decisions. My estimation of Eden has gone up. I never thought he had it in him.

Criticism of our action is pure hypocrisy due to a desire to gain some party advantage, to ignorance, and to an unjustified faith in the power of the United Nations. The Arab States have announced their intention to wipe out Israel; Egypt has been conducting raids into Israel territory for many months and has been receiving immense quantities of arms and other assistance from Russia; the United Nations have proved themselves to be an ineffective instrument for enforcing order anywhere in the world and Russia is interfering effectively in the Middle East and giving all the support she can to the Arab States with whom we are now in active conflict.

I should like to ask Gaitskell what he would have done if he had been Prime Minister; would he have relied on the United Nations to enforce peace, protect the Canal which is vital to our interests and the happiness and prosperity of England, would

he have allowed matters to drift until Russian troops and planes arrived in the Middle East? What would he have done?

This confidence in the United Nations is a positive danger. It has been surrounded with a mystical significance out of all proportion to its real effectiveness. Recent happenings in the Middle East and in Europe have merely outlined what should already have been well known. Russia knows it; we have yet to learn that the United Nations is just an inefficient ghost, incapable of action but wallowing in futile talk.

1.XI.1956. *Norfolk*

The Americans are furious at our armed intervention in Egypt. Splendid. One of the best results of our intervention is the breaking away from American apron strings and showing the Yanks that we still have a kick in us.

The Arab States, stunned by Israel's rapid advance and the complete defeat of the Egyptian Army in two days, are holding their hand. Gaza and El Arish are surrounded and should surrender in a day or so. I trust our bombing of Egyptian air-fields will be followed up at once by landings. Success depends largely on speed. No opposition need be expected from the Egyptian Army, no matter how many Russian weapons they possess.

The Opposition still claim that the matter must be referred to the United Nations, ignoring the fact that any such reference would be useless. A long list of failures, due largely to the use of the Russian veto and to inevitable disagreement among so many nations, and with no means of enforcing decisions, are the hall-mark of the ineptitude of this international debating society.

I should still like to know what the Opposition would have done if they had been in power. If they had referred it to the United Nations, Israel would now be sitting on the Canal and fighting, with high casualties, would have resulted with the possibility of Russian intervention and a Third World War.

Gaitskell asks us to 'obey the United Nations and accept whatever they say'. Are the United Nations infallible with the United States employing the most immoral lobbying, especially of South American countries, often under threats? Moreover

the United Nations cannot give orders, they can only recommend and they have no power, no force, behind their policy. Any policy, without force behind it, is just fatuous and empty words.

2.XI.1956. *Norfolk*

Nine o'clock news. Gaza and El Arish have fallen. Hundreds of Russian tanks captured. United States furious. United Nations dis-united and have been re-christened a 'political eunuch'. A vote of censure in the House of Commons defeated by sixty-nine votes. The Russians have no intention of leaving Hungary and are shooting down men, women and children in the streets of Budapest. Meanwhile, Nasser is saying the Egyptians will fight to the last man.

At last some bright person, a member of the 'political eunuch', has suggested an international police force to take over the Canal. That will be many weeks hence and months before it is efficient. And what if Egypt refuses to have it. Shall we remain on or evacuate the country to further chaos? Israel now has the whole of Sinai and Ben-Gurion speaks as though he means to keep it.

A United Nations police force of sufficient strength would be a tremendous asset. But could it not be rendered impotent by the veto? And to be any use it must be composed of all three arms under one supreme commander and of sufficient strength to deal with all minor crises; no force can deal with a major crisis. I can see immense difficulties and pit-falls and the dis-united nations are scarcely the body to forge an efficient and practical solution.

3.XI.1956. *Suffolk*

An excellent broadcast by Eden, who has gone up in my estimation. He is defying the 'Political Eunuch' and remaining on the Canal until a United Nations Police can replace our troops. This latter is now being improvised but could not possibly take over the Canal Zone for many weeks with any degree of efficiency. The air attack on Egyptian aerodromes continues. Speed is now essential before Nasser completely blocks the Canal. I trust our troops are already disembarking at Port Said and Suez. What a pity Israel did not go on and occupy the Canal Zone.

4.XI.1956. *Suffolk*

Gaitskell broadcast last night. The B.B.C. should never have allowed him to reply to the Prime Minister and spread his poisonous propoganda which is purely party politics. Eden spoke as the leader of the Nation to explain the issue at stake in a grave emergency. There was no necessity for a Party retort.

Bombing aerodromes in Egypt continues. No news of a landing, which is a pity.

5.XI.1956. *London*

We landed at Port Said early this morning and captured the aerodrome. Port Said surrendered this evening. So much for Nasser's 'fight to the last man'.

Gaitskell, an old Wykhamist, bears a heavy load of responsibility for splitting the country in two for party purposes. He has revealed a hitherto unsuspected capacity for rabble-rousing; and the rabble has indeed been roused. He claims that our action in Egypt has brought about Russia's brutal repression in Hungary of the Peoples' freedom. Gaitskell's words can only encourage the Russians. His accusation comes ill from the lips of any British politician and is as utterly baseless as the charges made by Bulganin yesterday which is a document of cunning and menace almost unique in diplomatic history.

10.XI.1956. *London*

On the 7th, Ben-Gurion addressed the Knesset in Jerusalem, a victory speech, confident that at last Israel was secure. But to-day Russian preparations in Syria have cast a gloom over Israel. Ben Gurion announced a complete reversal of his victory speech. He offers to withdraw from Sinai. Victory has been turned into defeat. What influenced Ben Gurion? A substantial threat from Russia, also an economic threat from America. It is also suspected that both Britain and France have told Israel that they would not be in a position to help Israel if the Russians attacked on the Korean pattern. This is tragic and very disappointing. Are we really going to stand aside and see Israel wiped out by Arabs assisted by Russia. America would no doubt find all sorts of reasons for non-intervention. But we, having given Israel their National Home, can hardly

stand aside and see her wiped out. If so, it will be a disgrace from which we shall never recover.

In any case, Israel must retain the Gaza strip which is not really Egyptian territory. The fact remains that Israel has destroyed one-third of the Egyptian army and has captured an impressive amount of Egyptian war material, including much sent by Russia. If their splendid victory has been negated by outside pressure, they can comfort themselves that they have the admiration of the civilized world and that Egypt will not be in a position to attack Israel or give powerful support to other Arab States for some time. But it is all very depressing and might never have happened if only we and the U.S.A. would stand up to Russia.

11.XI.1956. *London*

I am most disappointed at our very limited success in Egypt. We occupy about 20-30 miles of the Canal; we do not effectively separate Israel from Egypt; Nasser can still do untold damage to the Canal.

We should have acted and landed in Egypt when Nasser seized the Canal many weeks ago; but, not having done so, Israel invaded and swept out the Egyptians. We should have encouraged them to occupy the Canal Zone until United Nations forces could take over. We did not do so but landed at Port Said after a much-too-long air attack. We should then have pushed south down the Canal and completed its occupation or have asked the Israelis to do so. And, finally we should stand up to Russia, outlaw her, apply the same restrictions on her nationals as she applied to ours behind the Iron Curtain: we should stop all trade, send their Embassies packing and encourage the peoples of Russian satellites to rebel, giving them every possible assistance; the fact is we are afraid of war, a state of mind almost certain to produce what we fear. It wants a much tougher man than Eden to deal with Russia, and America would, for the third time in the last fifty years, refuse to join in until she had increased her profit at the expense of suffering humanity.

I should tell the Arab States in no uncertain terms that if they persist in their policy of trying to destroy Israel, both we and

America and the whole of the Free Nations would give Israel every possible assistance.

I should approach Israel with a view to setting up our Middle East Base at Haifa; if she refuses, as I suspect she would now, she might agree to 'staff talks', or occupy Sinai.

And finally I should publish to the world about Russian Labour and Concentration Camps and the cruelties being perpetrated on thousands of people because they disagree with Russian policy; this great Russian crime is even worse than the Concentration Camps of Hitler, which were never published until after the 1939 war broke out.

12.XI.1956. *London*

Bevan, with his magnetic influence over mobs of people incapable of thinking, is doing his best to keep the country divided on the Suez Canal issue.

Russia now threatens to send thousands of 'volunteers' to the Middle East unless Israel retires to the Armistice Line and we and the French evacuate the Canal Zone. Russia claims that this is a spontaneous movement by outraged citizens of the U.S.S.R.

Russia is certainly making capital out of the Suez Crisis. She is trying to build up a second Korea and also trying to cover up her atrocities in Hungary. If Russia seriously considers sending troops to the Middle East she is going to have a difficult transport problem over the Eastern Mediterranean which is dominated by Cyprus; also their maintenance will be a difficult problem in Arab countries where inefficiency is rampant.

But the threat has great propaganda value among a lot of silly Arabs.

The Hungarians are still resisting and the 'Political Eunuch' is still protesting.

Let Russia massacre thousands in Hungary, let Nasser deny Israeli ships the use of the Canal and send raiding parties into Israel, arm the Arabs in French North Africa and proclaim that they will exterminate Israel, and the United Nations are impotent; but if a country attempts to defend itself or, in the case of Britain and France, insist that international agreements be honoured, then indignation and condemnation flow from

U.N.O., the majority of whom have little or no interest in the Suez Canal or the fate of Israel.

13.xi.1956. *London*

Egypt has announced that 50,000 Russian volunteers together with another 50,000 from Indonesia and 5,000,000 from Communist China are prepared to come to the rescue of the Arab States and annihilate Israel. What a marvellous dream! Do they come as individuals or as organized bodies recruited by their respective governments? I trust we and the U.S.A. make it quite clear that such an invasion would mean war. But I suspect it is all bluster to keep the Middle East cauldron simmering and to conceal the terrible atrocities now being committed by the Kremlin in Hungary.

16.xi.1956. *London*

The first units of the United Nations police force have arrived in Egypt, but they will be quite useless for many months. I am much afraid that the United Nations are utterly impotent and incompetent to deal with the situation and that so soon as British and French troops are withdrawn, Egypt will again gain control of the Canal and we shall be exactly where we were three months ago and Nasser will have won, except that he has been signally defeated by Israel. In the meantime Russia is creating every possible difficulty to hide her abominable behaviour in Hungary where the United Nations are equally impotent.

Nasser has cut the sweet water canal supplying Port Said with water. I hope we shall let Port Said go without fresh water and compel Nasser to repair the Canal, but I suppose, as usual, we shall submit.

The Secretary of U.N.O. has been to Cairo; talks with Nasser and apparently nothing achieved. What a mess they have made of the whole business.

In spite of the effort of Labour to divide the country in two, the majority of educated opinion would have supported Eden in his policy if he had had the strength to carry it through; there was speed and resolution to start with but it rapidly dwindled. The assault on Egypt was too long delayed and once

started with success was checked with a bewildering and humiliating effect on the troops and on this country. We should either have encouraged Israel to occupy the whole Canal Zone or done it ourselves in the face of the United Nations and Russia. Instead we have achieved nothing. The cease-fire order was a catastrophe no doubt sponsored by the United States who are fearful lest we recover our prestige in the Middle East. Did we submit to a threat of economic sanctions by the U.S.A.; if so why? Would we have submitted to such blackmail by Russia or Egypt? At present our task is only half finished and had better not have been undertaken. The Canal is blocked by about fifty ships—Nasser's doing—and Europe will be short of oil—what America and Russia wants. Never did we want determined leadership more than to-day. Eden has proved his timidity, but who can replace him? Are we so bankrupt that no Englishman can stand up for his own country?

19.XI.1956. *London*

Mr Hammarskjold of the United Nations has seen Nasser; he apparently went as a suppliant, treating Nasser as an aggrieved party. He should have gone with a thick stick in his hand, accused Nasser of forcing Israel to attack, of sabotaging the Canal and breaking international agreements. The result of his visit will only confirm to Nasser that he has won and inflicted a maximum of harm to the West. Meanwhile, the United Nations police force is arriving in Egypt in dribblets, without organization and without commander (Burns is in New York), and without a definition of their role. A hopeless mess.

Eden is on the point of collapse and trying to justify his faltering policy which has left us in a worse position than if we had never interfered. And Labour continues to try to split the country in two, both Gaitskell and Bevan surpassing themselves in invective and abuse.

Oil is short in the West and petrol rationing seems likely. Just what Nasser and Russia want.

Work began at Basrah to-day on unloading a shipment of arms for Iraq from Britain. This is the second shipment to arrive in recent weeks, the earlier shipment having included tanks.

The present shipment includes nineteen Centurian tanks, three tankdozers, two Centurion armoured recovery vehicles, and fifty Land Rovers. The remainder of the shipment consists of ammunition and equipment.

This is the second shipment in a series due for delivery this year as the result of an order placed by the Iraq Ministry of Defence totalling £2,755,000. It will be recalled that this sum was placed at the disposal of Iraq as a result of Britain handing over British bases to Iraq. Two more shipments are known to have left Britain and to be en route for Iraq.

We are pouring arms into Iraq, the sole purpose of which can be to attack Israel. Will our Foreign Office never learn? They are dragging Britain down by their ruinous Middle East policy of appeasing the Arabs and hostility to Israel and by their inability to stand up to America.

22.XI.1956. *London*

The Americans are raising the scare of collusion between Britain, France and Israel; that we persuaded Israel to attack Egypt, etc. The whole scare is unfounded and ridiculous. Our War Office and the Government thought Israel was about to attack Jordan and warned them not to do so; also why, if there was collusion, did we stop Israel just as she was reaching the Canal; it was one of Eden's great blunders.

Eden, unable to bear the burden of error, has retired to the West Indies. Never in my life has a Prime Minister and a Government made such a criminal mess of a situation which could have been solved by firmness and common sense; the only result of Eden's impotence is to lay bare the impotence of the United Nations. The collapse of the Western Alliance has given Russia a free hand and if Russia became more aggressive and threatened a hot war, she need fear no united Western Front. Eden's folly has been made worse by the action of the United States who are more intent on crippling us than standing up to Russia.

The Suez Canal remains in the hands of the defeated (by Israel) Nasser who is now dictating to the United Nations. An ill-assorted handful of inexperienced leaderless men from many countries is termed a U.N.O. police force but has neither taken

over the Canal nor is likely to be allowed to do so by Nasser. Meanwhile, America is screaming for us to withdraw to placate Nasser who has blocked the Canal with forty-nine ships and obstructions.

Never has Britain sunk so low; never has Britain been governed by such incompetence.

Our essential aims against Egypt were to secure the Canal, ensure our oil supplies, shatter Nasser and defeat Russian penetration into the Middle East.

The outcome of our stupidity has been that we have not occupied the Canal Zone which is under Nasser's control except for a few miles south of Port Said, the Canal is blocked, oil supplies blocked for months, our own prestige sunk further, Israel who made our task easy feels frustrated, and the way opened for further Russian intrusion.

In sum, we have up to now made the worst of a bad job.

Why did we open with bombing, which is emotionally repugnant to world opinion, instead of a troop landing by air and sea at Port Said and Suez with an air landing somewhere half-way down the Canal.

Once having started bombing, why did we continue it so long, allowing world opinion to harden against us and allow Nasser to block the Canal all too effectively?

Why did we not co-operate with the Israeli Army and ask them to secure the west bank of the Canal and wipe out half Nasser's army instead of only a quarter?

Eden stopped Israel doing the right thing, knowing full well they would succeed, namely occupy the Suez Canal area and signally defeat the Egyptian Army, because he thought he could do it better himself and he did not wish Israel to get the credit for solving once and for all the Canal question. Eden failed through lack of determination and foresight and in sending troops into action with one hand tied behind their backs.

Why, when we at last made our airborne drop, on the sixth day, did we wait another twenty-four hours before the sea landings—thus sacrificing the chance of rapid exploitation to reach the other end of the Canal?

The only problem which appears to have been solved is that

of providing Israel with military equipment (which we had denied her) to balance what Egypt received from Russia (the bulk of which is now in Israeli hands). A pleasant piece of irony.

4.XII.1956. *London*

There is no doubt that Eden's moral and physical weakness is responsible for one of the greatest blunders and miscalculations in modern history. He stops the Israelis from occupying the Canal before Nasser blocked it, then he makes a perfectly futile landing at Port Said and listens to hysterical and impotent United Nations' orders to stop, when he might have occupied the whole Canal Zone. If Eden had showed determination and strength, Britain would have recovered her prestige, Nasser would have been humbled and a definite setback would have been administered to Russian infiltration into the Middle East. But now, we are despised by all, Nasser is gloating, a grievous blow has been dealt at our economic situation and America takes full advantage of a hopeless muddle, created by Eden and by nobody else.

American policy has been disgracefully inconsistent and governed by jealousy of Britain. Americans aim to make us a satellite, entirely dependent on her. America persuades us to evacuate the Canal Zone without obtaining Egyptian guarantees for free passage of all ships of all nations through the Canal; she whips up world feeling against us in the United Nations because we occupy Port Said. When Egypt nationalized the Canal, Dulles first threatened economic sanctions, then offered economic aid and then goes to hospital, a sick man.

When Dulles and Eisenhower rushed to Nasser's defence, forced Britain and France to stop and told the world that we were committing unjustified aggression, Nasser won back everything he had lost, blocked the Canal and proclaimed to the world that he had won.

Six points to consider:

(1) Subservience to the United States. Ever since the Roosevelt-Churchill admiration, but one-sided admiration, we have given way to the United States, whose one desire is to make us a satellite.

(2) Our Policy is the vacillating result of unreliable and ever-changing party debate.

(3) America, through jealousy, produced a political vacuum in the Middle East and this has now become a cesspool into which Russia, Britain, France, the U.S.A. and the Arab States are floundering.

(4) We have not yet learned that if we wish to preserve peace we must be sufficiently well armed to resist aggression; and that we must plan in advance to be prepared to use arms in case of need. It is worse than useless possessing arms if one is not prepared to use them. Action in a crisis is so much more efficient than talk.

(5) The Americans regard our action over Suez as nasty imperialism and an attempt to regain our prestige in the Middle East. For the Americans to control the Panama Canal is, of course, totally different and has nothing to do with colonialism, though the Suez Canal is as important to us as the Panama Canal is vital to America. We took action to preserve our life-line; the United States have done their best to strangle our economic life.

(6) Britain has been divided by an ill-informed political minority, trying to get party advantage during a national crisis. The opposition is almost Levantine in character, shrill, hysterical and with all the elements of an oriental bazaar and doing their best to split the country in two, discourage our troops in action and bring comfort to Nasser.

As I have said before, the Suez Canal Crisis is not just a question of who owns the Canal and free passage, it is not the Israel-Arab conflict nor the fear of a huge Arab Empire from Morocco to Iraq. The real issue is Russian dominance of the Middle East and extension to Morocco, the Atlantic and down Africa.

Russia is expert in taking advantage of circumstances which they do not themselves create. They struck at us in Berlin in 1948 and again in Korea in 1950. And now in the Middle East, Russia supports Nasser for no other reason than that it may help to destroy the West, and realize the dream of communist worldwide influence. In Nasser, Russia has found a willing tool.

Nasser has three objectives. To destroy Israel, to damage the Western Powers, especially Britain, as much as possible by seizing the Canal and then blocking it; his third objective being to place Egypt at the head of all Arab States, each governed by a military dictator.

The United Nations, led by the United States, have shirked the real issue and have become involved in an anti-colonialism campaign which has nothing whatever to do with the present crisis; 'Leave it to the United Nations and under no circumstances use force' has become a silly slogan which has disrupted the West and ignored the real issue which is Russia. It is the United States who have helped to undermine British influence throughout the world, putting nothing effective in its place and leaving the door open for Russia.

The United Nations, in their decisions, almost always favour the anti-colonial bloc against the colonial Powers; they are unable to render justice equally between their members.

7.XII.1956. *London*

This evening Colonel Aharon Doron of the Israeli Army dined with me; he was present at the recent capture of Gaza and is now doing a senior officers' course in England. He commanded a brigade.

We had a most interesting discussion. Doron kindly went right through from mobilization to the capture of Gaza, giving us a full account of resistance and booty captured. We asked him many questions and I am more than satisfied that:

(a) There was no collusion between Britain and Israel. It is an absurd idea.

(b) The Israeli army could have been on the Canal within forty-eight hours of starting the offensive and would then have defeated or captured more than half the Egyptian Army and would have prevented the blocking of the Canal.

(c) That if we had aimed at Suez, Port Said and Ismailia, instead of Port Said only, we could have occupied, in conjunction with the Israelis, the whole of the Canal.

(d) Israeli troops, though tactically on the offensive, were launched in self-defence; the Egyptian army was on the

defensive though their intention had been offensive.

(e) There is little doubt that the events of October gave renewed moral and physical strength to Israel. It exerted a great psychological effect on the country.

(f) Eden's lack of decision, fear of an impotent United Nations, fear of acting in concert with Israel and general lassitude in face of one of the worst crises since 1939, all amounts to criminal negligence.

(g) Israel must be absolutely firm in not retiring east of the old Turkish frontier Rafa—Suez until either Britain or the United Nations occupy east and south Sinai. Ben-Gurion must be adamant on this point.

16.XII.1956. *Drovers, Sussex*

Conversation centred around the Suez Crisis. There is a wave of hostility in Britain towards the United States; but I do not think it is so much hostility as criticism and resentment and in most cases a genuine desire to mend relationship. But there are signs of hostility; with severe petrol rationing, due to American action, several garages have put up signs 'No Americans served'. There is also a strong feeling in the country that we are rapidly becoming a satellite to the U.S.A. and that the U.S.A.'s policy is directed towards that end, I believe with truth. We shall never be friends with the Americans until they discard that policy. Both Eisenhower and Dulles have behaved abominably, doing their best to discredit us and comforting Nasser, for fear we might recover our lost prestige in the Middle East. It is American responsibility that the political vacuum was made in the Middle East and they are not prepared to fill it themselves; it therefore is filled by Arab Nationalism supported by Russia.

The United Nations has become a forum for partisan political speeches, where votes are cast strictly in accordance with political interests and where lobbying and bullying by the United States has concentrated on discrediting Britain. And why has the clearance of the Canal, vital to this country, been placed in the hands of a so-called 'expert'—General Wheeler. The clearance of the Canal has been repeatedly proclaimed to be a primary task, above and outside politics, and this man Wheeler is setting

about his task by delays and grovelling conversations with Nasser. Such action leaves most of us bewildered.

If a thief steals some of my property, am I not entitled to try to recover it; and if I try to recover it, may I not try to prevent him destroying what he has stolen; and having destroyed my property am I not entitled to be allowed to repair my property?

Wheeler, after ten days delay talking to Nasser, announces that ten more days will be required for a survey and that though the work of clearing the Canal would be wholly a United Nations responsibility, British equipment might be used but not British personnel. I cannot conceive a more gratuitous insult to Britain or a more complete sop to Nasser. Wheeler is no doubt supported by Dulles and Eisenhower.

It is incredible that the Canal should be allowed to stay in Nasser's hands after the many acts of defiance of United Nations' decisions; and the United Nations are now helping him to clear the Canal which he blocked; and with a victorious Israeli army occupying the whole of Sinai and ourselves in possession of Port Said, it would have been so easy to proclaim the Canal to be an International Waterway.

15.XII.1956. *London*

Meanwhile Gaitskell continues to gain party advantage from the crisis and does his utmost to discredit the Tory Party and split the county in two; his policy is directed solely so that he can gain power and follow Eden as Prime Minister. God help this country if that were to happen.

16.XII.1956. *London*

Meanwhile Pandit Nehru and Eisenhower are meeting in Washington and no doubt enjoying a good hate about so-called British Colonialism. Nehru is a humbug mixture of sanctimony, priggishness and deceit. Though head of a State bound to the Commonwealth, he preaches against it. He has been ruthless over Kashmir and Hyderabad and Goa, and said not a word when China enslaved Tibet. He condemned Anglo-French occupation of Port Said and lent his name to mendacious statistics about Egyptian casualties published by Nasser; and he has supported Russia over her atrocities in Hungary, saying we

must not allow 'our attention to be distracted from the Egyptian question by harping on events in Hungary'. It seems doubtful if India's membership of the Commonwealth has any genuine meaning. Nehru's actions have been both humiliating and dishonourable.

21.XII.1956. *London*

The obvious solution to the Middle East muddle must include an alternative route to the Suez Canal, for so long as Egypt holds it she will use it for blackmail and political purposes; it is clear that the United Nations will be highly effective against Britain, France and Israel, but hopelessly impotent against aggression by Nasser. It is most remarkable that Russia can bully Hungary and murder Hungarians in spite of United Nations resolutions; whilst in the case of Egypt versus the United States, Egypt wins. A Great Power wins against a small power even when she is in the wrong, and a small power like Egypt wins against a Great Power like the United States when she also is in the wrong. It does not make sense.

But to return to my solution:

- (a) We must have an alternative route to the Suez Canal.
- (b) We must secure the flow of oil to Europe without risking interruption from an Arab State.
- (c) We must give Israel security.
- (d) We must settle the Arab refugee problem.

The following suggestion solves these problems:

(1) The Sinai Peninsula does not belong to Egypt east of the old Turkish frontier Rafa-Suez. She must be compelled to give it up to the United Nations. The Gaza strip reverts to Israel.

(2) A United Nations occupation of Sinai forms a buffer between Egypt and Israel and gives the latter country security.

(3) A second Canal must be built across Sinai from the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aqaba. Or, if that is impossible, then a pipe line must be built.

(4) Sinai would then provide work for the Arab refugees and later on for maintenance.

(5) Sinai would be garrisoned by a United Nations Force with armour and aircraft, and commanded by a European.

(6) If the United States refused to co-operate then the Canal Users' Association must undertake the work. A threat to do so would bring the United States to reason.

The building of a canal through Sinai is a big job; it is a much longer distance than that traversed by the Suez Canal and through more difficult country. But with modern appliances it should not prove to be more difficult than the Suez Canal which was dug by manual labour.

Christmas Day, 1956. London

The evening's news announced that Moorhouse has been murdered in Port Said. This young officer was kidnapped in Port Said some days ago. What was he doing wandering about a bitterly hostile city alone? What was our Intelligence doing in a small town like Port Said? Why did they not locate him? Why have we withdrawn all British troops and left him behind? Stockwell never should have left until he was either released or satisfied as to his fate; and as Moorhouse was murdered, Stockwell should have remained until the murderers had been dealt with. It is all very humiliating. Meanwhile there is delay over clearing the Canal and Egyptian troops are re-occupying Sinai under Burns and his gang of useless observers. The U.S.A. is at the bottom of all this. What does Eisenhower or Dulles or any American care about clearing the Canal, the murder of British officers or stopping Egypt from attacking Israel? All they are intent on is eliminating our influence in the Middle East and our Government are utterly incapable of action to prevent it. They have had their chance and signally failed—even worse, aggravated and worsened an already tragic situation.