

**the  
tragedy of  
Palestine  
from  
the Balfour  
Declaration  
to  
today**

by the Rt. Hon. Anthony Nutting

DS  
119.7  
.N83



*D. Al-Mukhlam.*

**the  
tragedy of  
Palestine  
from  
the Balfour  
Declaration  
to  
today**

THE MAIN LIBRARY  
KING FAHD UNIVERSITY OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS  
DHAHRAN - 31261 - SAUDI ARABIA

**by  
the Rt. Hon. Anthony Nutting**

COLLEGE OF PETROLEUM & MINERALS  
LIBRARY

DJ

119

N 83

596631/596634

*This article was originally delivered at the Leon Lowenstein auditorium of Congregation Emanu-El, New York City, as a public address preceding the twenty-third Annual Conference of the American Council for Judaism in New York City on November 2, 1967. The form of an address has been retained.—Ed.*

FIFTY years ago today His Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, issued on behalf of Britain's wartime government the famous Declaration that was to bear his name: "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine".

Ladies and gentlemen, today, fifty tortured, bitter years afterwards, the national home for the Jewish people has become the national state of Israel and the civil rights of the Arabs of Palestine lie trampled under the heel of an Israeli army of occupation. Now, how has this happened, how has this seemingly great humanitarian gesture, the Balfour Declaration, turned so sour and left such a trail of bitterness and agony in its wake? And what are we going to do about it? Mr. President, I hope I may be forgiven if I take a little time this evening to review briefly the tragic sequence of events in Palestine which followed the Balfour Declaration and the establishment of the British mandate, because if we are to understand—still more to resolve—the current political crisis arising out of the Arab-Israeli war of last June, it is essential that we should recall just how this present impasse was reached.

First, we cannot forget—for if we forget no Arab will forget—that in 1915 Great Britain promised to Sheik Hussein of Mecca that in return for the help of his Arab armies in the campaign against Turkey, Germany's ally in World War I, all Palestine plus Iraq, Syria and Transjordan and the Arabian Peninsula would be free and independent once their Turkish rulers had been defeated. No sooner had this pledge been given and the Arab armies mobilized in response, in the common allied cause, than Great Britain and France got together and, in the infamous Sykes-Picot agreement of 1916, agreed to parcel out Syria, Iraq and Transjordan between them as the spoils of war. Following upon this, to complete the double-cross, in November 1917, exactly 50 years ago today, Great Britain decided to take over Palestine

as a strategic base from which to defend the Suez Canal under the humanitarian umbrella of the Balfour Declaration.

Ladies and gentlemen, small wonder that the Arabs felt betrayed by this cynical breach of the solemn pledges of independence which had been given to Sheik Hussein and to the Arab peoples. But still, because of a touching faith in their erstwhile allies, they allowed themselves to be mollified by a further series of pledges and assurances. The national home, they were assured, would not be allowed to become a national state and the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities—which, to say the least, was a quaint, if not a rather sinister, description of an overwhelming Arab majority—would be safeguarded. Therefore, the Arabs felt that perhaps, after all, the denial of the pledges of independence might only be temporary. When all was said and done the Arabs of Palestine did then number 92 per cent of the population and the Jews, only 8 per cent. And so, armed with these assurances, such Arab leaders as the Emir Faisal agreed to cooperate in the creation of a refuge for the Jewish people in Palestine from the persecutions of Europe.

**A**FTER all, such cooperation was in full and total harmony with the traditional hospitality which the Arabs had extended down the centuries to the persecuted Jews of Europe, from the Spanish Inquisition right through to the pogroms of Czarist Russia. The one people, the only people, in the whole so-called civilized world who had never persecuted Jews were the Arabs. In Palestine, even as late as 1948, so close was the relationship between Jew and Arab that each and every child born in the same week, whether Jewish or Arab, became automatically a foster brother and foster sister of the other. Ladies and gentlemen, I defy anybody to find a closer human relationship between two segments of the same race. Even the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem himself, who led the Arab rebellion from 1936 to 1939 against the Zionist agents in Palestine, even the arch-enemy of Jewish settlement, Haj Amin al Husseini, had three Jewish foster brothers.

Thus, provided that the rights of the Arabs were not threatened, in all the circumstances and with all the history of Arab-Jewish cooperation, it seemed both natural and right, as the Emir Faisal had agreed with Dr. Chaim Weizmann in 1919, that "all necessary measures shall be taken to encourage Jewish immigration on a large scale and to settle Jewish immigrants upon the land". Alas, poor Faisal and his fellow Arab leaders, both inside and outside Palestine, did not reckon with the determination of the Zionist Movement to create, not a home, but a state and a state which, in the words of Dr. Weizmann, would be "as Jewish as Britain is British". Nor did Emir Faisal reckon with the weakness of successive British governments in the face of this deter-

mined Zionist pressure; a weakness which allowed the Jewish Agency to be established and to become a government within the Mandatory government of Palestine, while the Arabs were denied any effective say in the administration of their country whatsoever; a weakness which permitted the Zionist Agency to buy at knock-down prices land owned by Syrian and Lebanese landowners who were cut off from their properties by the international frontiers separating British from French mandated territories; a weakness that also permitted the Zionist Agency to evict thousands of Arab tenant and farm workers to make way for Jewish settlers from Europe, compensating these tenants and workers at times with as little as ten dollars per family.

After nearly ten years of this treatment, Britain in 1930 at long last appeared to recognize the need to protect the rights of the Arabs by a closer control of Jewish immigration and by protection for the Arab peasants and tenant farmers. But it only required the threat of Dr. Weizmann to resign the presidency of the World Zionist Organization to force Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the British prime minister, to reverse his position and to revert to the policy of giving the Zionists a free hand in Palestine. Soon after this, the rise of Hitler in Nazi Germany created a steep rise in Jewish immigration. The Jewish proportion of the population climbed from 8 per cent to 30 per cent. The Arabs protested that they were being squeezed out. And again for a brief moment the British government recognized their claims and offered a legislative assembly, to be elected by proportional representation, which would give the Arabs a majority vote—not much after the other Arab mandated territories under Britain, Iraq, Transjordan and Egypt, had become completely independent. But once again the British government was forced to back down in face of protests from the Zionists, who feared that a legislative assembly with an Arab majority would threaten their plans to create a national Jewish state in Palestine.

**T**HE Arabs, now driven to desperation, decided that armed rebellion was the only way to assert their rights. From 1936 to 1939 the rebellion continued, led by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. The Arabs lost far more heavily in human lives and treasure than either the Jews or the British, but still they carried on the struggle. By 1939 the British government was finally driven to accept the fact that the Arabs had a case and that something must be done to make amends for the shameful way in which they had been betrayed and their rights had been ignored. A conference was called in London of all parties to the Palestine dispute and when, inevitably, no agreement was reached, the British government decided to impose a solution, the famous White Paper solution of 1939. Palestine, it was decided, after an interval of ten years was to be an independent, bi-national state with Arabs and

Jews sharing in the government and ensuring the essential interests of both communities. Immigration was to continue for five years at a predetermined rate of 15,000 a year after which any further immigration was to be by agreement with the Arabs. And the Arabs were to be protected against land purchase and land acquisition by the Zionist Agency.

This was by far the best, the wisest and the fairest solution yet contrived and had World War II not broken out a few months later it might have resolved the problem. But with Germany at her throat, Great Britain was no longer in a position to impose any solution on Palestine and by the end of the war Britain was too exhausted to cope any longer. The unspeakable atrocities of the gas chambers of Nazi Germany and of the occupied territories of Europe had turned the flow of Jewish migrants into Palestine into a flood totally beyond the capacity of Great Britain to control. In desperation, the British government handed its Mandate over Palestine back to the League of Nations' successor, the United Nations, to do their worst. Which is precisely what they did, by partitioning Palestine into six areas, three for the Jews and three for the Arabs—and incidentally, in a manner which gave to the Jewish areas all the best of the land and left the Arabs with the wilderness of Judea and the hills of northern Galilee.

Now from this moment when the United Nations passed their partition resolution, in November, 1947, until the departure of the British forces from Palestine in May 1948, when the Israeli state was formally established, the Zionists, aided by the Stern gang, went to work; went to work to persuade the Arabs to leave the areas which were to form the Israeli state. To reinforce the argument that such Arabs would have no place in Israel, the Stern gang, as some of you will remember, selected a few villages such as Deir Yassin to stage a massacre of the Arab inhabitants to create a general state of panic and hence an exodus of the Arab population. So that by May 1948, when Britain formally and finally abandoned her responsibility for Palestine, more than 300,000 Arabs had been evicted from their homes and farms and had become the first instalment of that hapless, hopeless, homeless group of suffering humanity known today as the Palestine refugees.

Ladies and gentlemen, Zionist propaganda would have us believe that the Palestine refugees are the product of the Arab attack on Israel in 1948 and that they were ordered to flee from their homes by their own Arab leaders, who promised that they would be restored when the Arabs had liquidated the state of Israel. The truth is the exact opposite. Before the Arabs attacked in May 1948, the Arab refugees numbered over 300,000; they had been ordered—nay forced—to leave by the Zionists who had neither use nor room for them in the areas of Palestine allotted to the Israeli state. Thus it would be truer to

say that the refugees were the cause of the first Arab-Israeli war rather than the result.

Of course, when the Arabs subsequently lost the war, in 1949, and with it lost northern Galilee and much of the territory allotted to them under the partition plan, the number of refugees increased considerably, doubled in fact, by the exodus from the areas newly conquered by the Israeli army. But just as, last June, it did not require exhortation from their leaders—indeed last June, if you remember, the Arabs left the west bank of Jordan against the exhortation of their leaders who told them to stay, and yet 175,000 still left—just like last June, it did not require exhortation from their leaders to make them leave in 1948 and 1949. The Arabs left because they panicked, as civil populations do panic in war, as the army of the conquering hordes spreads across their land, as the French and the Belgians and the Dutch panicked in 1940; or because they were evicted to make way for Israeli settlement of the conquered territories. Suffice it to say that when the dust of battle had cleared, the Arabs were worse off than ever in terms of territory and nearly 700,000 of their fellows from the Israeli occupied areas found themselves thrown on the charity of the Arab states and the United Nations for a bare subsistence and denied the opportunity to return to lands which they and their ancestors had owned and worked for thirteen centuries of human history.

And as the humiliation at their defeat and at the injustice done to the Arabs of Palestine rose in the throats of all the Arab world, they cast about for an explanation. How had this come upon them? Britain, they reckoned, had taken Palestine in the first place, in violation of her pledges to the Arabs, for imperialist and strategic reasons to establish a base from which to exercise a dominant influence in and around the Arab world. There was too much truth in this theory for it to be easily dismissed. World War II, they reckoned, had exhausted Britain's resources and she was no longer able to sustain such a base for herself. So, she and her Western allies had introduced this alien, Western European state of Israel to do for her and for them what she could no longer do for herself: to take over the garrison role which Britain no longer had the capacity to sustain; to act as a beachhead for British and Western purposes and designs upon the Arab world. These dark suspicions were tragically confirmed at Suez in 1956 when Britain and France, using Israel as their stalking-horse, invaded Egypt in a desperate attempt to seize control of the Suez Canal.

**L**ADIES and gentlemen, so much for the background to this tragic conflict between the Arabs and Israel. The rest is too well known for me to need to repeat it tonight: the refusal of the Arab states to recog-



nize the state of Israel and the refusal of Israel to repatriate the Palestine refugees; the continuation of the state of war and the denial of passage for Israeli ships through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba and the long stalemate broken by the Suez episode in 1956, which we might call round two, and punctuated by raids and reprisals across Israel's borders—a long stalemate which lasted until June of this year.

What we have to do now, and what I ask you to do now with me, is to address ourselves to the present day and to examine what, if anything, can be done to bring about a just and honourable settlement.

Mr. President, to put it bluntly, we have a situation today in which Israel, after the third round in the bitter running conflict with the Arabs, bestrides not just the U.N. partition frontiers nor just the frontiers which she gained by conquest in 1949, but the whole of the former state of Palestine, including the old city of Jerusalem, the third holy city in the Moslem world, together, for good measure, with the Sinai Peninsula. And Israel, it appears, is determined to stay in these areas, even to introduce Jewish settlements into them, while, for her own part, she still refuses to acknowledge any debt to the Palestine refugees who paid the price and are still paying the price for what Europe did to the Jewish people—paying the debt which Europe owes to the persecuted Jews of the world. Israel has made great play with the refusal in the past years of the Arabs to recognize her existence. Likewise, she has claimed that the continued state of belligerency on the part of the Arabs constitutes a permanent threat to her existence. And she has complained bitterly about the refusal of the Arabs to allow her freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. The last of these, the Gulf of Aqaba, as you remember, was the immediate cause of the outbreak of the war in June of this year.

But now the Arabs are prepared to concede all these demands, as has been evidenced by their endorsement of the Indian and Latin American resolutions before the United Nations Security Council. The Arabs will recognize more than that. They will respect the territorial integrity and political independence of the state of Israel. That is in the resolution. The Arabs will terminate the state of belligerency. That is in the resolution. And they will guarantee freedom of navigation through the international waterways in the area. That, too, is in the resolution if, in return, Israel will withdraw from the Arab territory which she seized last June and will contribute to a just settlement of the Arab refugees.

Mr. President, surely no impartial observer could find fault with such terms. Yet it seems that this is not enough for the state of Israel. From the latest utterances of Premier Eshkol it seems that, having pocketed these far-reaching and fundamental concessions from the

Arabs which could give Israel all the security and peace that she seeks, Israel is not prepared to withdraw, still less to settle Palestine refugees in their own homeland, and now demands individual negotiations with each individual, separate Arab state, and negotiations under the duress of Israeli occupation of that state's territory. Ladies and gentlemen, this is the doctrine of "divide and conquer" and these are conquerors' terms. If Israel persists in these terms, there will be no peace in the Middle East. Counsels of moderation such as Abdel Nasser was able to impose upon his colleagues in the recent Khartoum summit conference of Arab states will be rejected. The doves will have lost out and the hawks will say "we told you so". And I don't have to tell you who the Arab hawks will be. And the conflict will continue between the Arab states and Israel until a fourth or a fifth or a sixth round finally plunges the whole Middle East into a holocaust, when one or possibly both sides dispose of the nuclear weapon.

There is a dangerous tendency among many Arabs to equate the present situation with that of the Crusades. "It took us", I've heard this often said by Arabs, "It took us 200 years to get rid of the Crusaders. All right! If Israel will make no terms, if Israel will make no amends to the Palestine people, we will wait 200 years and we will get rid of them in the end as we got rid of the Crusaders, another alien state, another European incursion, another western beachhead upon our shores. We will get rid of it".

Ladies and gentlemen, this is dangerous talk because Saladin, who finally destroyed the Crusader state, fought Richard Coeur-de-Lion with swords and lances and not with atomic bombs, and yet this is the prospect for the Middle East in the fourth or the fifth or the sixth or some round, if nothing is done to bring a just and honourable settlement today.

**M**EANWHILE the relative calm on the West Bank of today which we hear about from the Zionists—how happy the Arabs are to be selling postcards to all those nice tourists from Israel—this relative calm, ladies and gentlemen, is largely due to the state of shock of the inhabitants. And it will give way, all too soon, if nothing is done, to a state of guerrilla war in which the Israelis will be driven to use ever more brutal methods of suppression, just as the Germans and the Japanese and the Italians were forced to escalate their suppression of national resistance movements in occupied territories in World War II. I was in France in 1940 and I remember exactly the same feeling, the same atmosphere amongst the French people as I am told now exists on the West Bank of the Jordan. How pleased the French were to be out of the war! How thankful they were that the Germans, far from being terrible people, behaved so correctly! No women raped,

no babies were butchered. And yet, ladies and gentlemen, not many months afterwards, somebody lost his head and somebody else lost his temper and somebody started shooting and the Germans shot back. And by 1944, innocent men and women were being taken out and shot as hostages because somebody had blown a bridge five miles away.

I don't care who the occupying power is. These are the sort of bestialities to which occupation gets driven by national resistance movements such as will come on the West Bank of the Jordan, and in the Gaza Strip, so long as Israel struts and strides in those areas, insisting upon conqueror's terms. And it is surely inconceivable that sane men in Israel or anywhere else, however callous they may be to the sufferings of humanity, it is surely inconceivable that sane men could invite such a prospect upon themselves. It is surely inconceivable that the United Nations could permit such a disaster to be perpetrated. Yet if nothing is done, and if nothing is done now; if the United Nations fails to endorse the terms and the concessions offered by the Arab states for a settlement: recognition, termination of the state of belligerency and freedom of passage for Israeli shipping through Suez and Aqaba; and if Israel cannot be induced to accept and to honour these terms and to do, for her part, what is necessary to bring about a settlement—then, ladies and gentlemen, these disasters will happen as surely as we are sitting in this hall tonight, however much it may cost the Arab world.

There is an old Arab couplet by an unknown poet which demonstrates my argument far more eloquently than I could.

Let none be with us proud or overbearing,  
For we can be more foolish and more daring.

And however foolish or foolhardy it may seem to some people, the Arabs will never abandon the cause of their dispossessed brothers of Palestine and will never accept that the land of Palestine shall remain as it is today under the occupation of an alien western state. Everything else, everything else—Aqaba, Suez, frontiers, Syrian Heights, Gaza Strip, even the city of Jerusalem—everything else is comparatively a side issue relative to this basic human issue of the people of Palestine. This is what this conflict is all about and this is the issue that has to be settled.

You and I know, ladies and gentlemen, that there is only one nation in the world today which can induce the Israelis to settle it, to accept the terms now offered by the Arabs, and to redress the wrongs done to the people of Palestine. There is only one nation that can do this and that is the United States of America. In 1956, when Israel had conquered far less territory than today, after the Suez episode, the United States told her to withdraw. Britain and France objected; they had to:

they had gone into the thing with Israel. They said "These people are misunderstood, they've suffered a terrible injustice, they should not be asked to withdraw unconditionally". But the United States said, "Withdraw"! and so the Israelis withdrew. Today no such American pressures seem to be available and Israel is able, indeed encouraged, by this totally negative attitude in Washington to stand pat upon her conquests. And once again to the Arabs the Western world seems to be encouraging Israel to expand at the expense of the Arabs. Once again the suspicions of the Arabs are confirmed that Israel was created and is still being used as a Western outpost to dominate an Eastern race.

**T**HROUGH you therefore, ladies and gentlemen, tonight I would issue this appeal on this historic occasion, the fiftieth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration. I would issue this appeal through you to the government of the United States. In the name of everything that you want to see created in the Middle East, stability, security and peace for all nations in the area, and in the interests of America's best relations with the Arab and the Moslem world, use your influence on Israel to accept an honourable and just peace such as is now within her grasp, such as the Arabs have now offered, and to work out through the United Nations the means by which such terms can be translated into effect.

Perhaps I might be permitted to add this further thought as to what sort of settlement might emerge for the future and I hope I shall not be thought too starry-eyed an idealist in what I have to propose. I think I've said enough of the dangers and the disasters that are implicit in the present stalemate. There is, however, one aspect of the situation, of this highly explosive and dangerous situation in the Middle East today, which might be turned to the account of a truly imaginative solution.

I have always felt, and many people who knew Palestine in the old days agree with me on this that, quite apart from the human problems that are involved, the human suffering of the people of Palestine, one of the worst results of creating a Western Zionist state in the Middle East was that, in doing so, we destroyed the state of Palestine by carving it into two or rather into six different parts. For the state of Palestine, notwithstanding all that happened in the 1920's and the 1930's, was by far the most cultured and educated state in the Arab world and had been so ever since the days of the Ottoman Empire. Now, it just so happens that geographically Palestine has been reunited—by conquest and occupation, yes—but reunited, nonetheless. Is it too much to hope that such counsels of wisdom and imagination might prevail even at this late hour amongst Israel's leaders as would enable the state of Palestine to be recreated not just geographically but

politically as a bi-national, multi-racial state? Is it too much to ask that Israel should say openly, and mean it, that a Palestinian Arab has the same rights to live and work in Palestine as a Palestinian Jew, and to share on equal terms with his Jewish cousins in the running of his country, insuring that the essential interests of each community are safeguarded and preserved?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, before any of you dismiss this idea as the ravings of a lunatic internationalist, which perhaps I may be, let me ask you what you would have thought in World War II if I had come to you and said that the answer to the problem of Europe was for France and Germany together to create a European community in which they would pool their economic resources and work towards the creation of a European political federation. You would have said, "He is a raving lunatic internationalist". And yet, ladies and gentlemen, twelve years after the war ended this is precisely what France and Germany did, and are doing today. Twelve years after the end of World War II! And France and Germany, after all, had a tradition of mutual enmity, jealousy and hatred which has never existed, could not exist, between Arab and Jew. Is it so impossible to create a bi-national state out of what are after all two segments of the same race?

Now it may be argued that this would fly in the face of all that Zionism stands for. But even before June fifth the Zionist dream of the state "as Jewish as Britain was British" had not been fulfilled. Even before June fifth Israel had an Arab residue of 300,000, the ones they couldn't evict, the ones who stuck it out, and stayed behind, which was about 15 per cent of the total population. And today Israel occupies an area with nearly a million-and-a-half Arab inhabitants in it; that is almost 40 per cent of the combined population, which scarcely accords with the old Zionist concept of a racially pure Jewish state in the Middle East. 40 per cent Arab! What would the old Zionists say? Thus, whatever final frontiers Israel might, in her present mood of intransigent euphoria be ready to settle for, there will always be, as be there must, a sizeable Arab complement in that area.

But the smaller the area, the less physically able the Israelis will be to resettle Palestine refugees, and Palestine refugee resettlement lies at the heart of any peace settlement with the Arabs. Only the whole of Palestine offers enough scope, given the rate of Jewish settlement both before and after the creation of Israel, and given the natural increase in the numbers of the Palestine refugees. Only the whole of Palestine offers enough scope for a solution of the Palestine refugee problem.

**T**HEREFORE, I put it to you, if sufficient sanity could be brought to bear upon these issues, it seems that here we have a marriage of necessity and opportunity. The need to solve the problems of the

Arabs of Palestine requires the reunification of Palestine and the opportunity to recreate a politically unified Palestine could be seized from the existing situation where Palestine has already been reunified, if only as a geographical entity. Likewise, in the creation of a bi-national state in Palestine lies the best hope of eradicating the suspicion of the Arabs that the sole aim of the West is to create a Western beachhead in the Middle East. The benefits which could flow from this are almost unbelievable and certainly infinite in number.

Yet no one could deny that such a bold step as the offer to recreate a bi-national state in Palestine would require a great act of faith on the part of all concerned. For the Jews to admit so large an Arab minority would require as much courage as for the Arabs to accept to live in a state with so great a Jewish majority. Clearly too, other problems such as the loss of the West Bank to the state of Jordan would also have to be resolved by some economic arrangement with the reconstituted state of Palestine. And there would probably have to be a cooling-off period to allow for tempers to subside, where perhaps the United Nations could help by taking the West Bank under some form of trusteeship until the final arrangements could be worked out to knit together the two parts of Palestine, Jewish and Arab. But if the Jewish people are to find any security in the Middle East then they must live with the Arabs and let the Arabs live with them. *Apartheid*, whether it is practised in South Africa against the Bantu or in Israel against the Arabs is both as repugnant as it is ultimately impractical.

And however long it takes, and however much it costs, in human effort and financial outlay, it is imperative that a start should be made now along this road and that means the earliest possible initiative by the United States of America with the government of Israel. Mr. President, the alternatives in human suffering and material destruction which a failure to act now could visit upon Jews and Arabs alike are too hideous to contemplate. Today on the fiftieth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, the Middle East is poised as never before upon the edge of the most awesome precipice. Yet today the Arab world is ready as never before to play its part in settling with Israel on the basis of a just and honourable peace. This, therefore, is probably the best chance that has ever been offered to the peacemakers to end this tragic conflict. But let us be under no illusions: it may well be the last!



The Rt. Hon. Anthony Nutting, P.C., was born on 11th January 1920. Educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, he served in World War II first in the Leicester Yeomanry and then in the Foreign Service in France, Spain and Italy. Elected Conservative M.P. for the Melton Division of Leicestershire in 1945, he was Chairman of the Young Conservative Movement in 1946, Chairman of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations 1950 and of the Conservative National Executive 1951. On the formation of Sir Winston Churchill's Conservative Government in 1951 he became Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Principal British Delegate to the Council of Europe. In 1954 he negotiated the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty regarding the disposal of the British base in the Suez Canal zone and in that same year became Minister of State for Foreign Affairs and a Privy Councillor. In this capacity he headed the United Kingdom Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly and to the Disarmament Commission and was a Vice-President of the U.N. Assembly. In 1956 he resigned from the Government in protest against the Anglo-French-Israeli attack on Egypt. From 1956-59 he was a Special Correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* and also lectured on Middle Eastern Affairs in the United States of America. Author of some seven books including "Lawrence of Arabia" (1961), "The Arabs" (1964), "Gordon, Martyr and Misfit" (1966) and "No End of a Lesson, The Story of Suez" (1967). He is currently at work on a book describing the scramble for Africa by the colonial powers in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Married twice with three children, he and his present wife, the former Anne Gunning Parker, live at 3 Cheyne Walk, London, S.W.3.