



Gavriel Cohen's Conversations with Isaiah Berlin: No. 22

Isaiah Berlin Online aims to post, in the fullness of time, PDFs of all Berlin's uncollected and unpublished users work, including lectures, interviews and broadcasts, so that it is conveniently readable and searchable online. The present PDF is part of this series.

The PDF is posted by the Isaiah Berlin Legacy Fellow at Wolfson College, Oxford, with the support of the Trustees of the Isaiah Berlin Literary Trust

All enquiries, including those concerning rights, should be directed to the Legacy Fellow at berlin@wolfson.ox.ac.uk

Gavriel Cohen's Conversations
with Isaiah Berlin: No. 22



For more information visit bit.ly/GC-IB

© The Trustees of the Isaiah Berlin Literary Trust and Henry Hardy 2024

**First posted in Isaiah Berlin Online
and the Isaiah Berlin Virtual Library 6 September 2024**

Last revised 22 September 2024

Gavriel Cohen: Conversation No. 22

Conversation date: 29 October 1988

Transcriber: Judy Friedgott

Disk conversion: Howard Atherton, Apex Technology Ltd's

Recording: **22A** | **22B**

Selected topics

'Jewish Slavery and Emancipation' (reprise)

Use of metaphors by IB in lectures and writings: how IB prepares lectures

The paradox of lecturing: precision versus ham acting

The spontaneity of the metaphors

How IB prepares his published work

IB's mistakes: an example in *The Hedgehog and the Fox*

Tracking references for IB's collections of essays

The forthcoming fifth volume of essays [CTH]

The introducers of the collections: Aileen Kelly, Bernard Williams, Roger Hausheer

IB's distaste for disciples

Noel Annan

IB's relationships with his students: not a very encouraging tutor

Supervising graduates

IB's attitude to social sciences (reprise)

No first-class way of writing about political institutions

IB's attitude to sociology: two kinds of sociology, descriptive and grand

The great sociologists studied other disciplines: Montesquieu, Marx, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Burckhardt, Weber, Durkheim

Sociology is either common sense disguised in quasi-scientific language, or gobbledygook (e.g. Parsons)

Raymond Aron, Kenneth Wheare, John Morley, Bagehot, Herzen as highly competent publicists

The Chichele chair: why IB applied
IB discards his lecture notes, losing huge quantities of writing
A professor of politics should be involved in contemporary
issues: the Vietnam War
IB happy at All Souls in the 1930s: the governing class there –
Leo Amery, Donald Somervell
The dreariness of New College dons, with exceptions: Cecil,
Crossman, Cox, Casson, Smith
Wardens Adams and Sumner of All Souls
All Souls after the war
Edward Bridges; his resignation
Bridges' support for the Foreign Office against Churchill
Churchill and the Cabinet Commission on Palestine policy in
1943 (GC's specialist subject)
Churchill wrote the conclusions
Members of the Commission: Morrison, Amery, Dick Law,
Oliver Stanley, Archibald Sinclair
Cranborne

Side A

GC When I asked you why you didn't want to reprint or republish
the article on 'Jewish Slavery and Emancipation', you said, *en
passant*, 'Well, you know, this metaphor of henchmen [sc.
hunchbacks], it can be said and not written.' You remember?

IB I didn't say that. I said that Keith Joseph said ...

GC Ah, I see.

IB Not I, no.

GC I see.

IB He said, 'You can call ...'. He read it in the *Jewish Chronicle*. He said, 'You can *say* Jews are hunchbacks, but you can't *write* it.' That's after he read it already.

GC Ah, Keith Joseph said that.

IB No, I never said that. I didn't reprint it because I thought it would produce a row; that a lot of Jews will object to being described as such, or say it's exaggerated; Zionism is all very well, but it's not true, they are not like that. That'll produce [?] offensive. When it was printed in France, it was reviewed with extreme coolness.

GC Coolness?

IB Oh, yes. It wasn't liked. No French Jew wants to be told that he is second-class, [?] something is wrong with him. Maybe the anti-Semites are wrong to accuse him, but that he has certain qualities which can be accused – that's not acceptable.

GC My question is now not the content but something ...

IB Some qualities which can be objected to. Yes, sorry; yes?

GC You use so many metaphors in your lectures and writings.

IB Yes.

GC So many. Are they prepared in advance?

IB No. If you want to know how I lecture, I will tell you.

GC Yes, I want ...

IB Before every – I'm the most nervous lecturer you ever met. Before every lecture – I have never enjoyed delivering a lecture in my life. I have lectured since 1933–4, I should think, and I have lectured till my voice gave, which is about five years ago, and so I must have delivered a very great many lectures in my life, here, in America and other countries. I have never enjoyed a lecture in my life. I am a nervous lecturer. I'm never sure what I am going to say, so I prepare each lecture with extreme care, and [for] each lecture I probably write about forty pages of notes. These I boil down to about six pages, and these I boil down to one page – with headlines, mainly, in case I forget, just in order – in case I am struck by aphasia. When I actually deliver the lecture, I don't look at the notes. I look straight in front of me, to the top right-hand corner. I cannot look at a human face. I have no rapport with the audience of any kind. I have no idea whether they like it, don't like it – not an idea – because I am much too frightened. I am rather like somebody crossing Niagara on a very narrow bridge with, I don't know, sharks on one side and tigers on the other, and all I want is not to fall off, and all I want is to get to the end – for the hour to be over. That's all I want. I am never quite clear what I am going to say next, and my habit is to repeat everything in various tones and forms. Hence the similes – similes come because my natural way of speaking is to repeat everything three times, rightly or wrongly. It annoys some people; it pleases others because they can get it down, they can get hold of what I am saying. Each time differently. And in order to say it differently, of course, that does mean that different similes and different images are employed. At the end of the lecture I always feel it's been a failure – now they can see through me. I am obviously a charlatan and the game is up. Since I feel an equal degree of shame after every lecture I have ever delivered – and some of my lectures must be worse than others – it must be a neurotic symptom. When people say nice things to me after a lecture – which occasionally happens – I don't believe a word they say, but I am very grateful to them for being so nice to

me. I am flattered by being flattered, but I feel it is probably flattery, just niceness, just being agreeable because they like me or want to put me out of my misery, or whatever it is. But I don't believe a word. I never have. And so I am told sometimes I am a good lecturer, etc. The real reason is because I am so terrified, a certain intensity enters my voice simply through terror, and that does communicate itself to the audience because there's a kind of tension without which no lecture is ever a success. All lectures are forms of acting on a stage, inevitably. Now there is a paradox about lecturing, which I have always been aware of. It takes two gifts which are incompatible with each other. One of the great examples of fundamental incompatibility between values, which I have preached all my life. One is that you need to know what you are talking about – you need to be a quiet scholar in a study accumulating material, and thinking, above all, in a peaceful and orderly way, in order to arrive at what it is that you want to say to the public. Privately you can think anything you like, but if you are going to talk in public you must have some responsibility for the truth, the validity, of what you believe you are saying. Some respect for – you must believe in the truth or the validity to some degree, and if you have doubts you must express those. The second gift is that of a ham actor – the two gifts don't go together. So there is always a certain conflict between the desire to be precise and to have thought properly, and to know what you are going to say, and the ham actor part which invariably exaggerates, goes too far, repeats itself too often, uses too many images, and mainly wants to impress the audience. Those two gifts don't combine. That is true of all lecturers, at all times. It's all right for Socrates talking to a few disciples, but a man on a platform – I always feel it's an unnatural situation for one man to be talking, and everybody else to be silent. Seminars I don't mind so much. People can interrupt. Once they ask questions I am liberated, then I can talk freely. But on the lecture platform I am in a state of agony. So what you say about metaphors etc., that's because of the habit of repetition which I

think may be natural to me anyway, because I'm so talkative, but I am particularly stimulated by the need to convey what I want to say in more than one brief sentence. I don't read from notes. I have done it in the case of rather pompous – what's called important lectures, because I want to get it right. The inaugural lecture, for example, when I became professor, was read. The Bowra Lecture, which was about Moscow and so on, was read only because my voice had given already, and I didn't want to risk anything. I thought if I read it in an even voice there would be less of a strain on my vocal cord which is paralysed. But otherwise I don't read. On the radio, for example, I have delivered two courses of talks,¹ each of an hour long – twelve lectures, twelve hours. I could never look at a note. Some of them slopped over, some were an hour and a quarter, so that was too long, an hour and twenty minutes, so that I had to do again, but I did it again – again without looking at notes.

GC You preferred to do it again than writing the paper?

IB I can't talk from paper, it sounds dead; it's dead. If I read from paper it's exactly like reading minutes of a – written by another secretary.

GC So the metaphors are invented during the lecture?

IB Oh, yes. Positively. Absolutely. *Ambulando*. During – they are not prepared.

GC If somebody afterwards reads your lecture and there is a sentence like this: When you discover thinking, you say to interpret, to classify, to symbolise, to relate, and you don't say to analyse. Now is it deliberate, or just by chance?

¹ One is 'Freedom and Its Betrayal'; the other may be 'The Roots of Romanticism', which was broadcast on the radio, but not originally delivered on it.

IB No, whatever comes to my head. It's absolutely spontaneous; it sometimes comes out wrong, but it *is* spontaneous.

GC And when you read your lecture afterwards?

IB I don't read it: what do you mean? It's not written down. Ah, if it's published, if I get a transcript? Then I am horrified, then I am invariably horrified, I think it's too awful. I do the same thing when I dictate articles or even dictate the kind of lecture that I *am* going to read. I dictate them first. The secretary takes them down, does it from the machine into which I dictate, and then she gives me the transcript. I look on it like an essay by a bad pupil. Every sentence seems wrong to me. I correct it totally – I cross everything out and I rewrite, but the basic pattern of course remains the same. I don't completely rewrite it, I simply correct it.

GC You don't rewrite?

IB No.

GC Because it has the flair of ...

IB Of something spoken. I know. No. There's a fatal given form which I don't alter. I don't start again. I eliminate some things and I correct them, and then a second version, and I cross that out too; and that could go on indefinitely, because there is nothing I hate more than looking at things I have written myself. They always seem wrong to me afterwards. I haven't conveyed it; what was I thinking of? Why did I say this? Sometimes I am caught out. A Soviet scholar arrived the other day, and he's an authority on Tolstoy and other things, very learned, a man called Lurie[sp?], an elderly Jewish Russian historian of literature, extremely learned, very very accurate and impressive. He read my piece on Tolstoy

and in one of the footnotes I say that the historical views of Tolstoy have been compared with those of Kautsky, Lenin and Stalin. And at this point I say that this belongs to the realm of politics or theology.² And my friend – at least my visitor – said, ‘Where exactly was it so compared?’ I was unable to say, because obviously Soviet books wouldn’t be likely to talk about Kautsky. He said it’s impossible that anyone in the Soviet Union could ever have compared Tolstoy’s views to those of Lenin or Stalin, because Tolstoy’s historical views are totally denied. Not a single one of them even begins to be accepted, to this day. He was not a materialist, his theories of history were quite wrong, and Lenin wrote a famous essay about him called ‘Tolstoy: Mirror of the Revolution’, in which he made it plain that all that is to be rejected; and therefore there cannot have been any Soviet scholar who could have compared it even in a derogatory fashion. So where did it come from? I had no idea. I referred him to, I think, an American writer from whom I hoped it might have come, but I had no memory of it. That’s what I mean by saying a certain unscholarliness. I don’t give sufficient references. When my friends edited my [?] essays, which appeared in four little paperbacks – and the fifth is about to appear, I am told, apparently, yes, sometime, if I allow them – first of all I don’t give footnotes, if it comes from lectures; secondly, when I do give them they are often wrong, so they have had terrible labours in order to trace them and identify the references. Sometimes they couldn’t be found. In that case the footnotes are crossed out, they are put in indirect speech. I put things in inverted commas and then nobody is able to discover – so I am afraid I have a somewhat creative memory which sometimes invents and distorts. I am very inaccurate, yes. I remember things in general but not in particular, so sometimes I

² ‘As for the inevitable efforts to relate Tolstoy’s historical views to those of various latter-day Marxists – Kautsky, Lenin, Stalin etc. – they belong to the curiosities of politics or theology rather than to those of literature.’ *The Hedgehog and the Fox*, HF2 9/1, RT2 30/2, PSM 441/3 (on 442).

get it wrong. For example, I was absolutely sure that Montesquieu talked about the danger of *les grands simplificateurs*, the great simplifiers. There is nothing about that in Montesquieu. But I think it was probably produced by a man *about* Montesquieu, namely somebody in the nineteenth century who wrote about him; I think it was Sainte-Beuve in fact who used it, but I was quite clear that one of the central doctrines of Montesquieu was fear of the great simplifiers. It's fundamentally correct about Montesquieu, but he didn't use the words.³

GC The fifth volume is going to be around a certain ...

IB No. Just a collection of [?]. They'll have to invent some kind of unifying title.

GC Is it later lectures?

IB No, later printed pieces. Yes. I can't remember what they are. There are one or two things which I never had printed before about Romanticism,⁴ and a lecture I delivered in Japan,⁵ a lecture I delivered in Venice,⁶ that sort of thing. And there's a piece about Edmund Wilson in Oxford, which is a comical piece.⁷ And there is, of course, the Agnelli lecture in Turin⁸ – the last one – that would go in. And then, they keep on pressing me to give my manuscript on de Maistre, on whom I wrote a huge piece. It was never published, it's confused, it's too long. Mind you, I did send

³ See PSM 380/1.

⁴ 'The Apotheosis of the Romantic Will: The Revolt against the Myth of an Ideal World'.

⁵ 'The Decline of Utopian Ideas in the West'.

⁶ If this is 'Tolstoy and Enlightenment', an early version of which was delivered in Venice in 1960, it is in RT not CTH.

⁷ 'Edmund Wilson at Oxford': not in CTH, but included in PI2 in 1998.

⁸ 'The Pursuit of the Ideal'.

it to the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, who said it was too repetitive and too long, so I just threw it away, but it may exist somewhere in manuscript – typescript. Well, they can get hold of it if they like, I can do nothing to it.

GC Is there an editor of this volume?

IB Oh yes, there will be.

GC Who is it?

IB Henry Hardy, I suppose.

GC The first four?

IB Entirely by Henry Hardy. He was the editor. Other people wrote introductions.

GC How were those written introductions ...?

IB He was helped of course, Henry Hardy, by some of the people who wrote the introductions. They were very good about this.

GC I was going to ask – we discussed Noel Annan's introduction, but the three others ...

IB The first, on the Russian thinkers, was Aileen Kelly. She certainly helped to trace some of the references. She worked with Hardy. Very devotedly. I was very grateful to her. She did quite a lot for me. She said I did a lot for her, but if so, it was handsomely repaid. That's one. The next one was ...

GC And the introduction, you liked her introduction?

IB I did. Well, there were certain things she put in it which I had to remove because the praise was a little too extravagant, it went a little too far. I begged her to take it out. I thought it would seem ridiculous to the reader, not only to me. And then the next one was done by Bernard Williams. It was very generous of him to offer it. I didn't correct a word of that.

GC It was a (*inaudible*).

IB I know. He's a very good philosopher and a very good friend.

GC Who picked him out?

IB I don't know. I cannot remember. I don't think so. I think Hardy probably suggested him, among others.

GC It was really first class.

IB Absolutely. I agree, and it got it right. My views are correctly stated, yes. The third volume was a man called Hausheer [House-here], or Hausheer [How-sheer] he calls himself. I don't know what he is by origin – Swiss, I should think. He's a graduate student at Wolfson. And he's a German scholar, and he's a student of Fichte, and he has been writing a doctorate thesis for about twenty years now. It has never been presented. He's a very nice, very intelligent man, great friend of Hardy, in Wolfson. They were there together and he really knows my works through and through, and I am sure he will want to write something about me after I am dead, as well. I have a feeling that he is accumulating material. He will probably help with the last volume too. He is a kind of a disciple. I think he is the only disciple I have ever had.

GC Really?

IB I think so. I have never had disciples. Never.

GC And I understand why. So how come that he's the only disciple?

IB I can't tell you, I never know. He suddenly began coming to me and listening to what I said and discussing. I must have made some impression on him, that's all I can say.

GC I thought that you said about disciples that you were quite ...

IB Well, I don't want them. No. I hate accepting responsibility for people, in general. I have a certain fear of influencing people. I always hoped not to. When people say they were influenced by me, it causes me to – a certain reaction. I always wonder whether it's for their good, or what they have derived. The last thing I want is to have a following.

GC Hausheer's introduction is very good, but very Germanic.

IB Certainly. I think he must have German blood in him. He's a German scholar, of course, that's what he got his degree in. He was at St Catherine's.

GC It's heavy.

IB It's heavy, but it's correct. That's all I ask for. All that was wrong with Noel Annan was that it bore no relation to many things – to the facts.

GC Speaking about students ...

IB Noel Annan is writing a book at the moment, it's about to – Noel Annan is about to produce a book called *Our Age*. It will say

some very interesting and very intelligent things, and some rather odd things too. Bound to. Yes.

GC It's a kind of sociological ...

IB He writes very well. His reviews in the *New York Review* are excellent, but it's hit and miss. Sometimes it works, sometimes not quite.

GC Yes, we spoke about that. Coming back to your students, generally speaking – I mean graduate students that you had – did you anticipate their future correctly? Did your evaluation of them – was proved to be right?

IB Yes, on the whole. It's a very conceited thing to say. I am quite a good judge of form. Quite a good judge of quality, yes. On the whole I anticipated correctly what kind of degrees they would get. Not what would happen in after life, but roughly what their quality was. It appeared to me to be verified by their future careers and experiences.

GC In the last meeting we spoke about social sciences ...

IB I have to interrupt. I wasn't a very good tutor. In the case of very clever – of course I liked clever people to argue with, but I wasn't very good. I was too easily bored by rather conventional work and I wasn't conscientious enough in the way in which, say, Herbert Hart was, of really looking at what they are saying and carefully arguing in a rational manner for what I thought to be right and what I thought was mistaken in their case. I talked too much at them. I may have influenced them by telling them. I didn't examine their theses, perhaps, minutely enough, and sometimes I dismissed them too rapidly and too easily. Some of my pupils I think probably bear a certain grudge for that to this day, of

knocking out, knocking down what they said, and putting nothing in its place, of which I have a certain tendency. What I was accused of, and I think rightly, was whenever anyone said anything, I said, 'Oh yes, there is nothing new in that, so-and-so said that; oh well, you'll find it in so-and-so; oh well, yes, that's an old idea, yes' – that's obviously irritating – instead of doing what my colleague David Cecil said, 'How very interesting you should say that, that's very interesting. Do develop that a little, that's very good', which encouraged them immensely. I think, on the whole, I was a discouraging and not an encouraging tutor. So when I became professor, it probably relieved – not relieved, it probably saved people from unnecessary neglect and unnecessary criticism.

GC But you were supervising when you were a professor?

IB Oh yes. Supervision is different. Then I could read long pieces by already qualified people, and I would go into that very well. Like this last girl I supervised. Then I really did take trouble. I can do that, if the thing is worthwhile. I have done it to quite a lot of graduate students. I've been over – theses, yes, chapters, certainly. Graduates, that's different. If they produce long written material, carefully done, then I'm all right. And on the whole they are very generous in acknowledging their debts when their books are published. I have written lots of introductions to books too. That's my speciality. I have stopped doing it – thank God.

GC When we talked about social sciences and social studies, if I am not mistaken, you said economics is quite ...

IB A serious subject, intellectually demanding.

GC And economists are clever. Clever people deal with it.

IB No, it is intellectually demanding, that's all I am saying.

GC I thought I detected you as saying that those who deal with sociology, often even political theory, are not clever people.

IB I did, yes. Not political theory. Politics in general. Political science, it's called. Yes, I believe that, yes.

GC So what did you mean, not clever?

IB That the subject is not intellectually demanding, that not very clever people appear to do it at the level at which it is expected of them. Just that. In other words, that – I'll tell you something very simple. When I examined in PPE, there were three principal subjects. One was philosophy, one was economics, and one was politics. Now, if a man got an alpha mark in logic, whatever other marks he got somewhere else, there was something first-rate about him. He might not get a first if he fell down on the other things, but if a man got an alpha in logic, he had some first-class quality. If he got an alpha in economic theory, he had some first-class quality. There was no paper in politics about which this could be said. There was no way of being first class. In political theory, yes, because that's a branch of philosophy, straightforwardly, but someone who writes about political institutions, there's no first-class way. For three years I examined in that; there was never anybody, whether a specialist or not, who – what I mean is, my fellow examiners, including the politics examiners, who take notice of an alpha in logic, an alpha in economic theory – an alpha in politics didn't count for nearly so much. There must have been some reason for this. Sociology wasn't part of the school, but it applies to it even more. I think I have delivered a lecture about sociology.

GC Not a lecture, no.

IB Well, let me tell you now. It may take ten minutes. I'm warning you.

GC We spoke about it but I prefer if ...

IB There are two kinds of sociology. There is what might be called empirical sociology. That means, if you want to know how many bearded men are likely to live to the age of seventy in Sheffield, this can probably be calculated quite well on the basis of statistical data and other relevant facts which you may collect, in the way in which actuaries work in banks for insurance purposes. Or accidents can be calculated roughly – the number of persons killed on the roads in given situations. It goes a little further. Descriptive sociology is all right. You can give a description of people's relationships in a society, probably with a certain degree of accuracy and a certain degree of skill, and reliability, and truth. Then there is a grander kind of sociology which discovers general propositions about the nature of human societies, and therefore is able to, in theory – calls itself a science because if you know enough facts and you know a sufficient number of laws, which such persons claim to have discovered, one can presumably predict some of the future and retrodict some of the past. Now the first types, namely the kind of sociology useful to governments, political parties, commercial firms and those kinds of organisations, that is absolutely OK, there is no reason to be against it, it's a perfectly genuine subject, of a socially extremely useful kind; and provided sociology is that, I have nothing against it. But, that is not intellectually demanding, any more than actuaries, or statistics of a kind used by these, is intellectually too demanding. So it seems to me. Now, the descriptive sociology is good because it probably can analyse quite well the behaviour of social groups and the interplay between them, so that the sociological approach to history, or to politics, or to geography, improves these subjects in a way in which mustard or salt can improve dishes, but taken neat, it doesn't work.

That's my thesis. I am in favour of sociological admixtures. Undoubtedly people are influenced by sociology like the French Annales school certainly has done good work. Now, the grand sociology – there have been some men of great talent who did that, for example ...

GC It is intellectually demanding. But ...

IB It's a demand that can't be met. That's the point. The point is this: the great sociologists are – who shall we say? – Montesquieu – Montesquieu is always regarded as the father – Karl Marx, a sociologist or he is nothing, that's how he ought to be described. His economics I don't understand – I know nothing about economics, so I don't know whether that's of value. Sociology obviously is. Saint-Simon is a sociologist. He predicted, for example, technocracy. Fourier discovered the contradictions of the capitalist system. Burckhardt predicted the military–industrial complex. Karl Marx predicted big business. And more like ... Now, the great nineteenth-century sociologists, of a systematic kind, were Marx, Weber and Durkheim. They did not learn sociology. Marx studied law and philosophy, Durkheim studied philosophy, and Weber studied history. From there they advanced in interesting ways and it seems to me that in the twentieth century there has been nobody of comparable quality. Maybe Marcel Mauss, the son-in-law [sc. nephew] of Durkheim made some contribution. And there was a German – I can't remember who – who wrote about money, who never got a proper chair in Berlin because he was a Jew. I can't remember his name.

GC Karl Mannheim?

IB No. Mannheim, again, did contribute some ideas. Of course, I don't hold with them. He was a Marxist sociologist. Mannheim was quite an able man. Now, let me tell you about that. People like that

are divided into two types: either its common sense disguised, written in – wrapped up in quasi-scientific language, or it's gobbledegook, it's just – simply what the French call *cliquetis de formules*, simply the clicking of formulae, one way or another. An enormous vocabulary where one proposition takes in the dirty linen of another proposition. That's what, fundamentally, modern grand sociologists of the Parson[s]ite type seem to me to be. Parsons, whom I knew, was an absolutely honest, an extremely honourable, nice and learned man, but he was a man of very, very dull intellect, dull imagination, very decent. But I never could conceive that a man like that could have made a bold contribution to the subject which would really make a difference to what we thought about the world. I fear that some of his disciples, whose names I will not mention ... In a other words, bright ideas – take Raymond Aron, professor of sociology. He was an extremely clever man, by any account; he was a wonderful political analyst, wrote extremely good analyses of contemporary French politics. His book on the German school of philosophy of history is a very second-rate book. His book on sociologists is a very second-rate book. His own books of a sociological kind are extremely intelligent. They are very readable. But any highly competent publicist could do that, I mean a publicist of the first order. You don't need training in a discipline to achieve these results. You need clarity, training in some discipline, but not that discipline and general powers of observation, intelligence and analysis, which are very good things. But there isn't a science there. There is some kind of technique, maybe, I don't know. That's what I mean by saying that if one hears of somebody as being a sociologist, one does not immediately or automatically respect them. The same is up to a point true about politics too. Yes, unless there is a large infusion of history, it doesn't work. Certainly at least one Oxford student of politics who hated the idea of introducing history – that was the late [Wilfrid] Harrison, history at Queen's – the fellow then became

professor somewhere, I think somewhere like – oh, at Keele, perhaps, I don't know.

GC In the North. Yes, I think ...

IB Somewhere in the North, yes.⁹ Maybe somewhere else. He thought that politics is an independent subject, and – well, I think Wheare, who was a very, very intelligent man, who was professor of it here, wrote extremely well on constitutions. Kenneth Wheare, the Vice Chancellor, a highly intelligent man, and wrote good books. Wrote a good book on the Statute of Westminster; he wrote a book on committees. Well, that was done by – any highly intelligent man could do what he did, and he was exactly that. In the old days, they were called publicists. Morley was a man like that in the nineteenth century, who wrote a book on compromise.

GC Bagehot ['Bay-got']?

IB Bagehot ['Badge-ot'], yes. I call him 'Badge-ot'; some people call him 'Bag-ot'. Yes, absolutely, very gifted, remarkable. He didn't call himself a sociologist. Nor did anybody else call him that. Oh yes, first-rate. Herzen was a publicist of that kind. Said very very intelligent things, which sociologists could do well to mark. Very good.

GC Again, if I got it correctly, when you said that ...

IB What I really mean is this: that distinction in sociology is compatible with industry, lucidity, a passion for the subject, some powers of analysis, and stupidity. None of these qualities contradict each other. That is not true of scientific subjects.

⁹ Liverpool, then Warwick.

GC When the chair of Political ...

IB Theory. Social and Political Theory. It was created after the war.

GC I thought that [?].

IB Yes, absolutely. Before that it was combined with political institutions. But the people who held it knew nothing about political theory. The first holder, I can't remember, before the war, before the First World War – no, I think maybe the first holder – the Gladstone chair, it was called – I think the first holder [of the Gladstone chair] was probably Adams: became Warden of All Souls. He was Lloyd George's Secretary for Agriculture in the First World War. He knew a lot about Blue Books in very considerable – but he didn't know a word of political theory. He was succeeded by Salter, whose knowledge of political theory was sub-zero. Then came the war, and then came Cole. The chair was divided into two. Wheare took one chair, Cole took the other. They were both excellent professors. That's exactly what happened – divided into political institutions and political theory.

GC You applied for this job and you said it was because of the problems you had when you were a Research Fellow. You didn't want to be pressed – Are you writing? Are you not writing? Are you publishing? You know.

IB No, because I wanted to be maybe a little more harsh towards myself. I became a fellow of New College for that purpose, not professor. I became a fellow of New College in 1938 – I was a Research Fellow of All Souls then – in order not – I'd published a book on Karl Marx, but I didn't want be constantly scrutinised about whether my research was going well or badly and how much I wrote.

GC Ah ha!

IB I did write one or two other things, even including the book, but I didn't want to be – I just wanted to teach and what I do with the rest of my time is my own affair. That was when I became ...

GC That you went to New College?

IB 1938. I applied for the – then I came back to All Souls as a Research Fellow. By this time I had published a certain amount – lectures, articles, not a book, certainly. I never did publish a book after that. But then, my reason for wanting to be professor – partly, as you say, because I didn't want to be – people to breathe down my neck, but mainly not that. Mainly because I wanted a discipline. I thought I might be idle, I might waste time because I have a great tendency for enjoyment. I don't like work. All the work I've done in my life comes from shame about not doing work. And therefore I needed some kind of discipline, some institutions, yes, to make me do certain things. Two lectures a week, two terms; that meant that I worked very hard and published very little, because once I had delivered the lecture, I threw away the notes, which in a way was a waste, but I always did that because I couldn't bear the thought of this kind of thing. I thought – as I told you, each lecture was to me no good and therefore the notes were worthless. I have wasted a great deal of writing in that way. As far as pages are concerned, I could have produced thousands and thousands of pages of written documents if I had preserved my notes. But I have suffered from a certain degree of self-contempt. Self-contempt and lack of self-confidence, which is a permanent characteristic of mine to this day.

GC You said it to me ...

IB What?

GC I know that you think so.

IB I think it's true. I have certainly a lack of self-confidence. That is genuinely true, otherwise I wouldn't be nervous all the time, and that kind of thing.

GC You don't appear to be nervous.

IB I know, but that's part of the acting, that's part of the ham acting – ham actor part.

GC But still, your close friends know?

IB I've no idea what they know.

GC You have never discussed it?

IB Never. No. I never discuss my own character, much. It's not a subject in which I take great interest. There are people who do, but I am not very self-interested. It's part of my lack of confidence that I think my personality is not worth discussing, by myself or anyone else. If I know someone else does, I become worried. I don't like the thought that someone is writing about me – favourably or unfavourably.

GC After some years you were bored in the chair.

IB Yes.

GC And you said another sentence that intrigued me. You said, 'A professor ought to be involved ...'.

IB Yes.

GC What did you have in mind?

IB Just that. That if you are talking about political theory, if you are not interested in the arguments and the issues which go on in your own time and confine yourself to the description and analysis of theories held in the past, you are not worth your chair. You shouldn't hold it. Any art historian who has no interest in contemporary art at all shouldn't write art history. He may produce quite useful work. But fundamentally something is suspicious about the man who is interested in art but never in any contemporary art. And I felt exactly that. Now, when the Vietnam War occurred, there was a book published of various people's opinions. It was a model [sc. modelled] on a book during the Spanish Civil War, when, as you remember, the left supported the republic, and Evelyn Waugh or Roy Campbell, who was a right-wing poet, made the opposite statements – all right. A man called Woolf, who was nephew of Leonard Woolf, I can't remember his first name [Cecil], decided to publish a book like that – opinions about the Vietnam War. I was asked to contribute. I absolutely hated doing it because I didn't have a very fixed view. I knew what most people would say. But I made myself write a piece, I did contribute, because I thought it was wrong not to.¹⁰ I could easily have got out of it, but I thought it was morally wrong. What I said, of course, was immediately attacked by both sides, which happens to all my works. What I said roughly was that I did not believe in political crusades, in military power used for political purposes, that therefore I did not approve of the American anti-Communist crusade in Vietnam, but, on the other hand, I didn't want – I thought massacres were worse than wars and therefore the idea of

¹⁰ IB's contribution to Cecil Woolf and John Bagguley (eds), *Authors take Sides on Vietnam: Two Questions on the War in Vietnam Answered by the Authors of Several Nations* (New York, 1967), 20–1, was reprinted as 'Taking Sides on Vietnam' at B 601–2.

the Americans just leaving and telling the Vietnamese, ‘Very sorry you can’t go on, it’s gone on too long, just goodbye, and look after yourselves as best you can’ was a betrayal. If Mr Walter Lippmann, I said – [his] idea of the Americans occupying the ports was of preventing, of allowing people to escape because they wanted to, or protecting them, was feasible, I’d be in favour of that, clearly. I didn’t think it was. So what I said, roughly, was that it was not a war I particularly approved of, but the idea of the Americans just getting out seemed to me to be a betrayal.

Side B

GC Walter Lippmann’s and the others’?

IB Only Walter Lippmann, but it was an idiotic idea. But his practical ideas very often are very silly. But as a result I was, of course, attacked by both sides straightforwardly. Conor Cruise O’Brien accused me of sitting on the fence – not in writing – and – what’s his name? – somebody attacked me in *The Spectator*, I remember.¹¹ Who was it? Oh, somebody conservative – the present editor of the *Sunday Telegraph*, Worsthorne.

GC Ah, the *Sunday Telegraph* – what’s his name? – Peregrine ...

IB Peregrine Worsthorne. Yes. He attacked me in [?] somewhere, I think it was *The Spectator*, for saying, really one can’t be on both sides at once. One has to make up one’s mind, and clearly I’m not known to be a left-winger, so I ought to have come down heavily on the side of the Americans, and no nonsense. All this finicking, not knowing, while explaining about a position that is not very clear, that won’t do. So I got into trouble with both sides. I

¹¹ Peregrine Worsthorne, ‘Writers’ Mandate’, *The Spectator*, 22 September 1967, 329, describes IB’s contribution as ‘sage equivocation’.

remember I had a friend called Burdon-Muller, who was a – doesn't matter who – he was just an old aesthete, of German origin, ultimately. He was an American who went to school in England, whom I knew. Rich man. Lived in Boston. He was very rich, and very finicky and very aesthetic, very homosexual and very left-wing. What? Burdon-Muller: B-u-r-d-o-n, half English, half German. He accused me of saying what I said in order not to displease McGeorge Bundy, who had given me so much money for Wolfson.¹² That was the worst insult ever delivered and I refused to speak to him for about six months.

GC Did he speak, or did he write?

IB He wrote it to me – that was enough. He may have written to others too. He wrote it to me, saying, I realise, of course, that your view is absurd, naturally we don't want [?] – in other words that I was trying to suck up to my benefactor, trying to flatter him in some way, or keep in with him, as you might say. That really did irritate me. Straight insult, that was – accusation of total lack of integrity, which I didn't much like. That's what I mean by saying that's why the fact that I did so hate writing about the Vietnam War proved to me that I was not a suitable professor of political theory, however much I might know about other people's views.

GC Well, it is – that's your feeling. Would Plamenatz have his opinions ...?

IB Maybe not. He did have views, but I don't think he thought it necessary. Plamenatz was entirely historically-minded. Not even historically. He liked analysis. He was not a good historian – a bad historian. But he did a very careful, scrupulous intellectual analysis,

¹² Exactly the charge later levelled against IB by Christopher Hitchens: see B 278/5.

and he thought that was quite enough. Maybe it is quite enough, but I didn't agree.

GC Now, the article on Vietnam, did anybody want to include it in the volume of, let's say, you *Against the Current*?

IB No.

GC Did they know about it?

IB I doubt it. It wasn't long enough. It was just a reaction. I mean there were eighty words, a hundred and fifty words, three hundred words.¹³ One of them simply said, the Americans are in Vietnam, I think they shouldn't have got in, and they should get out. Signed. It needn't have been longer than that.

GC Generally speaking, I thought once that you were always happy in All Souls. Now I have the feeling that it was not the case, that you had your periods there.

IB That is correct. I was perfectly happy in All Souls in the 1930s.

GC You were happy?

IB As a young man, yes.

GC Socially, it was of course then the establishment, and ...

IB No, not at all. Half and half. The important people were part of the government of England – governing class. Yes. So I knew – one discovered how things were done. It was fascinating. They

¹³ 710 words.

were mostly conservative and reactionary. Some were nice, like [Leo] Amery, some were not.

GC Amery was nice?

IB Oh yes, very. A very nice man. Very nice man indeed. Absolutely honest. Absolutely a man of unimpeachable integrity. Honest, clear, very responsible, serious and decent, in every possible way and terribly heavy and rather boring. Oh yes.

GC It's all starts inside.

IB I'm sure.

GC All the politicians. The heaviness on the one hand, but being so earnest.

IB Totally earnest. He bored the cabinet. According to – who was it? Someone told me – I think it was Donald Somervell, who was something like Solicitor General, I think, in Baldwin's government, maybe the Attorney General¹⁴ – he bored the cabinet with expounding conservative ideology, derived from Milner. The conservatives didn't want to have ideology; they prided themselves on having none. They were very, very bored by these heavy lectures. I used to hear him make after-dinner speeches in All Souls. The longer he went on, the duller he became, and the more benevolently one felt towards him, one felt very well, and one didn't mind, he was such a nice man, and although it *was* boring one felt very well disposed, one was never exactly – one had no negative feelings, at least I didn't. He believed in Austria–Hungary of course, and was violently anti-appeasement.

¹⁴ Both: also under Ramsay MacDonald and Neville Chamberlain.

GC Very right wing? But violently anti-.

IB Well, some people were, of course.

GC Very right wing.

IB Very, yes.

GC To the extent that at a certain period he was evaluating what was more important, to encounter Russia or Germany.

IB Yes, certainly. Austria–Hungary was what he was told was the perfect kingdom. Partly his Hungarian blood, probably.

GC Is he?

IB We are told. I used to think that Amery was Emerich. It isn't. Amery is an English name. The Hungarian blood came from his mother.

GC Aha. Yes, on his father's side he's from Cornwall or Devon.

IB Absolutely. Ottery St Mary.¹⁵ The mother yes, I don't know what she was, but – I'll tell you: she was the sister of Hamar Greenwood, who was responsible for the Black and Tans.¹⁶ So she was a Miss Greenwood, presumably, but she must have had – her mother, something. He wasn't more than a quarter Hungarian, couldn't be more than that. So I don't think that had much to do with it. He *looked* rather Hungarian.

¹⁵ A village in Devon. In fact, it appears, he was from Lustleigh, also in Devon. His son Julian became Baron Amery of Lustleigh.

¹⁶ This was Amery's wife, Florence Greenwood. His mother was the Hungarian Jew Elisabeth Johanna Saphir, making Amery half Hungarian.

GC Who?

IB Amery. Short, tough. Hungarians look like that a bit.

GC So back to All Souls. On the whole you liked this period.

IB Very much, because my contemporaries were very progressive, very nice, and imaginative and delightful. Some of them were very agreeable to talk to. The life in All Souls was intellectually very stimulating, which it was not elsewhere. My two months in New College were I think the dreariest months I ever spent in my entire life. I became a lecturer in September 1932. I was a protégé of Crossman's in that period. I have never been in such a boring Common Room in all my life. I really was unhappy – bored, unhappy. They were pompous, they were dull, they were disapproving. I never met a body which so inhibited me. All Souls was total liberation.

GC You know, the image is entirely different – that All Souls was very snobbish and that New College was very lively.

IB The exact opposite is true. There were about three lively people in New College common room, the rest were gargoyles. Cecil was all right; Crossman was not a nice man, but he was somebody; a man called Christopher Cox was amusing, a very agreeable ancient historian, and there was a kind of jester called [Stanley] Casson, who was an archaeologist. Apart from that there was absolutely nobody to talk to. Oh, Smith, a philosopher I liked very much.

GC Who became the Warden?

IB Who became the Warden, yes. He was amusing, agreeable man, but of no intellectual interest. Ideas were never, never discussed, in New College, in my presence.

GC In All Souls you had a very good period. Who was the Warden?

IB The Warden under me – I was elected under Chelmsford, who was Warden for six months. He died about six months after he was elected. Then Adams, who was a nice old man, who was not at all intellectual, but was kind and amiable.

GC So it's not the Warden that actually creates ...

IB No, not in All Souls. Well, he can do. Adams was a kind of nice old farmer, made no difference. On the whole the College ran quite peacefully and people did what they liked. He had very little to do with elections. He was modest and not intellectual, let the other Fellows do what they wanted. After him came Sumner, who was an eminent Russian historian, from Balliol, yes, whom I didn't really like very much, other people obviously adored him. He was very nervous, very suspicious of me. He thought I was just a chatterbox, and just because I had done well in the war with my famous dispatches, decided to get me back. He was entirely influenced by conventional, *bien pensant* opinion, and because some of the Fellows of All Souls spoke very well – favourably about my work during the war, he changed his attitude. But fundamentally never liked me very much. But he couldn't resist, he wanted me back because they all said how marvellous I was. So that influenced him, and that's why I despised him rather. He had no real independent view of his own. He always wanted to keep in with people whom he regarded as the right kind of people who hold the right kind of opinions.

GC In 1945, you again became a Research Fellow?

IB In 1950.

GC Between 1945 and 1950?

IB I was in New College.

GC And still the same atmosphere?

IB No. They had changed during the war. Fisher was dead, Smith was Warden, some of the older Fellows disappeared, some young men came in – James Joll became a Fellow, Bullock became a Fellow. I did like [?], it was better. Nevertheless, when I used to go and dine at All Souls I felt myself to be in a different atmosphere, which was more congenial to me.

GC And the atmosphere, after the war, what was it like, in All Souls?

IB Well, some of these old men were gone. Simon didn't live very long. Dawson also not. That sort of heavy British Empire group. Simon wasn't part of that. But the sort of British liberal imperialists – they'd gone. And so it was all right, it was just – perfectly nice, agreeable, easy-going, enjoyable.

GC (*inaudible*)

IB Nothing like so much, exactly. Douglas Jay was the only minister we had in All Souls, in the Labour government. I don't think we had others. We had the Editor of the *Sunday Times* – we had a man called [Harry] Hodson. We had [?] some Conservative MPs, certainly. Donald Somervell, yes ...

GC (*inaudible*)

IB No, he died fairly soon after. When did Amery die? Not long after the war [1955].

GC He was in Israel. He came to the state of Israel in 1949.

IB [?] He must have died [?] 1950. Yes he probably – he came to All Souls after the war. Certainly he did. He used to bring Julian to dinner. That's right. I don't remember who of the old lot. Simon was alive. Halifax was alive.

GC And was he coming?

IB Yes, he came a certain amount, after Eden – although he was Chancellor, you see. He came.

GC Chancellor?

IB Yes, he was Chancellor, he wasn't a fellow, but he came. He certainly came, and dined occasionally. Oh yes, he certainly came: he came to gaudies. Wait a moment, who else? – I believe he was not in power during the Labour government. He wasn't in power during the Conservative government either. When he came back from America he no longer held any job. Churchill didn't like him. He was rather disappointed, expected something. I am trying to think who else there was of that sort in All Souls.

GC Coupland was not alive?

IB Coupland, yes. Coupland was certainly alive in 1951.

GC And he was in Oxford?

IB Coupland was at All Souls, yes. He lived in a house by himself, although he was a bachelor. He died in the 1950s [1952]. He was still a Fellow in 1951. Certainly. He took part in the election. Coupland, yes. I am trying to think who else ...

GC Cyril Falls was there?

IB Cyril Falls, yes, professor, yes. But it wasn't like the old est[ablishment] – they weren't the governing class, they weren't at all, no – didn't count for these purposes. I'm trying to think, certainly there were no Labour ministers, apart from Jay, and during Conservative governments, well, Donald Somervell was ill, he was the Home Secretary in the caretaker government, a lawyer, a chemist by origin. Wait a moment, who else might there have been? Simon, yes, still about. I cannot think of anybody else. Certainly not [?] – Lang was dead; he died fairly soon; Dawson certainly didn't function – certainly not Editor. He ceased to be Editor during the war. Barrington-Ward surely came in during the war [1941]. Who else could there have been? Oh well, Bridges was there.

GC Bridges?

IB Yes, he was there. Secretary to the Cabinet, yes.

GC When was he elected?

IB When was he elected?

GC To the College?

IB Bridges was elected as a Prize Fellow – no, in about 1922 [1920]. You mean Edward Bridges? Well, Edward Bridges was born in about 1900 [1892].

GC What was he, historian, philosopher?

IB I don't know what he was elected as, but he went to the Civil Service, immediately.

GC He was a Prize Fellow?

IB Prize Fellow means elected as an undergraduate after – like me, [at the] age of twenty-one, continuously.

GC All along?

IB He may have ceased like me. Amery wasn't there continuously. He ceased to be a fellow and then was re-elected, like me. Bridges I think ceased to be a fellow, was a quondam fellow, and was made a fellow again, and he was certainly there in the 1960s.

GC And was he [?] then?

IB No. He was a very nice man. He was a man of unimpeachable integrity. He was boyish. I liked him. I liked talking to him. He was lively, he was a man of great honour, extremely high-minded and a man of powerful character. Interesting? No.

GC He was [?].

IB He certainly – absolutely.

GC To run England in 1933 ...

IB He governed England. I know he did.

GC And one could see that he was very decent [?].

IB He was not very interesting. And he more or less died of overwork in the end. Yes. He ceased to come to All Souls when he

was scandalised by what happened. When – it’s a story that I needn’t tell you because [?] only you and me. First All Souls discovered they had too much money. So then they thought they would have graduate students. Then the Franks Commission was called to examine Oxford. Bridges appeared as one of the delegates from All Souls. He was in favour of having graduates. Then the College changed its mind. Bridges said, ‘I am not in the habit of eating my words’, and resigned. He was persuaded not to resign, but he never came back. He thought he had been betrayed. He thought his reputation was tarnished. He promised something to the Franks Commission and the College didn’t fulfil it. That degree of vanity he did have.

GC It’s vanity?

IB Well, he was a very eminent person, he made a formal promise as an important person; he put himself – committed himself to a policy – and a policy which the College had voted for – and then without telling him they simply changed their mind. He thought that was disgusting. At least he ought to have been consulted; at least he ought to have been made to try and persuade them.

GC And I think he was right.

IB Absolutely.

GC So it’s not vanity.

IB [?] It’s Sparrow who did it. Who didn’t like them at all. He didn’t like the humourless, Aristides quality of this – the just man. He had the reputation of being the completely just man. Well, I like just men, but some people are maddened by them. They don’t like that sort of high-minded, priggish, Wykehamist, sort of – I think he was an Etonian. [?]

GC Now did you ever discuss with him vanity?

IB No, I don't think I did. I don't know why not, but I didn't. I'm sure I could have done, and I'm sure he would have been quite reasonable.

GC He knew a lot.

IB Must have done. Was he anti-Zionist?

GC No.

IB Neither for or against?

GC No. But at a certain moment he represented the Foreign Office opinion against Churchill.

IB [?] Yes.

GC I'm sure that he did it because he thought that ...

IB That's what Civil Service ...

GC ... that was one of the things that Churchill was responsible [for]. You know, Churchill would come in the morning ...

IB When was this?

GC In 1943, 1944.

IB Oh, during the war, yes. Well, I'm sure that Eden – the Foreign Secretary was Eden?

GC Yes.

IB Well ...

GC I'll tell you. The point was that the way he worked with Churchill was that they knew each other well (IB Yes), and Churchill would wake up in the morning with ten bright ideas. Eight or nine ...

IB No good. Yes.

GC And one good or not. And Bridges, on the one hand, and [?] on the other hand ...

IB Calmed him down.

GC So when it came to such issues, Bridges considered himself sometimes to be more than just the secretary.

IB Oh, certainly.

GC [?] I'm going to tell you a terrific story. When Churchill decided to establish the Cabinet Commission on Palestine policy, the very fact that he established the Commission was already the counter-move ...

IB Against the Foreign Office – the White Paper.

GC ... to the policy of the Foreign Office and the Colonial Up It's incredible how ...

IB Against the White Paper, yes.

GC He went even further. He got many memoranda by ministers saying that it was against – anti-Zionism and he cut it.

IB Churchill?

GC Incredible. Then, there was a full cabinet meeting in June 1943, a discussion, and even Wavell was present. The mood was turning against the Zionists.

IB Surely.

GC And again, Churchill made the conclusions, and the conclusions were ...

IB What he wanted.

GC To establish a Commission to discuss politics for after the war, post-war policy, and to begin with considering the Peel Report. It meant a lot. And then, Bridges, as usual, had to write a conclusion.

IB Minutes.

GC Minutes, sorry. Minutes and conclusions. And it's the only time I remember that he wrote conclusions ...

IB The decision – by conclusions you mean what the Cabinet decided?

GC Yes, part of the minutes (IB Yes), and Churchill corrected in a rather rebuking ...

IB Yes, quite.

GC Incredible – he rephrased the con[clusions]. The conclusions are the – it’s called: conclusions are the decisions of the Cabinet, A, B, C. (IB Of the Cabinet, of course, yes, A, B, C, yes.) Churchill forced him to rewrite the conclusions in the way he wanted it to be. He forced him to add to the minutes some parts and that’s why they look not coherent, you know, because ...

IB The conclusions didn’t follow from the minutes.

GC And he forced [?]. ‘And I want the Commission to be consisted of X, Y, Z.’ And he agreed with the suggestion of Bridges and Leopold Amery, who knows a lot about Palestine, and that’s not the reason not to add it in.

IB Quite. Very typical Churchill.

GC It’s the only time that I saw Churchill react and I read so many ...

IB Collision. But Bridges accepted it?

GC Oh, sure. And then he was the Secretary of the Cabinet Committee.

IB Also of that Cabinet Committee?

GC Yes. It was one of the two-three most secret committees.

IB Of course.

GC It’s incredible how secret and why, but that’s ...

IB And yet it was leaked to Weizmann?

GC It leaked to Weizmann.

IB Quite definitely? Who leaked it? (GC Angus[?]) No, it was done more or less officially. The Foreign Office knew it had been leaked to him.

GC Churchill didn't know the exact – who were the members of the Commission.

IB (*very surprised*) Really?

GC He knew about forcing[?] heavy stakes. Not Churchill, sorry: Weizmann.

IB Weizmann. Yes. Oh, nobody gave him a list.

GC He sensed about one or two. I mean – Baffy Dugdale learnt about it something ...

IB From Walter Elliot.

GC Though in 1943 Walter Elliot was not in ...

IB They probably [?] gossiped. Probably, because what was Walter Elliot in 1943? He was a Member of Parliament.

GC He was a Member of Parliament.

IB Yes, well he probably ...

GC But he was not a Minister.

IB No. But he was probably – gossiped. Talked to people who were.

GC [?] gossip; you can't ...

IB A super-secret, I understand. Now who were they? Amusing. I'll tell you ...

GC There was Morrison.

IB That's right. And there were – let me tell you what I seem to remember, what Goldmann told me, when I learnt of it, after all. Morrison was the chairman, there was Amery, there was Oliver Stanley ...

GC It was Preston[?] already. No, Stanley.

IB Stanley was Colonial Secretary. (GC Definitely Oliver Stanley.) The Foreign Office was represented[?] by Dick Law. I know. Eden refused them.

GC [?] (IB What?) Dick Law was ...

IB But he represented the Foreign Office point of view.

GC Not to the extent they wanted him to.

IB (*with great surprise*) I see! Because I thought he was against.

GC No, he was better than the Foreign Office.

IB He would be.

GC There was a moment he said, 'That's my opinion, and I want to bring the Foreign Office opinion.'

IB Yes, I see. Like that. He was a very nice man, and very decent about Jews. He was not an anti-Semite like Eden.

GC No, he was not at all.

IB Not at all. I knew him very well. I don't know why he became so terribly reactionary towards the end of his life. He did. Totally reactionary. He was embittered somehow.

GC Partly disappointment.

IB He was a progressive Minister.

GC I (*inaudible*).

IB I knew him very well. I knew him exactly then. And I used to see him when he was in Washington. We made friends. I stayed with him. Dick Law. Yes, I actually stayed with him.

GC He wasn't appointed.

IB Yes, he was shoved aside by Eden, who was dreadfully jealous – who was violently jealous of him – violently. Because he was a promising man – Prime Minister maybe, etc. New Dealish, in a way. He was on it, yes, I know; and wait a minute, who else?

GC Archibald Sinclair (IB Yes), because of being a Liberal.

IB They were represented [on] that, yes. Who else could have been?

GC Morrison, Amery, Dick Law, Oliver Stanley, Archibald Sinclair.

IB Enough. (GC Maybe [?]) What other ministers are there? I mean, who else could have been? Not Anderson.

GC No.

IB Nobody like that, no, not Treasury.

GC I think that's it.

IB Foreign Office, Colonial Office, India Office. All right. That was Amery's official reason for being on it.

GC And he was the Colonial Secretary. (IB Quite.) I have to check if Cranborne was there.

IB No. Couldn't have been.

GC Why?

IB Because he was no. 2 in the Foreign Office.

GC Law was.

IB Ah, Law had become it. Cranborne was then – what was Cranborne Minister of? Defence.

GC. Colonial Office.

IB What? Definitely Colonial Office?

GC Yes, surely. He moved from the Colonial Office to the ...

IB He was never Colonial Secretary.¹⁷

GC Cranborne?

IB (*surprised*) Surely – was he?

GC Yes.

IB I didn't know that. He moved to the Dominions. And the Dominions and the Colonial Office are different.

GC [?] very different.

IB That's when he made that speech about *Struma* and *Patria*, too. But that's when he was in the Foreign Office.

GC (*inaudible*) No he was Colonial Secretary. Surely?

IB He became – he was no. 2 in the Foreign Office under Eden.

GC When?

IB Before the war.

GC Ah. But in the war ...

IB Wait a moment. After the war – during the war ...

GC For a while Lord Lloyd was Colonial Secretary.

IB Correct.

¹⁷ He was (February–November 1942).

GC And then Cranborne.¹⁸

IB Could well be.

GC And then Oliver Stanley.

IB At the beginning of the war he was not dead.

GC No, he was not. Lloyd was.¹⁹

IB That's [?]. What was Cranborne? He was something.

GC But he was Minister of the Dominions.

IB [?] One o'clock, I have to go.

GC All right.

IB Oh Lord.

¹⁸ Lord Moyne served between them: Lloyd, May 1940 to February 1941; Moyne, February 1941 to February 1942.

¹⁹ He died in office in February 1941.