

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION IN CAIRO

AS NOTED FROM AN UNOFFICIAL ANGLE.

15th September, 1954.

On arrival back in England, after a further five years passed in Egypt, during which that once prosperous country has been involved in conditions of increasing unrest, culminating in two years of fantastic change, and a disintegration of all established authority, and the setting-up of a regime whose future is as problematic as its past is lacking in experience, one has been seeking to note the reactions towards this explosive situation by the people of Britain as a whole. One has now to realise that the reaction here is, in general, not wide, yet there are, in fact, many who are indignant and perplexed at British humiliations in Egypt. On the other hand, one must realise also the special sensitiveness of British people who for many months have been forced at close quarters almost impotently to watch the rise of yet another police state, with tendencies to the usual totalitarianism, arrogance and ruthlessness increasing steadily all the time. It is in a way restful to find oneself after an air journey of only one day, transported from a setting where the working up of fanatic hatred towards England and the West has seemed an ever-present and sinister threat to British interests, and, indeed, to all constructive world interests, to this atmosphere of unconcern; and then, on second thoughts, one's peace of mind is no less disturbed than before. How many times, even in the not far past, has this unconcern in England led us into the utmost peril of a crisis for which we have not been prepared. Japanese war atrocities in China seemed far away from England - until the gradual but sure involvement from the unchecked injustice of that war led to a world war in which those atrocities were inflicted upon our own people. Nazi encroachments on the rights of other nations seemed far from England - until their inevitable involvements brought grievous disaster to our own homeland. So it seems to me now on arrival in England from the Middle East, and for all one's relief to rest awhile in English tranquillity and good order, yet memories of the past soon shatter one's content in any sort of English tranquillity based only on blindness to the facts of world reality. In the House of Commons on 6th November, 1951, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden, made a declaration which included the following assurance: "In Egypt and the Sudan we are pursuing the policy adopted by the late Government . . . . We are resolved to maintain our rightful position in the Canal Zone in spite of the illegal and one-sided Egyptian action over the 1936 Treaty. We shall do our best to safeguard the Canal as an international highway, using of course no more force than is necessary. Here I think that time, within certain limits, and restraint and forbearance - not so strictly limited - may give the best chance of the crisis being successfully surmounted". The assurance indicated in the above statement has been repeated from time to time, right up to the moment of the startling reversal of policy suddenly announced just after the British Prime Minister's most recent visit to America a few weeks ago. One is supported by the hope that the deeply respected leadership of our present Government has some master plan beyond the present unconstructive appeasements. If this is not so, then future prospects in the Middle East and Africa are grim indeed.

When I left Egypt two weeks ago, the position of the Egyptian Revolutionary regime, after various vicissitudes led now by Colonel Nasser, (though General Neguib is still nominally President of the Egyptian Republic), was very precarious; a condition in which it has, in fact, existed almost from its outset, when once the Egyptian people had recovered from their astonishment at the fall of their almost sacred monarchy, and had realised that "Reform" is more easily preached than practised, even by a "Revolutionary" regime. Everyone, in Cairo at least, vividly remembers the events of Black Saturday, 26th January, 1952, when the city of Cairo was at the mercy of mob law, and when several hundred buildings were set ablaze, and damage amounting to fifty million pounds done, amidst scenes of pillage and the brutal murder of many Europeans. The organizers of that violence are still at large, and at the time of my departure from Cairo a fortnight ago, it was known that a similar outrage was being planned by Communist-inspired elements, only this time on an even more ambitious scale, and encouraged by the withdrawal of the British forces from the Canal Zone.

What has caused the British people, the world's best established democracy, to acquiesce apparently so easily in thus jeopardizing the welfare not only of the whole of the Moslem states of the Middle East, (for the fate of Egypt inevitably will strongly affect all the Middle Eastern states also), but the safety of the civilised world, by subjecting it to a handful of young fanatic revolutionaries in Egypt. Is it possible that the English public is again beginning to regard democracy as a sort of self-winding watch, forgetting that even a watch of that type depends for its continued working upon the active movements of its wearer?

The essential part of democracy is the "demos", that is, the people, the actual individuals of the nation. The affairs of our great democracy must be keyed to individual thoughtful knowledge of world affairs, not to the range only of internal affairs, or the personal decisions of some elected M.P. Moreover, the benefits of British democracy, which have been founded upon centuries of experience, must not be presumed to ensure immediate success when imposed suddenly upon peoples with no democratic experience at all.

It must be realised at the outset that the present revolutionary regime in Cairo is led by very young men, without experience, and almost all with a record of one-track fanaticism. It is true that they are of patriotic intention, that they are decent-living young men, above the local average in their wish to assist in the uplift of the under-privileged population in Egypt. It must not be supposed, however, that there is anything immaculate about this handful of young officers, or that they have any miraculous revelation in their mental make-up as to the administration of national, and still less international, affairs. Moreover, several of them worked actively against us in the recent world war. There is also now an arrogance and high-handedness in their methods, which is somewhat sinister, as, for instance, in the brusque expulsion recently of the Turkish Ambassador, under unprecedented conditions of official insult; largely because his wife is a Princess of the Egyptian Royal House. With the exception of General Neguib, these men are none of them older than in their early thirties, and, with the exception of Colonel Nasser, who is to some extent a student of world affairs and an organizer, they are all limited to the ordinary local training of an Egyptian junior officer, and most of them since an early age have been well-known as tending to indiscipline and agitation against authority. It is as inaccurate to suppose that these men are gifted reformers as it is to regard the Egyptian monarchy and all former Egyptian statesmen who preceded them as monsters of iniquity. Because of their youth these men have grown up with a minimum of contact with British officers, whose devotion and efficient guidance to their Egyptian subordinates was formerly a well-known and well-accepted fact, and have formed their opinions at a time when it has been the fashion to hate England, and, indeed, to hate anything outside a limited form of local nationalism. General Neguib is in a different category, and is some fifteen years older than any of the other revolutionary leaders. He did not take part in the planning of the revolt, but was brought in later by the young leaders with the tacit intention of using him as a figure-head because his senior rank and genial manners had good publicity value. It is in this way exactly that he has been used, and is now cast aside. He is now little less than a prisoner; many of his friends are already in gaol, including his intimate associate Colonel Showky, former Commandant of the Cairo garrison, who has very recently been condemned to ten years' hard labour for so-called "treason" to the regime. It was his moderation and his desire to expedite the setting up again of more normal conditions in Egypt, and to establish a constitutional Parliament after free elections, which has caused his final downfall, and his alienation from Colonel Nasser and his clique. He remains nominally President of Egypt only because Nasser considers it expedient not yet to offend the Egyptian working classes, who still have sympathy with the General. No-one knows how long this facade will continue. I quote now an extract from a letter which I wrote jointly to certain of the Revolutionary leaders, at a time when it was being suggested by some members of the Revolutionary regime that I might act as intermediary between them and the British Embassy, after a threat by the Revolutionaries to "declare war" on England. "I feel most strongly that the word "war" in regard to the present Anglo-Egyptian disagreement should be the very last word to be introduced. Human reason and common-sense can surely arrive at a settlement, which, in fact, I believe has been so nearly reached. War, on the other hand, can achieve nothing but untold misery for all of us concerned. One feels that public utterances, newspaper articles and so on, should avoid by all means, all exaggerations of statement and all stirring up of hate. Of course, it is possible for Egypt to declare war. What is not apparently so clearly realised is the misery and useless chaos which war would lead to. A good patriot, whether Egyptian, British, or other, must also be a good world citizen; and anyone of us who unnecessarily risks the spread of the ghastly microbe of war has to bear, in these times especially, a grim and terrible responsibility. The British and the Egyptians are not enemies; they are friends who have had a rather serious misunderstanding. We are all lovers of freedom and reform, those qualities upon which I understand your movement has been founded. We have this common basis of sympathy, and surely with the common-sense of responsible men, we can and must reach a practical and constructive agreement".

In their attitude to international affairs, there is a good deal of the theatrical element amongst the younger Revolutionaries, with little realisation of the dangerous game in which they are involving themselves. Though on the whole, as has been said before, decent-living young men in their private lives, their public intentions are confused, and their aims, however idealistic, are without practical method. Moreover, their code in the past has not excluded the sort of fanaticism which plans assassinations and reckless intrigue against grievances - often imaginary grievances. There is serious dissention between these Revolutionary leaders, even amongst themselves, and now after the end of the second year of their regime, they can scarcely be said to be representative of any part of the Egyptian nation except themselves, and even that more individually than collectively. Having outlawed all former political parties, they have now also outlawed the Moslem Brotherhood, (with whom they at first attempted an alliance), despite the illogical fact that only a few months ago they condemned to fifteen years' hard labour an Egyptian statesman and recent Premier, mainly on the grounds that he had himself carried out the very same measures of suppression against the Moslem Brotherhood which the Revolutionary regime is now enforcing. They have, of course, the enmity of some seven hundred regular officers, who have been placed in forced retirement. Because of ruthless and indiscriminate confiscations of property, in many cases not only of lands, jewellery and funds, but even of personal clothing, belonging to even the most distant relatives of the Royal House, they have alienated, amongst the many hundred people thus involved, many highly cultured and intelligent individuals who would in fact have been prepared to support and assist them in their patriotic aspirations for Egypt. They have the distrust of the middle classes, of merchants and all those who are suffering from the depression in trade relationships. Even those peasants, who suddenly find themselves the possessors of land, are ill at ease through lack of experience and means to work their land profitably. The increase in unemployment in Cairo alone is enormous, and, of course, the early promises of redress so readily made to almost any person who produced a petition are now producing the inevitable reaction of anger and dismay, when it is found that these young men are no more able to achieve miracles than any other previous Government. Furthermore, in spite of the energetic and usually anti-British activities of Major Saleh Salem, they have not succeeded in bringing the Arab League States into greater unity. These States are united only in their detestation of Israel in Palestine. In view of this set of circumstances, which is universally known in Egypt, it seems to the onlooker, certainly to any British subject of many years' residence in Egypt, incomprehensible that a British Conservative Government should so suddenly reverse all previous statements of policy as to our base in the Canal Zone and British interests in Egypt, and hand these over into the precarious keeping of these new leaders, possibly patriotic in intention, but certainly inexperienced and more strikingly outspoken in their hatred of England, than any regime in the past history of Anglo-Egyptian relations. Even on the very day of the so-called agreement between the British and Egyptian negotiators, there were anti-British articles in the Egyptian press, huge anti-British slogans erected in Arabic on all Cairo's main streets, and, most intriguing gesture of all, a large canvas placard inscribed in English denouncing British tyranny was erected in front of the British Embassy, under which all British negotiators, including the Envoy from England, had to pass on their way to sign the "agreement". Amongst the articles published at that time was a virulent commentary on Anglo-Indian affairs, by a gentleman named Biswas, by way of variety to the chorus of hate so incongruously raised on the very day of alleged good accord. Anti-British activities during the past two years have included the kidnapping and murder of British soldiers in the Canal Zone, which definitely has had the connivance of the Revolutionary Council in Cairo, and the arrest of Egyptians in Cairo for alleged friendliness towards Anglo-Egyptian co-operation. These Egyptians were tried before the Revolutionary Tribunal in secret session. Some were given savage prison sentences, and some condemned to hanging. Those thus condemned to death were, moreover, by official arrangement, depicted shockingly upon the cinema screens of all Cairo's cinemas in their last tragic moments; a malicious episode intended as much to show contempt for England as to sow terror amongst her friends in Egypt.

It will be relevant here, I think, to quote an extract from "Punch", of 25th February, 1953, more serious in tone than usual in that good humoured journal, referring in particular to the recent happenings in the Sudan. "History will tell how, in the name of self-determination and representative government, territory after territory has been handed over to as corrupt and pettifogging oligarchies as ever plagued mankind; and despite the constantly repeated experience, each new essay of the kind was greeted with the same idiot satisfaction and platitudinous good wishes".

Whether or not the sentiments expressed in this extract coincide entirely with one's own way of thought, they do, I believe, represent the point of view of a very large number of thinking people, both British and non-British.

It is also interesting to remember the opening sentence of the oath officially administered to the "Liberation Movement" in Egypt, by the Revolutionary leader there. It is as follows: "O Allah, you who love the strong and hate weaklings". At what point does our policy of conciliation become in the Egyptian mind a symptom of a weakling? That is an important point for our consideration.

The malign defamation of prominent British personalities, both our statesmen and prominent English personalities in Egypt, is now a commonplace, and a Government-sponsored newspaper did not hesitate upon the death of Sir Thomas Russell Pasha to produce a most scurrilous attack upon his memory. As is known throughout the world, Sir Thomas had especial renown in his life-long devotion to the suppression of the drug traffic in Egypt. Nevertheless, he was, with the tacit permission of the Revolutionary leaders, described in the Arabic press as a man who had by no means suppressed the drug traffic. He had, they implied, himself been a drug addict, and a secret organiser of the import of drugs into Egypt in order that the Egyptian people might become increasingly demoralised. One of Sir Thomas Russell's British colleagues (now retired) did succeed in obliging an English-language Egyptian newspaper to publish his letter of vigorous protest. As far as the ordinary public in Egypt could know, however, there was no formal protest from the British Government at this distortion against a British official personality, so well-known as Sir Thomas Russell for his devotion to duty and to the welfare of his Egyptian subordinates and the Egyptian people during the many years in which he held the most senior appointments in the Egyptian policy force. This is only one outstanding example of similar tactics of which one has been the witness in Egypt throughout the past two years. It can no doubt be realised that these conditions are a particular menace to British subjects of ordinary modest status, whose families have lived perhaps for many years and even generations in Egypt, and whose property and welfare is entirely held within that country. When great names can with impunity be unjustly attacked, lesser people naturally fear even to complain of the humiliations and damage to which British people are subjected in these strange times. Our Embassy itself has not escaped attack, and the Revolutionary regime chose the moment of the signing of the so-called "agreement" to insist upon bulldozing a road right through the Embassy gardens, destroying thereby a large part of its amenities and, far more important, a large part of its prestige. Embassy ground is, of course, considered to be part of the land which that Embassy represents, and this action, carried out at this particular moment with a chorus, as is to be expected, of derisive commentary in the Arabic press, has been a deplorable incident. It has been made no less deplorable by the announcement that the British Government had received a very high cash payment for this surrender. Such things are not to be bought and sold. It is most improbable that the British public realises the facts of this incident, or the atmosphere which it created in the existing circumstances.

In spite of the comments I have made above, there have been many times during this revolutionary movement when one's heart has gone out in sympathy to these young officers of the Egyptian Revolutionary Council, who certainly, though they may lack in tact and experience, do not lack in personal courage, and are facing up to the terrific task which they have undertaken. Even General Neguib, who as was mentioned before, is at least fifteen years the senior of any of the other leaders, is, in fact, just an amiable, somewhat eccentric senior officer, with nothing beyond his regimental experience to guide him. This little body of brave visionaries is setting out, in theory at least, to set right many centuries of grievous wrong. The younger leaders have been brought up to detest the English as arch imperialists and selfish tyrants. They know little or nothing of real historic facts, nor of how that very imperialism (for British imperialism has always included common-sense, humane, and even generous, aspects) is the very power which has built up and made possible the present fact that Egypt is an independent state. Actually, their over-hasty actions and fanatical prejudices may increase rather than lessen the injustices and misery within that country. To suggest that British influence has brought no benefit to Egypt is merely to be wilfully blind; yet when we criticise a little harshly the present conditions in Egypt, do we perhaps conveniently omit the memory that British administration up till recently predominated in Egypt during a period of some seventy years? Had we given to social services, schools

and hospitals the same energetic priorities that were given to cotton, the Canal and commerce, might we not now be reaping a far greater and more beneficent harvest in the gratitude of the Egyptian people, and their basic soundness for facing the world as our allies? That, however, is all over and past. Perhaps the diplomatic explanation of the present Egyptian situation may officially be that we wish now in no way to interfere in the internal affairs of any Egyptian Government. Admirable as this may sound, it seems unfortunate so suddenly to come to this strict decision with a Government - or, more correctly, Dictatorship, - such as is represented in Egypt to-day by the Revolutionary junta of Colonel Nasser.

Colonel Nasser, a most ambitious man and the most capable of the junta, is one of the less attractive personalities in that set-up, and is widely disliked in Egypt, even by his own Revolutionary Council. Incidentally, in a speech not long ago, he publicly announced that Hitler is his personal hero, upon whom he hopes to model his own methods. Since then he is said to have concentrated rather on a study of Kemal Ataturk, the first dictator of Turkey. That, perhaps, is a more hopeful sign. Nevertheless, though agreement on a generous basis some few years ago might have seemed to the credit of the British Government, the present apparent yielding to the threats and terrorism of an upstart dictatorship based on Nazi principles can bring nothing to the British name in Egypt but contempt and arrogant disregard. It is true that Nasser has expressed anti-Communist views, but in the Revolutionary junta there is undoubtedly an incongruous tendency towards the extreme left. One must not forget, for instance, the permission accorded by General Neguib and Colonel Nasser for the East German Trade Exhibition in Cairo last year. This opportunity was certainly not missed by German Communists under Russian control; the fact that ex-Nazi misfits from West Germany are now also established in Colonel Nasser's Security Department does not in any way counter-balance Communist infiltration. Our policy for the educating and preparing of "Protectorate peoples" to eventual self-rule shows nobility of principle. However, in carrying it out, in realising the moment when the protected races begin to expect equality in social relationships; in maintaining a certain inspiring leadership in the early stages of bestowing independence; in checking firmly the early precociousness of young nations, while yet showing sympathy for their growing pains; in these things we certainly seem to have lacked and still to lack, both in logic and humanity. What we are witnessing in Egypt at the moment is the start of another police state with increasing tendencies to absolutism and violence; I have had urgent warnings from many categories of Egyptians. These have included students, artisans, shopkeepers and lawyers, retired officers and members of the Royal Family. All these people are dissatisfied and afraid; and now in addition the Moslem Brotherhood, under the leadership of Hudheibi (a man of moderate outlook) has declared the start of radical antagonism to Nasser and his regime. Is it in conditions such as these, full of uncertainty and instability, whatever idealisms they may also include, that our Government should decide suddenly to withdraw all their rights acquired, and justly acquired, throughout past years in Egypt, and to leave this adolescent nation to the possibility of chaos which would undoubtedly affect the whole of the Middle East and have world-wide repercussions of a formidable sort.

On 26th July, 1952, we totally abandoned H.M. King Farouk to his fate. Farouk, as I well know, was never basically hostile to England. He could have been a great friend to this country, and in this opinion I have the support of British authorities of far greater political experience than myself. I know definitely also that in the latter period of the revolutionary crisis, King Farouk sought the advice and intervention of the British Embassy, and this was refused. It is true that in the last two years of his reign there was small cause for sympathy towards Farouk in the indiscretions in which he involved himself; but by then evil advisers had seized the opportunities which our authorities had failed to take. If official rigidity could have been put aside and a more humane approach made to this young man during the unique opportunity with which his formative years provided us, what great rewards might have been ours. If the official attitude had been more tolerant of this inexperienced yet promising young King, and less tolerant of the very experienced, unscrupulous and, in several cases, personally odious leaders of the Wafdist party (for whom British support was unmistakable), the result might indeed have been happier for us all. Thereby we could have gained a reputation for the building up of a sound Monarchy rather than the doubtful fame of involvement with a corrupt and selfish political party. An Egyptian Sovereign, wise and attractive, friendly to Britain and considerate to his people's welfare, all of which qualities were included in Farouk's early make-up, would have been far more natural to Egyptian sentiment, and might have prevented an infinity of disastrous discord.

Surely in these days official attitudes should be simpler in their aim; ordinary right and wrong should be their guide more often than those diplomatic pass-words "Policy" and "Expediency", which produce such transitory gains.

It is difficult indeed to understand, looking back on our responsibilities in Egypt and the Middle East, and particularly in Egypt, that we should now so suddenly be prepared apparently to sacrifice the prestige of Britain and the rights of British people, to abandon the great mass of simple folk in Egypt who are in no way hostile to England, and to betray so many people of education and prestige who have had the courage to express openly their friendship for us, and then to place such confidence in an upstart and unfriendly regime, as to surrender our vast base in the Canal, and our influence in Egypt, unconditionally into their keeping. How can it be that these things which, so recently as a few months ago, were re-affirmed by the British Government as being of supreme importance, are now of no real importance at all! There is no logical reason why Egypt, under the generous and reasonable terms of equality of status offered by England should not have co-operated in the interest of world security, thereby gaining rather than losing international respect.

Let us by all means be sympathetic and reasonably disposed to the Revolutionary regime in Egypt, but let it be with reality, and understanding of their faults as well as their good intentions and with an attitude of strong though friendly guidance, which is not only our right as a nation, but which it is our duty to conserve for the security of established control in the Middle East, which, certainly, it is the Communist policy to undermine. In our decisions let no nation, however friendly, intrude its inexperienced bias in decisions which are essentially the responsibility of Britain. Such interference has already caused too much harm.

Discussions on a high level with local personalities, whether those of a Royalist set-up or of some such set-up as is at present led by the Egyptian Army movement, are far from producing practical results for the main problem. Discussions on such a level mean nothing to the discontented, restless and desperate mass of the people. The only effective possibility seems to be some action which can have direct and immediate impact upon the people themselves, by trade concessions or welfare organisations which would immediately be felt by these people. Thus, some gratitude and sense of understanding might be achieved by the democratic powers, instead of this gratitude being turned towards the Soviet through some such development as the various approaches which one notes have already been made between the Egyptian Government and Polish and Russian authorities.

The night before I left Cairo, I was visited by a prominent member of the old Royalist regime. He visited me by careful arrangement, and at night, because for many months it had been dangerous for us to meet, owing to the surveillance from Nasser's "Gestapo", of which we were well aware. My visitor told an extraordinary story of the menaces to which he had himself been subjected. He confirmed, however, what I had already heard of the instability which still exists in the Egyptian Revolutionary Army, in spite of the numerous arrests and suppressions which have been already carried out under Nasser's control. My visitor had special information on this subject through the fact that certain junior members of his family had themselves joined the Revolutionary movement. He told me additionally that the Revolutionary Council is especially concerned at the often resentful attitude towards them amongst senior Egyptian N.C.O's. Attempts are made to placate these malcontents but without much success, and this situation is being made use of by Communist agents. In addition to this, my visitor spoke of the increasingly dangerous situation vis-a-vis Israel. Major Saleh Salem, the famous "Dancing Major" of the election period in the Sudan, has made inflammatory speeches in which he has included the suggestion that Egypt is waiting only for the clearance of the British Army from the Canal Zone to resume its attack upon Israel. However unwise this attitude may be, there can be no doubt that it exists. The great powers in recently past years have indeed done little to adjust the tragic situation in Palestine. Their indefinite attitude is fair neither to Jews nor Arabs; and the fact and misery of the many thousands of Arab refugees is in itself a constant irritant. As an eye witness I can fully confirm all this. Though deplorably late, it is almost certain even yet that a strong line taken by Anglo-American Governments combined could yet achieve a settlement, though the action now would need an increase of firmness in decision in proportion to the

increase of resentment and provocation which has continued between the Arabs and the Jews during the years of procrastination. A solution to this problem is, however, essential before there can be any hope of security and peace in the Middle East. In a recent broadcast, Mr. Sam Watson, the Labour Member, who was amongst those to visit China, used the words "There can be no peace through weakness". If this applies in China it certainly applies also in Egypt, and in the Arab-Israeli confusion. There has been a regrettable tendency in public statements by some British personalities to make a kind of apology for British imperialism. British imperialism needs no apology. At no time has its influence been evil, and it has so often had an influence constructive and sound that there should be no question of surrendering British authority, except to nations who have proved their worthiness to take up responsibilities. In these days, it is surely the wish of the British Government to show friendship and to grant independence to all peoples who have been within the Imperial orbit; but only when they have shown their capability of acting as modern and civilised Governments should, and not at the cost of useless humiliation and loss of dignity and authority on the part of the great nation which has guided them so far along the lines of progress. All these points very clearly apply in Egypt and the Middle East to-day. It is not enough to give a young nation its independence. It must be given inspiration and leadership as well, and if necessary the salutary warning of stern restraint. Let us remember too, but without prejudice, that ancient saying of Herodotus: "The Egyptians are a people incapable of gratitude, but singularly amenable to fear". Very definitely, of course, this no longer applies to Egypt as a whole, but it does still definitely apply to the type of Egyptian extremist, whether of Nazi or Communist sort, whom we are up against in these days of crisis. Let us face realities, and let us keep our own British principles above reproach.

I have recorded the preceding commentary partly for personal interest as an addition to my written reminiscences, and partly because I think it may be of possible interest in England in putting forward some aspects of the present situation in Egypt as it affects ordinary Egyptian people, British subjects, and retired British people there without official status, who have great difficulty in making their views known outside.

---

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PRESENT SITUATION IN CAIRO

AS NOTED FROM AN UNOFFICIAL ANGLE

15th September, 1954

ERRATA

Insert after the word "House" in Line 20 of Page 2:

"and because he is known to be on cordial terms,  
officially and personally, with the British Ambassador."

Insert after the word "themselves" in Line 3 of Page 3:

"Also one cannot fail to note an element of political  
hypocrisy in their attitude, as, for instance, in their  
opportunist adulation of certain Middle Eastern  
Governments whose regimes are still of "feudal" basis,  
and almost mediaeval in regard to legislation."

Insert after the word "exists" in Line 56 of Page 6:

"Illogically, however, Col. Nasser and Major Salem  
have drastically brought to a close the work of the  
United Committee for Aid to Arab Refugees, a work  
organized jointly by Egyptians and foreigners in  
Cairo. Nasser's pretext for closing this was that  
the work merely fostered "imperialistic propaganda."  
Committee members and sympathisers in some cases  
have even been arrested."