

## Conversations with Professor Philip James Allott

by  
Lesley Dingle<sup>1</sup> and Daniel Bates<sup>2</sup>

### Second Interview: The Foreign Office years (1960-1973)

Date: 22 February 2011

*Between February and April 2011, Professor Allott was interviewed five times at his room off stairway F at Trinity College to record his reminiscences of almost sixty years of a varied career which was spent initially in various capacities at the FCO, and in later years in the Faculty of Law at Cambridge.*

*The interviews were recorded, and the audio version is available on this website with this transcript of those recordings. The questions and topics are sequentially numbered in the three interviews for use in a database of citations made across the Eminent Scholars Archive to personalities mentioned therein.*

Interviewer: Lesley Dingle, **her questions and topics are in bold type**

Professor Allott's answers are in normal type.

Comments added by LD, *in italics*.

All footnotes added by LD.

**22. Professor Allott, in our previous interview on Friday last week, talking about the earlier part of your career, we reached your involvement with the ICJ Northern Cameroons case in 1963 and I wonder if we could complete the section on your time as a civil servant in the Foreign & Commonwealth Office and perhaps before we do that we might just pause in case there are any memories that you perhaps left out of the previous interview.**

Yes, I think there was quite an important one that I should've mentioned, which took place in 1962, which was my first conference at which I actually spoke on behalf of Her Majesty's Government. That was a heady moment of power and it was a conference in Meyrin in Switzerland, just near Geneva, near the border with France at the CERN headquarters<sup>3</sup>. It was a conference to establish what eventually became the European Space Research Organisation, ESRO. This had been the brainchild of a man called Harrie Massey<sup>4</sup>, an Australian, an immensely livewire Australian who actually had been a research student at this college, Trinity College, and he was the great moving spirit Harrie Massey. His research

---

<sup>1</sup> Foreign & International Law Librarian, Squire Law Library, Cambridge University

<sup>2</sup> Freshfields Legal IT Teaching and Development Officer, Faculty of Law, Cambridge University

<sup>3</sup> <http://public.web.cern.ch/public/>

<sup>4</sup> Sir Harrie Stewart Wilson Massey (1908-1983), Australian astronomer, physicist. Founding Chairman of the British National Committee for Space Research.



supervisor was Paul Dirac<sup>5</sup>, a very famous theoretical physicist at St John's, and I can't resist recalling a famous thing said about Dirac, who was an immensely silent man. It was said that his friends invented a unit of measurement called a Dirac, which was defined as one word per hour - I've known people like that and I've known academics like that. I was just thinking that I can't remember who said it about whom, it's completely irrelevant to this interview, but it was said of somebody that he was silent in five languages and I've known academics like that as well, it drives one mad.

Anyway, the European Space Research Organisation. We were there creating this thing, which was the convention establishing a body. At that conference I actually did speak on behalf of the British Government with scientists on the delegation and that led to a very strange thing, I think probably the following year. This was the creation of a body called the European Launcher Development Organisation, ELDO, and that arose because British engineers had designed a rocket called Blue Streak. I think it was originally military, but the military didn't want it. So, they said "Why don't we make this the first stage of a space launcher". We had sold that to the Europeans - that Blue Streak<sup>6</sup> would become the first stage of Europe's own space thing.

The Minister of Aviation at the time was Peter Thorneycroft<sup>7</sup>, who became a leading Conservative politician, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Defence and so on. I remember in Whitehall it was run by the Ministry of Aviation - he must've been Minister of Aviation. I've not forgotten, because it's in my favour, that on the Monday of one week the Minister of Aviation sent me a piece of paper giving the terms and conditions for participating in what they called "this club", and by Thursday I'd produced a complete convention, establishing this organisation, which slightly amazed them. I'd obviously copied it from other conventions of other organisations, but it was complete, from Article One, "there is hereby established" to "this convention shall enter into force".

We went to Strasbourg and stayed in a very grand hotel the Château Rouge with Peter Thorneycroft, who was a great *bon vivant*. If I may go anecdotal, he married as his second wife the Countess Roberti<sup>8</sup>, who was the mother of a boy I'd been at school with, Piero Roberti. She was one of the founders of *Venice in Peril*<sup>9</sup>, Lady Thorneycroft, and little Piero Roberti eventually succeeded to the countship and became Count Roberti and married,

---

<sup>5</sup> Paul Adrien Maurice Dirac, Professor, OM, FRS (1902-84), theoretical physicist, shared the Nobel Prize in physics for 1933 with Erwin Schrödinger

<sup>6</sup> An intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) designed in 1955 to replace the V bombers. The military programme was cancelled in 1960, and the rocket used as the first-stage of the European satellite launcher Europa tested at Woomera, Australia. Whole project finally cancelled in 1972.

<sup>7</sup> George Edward Peter Thorneycroft, Baron Thorneycroft CH, PC (1909-94), Conservative politician, Chancellor of the Exchequer (1957-58), Minister of Aviation (1960-62), Minister of Defence (1962-64), Secretary of State for Defence 1964.

<sup>8</sup> Carla Thorneycroft, Baroness Thorneycroft, DBE, OM (Italy) (1914-2007). Lady Thorneycroft was a noted philanthropist and patroness of the arts.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.veniceinperil.com/> For over 40 years, the Venice in Peril Fund has disbursed millions of pounds for the restoration of Venetian monuments, buildings and works of art.



would you believe, the daughter of the Graf von Stauffenberg<sup>10</sup>, who was executed following the plot against Hitler in 1944. I think Piero himself was killed in a ballooning accident. I can't remember the details of it.

There we were in Strasbourg with Peter Thorneycroft. We had marvellous meals, because he was keen on that sort of thing. So that was created. Eventually ESRO and ELDO were combined to form what is now the European Space Agency. Since about 1975 it's been called the European Space Agency<sup>11</sup>.

### 23. Berlin.

We have got to the stage [LD: *in previous interview* ] where I was just about to go to Berlin. In 1965 I became Legal Adviser to British Military Government, Berlin. Of course Berlin at that time was divided into the four sectors, British, French, American and Russian and we were in West Berlin, the three western sectors. East Berlin was supposedly the capital of what the Russians called the German Democratic Republic, which we didn't recognise as a state. We regarded it as the Soviet occupation zone of Germany. We had created the Federal Republic of Germany in our occupation zones, but for some reason we were able to say that that **was** a state and the German Democratic Republic wasn't. Eventually the House of Lords in the *Carl-Zeiss* case<sup>12</sup> held that the British courts could give effect to the legal acts of the GDR, even though the British government didn't recognise it as a state, on the very interesting ground that the GDR was the agent of the Soviet Union. So they managed to avoid undermining our non-recognition, but were able to give effect to the fact that the GDR was a vast state producing vast amounts of law.

There we were in West Berlin and of course this was the height of the Cold War. People nowadays who didn't live through it can't imagine what the Cold War was like. The whole world was divided in effect into two camps run by Washington and Moscow and there was a so-called Third World, which was more or less non-aligned, if it was not in one of those two camps. That meant that international relations for a while were incredibly simplified and obviously, now looking back, it was a state of total lunacy, because it was based on the ultimate nuclear deterrent, so that neither side could go too far in any direction in taking over other countries.

We in Berlin were an absolute hotspot, because Berlin was at the centre of the GDR surrounded by this Soviet Zone of occupation. The Russians had isolated Berlin in 1948, leading to the Berlin Airlift<sup>13</sup>, and in 1961 they'd caused the construction of a wall dividing the East and Soviet sector from the western sectors and it was always seen as a potential flashpoint. If the Soviets wanted to create trouble they would simply march into West Berlin, because they had twenty-one divisions stationed in East Germany and of course they could. We used to have exercises, military exercises, in West Berlin with scenarios based on having

---

<sup>10</sup> Konstanze (b. 27 January 1945). Claus Schenk Graf von Stauffenberg (1907-44) was the would-be assassin of Adolf Hitler, 20 July 1944

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.esa.int/SPECIALS/About\\_ESA/index.html](http://www.esa.int/SPECIALS/About_ESA/index.html)

<sup>12</sup> *Carl-Zeiss-Stiftung v. Rayner & Keeler, Ltd., Degenhardt & Co., Ltd., and Carl-Zeiss-Stiftung* (No. 2). Lord Reid, Lord Hodson, Lord Guest, Lord Upjohn, Lord Wilberforce. Date decided: 15 May 1966. [1967] 1 A.C. 853-978; [1966] 2 All E.R. 536-592; [1966] 3 W.L.R. 125; [1967] R.P.C. 497; (1966) 110 S.J. 425.

<sup>13</sup> June 1948 - May 1949



become a world diplomatic incident place. Completely laughable exercises obviously from the British point of view, but we had to draft statements of shock and horror at what the Soviets were doing and all that sort of thing and that was fun.

Our offices, the British Government offices, Military Government offices in Berlin were in the Olympic Stadium, which had been built for the 1936 Olympics and were in the building of the Sport Ministry, the Reich Sport Ministry - a great brutal, concrete thing, rather like the stadium itself. I had a very large office which was full of heavy German furniture, including, I remember, a grandfather clock that didn't work that had a big Swastika on the front of it. It never worked. I, at the time, had the equivalent rank of Lieutenant Colonel, which was a little bit unlikely given that I was only 28 and looked about 17, but we worked very closely with the army obviously, the occupying army. The head of the whole British thing was a General, whose name I now forget and his deputy was the senior Foreign Office person there, Deputy Commandant. Our offices were just beside the army's offices and that was the first time I'd been in close contact with the British Army. I came to admire, I must say, the way they worked, but there was a comical element in that they had a string of offices with the General at one end and a Corporal at the other end and in between was a Brigadier, and a Colonel and a Lieutenant and a Sergeant and the Corporal.

The way it used to work was that the General would utter something that would then be passed down this hierarchy and there was a marvellous Sergeant who actually did all the work. All the others were far too grand to work, but this tubby sergeant actually did everything. We had to work with them and we had endless meetings with them. They had a odd attitude to us. They occasionally started sentences with "Of course I'm only a soldier, but...", because they regarded us as in possession of higher wisdom and they being nuts and bolts people. It was an act, because they're extremely skilful in their own profession, but it was extremely interesting because the army in those days was a very social thing, very sociable. We had endless parties.

I remember we lived in a block, all the non-army staff, just beside the NAAFI<sup>14</sup>, the army supermarket, and there was nothing much else to do except have parties. We had an Officers Club just near us where we played tennis and we could go into East Berlin, we had allied rights, as they were called, to go into East Berlin in our cars. We couldn't go into East Germany beyond East Berlin and I can't remember what the basis of those rights was. I must have known since I was supposed to be the legal adviser, but we used to go into East Berlin more or less to prove these rights. We would go to the opera, the Staatsoper on Unter den Linden or go to the Brecht Theatre or something. Of course East Berlin was an infinitely miserable and sad grey place, and very poverty-stricken. That was a very peculiar life.

One would go from playing tennis and sweating, dashing in one's car to East Berlin and go to Wagner at the Staatsoper. The whole thing was full of terrible anxiety. I used to worry that somebody would slash our tyres in East Berlin and a great diplomatic incident would occur. [*Also*], driving from Berlin to Germany, the British Zone in Germany, one used to go down the remains of autobahns, but the East Germans had allowed the one to the west to collapse, the surface to collapse, and I used to worry dreadfully that, because they used to change the speed limit down to 20 kilometres an hour when there was a bad road that one day I would exceed the speed limit and will end up in Leipzig or somewhere as a prisoner of the East Germans.

---

<sup>14</sup> Navy, Army and Air Force Institutes



## 24. Which could have happened?

Very easily happened. So I did observe those speed limits. Obviously the whole place was shrouded in secret goings on because the Cold War had a second hidden war, a war of spying - there was a great deal of that. I remember meeting a famous East German lawyer called Wolf, who was a great one for organising spy exchanges. I did attend a spy exchange on the Glienicke Bridge<sup>15</sup> which was infinitely less glamorous than appears in the films, but to an anxious person like myself, it was a continuous worry.

Oh, another thing I remember is that during my time there, there were student riots in Berlin, West Berlin, because it was the beginning of that time of student riots all over Europe. They were really quite violent in Berlin, and one day I remember going with Christopher Mallaby<sup>16</sup>, who eventually became ambassador in Bonn and Paris, to the back room of a cinema in the Kurfürstendamm to talk to one of the leaders of these student riots. We must've got a telegram from the Foreign Office asking us to please establish what their aims and purposes were, these revolting students. These two ludicrously British people went and talked to these fierce students - I can't remember we got anything at all out of them, but I'm afraid that's the way we behaved.

Of course we read the East German newspaper *Neues Deutschland*, and we watched East German television and tried to form views about what was going on. Every Friday I would be driven to a meeting of the Legal Committee of the Allied Kommandatura in the American Sector<sup>17</sup> where I would meet the French and American legal advisors. The Russians didn't any longer come to that - we kept a place for them, but they didn't come. We never had much work to do, but again it was symbolically important that bodies of the Allied Kommandatura should meet.

The Russians only took part in two remaining things - Spandau Prison and the air control system in Berlin. In Spandau Prison for major German war criminals we, I and the American and the French and theoretically a Russian, were the Higher Executive Authority of Spandau Prison. We constituted the Higher Executive Authority and there were three major German war criminals remaining in my time: von Schirach<sup>18</sup>, Speer<sup>19</sup> and Hess<sup>20</sup>. We let two of them out in 1966, Von Schirach and Speer, and that left Hess as the only remaining person

---

<sup>15</sup> So-called "Bridge of Spies". Famous for the exchange of American pilot Francis Gary Powers and the KGB spy Rudolf Ivanovich Abel 10th February 1962.

<sup>16</sup> Sir Christopher Leslie George Mallaby, (b. 1936) ambassador Bonn (1988-92), ambassador Paris (1993-96).

<sup>17</sup> The Allied Kommandatura was located in Dahlem, sub-district of Zehlendorf, #16-18 Kaiserswerther Strasse / Thielallee. (vicinity of Berlins' Free University complex of Garystr. & Ihnestr.) The building, erected in 1928, was home of the main administration of the Public Fire Insurance organizations. On July 25, 1945, the building was occupied by the four victorious powers. The Soviets effectively left it in 1948 but the three western Allies, United States, United Kingdom and France continued work. With Berlin's reunification on October 3, 1990, the compound was turned over to Berlins' Free University.

<sup>18</sup> Baldur Benedect von Schirach (1907-74), Leader of Reich Youth, released 1<sup>st</sup> October 1966.

<sup>19</sup> Berthold Konrad Hermann Albert Speer (1905-1981). German architect, became Minister of Armaments and War Production for the Third Reich.

<sup>20</sup> Rudolf Walter Richard Hess (1894-1987). Adolf Hitler's Deputy the 1930s and early 1940s. He flew to Scotland to negotiate peace with the United Kingdom, but was held captive for the rest of the war. Sentenced to life imprisonment at Nuremberg.



in this vast prison. Just one person and we, the British, thought that this was a bit ridiculous, either he should be released or we should put him somewhere smaller. Well, the Russians objected constantly to that, they would never allow him to be released and of course he eventually died in Spandau Prison, Hess<sup>21</sup>. I remember drawing up on a piece of squared paper a little prison building to put in the courtyard of Spandau, just for one person with the usual facilities, but again the Russians wouldn't hear anything of that, he must remain in this echoing dark prison by himself and of course he went slightly odd.

Below us, as the Higher Executive Authority, there were people called Governors, Colonel Banfield was our governor and the American governor was called Eugene Bird<sup>22</sup>, I think. He became famous, because he'd become terribly friendly with Hess and wrote a book about it. That was really frowned upon by everybody and above all the American Government, but I've no doubt it sold extremely well.

I did see Hess in his cell, I didn't speak to him, he was not allowed to speak to us I don't think. There were warders he spoke to, and the Governors he spoke to. Etched on my memory is the sight of him - this gaunt man in his cell, standing at the far end of the cell, we standing outside, his being spoken to in the distance. The oddest feature about all the thing was quite unbelievable, namely every month we had a lunch in Spandau Prison to which guests could be invited. Each of the four powers was in charge of Spandau month by month and each of these lunches were catered by one of the four powers who was in charge that month. So we'd have Russian food one month and French food another month and there was a cocktail party before it in the prison. Most bizarre. Again the thought was that anything to get the Russians to come to things, so every four months there was an extremely vodka-filled lunch. I remember Mrs Banfield the wife of the governor saying "I always stand near a potted plant to get rid of the vodka", she felt that she couldn't simply refuse it. That was an extremely bizarre event.

The main excitement I remember was when a Russian fighter for some peculiar reason, ditched in a lake in the British sector and of course we hadn't had our hands on our Russian fighter to put it politely, so we took a fair amount of time to decide to return it. That was a major excitement, but we never actually had the ultimate diplomatic incident of the moving into West Berlin of the Soviets. I was there for three years until '68, '65 to '68.

**25. Professor Allott, '68 was the year of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, did you have any....?**

No, I didn't. It wasn't involved. I would have been if I'd still been advising that department in the Foreign Office, but I wasn't involved with that.

**26. I also wondered whether you experienced, in your department, much consternation or fallout as a result of the invasion by Russia of Czechoslovakia?**

Well, no, the events in '68, because we were very remote to be quite honest. For obvious security reasons, telegrams were not copied to us in Berlin unless they were relevant to us. I can't emphasise strongly enough that the atmosphere of secrecy was absolutely

---

<sup>21</sup> He committed suicide.

<sup>22</sup> Eugene K. Bird (1926-2005) wrote *The Loneliest Man in the World: The Inside Story of the 30-Year Imprisonment of Rudolf Hess* (1974) about his relationship with Hess.



overwhelming. One assumed that there were microphones everywhere and there was nothing much you could do about it. One also assumed every detail of one's private life was seen by somebody somewhere and one assumed that on our staff there were probably people who were recounting things to the East, because the East German secret police obviously were an extremely efficient lot, to put it very mildly.

One other tiny thing I remember is that the British lot all shared a German language teacher called Ingo Weber, and in my novels, called *Invisible Power*<sup>23</sup>, I've made Ingo the son of the countess in those novels. I've tried to pop in interesting people's names into the names of characters in those novels, but that's why that character is called Ingo.

## **27. Very interesting.**

I'm not sure I learned very much German. I read it, but I don't speak it very well, so I think we maybe just talked about things. I had an English secretary and a German secretary and a German legal adviser. The German secretary was a delightful woman called Frau Olivier from southern Germany, my English secretary was a daughter of somebody in the army and the German Legal Adviser was called Herr Kauffman who dealt with legal matters affecting the German system.

One other thing I'll mention is that they had an annual lawyers' Bar Association dinner in Berlin to which I went. I remember sitting beside an elderly man at one of those Bar Association dinners who told me that he'd been defence counsel for one of the defendants in the Nuremberg Tribunal. I think he defended Dr Schacht<sup>24</sup>, who had been head of the Reichsbank and economics minister under Hitler. I think Schacht was acquitted, one of the few people who was acquitted at Nuremberg, so this chap must've done a good job. He was a very nice charming chap, this defence counsel, but he obviously must've done a good job.

I have to say we also visited the awful prison, which by Freudian block I've forgotten the name of, where the most terrible executions took place, which I will not describe, under the Third Reich, but thank goodness I've forgotten the name of that, that was infinitely distressing.

So, that was an odd experience I have to say and the net result of it obviously was to convince me of a) the ludicrousness of the Cold War and b) the general horror of European history in the 20<sup>th</sup> century that this wonderful, cultured nation, who I came to admire even more there, could've been involved in this absolutely dreadful thing. Those had huge long term life effects and no question about it.

Then I may have forgotten something significant, but I'll go on now to the time I came back shall I?

## **28. Was that when you became the Adviser to the Arabian Department?**

Yes, in 1968 it must have been. I became the Adviser to the Arabian Department. That was quite an interesting time, because the British Government, Labour government,

---

<sup>23</sup> *Invisible Power: A Philosophical Adventure Story*, 2005, Xlibris; *Invisible Power 2: A Metaphysical Adventure Story*, 2008, Xlibris.

<sup>24</sup> Dr. Hjalmar Horace Greeley Schacht (1877-1970). President of the Reichsbank and Minister of Economics during Adolf Hitler's government.



announced that we were withdrawing from the Persian Gulf to save the costs of stationing British troops there, which I think was something ludicrous like £300,000 a year. We, the British, had been in the Persian Gulf since 1820. We were absolutely deeply involved in their history. We were very fond of them, all these rulers in the Persian Gulf, and they were very fond of us. They asked us not to leave, but we did.

That led to quite complicated problems, because there were all sorts of disputes, territorial disputes in the Persian Gulf, which had been pasted over for years and the British had enormous investments, oil investments, in the Persian Gulf. Since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century we'd been involved there in the oil industry and with the Americans. To be perfectly simple about it we did rather control all these little countries and we used to write for them the legislation applying to these oil companies. We had glamorous people called Political Agents, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, who were allegedly advising the rulers of these countries.

[*It was*] the most marvellous job really. They were ruling them, to be quite honest, these Political Agents at a time when the Foreign Office was full of, so called, Arabists. They went to a school in the Lebanon to learn to speak Arabic and probably to learn one or two other things which I won't mention. They knew all there was to be known about the Arab world and for old timers it's a great loss that they've all disappeared, those people. Now, with the fabulous problems of the Middle East, you would've thought they were quite important people.

Then the other thing we had to do was to decide what political organisation should succeed us in all these little countries. Also, we'd been involved, even in the bigger picture - creating Saudi Arabia and creating Iraq after the First World War, and deeply involved in the history of Iran, former Persia. So, it was a traumatic thing, suddenly disappearing. There were all these disputes, particularly the territorial disputes: ownership of islands, sea boundary disputes, and one of the main disputes was with Iran over some islands called Abu Musa and The Tumbs<sup>25</sup>.

These were claimed by Iran, but we said [*they*] belonged to one of the rulers. There were obviously oil reserves around these islands, so it was quite important who they belonged to. That led to one of the greatest excitements, because there were two American oil companies interested, one Buttes Oil & Gas and the other Occidental Petroleum - and I have to be careful what I say, because, would you believe, there are still ongoing legal proceedings. A former student of mine said "I've been reading a letter of yours about that dispute and how could you have written such a letter". I was staggered that under the 30 year rule he'd been able to read this, because there's a famous exception to the rule under which government documents are available to the public after 30 years, the exception is "except in relation to ongoing disputes with other countries". So, I was staggered that he'd read this. I refused to comment to him in any way, he being involved in the current legal proceedings.

Occidental Petroleum was run by an extraordinary man called Armand Hammer<sup>26</sup>, and Buttes Oil & Gas was run by some man whose name I forget now, I think called Ely<sup>27</sup>. We had to decide which of these two companies to prefer. Again I've got to choose my

---

<sup>25</sup> In the Straits of Hormuz, occupied by Iran in 1971

<sup>26</sup> Armand Hammer (1898-1990). American business tycoon most closely associated with Occidental Petroleum.

<sup>27</sup> John Boreta. Ely was Buttes' extremely wily legal counsel.





language rather carefully and there came a moment when, I think it was Occidental Petroleum, had a drilling platform which was making its way towards one of these islands. Of course Iran took a dim view of this and that was probably the most exciting moment. We had to decide whether to stop an American vessel on the high seas. The Royal Navy, I remember it was a ship called the HMS *Yarnton*<sup>28</sup>, did stop this vessel, and for some reason I can't remember the detail now, I may be Freudianly blocking this as well, Iran threatened to occupy these islands and we had to decide whether to stop Iran.

So, we were within inches of a little war with Iran. At that point, although I was relatively senior, I did start consulting higher up in the office, the chief Legal Adviser, because we were sending dramatic notes about all this and one just hoped one had got the law right! We'd decided whose the territorial waters they were and how far they extended and we'd drawn maps. We went eventually up to the Foreign Secretary who had to be involved in these rather exciting matters, I think it was Alec Douglas-Home<sup>29</sup>. It led to vast proceedings in the courts, up to the House of Lords<sup>30</sup>, and then proceedings also in the United States between these oil companies, but I think I'd better not say anything more about all that, because a) I'm very conveniently failing to remember and b) it's still very sensitive apparently, because particularly Abu Musa and The Tumbs are still in dispute I believe, over their ownership. Of course the situation of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf is now it's so fraught and so dangerous that one has to be very careful.

**29 I just wonder whether you feel that British foreign policy has contributed to the current very complex situation we find today, or do you think that it was just inherent in the circumstances of the Middle East?**

Well, I think both things are true. Ideally it would've been infinitely desirable that we remain there, but on the other hand Britain's situation had changed so greatly - the two world wars more or less destroyed Britain. I always say we lost both of them, both those wars, so it is true we couldn't afford to go on pretending that we were an imperial power. In a sense, it would've been extremely desirable that we did, because we were terribly experienced, we knew everybody and we were very fond of these places, but we had to decide. I remember we organised a mediation, which occupied a lot of my time. We got some gentleman in, I'm ashamed to say I've forgotten his name at the moment, to mediate one of the territorial disputes, not Abu Musa and Tumbs, but one involving two others of the states. Lawyers had to be appointed on both sides to represent them and I've forgotten what the outcome of that mediation was, but that was interesting - constructing a mediation. That defused, as mediations always do, a very embarrassing situation. Lawyers for the two sides had to produce vast documents giving the whole history really of the Persian Gulf since 1820, but I

---

<sup>28</sup> A minesweeper, 365 tons, built 1956, scrapped 1986.  
[http://www.oldships.org.uk/SHIPS/SHIP\\_HTM/Yarnton.htm](http://www.oldships.org.uk/SHIPS/SHIP_HTM/Yarnton.htm)

<sup>29</sup> Sir Alexander Frederick Douglas-Home (1903-1995). Foreign Secretary 1960-63 & 1970-74

<sup>30</sup> Dispute relates to 1969-73. House of Lords. *Buttes Gas and Oil Co. And Another, Respondents v Hammer and Another, Appellants. Buttes Gas and Oil Co. And Another, Appellants v and Hammer and Another, Respondents*. See annotated judgment at [1982] A.C. 888 and [1981] 3 All ER 616. See Jones 1982 *Virginia JI Int Law*, 22, 433-478.



was not physically involved in the mediation once we'd set it up, so I can't remember much about what came out of it.

One of the most interesting things is we had to decide the political future, and indeed the constitutional future, of these places. We decided eventually to set up a thing called the United Arab Emirates, and I've got to be careful what I say about this, because we had some fun choosing the name of the United Arab Emirates. Well, I won't say any more about that, but there were 100 things you could've called them and the United Arab Emirates meant that they sat quite near us in UN bodies, beginning with U, which probably was one of the considerations. Whenever I go past the Emirates Stadium<sup>31</sup> on the way to London, I [*have*] a slightly possessive feeling about it.

That was one little group of them and then there was Bahrain. I remember we advised against him calling himself king, the ruler of Bahrain, I think he is now called king. [*Also*] there were the other ones down the other end, including Muscat and Oman, which were a terribly glamorous part of British imperial history - the Trucial Scouts, the British local military presence from the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Very glamorous - T E Lawrence<sup>32</sup> stuff - and Muscat and Oman where we ran the little army. I must say, for those of us who are rather fond of British imperial history, this was the most delightful thing to be involved in, although it was terribly sad. Really, one was experiencing a bit of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and regretting that this was happening. A certain amount of trouble has followed since.

**30. Your earliest publication dates from that time - that was your *Language, Method and the Nature of international law in the British Yearbook*<sup>33</sup>. Was it difficult to publish articles while you were still a civil servant?**

Well, I no doubt had to show it to somebody, [*although*] I can't remember showing to anybody, that article. I hope the first footnote gives my status - Legal Counsellor, Foreign & Commonwealth Office and that this article reflects only the views of the author, you know, the sort of thing you put in. Since it was extremely abstract and theoretical, I always regarded that as a bit comical, because I don't think Her Majesty's Government had many views on the theoretical basis of international law. I can't remember now why on earth I wrote it, but it was already the beginning of, as it were, my own view of international law. In an odd sort of way that article's been quite influential in that there came into international law a strand of what nowadays is called post-modernism. The article was called *Language something.....*

**31. *Language, Method and the Nature of International Law*.**

That's right, *Language, Method and the Nature of International Law* and of course the turn towards language is very much part of post-modernism and to treat international law as a linguistic phenomenon. I think it was probably the first time that had been done. Many people obviously have gone much further with that since. So, that was rather an odd event.

With Arabian Department in the Foreign Office, I became very, very close to the people in that department, of whom I was extremely fond. The Head of the department was

---

<sup>31</sup> Home of Arsenal Football Club in north London

<sup>32</sup> Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Edward Lawrence (1888-1935). British Army officer renowned for his role during the Arab Revolt against Ottoman Turkish rule (1916-18).

<sup>33</sup> 1971. *Language, method and the nature of international law*. *British Yearbook of International Law*, 79-135.



Antony Acland<sup>34</sup> who became Provost of Eton after he retired from the Diplomatic Service, and I remember David Miers<sup>35</sup> who became British Ambassador in The Hague and Stephen Egerton<sup>36</sup> who became British Ambassador in Rome, and who had been almost a contemporary with me here at Trinity. I remember he had the rooms under the clock in Trinity. That was a very nice feature of the job - one was working with people, really excellent people, whom one really liked.

When I came back, when I gave up that, I then became involved, from 1971 I suppose, with the European Union business.

### **32. You were the UK Permanent Representative?**

Well, eventually yes, but during the negotiation of the Treaty of Accession, I was part of the London team negotiating the Treaty.

Ian Sinclair, chief legal adviser, spent most of his time in Brussels doing the actual negotiating, so, as you can imagine it was a fabulously complicated business, because the eventual Treaty of Accession was an enormous document and it involved almost every Whitehall department. We had enormous, endless meetings trying to agree instructions to be sent to Brussels and that was terribly difficult and urgent work.

I was just thinking, on one occasion [*there*] was a meeting at 9.30 one morning in the Home Office to discuss what should be the position of the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man in relation to the European Union. I remember that morning getting to the office thinking I don't know anything about the existing status of the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, which is very obscure. So I looked in Chambers's Encyclopaedia and discovered the very odd nature of their status - the Channel Islands not being really part of the United Kingdom, but being a possession of The Queen, in a way. But we had to decide what to put in the Protocol on the status. I went along to the Home Office and no doubt looked thoughtful and wise, and it turned out to be quite controversial, that protocol, because they, the Channel Islands, the Isle of Man got a considerably advantageous position, not full members of the European Communities, but with some of the better advantages of the European Community. So, it turned out to be quite successful.

The highlight of that for me was we then had to draft the legislation to take us into the European Communities, what turned out to be the European Communities Act 1972. That involved many Whitehall departments, but the constitutional side of it, I think it's fair to say was more or less done by me and a man from the Lord Chancellor's office, as it was then called, called Karl Newman<sup>37</sup>. Obviously the problem was the famous problem of how on earth you introduce into the British legal system a new source of law, and a source of law,

---

<sup>34</sup> Sir Antony Arthur Acland (1930-) Diplomat (1953-91), Provost of Eton 1991-2000. Head of Arabian Department, 1970-72. Also, incl. Ambassador to Luxembourg, 1975-77, to Spain, 1977-79; Deputy Under-Secretary of State, FCO, 1980-82, Permanent Under-Secretary of State, FCO, and Head of Diplomatic Service, 1982-86; Ambassador to Washington 1986-91. Acland is a vocal opponent of the United Kingdom's entry into the euro.

<sup>35</sup> Sir David Miers CMG, (1937-). Ambassador to Lebanon (1983-85), Greece (1993-96), Netherlands (1996-2001).

<sup>36</sup> Sir Stephen Loftus Egerton (1932-2006). Diplomat (1956). Ambassador to Iraq (1980-82), Saudi Arabia (1986-89), Italy (1989-92)

<sup>37</sup> Karl Newman (1919-2001)



which, very strictly speaking overrides English law, including Acts of Parliament. That was a bit of a tall order from a constitutional point of view. Needless to say it has had a vast subsequent history. So we had to write instructions for parliamentary counsel on the drafting of this Bill, and to my dying day I will remember the meeting that we went to in the offices of the Chief Parliamentary Counsel who was called Sir John Fiennes<sup>38</sup> - beautiful offices in Whitehall. An afternoon meeting, 2.30, when he produced the first draft of the European Communities Act with the utterly brilliant, genius level Section 2, which gives effect to Community law, and another little section, which includes section 2.4, which gives overriding effect, but concealed behind some very complex words<sup>39</sup>. We saw at once and were struck silent by the brilliance. He was a famously clever chap, who did the Ximenes crossword in *The Observer*<sup>40</sup> in ten minutes or something, brilliant man. I'm afraid he had a nervous breakdown later, because the strain on him was immense.

So, he produced this little Bill with very few clauses and we didn't change it. It was so clever and it went through Parliament without a comma being changed. An immense constitutional event. I think I can probably dare to say now that the White Paper we had to produce describing the effect of all these things contained a sentence which made me consider resigning from the Foreign Office. Karl Newman drafted this sentence, which said "this legislation will not affect the sovereignty of Parliament". Well, I knew perfectly well that it did, unless you had a very complex view of the situation. Obviously it would affect the sovereignty of Parliament. So, I did ponder. The Lord Chancellor<sup>41</sup> thought it was absolutely essential to say this, because parliament would have exploded. I did actually ponder whether I really ought to resign, since I was agreeing to this sentence, but I didn't. It went through Parliament, incredibly, without anything being changed.

That was a very exciting time, because every day we were facing new problems and giving instructions to the people.

### **33. Quite a frenetic time it must have been.**

Oh it really was and it was all done very rapidly. The *Treaty of Accession*<sup>42</sup> was fabulously complicated, hundreds of issues including famous things like fisheries rights,

---

<sup>38</sup> Sir John Fiennes (1911-1996)

<sup>39</sup> 2.4. The provision that may be made under subsection (2) above includes, subject to Schedule 2 to this Act, any such provision (of any such extent) as might be made by Act of Parliament, and any enactment passed or to be passed, other than one contained in this Part of this Act, shall be construed and have effect subject to the foregoing provisions of this section; but, except as may be provided by any Act passed after this Act, Schedule 2 shall have effect in connection with the powers conferred by this and the following sections of this Act to make Orders in Council and regulations.

As in *European Communities Act 1972*, amended by subsequent European Communities (Amendment) Acts, including the *European Communities (Amendment) Act 2002*.

<sup>40</sup> Ximenes was the crossword pseudonym of Derrick Somerset Macnutt (1902-1971). Ximenes was the successor of Torquemada, grand inquisitor of the Spanish Inquisition

<sup>41</sup> Quintin McGarel Hogg, Baron Hailsham of St Marylebone (1907 - 2001) in Edward Heath's Conservative administration.

<sup>42</sup> For full text of Treaty of Accession of the United Kingdom to the European Communities, see: <http://www.eurotreaties.com/eurotexts.html#ukaccession>



which have been terribly controversial since creating a Common Fisheries Policy. I have honestly to say that a lot of them one could not understand - just in a day or two you couldn't possibly understand all these things we were dealing with.

Ian Sinclair, a man I admire enormously, had the job of negotiating them. He was a very quiet Scottish man and a terribly successful negotiator. He had a famous group of people from the Board of Trade, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries and so on, this little group of, I think, about five people, notorious negotiators in Brussels, tough as old boots. They probably did quite a good job for the British, and as I mentioned last time, the British take all these things infinitely seriously - not a single word would be not thought about.

**34. During this time, Professor Allott, did you or your colleagues interact with any political figures?**

No. Edward Heath was the Prime Minister, but he was too busy to deal with the details. I'm trying to remember who the Lord Chancellor was and I simply can't remember. No. At the very highest level there were political considerations, but this just had to be dealt with technically by civil servants.

**35. Was there a great celebration once this was achieved?**

No. It was achieved eventually at the end of '71 or early '72, because then I was posted to Brussels as the Legal Counsellor in the British Permanent Representation to the European Communities before we joined.

We became a member on 1 January 1973, but we had before that nine months of what was called, I think, a transitional period [*LD: interim period*] where we were present at all the meetings of the European Communities, physically present, but we were not legally parties. I was the first Legal Counsellor in the Permanent Representation for this period and the Bill was still going through parliament when I was in Brussels. I must have gone out right at the moment when the negotiation ended.

The then Foreign Office Chief Legal Adviser, Vincent Evans<sup>43</sup> [*had*] his room next door to mine in the Foreign Office and one afternoon he and I happened to meet outside our doors. He said "Would you mind going to Brussels next week?" and I said "Well, I've just bought a house near Cambridge and it would be extremely inconvenient". He said "Well, it is quite important, if you possibly could". So, I did, and abandoned the house and came back to it later. The Bill was going through Parliament, because we got a telegram from the Foreign Office one day saying members of Parliament are a bit agitated because they can't understand how the European Communities work. There were almost no books, nothing on it. Nobody knew, I didn't know and they said "Could you possibly, by tomorrow morning, give us a statement on how the institutions work, to be laid in the House of Commons' library?".

Somehow I had to get to work. I didn't really know how the Council and the Commission and the Court and all these bodies worked, and the European Parliament, and as I say there were almost no books. There were one or two books in French, which we had in the Delegation. We sent this paper saying how they worked and that presumably is still in the House of Commons' library somewhere. I dread to look at it, it's almost certainly wrong, but it seemed a reasonable request by members of Parliament, since these bodies were about to

---

<sup>43</sup> Sir William Vincent John Evans, GCMG, MBE, QC, (1915-2007). Judge of the European Court of Human Rights (1980-91).



become rather powerful in Britain. It was a reasonable to know how on earth they worked - how is the voting system and all that.

Another thing I remember on a smaller scale was that, as you know, all the documents in the European Communities have a national colour - the German ones are all in yellow and the French ones are in blue. There came a delightful moment when we had to decide in what colour to have the English documents. I remember going along one afternoon to a meeting in the European Commission where we would decide this. There were various suggestions and I think I'm right, I may be inventing this, but I think I did choose purple, which is the colour that they are in, for obvious, imperial reasons. I like to think that, it may be that really there was in the end no choice, but Monsieur Lelouche, the chap who ran Publications Division, well he ran many other things in the Commission, but including that, held this meeting with only the Head of Publications Office. That's one of my real only material achievements.

We worked very closely with the Legal Adviser of the Commission and the Legal Adviser of the Council, there were two. The one who was there when I arrived then retired, but the one who took over was a marvellous man called Claus Ehlermann<sup>44</sup>, a German, and the Legal Adviser of the Council was Puissochet<sup>45</sup>, who became a Judge on the International Court. They were marvellous, intelligent people, but were not terribly inclined to tell us anything about how anything worked. For obvious reasons they didn't want us to do it too well. It was extremely laborious, discovering. One day I said to them "the House of Commons says that we accept all the treaties concluded by the communities, Britain accepts them, but could we please know what these treaties are?". They said "Well, we've never made a list of them before, we can't really tell you what they are". I said "Well, it's quite important since Britain is about to be bound by all these treaties concluded with third countries and so on". They did produce the first list ever of the vast numbers of agreements concluded by the Communities with other countries and so on, and then eventually there was a sort of Communities treaties series.

I was so amused. And then I remember once going along and saying "I've come across this regulation, this is backdated". I said "I'm terribly sorry in British Law you cannot backdate laws, it's against the fundamental principle of the Rule of Law". They said "Oh well we sometimes do that, we sometimes backdate things if it's necessary". I'd formed the view that we think we're terribly pragmatic and the Continentals think we're very pragmatic lawyers, but it turned out that the British are much more formalistic than the Continentals. They don't really care very much what's in any of these things. We care desperately about every single word. I was amazed at that, we had always regarded them as madly formalistic lawyers, but it was the British Civil Service tradition that you didn't simply accept things. They've got to be right, and so they discovered that we went through everything with a fine toothcomb. [It was] the British who invented two Parliamentary Committees, European Scrutiny Committees. We were the first to do it, and to this day they look through every draft Community act. The reports of those Parliamentary Committees are read all over Europe, because they are a very good analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of every projected piece of legislation. That was a great discovery for me. We turned out to be much more serious about all these things and that's partly because of Parliament. Accountability of the Government to Parliament is a very real thing in Britain. A lot of time in Government departments is spent preparing answers to Parliamentary Questions. That's a very laborious

---

<sup>44</sup> Claus-Dieter Ehlermann (b. 1931-) Professor of Economic Law, European University Institute, Florence

<sup>45</sup> Jean-Pierre Puissochet



business, because you have to imagine the supplementary questions as well, so the Minister goes in with a little booklet as it were, and there's a row behind the Ministers in the House of Commons where some civil servants sit. This is quite a frightening business, because the Minister can turn round and say "What the dickens does that mean?" Well, he wouldn't do that personally, but his sidekick would. Parliamentary Questions are taken enormously seriously by ministers. I remember ministers quivering before going into Parliamentary Questions, because they're on show and to be made to look stupid is terrible.

In Brussels we would get lots of these [*enquiries*] "the minister has to answer this question. What is the answer?" And that's very difficult, because you've got to get it right.

### **36. Do you regret the entry into the EU or do you still think it was a good thing?**

Well, I've always had two views on it, really. I'm passionately keen on European integration in a general sense - we belong together, the countries of Europe. But I'm fairly passionately against this immensely statist body that the European Communities are. They've been mostly made by the French and the Germans, strictly speaking, and to put it politely they have a very different history, experience of government. Germany really had a little moment of democracy in 1918, but really has only had democracy since whenever it is, 1950 something, and the French through all their different revolutions have a very different experience of democracy. So, they've never really been able to understand why the British are so sceptical about the European Union as it is. A lot of us, particularly the British ruling class, are very fond of European countries and very fond of European culture, but we're bitterly opposed to excessive government and unaccountable government.

Oddly enough, it probably won't go on your tape, but next week I'm going to speak to the all party Parliamentary Committee on the Constitution, about this European Union Bill that's before Parliament at the moment and which raises awful constitutional problems. There I will have an opportunity to say that on the one hand, [*while*] on the other hand we've got ourselves into the most frightful mess constitutionally in the European Union<sup>46</sup>.

Back to Brussels. The main point I was going to make, which I mentioned in passing earlier last time, is what a joy what I call multilateral diplomacy is, both in the UN and in the EU, because the EU, as it's now called, obviously [*involved*] millions of meetings. It is essentially run by a thing called the Committee of Permanent Representatives, which are the ambassadors, a very powerful body. The Council more or less rubberstamps what the Committee of Permanent Representatives, so called COREPER, decides.

COREPER therefore was the main activity. Every day of the week it was a different topic, and so one had to advise our Permanent Representative on things one hardly understood. I always say that when I left, I left in my in-tray a request for advice on something called Monetary Compensation - monetary compensatory amounts in the Common Agricultural Policy. I simply couldn't understand [*them*], and when I came to lecture on the subject here in Cambridge, I made an effort to understand what monetary compensatory amounts were, but I'm not sure ever fully understood it. These [*were*] very difficult things.

---

<sup>46</sup> See summary of the evidence presented: [http://www.consoc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/1321376410\\_magicfields\\_document\\_file\\_6\\_1.pdf?keyword=allott](http://www.consoc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/1321376410_magicfields_document_file_6_1.pdf?keyword=allott)  
see also <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmeuleg/633/633ii.pdf>



COREPER had hundreds of working groups under it, doing the real nitty gritty, because the COREPER were rather grand people, ambassadors. You spent your life in these. In those days it was 9 member states and now it's 26 or 27 or whatever it is. That was a delightful activity, conducted in English and French. You obviously got to know people well. At the end of the table would sit the Commission people and the Council people and I have to say I enjoyed that immensely - a) we had the advantage that very often we were working in English, which is wicked, because it gives you huge advantage as in the UN and b) as in the UN, it involves all your personality, trying, to put it crudely, getting things past people from other countries, and that may involve saying "Good morning" nicely to them. As in the Delegates' Lounge in the UN, the nature of diplomacy [*is that*] you've got to always be trying to influence people. I became a bit notorious, because I would say things like "I think as a matter of good English it would be a good idea to put "will" instead of "shall"" The ones who are more on the ball would notice that this had an enormous effect and that I had an instruction in front of me, which said on no account would the word "will" be acceptable or "shall" be acceptable - you had to put it in such a way.

Forgive me for going off track a bit, but I remember a famous occasion that I heard about, I wasn't involved in it, on the Subsidiarity Article in the draft Constitution. The British one day appeared, I think it was the British Foreign Secretary, and said "We would like to divide this article into two or perhaps three paragraphs". All the other people say "Oh my God what on earth is the Foreign Secretary involving himself in ridiculous things like that". It went through and the article eventually came in three paragraphs. The British had noticed that if you divided it into three paragraphs, the second paragraph didn't refer to the first and it was hugely important. Of course they didn't explain that, but I use that as an example of the things you could do, and then send a telegram in the evening saying we managed to get this, that and the other. You all waited for the famous Foreign Office telegram the following morning saying "You spoke well". That was the indication that somebody had noticed.

I must say I loved that and miss it terribly - it involved the whole of you. You spent vast amounts of time doing that and civil servants would come out from London for those meetings, very, very specialist civil servants would come out. Forgive me if I've mentioned this before, but it always amused me that in the early days they came very reluctantly - "What are we going to this foreign place for, to discuss matters which are entirely our business and we've no need, our system is perfect, on some detailed matter. What are we doing discussing this with all these foreigners". They came in rough, ordinary working suits, then it all gradually changed. They liked coming on a shuttle from London and suddenly they thought it was rather nice talking to all these foreigners, because by and large they used to win most things. Then they started wearing better suits and fitting in to the international game. It was so funny and of course they became very good at it, because they were very, very knowledgeable about their own [specialty], and with parliamentary accountability, they knew that they had to defend this when they got back home, while very often the foreign civil servants don't have to defend it to anybody. Their Minister would have to get up into Parliament and say "We did rather well in Brussels, we got this text in this Directive" or something. It's amazing the discipline of parliamentary accountability is a very real thing. I don't know now whether it's still true, but it certainly was true then. That was what it was like - there were lots of parties there, endlessly, because there were all the embassies in addition to all the Permanent Representations.

I went to Luxemburg once or twice to the European Court, [*but*] I was never involved in a case there at that time.





**37. Did you have much time to write during this period, I know that you published in 1972 your *International Court of Justice in International Disputes*<sup>47</sup>?**

I did write an article - actually in French for the *Annuaire Français* because my French opposite number (gosh I've forgotten his name) was one of the editors. He got me to write this enormously long article in French on European law in the United Kingdom<sup>48</sup>. I don't know how on earth I did that. He was a remarkable chap - very clever - from the Ecole Nationale d'Administration, which was wonderfully arrogant intellectually.

Oh Daniel Vignes, yes, that's right - a very clever chap - and I loved him because he was exactly in the French academic tradition. I remember him once saying in some speech that he was making "And ninthly", because the French tend to put things in order. "And ninthly", I think he said, which of course the British were incapable of doing such things. I went back and more or less the following week came to Cambridge.

I think I'll perhaps just say one word about leaving the Foreign Office. I don't quite know how it happened now. It was partly because there was a great family problem, which I won't go into, partly that I did see, I must've been 36 at the time, that I had been a bit lucky in the things that I'd done, and it's not likely that I would have done such interesting things for the 25 years remaining. In those days you just went up step by step, it may be different now, but you knew where you would be in 10 years time, 20 years time and so on. Also I decided to stand for Parliament.

I'd got permission from the Personnel Department to take part in local politics in Hampstead where I lived, and when I went back to London was going to do that in Hampstead, in the Borough of Camden in London. Obviously you can't take part in national politics when you're a senior civil servant, and I thought, it seems mad now, that being an academic would be a source of income while I was looking for a seat to get into Parliament. Of course as soon as I got here I discovered that being an academic was rather a full time job. I thought from the time I was an undergraduate that you just messed around for eight weeks and then all the rest of the time you're free.

So I never did stand for Parliament, which of course is another of the might-have-beens of one's life. I came here and discovered that it was extremely arduous, but it was almost from week to week - I think I left Brussels, and more or less the following week came here. I have to say that they were extremely nice in Brussels, extremely reluctant to let me go and there again they were marvellous people. The head of the Mission was Sir Michael Palliser<sup>49</sup>, whose wife was the daughter of the famous Belgian Foreign Minister, who more or less founded the European Communities. Stupidly I've forgotten his name<sup>50</sup>, and the Head of Chancery was a man who played rugby for Scotland.

---

<sup>47</sup> 1972. The International Court of Justice, in *International Disputes – the Legal Aspects* (David Davies Memorial Institute;1972).

<sup>48</sup> 1973. Le Royaume-uni et le droit des communautés européennes, XIX *Annuaire français de droit international*, 35-101.

<sup>49</sup> Sir Arthur Michael Palliser (b.1922 - ) Ambassador and UK Permanent Representative to EEC (1973-75), Head of Diplomatic Service, FCO (1975-82).

<sup>50</sup> Paul Henri Charles Spaak (1899 - 1972). His daughter was Marie M. Spaak (d. 2000).



The last anecdote is a painful one. He was extremely kind and more or less tried to prevent me leaving, but once I'd started here I remember being in London one day, waiting for a bus outside Charing Cross station. It was pouring with rain and I was utterly miserable. I looked across the road, and across the road is the headquarters of Coutts Bank and this chap who had been head of Chancery in Brussels, who is now Chairman of Coutts Bank<sup>51</sup>. I thought isn't life odd? Here's me, a pathetic little figure waiting in the rain and there is he, the head of Coutts Bank, which is The Queen's bank. But then that's how life organises matters.

I've probably forgotten things, but perhaps we could stop there?

**38. Well, thank you so much Professor Allott for a marvellous account. I'm looking forward very much to covering your time in Cambridge in our next interview.**

Which is a completely different character.

---

<sup>51</sup> Sir Ewen Alastair John Fergusson, (b 1932), capped five times for Scotland. Ambassador to South Africa (1982-84) and France (1987-92). Chairman of Coutts (1993-99), Savoy Hotel Group (1994-98), and Rugby School (1995-2002). Trustee of the National Gallery (1995-2002).

