Article:
Richardson, A orcid.org/0000-0002-1925-142X (2019) Orme Sargent, Ernest Bevin and British Policy Towards Europe, 1946–1949. International History Review, 41 (4). pp. 891-908. ISSN 0707-5332

https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2018.1454492

Sir Orme Sargent, Ernest Bevin and British Policy Towards Europe, 1946-1949

1. Introduction

'Must be kinda queer for a chap like you to see a chap like me sitting in a chair like this?'[1] While it might seem almost comical in retrospect, for many Ernest Bevin's opening remark to Gladwyn Jebb during their first formal meeting following his appointment as Foreign Secretary hit the nail on the head. Many senior officials in the Foreign Office were concerned at the appointment of the Labour man who they feared would cast them aside as many on the left of the Labour party wanted.[2] Despite their work in the wartime coalition, there had not been a Labour government since 1931 and the Ministers that the Foreign Office had worked with during the war had been Conservatives, notably the Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, and the Prime Minister, Winston Churchill. The future for the mandarins with this unknown quantity was uncertain. As Robert Bruce Lockhart, Director of the Political Warfare Executive, noted during Eden's farewell party after the 1945 election, the mood of the Foreign Office was 'gloomy'.[3]

For Sir Orme Sargent, the Deputy Under-Secretary in the Foreign Office, these feelings of uncertainty were evident in his characteristic pessimism. According to Bruce Lockhart, Sargent was in 'the murkiest gloom on account of the Labour victory in the election'.[4] His colleague Pierson Dixon, later Britain's representative to the United Nations, similarly noted that Sargent was 'in the depths of gloom' fearing - amongst other things - 'a weak foreign policy' and 'a private revolution at home'.[5] The Labour victory of 1945 clearly filled this career diplomat with dread. However, once installed in office Bevin pleasantly surprised his new officials. Sir Alexander Cadogan, the Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office, felt that Bevin was the 'heavyweight' of the Cabinet and that if he could be 'put on the right line' it would be good for the Foreign Office.[6] The officials were beginning to warm to their new political master and the feeling was mutual. But the thaw in opinion is

most clearly seen with Sargent. In his understated manner, he opined that after seeing Bevin in action the Foreign Secretary had 'not only been behaving reasonably but also had quite sensible views and a sensible policy of his own'.[7] This appreciation of Bevin would continue for the rest of Sargent's working life and, in retirement, he reflected that 'by comparison with any of his predecessors he considered Bevin a great foreign secretary'.[8] This was some praise from a man who had worked for every Foreign Secretary from 1906 to 1949.

It is this developing relationship and the reasons behind it that are the aim of this article to uncover. In exploring the relationship, it will become clear that Sargent and Bevin were driven by similar motivations in their conception of British foreign policy. Despite coming from very different backgrounds, a congruence in their views occurred. Any differences that did emerge were often over method or speed of movement rather than aim as Bevin on occasion displayed an initial reluctance for the path suggested by Sargent. Nonetheless, Bevin often took the advice given by his Permanent Under-Secretary. Both men had clear ideas in 1945 on the direction of British foreign policy but the immediate post-war years saw them become increasingly pragmatic. Behind the policy formulation, however, was a relationship of both a professional and personal nature. Bevin was prepared to back the Foreign Office in internal power squabbles in a way its staff had not seen for decades. This earned him the respect of his officials, many of whom had been initially sceptical of the Labour man. The article will conclude by reflecting upon the personal relationship that blossomed between the two men, showing that the traditional view that Sargent and Bevin did not get along is incorrect.

Despite the mutual respect and friendship that developed between them, Sargent and Bevin came from very different backgrounds. In terms of his upbringing Sargent was similar to many of his generation in the Foreign Office. Prior to joining the Foreign Office, Sargent attended public school – in his case Radley College – before spending time abroad in

preparation for the Diplomatic Service examination which he passed in March 1906. His early career also echoed that of his peers. He spent time in the Foreign Office as a clerk and abroad at legations in continental Europe. It was following his return to Whitehall in 1925 that his career deviated from the norm. After then Sargent never left Britain for a post abroad, spending the final twenty four years of his career in Whitehall at the heart of British decision-making on policy towards Europe. He became Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office in February 1946 as his career culminated with him as the Foreign Secretary's chief advisor on foreign affairs.[9] Sargent's unbroken service from 1925 to 1949 in the Foreign Office was untypical. His senior colleagues often spent time at a postings abroad during their career while many of Sargent's predecessors as Permanent Under-Secretary concluded their careers with a posting overseas.[10] Given his length of continuous service in Whitehall, Sargent was definitely one of those individuals who Zara Steiner described as 'at the centre of the black box' of international history. [11] In contrast, Ernest Bevin had little formal education before beginning work at age 11. He was one of the founders of the Transport and General Workers Union, and became increasingly involved in politics throughout the inter-war period. Bevin became an MP in 1940 following his appointment by Churchill as Minister of Labour. He served with distinction in the wartime coalition and worked well with the Prime Minister, joining Churchill's War Cabinet.[12] Despite his lack of formal education, Bevin was hardly a novice in foreign affairs when he became Foreign Secretary in 1945. He has been involved in international trade union affairs for decades and was a member of Chatham House, having been on a visit to Australia for them prior to the Second World War.[13] During the war he was close to Eden and Churchill, occasionally being the Foreign Secretary's guest when entertaining foreign visitors. He was, as his Private Secretary Frank Roberts put it, 'no ignorant amateur' when he accompanied the new Prime Minister Clement

Attlee to Potsdam in summer 1945.[14] Nevertheless, by upbringing and life experiences Sargent and Bevin cut two contrasting figures.

Yet despite these differences, Sargent and Bevin were a lot closer in their views on foreign policy in summer 1945 than probably either of them recognised. At heart both of them believed in the guiding principles that British policy needed to be defined by British interests and that Britain was still a great power. Their ideas for Britain and its role in post-war Europe were on similar lines. At the end of the war Sargent penned a memorandum which is regarded as seminal in Britain's self-analysis at the end of the conflict. The paper, 'Stocktaking after VE Day', was the result of Anthony Eden's request for a review of the general political situation. This memorandum offered the basis for Sargent's thinking during the final four years of his career. Instead of talking about a Four Power Plan or the United Nations, Sargent advocated that all problems arising out of the war should be dealt with by tri-partite co-operation between Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. He felt that this tripartite co-operation would give Britain a 'position in a world which we might otherwise find it increasingly difficult to assert and maintain'. In order to secure this, Britain had to increase its strength not just diplomatically, but also economically and militarily. To achieve this Sargent advocated the creation of a Western bloc led by Britain. This bloc would include France, the Dominions and lesser Western European powers. This, he felt, would compel the United States and the USSR to treat Britain as an equal. In Sargent's view Britain was and could still be a great power. The memorandum also made clear Sargent's career-long suspicion of the Soviet Union. In analysing the future foreign policy of Britain's tri-partite partners, more was written on the USSR and its desiderata, indicating strong misgivings as to the future. Britain needed her own policy and to stand by it – the western bloc gave that.[15] Sargent repeated his views in the autumn when he described Britain as 'Lepidus in the triumvirate with Mark Antony and Augustus'. Reiterating that the only way to build Britain's

position was to become ‘the great European power’, he returned to the idea of collaboration with France.[16] Once Britain had secured this position he felt that the USA and USSR were more likely to respect Britain. Ernest Bevin shared Sargent’s approach towards Europe. On his return from the Potsdam conference he spent time with his new colleagues in a series of meetings discussing British policy. In one of them he explained that his long-term policy was to ‘establish closer relations between this country and the countries on the Mediterranean and the Atlantic fringes of Europe’. Like Sargent, Bevin drew out France as a key part of his policy and for him it was ‘necessary to make a start with France’.[17] The key difference that emerged was one that defined the early Bevin – a reluctance to act before considering Soviet reactions or whether they would be upset. Sargent was much less concerned about that as he saw the Soviet menace more clearly, as indicated in ‘Stocktaking’. Nevertheless, it is apparent that both Sargent and Bevin had a similar conception of Britain’s place in Europe in autumn 1945. The shared belief surrounding Britain's position in the world allied to the notion of Britain’s great power status offered a guiding principle to both. This similarity of view helped them develop a strong working relationship and endear themselves to one another.

Scholarship on both Sargent and Bevin is in need of improvement. Traditionally when considering foreign policy the biographies of politicians, diplomats and some civil servants lead the way. If we think of Foreign Office civil servants there have been works on Sir Robert Vansittart and Eyre Crowe as well as Thomas Otte and Keith Neilson’s work on the office of the Permanent Under-Secretary.[18] If we consider diplomats there is, amongst others, Brian McKercher’s work on Esme Howard and that of Gaynor Johnson on Lord D'Abernon.[19] But despite these there are still gaps. The Otte and Neilson work only goes up to 1946 and in some cases this is all the work there is on some Permanent Under-Secretaries. Whilst there has been some work on the inter-war Foreign Office, the post-Second World War Foreign

Office still requires attention.[20] Orme Sargent therefore falls into this historiographic gap. His short tenure as Permanent Under-Secretary from 1946 to 1949 should not hide the fact that this was an important three year period; it was not simply an interlude before the events of 1949 and the 1950s. The one published study on Sargent by the late Keith Neilson only deals with a very short timeframe in Sargent's distinguished career, 1933-1939, using the official as a case study to demonstrate the significance of the individual in foreign policy decision-making.[21] While there are no other sole studies of Sargent, he does appear in some of the literature surrounding Britain's relationship with the Soviet Union during the Second World War. This scholarship shows Sargent's involvement in developing and trying to maintain a co-operative relationship with the USSR during the war.[22] Nevertheless, most mentions of Sargent after 1939 focus, inevitably, on offering some examination of his seminal 'Stocktaking' paper.[23] If Orme Sargent remains an enigma to historians, his colleagues were no better informed. Many of the comments on Sargent that do exist are mainly based on his personality. The best known of these is the quip by Sir Robert Vansittart that 'Orme Sargent was a philosopher strayed into Whitehall. He knew all the answers; when politicians did not want them he went out to lunch.'[24]

While Sargent has remained for the most part absent from the historiography, the role played by Ernest Bevin in British foreign policy has proved to be an area of contention. The assessment of his time as Foreign Secretary has seen two separate schools of thought emerge. The first argues that Bevin was one of Britain's greatest Foreign Secretaries. This is based on the premise that Bevin was a store of great ideas and was the originator of a lot of Britain's post-war foreign policy. It suggests that Bevin led the Foreign Office with a strength absent from the office for decades, making it once again the key player in the formation of British foreign policy. The key scholar behind this view was Alan Bullock, particularly in his third volume on Bevin which focused on the latter's time as Foreign Secretary. In this he described

Bevin as playing ‘as decisive a part in shaping policy as any Foreign Minister in modern times’.[25] This view was buttressed by the comments of Bevin's officials in the Foreign Office, including his Private Secretaries Sir Roderick Barclay and Sir Frank Roberts, and Sargent’s successor as Permanent Under-Secretary, William Strang.[26] However, a revisionist literature surrounding Bevin has also emerged, offering a critical appraisal of the traditional view. Instead of Bevin being a great man of British foreign policy, it suggests that he was took in by his permanent officials and converted to their views. Peter Weiler has argued this, suggesting that Bevin was at the mercy of the Foreign Office mandarins, simply becoming their mouthpiece.[27] Nevertheless, the debate and interest in Bevin shows no sign of abating and he is surely due a new biography. John Bew’s recent work on Clement Attlee shows that interest in the post-war Labour government endures.[28]

This article thus offers a first study on Orme Sargent during his time as Permanent Under-Secretary, subsequently filling an important gap in the existing historiography on the man himself, British policy formulation in the aftermath of the Second World War and Britain’s relations with Europe. The article also builds on the existing literature surrounding Ernest Bevin. Bridging the two main opinions detailed above, this study shows Bevin as a man with his own ideas but also one open to the advice of his officials. In taking the two men together, it helps us to understand two of the most important and distinguished figures in twentieth century British foreign policy, the relationship between Foreign Secretary and his Permanent Under-Secretary and also the role of the individual in foreign policy decision-making. To do this, the article explores four areas. Firstly, it examines the question over which government department had decision-making power with regard to post-war Germany. This shows the influence of Bevin as Foreign Secretary and the backing he gave his officials which enabled the Foreign Office to regain control of foreign policy decision-making. Secondly, it explores Anglo-French relations from late 1945 until the signature of the

Dunkirk Treaty in spring 1947, highlighting the development of both Sargent and Bevin's ideas in an emerging Cold War environment and the pragmatic approach they both took to foreign policy. Thirdly, the paper looks at British policy towards the Soviet Union and the run-up to the Brussels Treaty of March 1948. This exhibits how the two men worked together as Sargent offered the spark to afford Bevin the opportunity to move in the direction he wanted. Finally, the paper reveals the personal relationship that existed between the two men, focusing on the period following Sargent's retirement in early 1949. Given the tumultuous and lasting significance of the events during this period, this paper focuses on policy towards Europe. Despite his responsibility for advising on global policy given his role as Permanent Under-Secretary, Sargent had spent the bulk of his career working on British policy towards Europe; this was where his specific expertise lay. As his 'Stocktaking' memorandum shows, Europe occupied a key position in Sargent's thinking. Likewise for Bevin the continent held significance as a place where he believed he could strengthen Britain's position in the post-war world. Given the position of the continent in both men's thinking, the focus of the paper will be on British relations with Europe.[29]

2. Internal Backing

The position that Bevin gave the Foreign Office was clear during Sargent's first months as Permanent Under-Secretary. It confirmed the Foreign Secretary's status as the heavyweight in the Cabinet and also helped endear him to his new charges. Sargent used the position Bevin gave the Foreign Office to combat an old bugbear of his and of others of his generation - the interference of other governmental bodies in foreign affairs. For Sargent, foreign policy was the sole work of the Foreign Office and he endeavoured to ensure that this was the case. Bevin's status enabled Foreign Office officials to exercise a powerful position in foreign policy decision-making. In 1946 this led to a power struggle with the Control Office over who had decision-making power regarding Germany in Whitehall.[30] The failure

of the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in spring 1946 to reach agreement over Germany's future saw the Foreign Office launch its attack. Following a Foreign Office meeting on the administrative arrangements for dealing with Germany involving Sargent, William Strang, political advisor to Field Marshal Montgomery, and Patrick Dean, Legal Advisor on the British zone in Germany, a paper was produced which argued that the Commander-in-Chief in Germany should report to the Foreign Secretary through Foreign Office channels, not to the Control Office.[31] The paper argued that the Foreign Office position in regard to matters involving Germany was unsatisfactory. It was feared that due to insufficient contact with German problems the Foreign Office and Foreign Secretary might become unable to deal with such problems properly at international conferences.[32] When Sargent broached the subject with his counterpart in the Control Office, a scheme involving the Commander-in-Chief in Germany reporting to the Foreign Secretary on political matters was rejected.[33] The only solution offered by the Control Office was a radical one - to reduce it to a department of the Foreign Office. Given the deadlock, Bevin wrote to Attlee for his thoughts. In a draft minute for the Prime Minister, it was argued that the Minister and the Foreign Office were 'handicapped by lack of the necessary knowledge' and that if he was to be in a position to do a proper job with regard to Germany, 'all German matters with major political implications must be dealt with by me and my Department'.[34] The Prime Minister, however, was uncertain and deferred making a decision.

Not to be deterred, Sargent took the initiative. Viewing the upcoming Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in November as vital to the future of Germany, action was needed and instructions had to be sent to Strang and General Robertson, the Deputy Military Governor of the British Zone. Bevin was due to meet both in Paris and Sargent was concerned about the bureaucratic slowdown caused by requiring matters to go through the Control Office. A directive on issues that needed to be settled before the Council met was

drafted in the Foreign Office in preparation for Bevin's trip to Paris. Both Strang and Robertson needed to agree to the directive. In Sargent's opinion, it would be 'hopelessly cumbrous and time-wasting' to try to do this through the Control Office. He asked Bevin for permission to send the draft straight to Robertson and Strang. While accepting that this was 'short-circuiting' procedure, it was of vital importance to British policy to have matters settled.[35] Bevin agreed and informed Attlee who agreed on the grounds that the issue was one of 'power politics which brooks no delays'.[36] This was a victory for Sargent and the Foreign Office at the highest level of government. When a copy was then sent to the Control Office, they were unsurprisingly unhappy. Sir Gilmour Jenkins, the Permanent Under-Secretary of the Control Office, complained about the short notice given regarding the directive and levelled the accusation that the Foreign Office had been drafting it for weeks.[37] He was clearly alive to the idea that the Foreign Office was looking to seize control of decision-making. In his reply it is notable that Sargent apologises for any distress or embarrassment caused but not for his tactics. The political importance of the matter and the speed with which it needed to be dealt with, he argued, had led to Bevin - who had been persuaded by Sargent - to agree that the normal procedure needed to be abandoned. All major questions, he argued, affected the Foreign Office 'most closely' and no time could be lost in finalising British policy. He ended by referring back to the previous issue and reiterated his view that big political issues should be the responsibility of the Foreign Secretary.[38]

Sargent had asserted the primacy of the Foreign Office in decision-making and had the support of the Foreign Secretary in the matter. Following the incident, a call was made for the roles of the departments to be settled but by now Sargent and the Foreign Office clearly had the upper hand. Nothing was settled immediately but the icing on the cake came in December when General Robertson told Sargent that he wanted to report through the Foreign Office to the Foreign Secretary. His rationale was simple - there was more authority in

reporting to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.[39] The position of Bevin – both as a heavyweight in the Cabinet and in his close working relationship with the Prime Minister - proved crucial and in early 1947 Attlee expressed the wish that Bevin and the Foreign Office should take the responsibility for British policy towards Germany. This involved all major political questions. Sargent had gained control of foreign policy decision-making and his belief in the primacy of the Foreign Office in such matters had been backed by Bevin. His political master had been converted to the cause and the Foreign Office had restored some of its more traditional role as the decision-making body for foreign policy. It also showed that Bevin backed his officials and it increased their admiration for him. The office had arguably not had a political chief that fought for them like this since Austen Chamberlain in the 1920s, if not before then.

3. Anglo-French Relations

As noted earlier, Sargent and Bevin had similar ideas regarding France and Britain's role in Europe. The feeling was that better relations between the cross-channel neighbours would help secure a foundation for the collaboration of nations within Western Europe and consolidate Britain's position both on the continent and globally.[40] When Bevin returned from the Moscow conference in December 1945, he told his Cabinet colleagues that it was his policy to bring about closer Anglo-French relations. However, such an alliance was difficult at that time due to problems in the Levant and disagreements regarding the future of Germany. While these would have to be solved first, it did not lessen the desire for a greater friendship. But all this changed in January 1946. While reports of the deteriorating French domestic situation had been reaching the Foreign Office for months, the resignation of de Gaulle brought them into focus. Pessimistic appreciations were offered by Oliver Harvey, the Deputy Under-Secretary and Duff Cooper, the Francophile ambassador at Paris. While the Foreign Office had initially promoted reserve from the French domestic debacle, by the

spring there was a change. Duff Cooper suggested that the fear of a communist victory in the elections was a good reason to seek an agreement.[41] Sargent agreed. He asked for a paper to be prepared for Bevin to help 'prevent a Communist landslide in the coming French elections'. This was due not only to the fear of Communism in France but also to the suggestion by the Chairman of the Provisional French Government, Felix Gouin, that an alliance should be signed. Sargent felt that Gouin, like the Foreign Office, believed that the alliance might be a 'useful weapon in the hands of the anti-Communist Parties' during the upcoming elections.[42] An Anglo-French agreement now appeared desirable not on a platform of Britain's European ideas, but because of French domestic difficulties. Bevin was persuaded by his officials and at a meeting involving the Foreign Secretary, Sargent and Harvey it was decided that Harvey would be sent secretly to Paris for discussions to see if the French wanted an alliance before the disposal of the Ruhr question.[43] However, the mission failed before it began with French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault dismissing Gouin's statement. Harvey's meetings with Bidault confirmed this. The British and French began to drift apart and Sargent agreed with Harvey's opinion in late July that Britain should not run after the French for an agreement. The desire on the side of Sargent and the Foreign Office for an agreement with the French had cooled and things would remain that way for many months.

This cooling in Anglo-French relations continued into the winter. The possibility of an alliance was slim. Alongside the British reluctance for an agreement, the French domestic situation had not improved. Recent elections failed again to produce a victor and the Socialist vote had decreased. A caretaker government was in place. Discussion for a Western bloc based on an Anglo-French footing of nations was revived by Assistant Under-Secretary Sir Nigel Ronald in December, but it was ambassador Duff Cooper who on receiving the paper pushed for its implementation. The ambassador, a long-time proponent of an Anglo-French

alliance, told Sargent that such an alliance would be popular in France and all would be fine so long as it was predicated on the containment of Germany. He felt that it would boost the French and be a framework that could later be augmented.[44] Sargent was clearly persuaded by Duff Cooper that now was the time to begin preparations for such a move. In a minute to Bevin he noted that in January the first constitutionally appointed government in France since before the war would be in power and that, while the government might not last long, it was time to consider whether 'we should not avail ourselves of this occasion once more to propose the conclusion of the long deferred alliance'. If it was decided to make a move there were three contexts in which the utility of such an agreement could be considered. Firstly, such an alliance was desirable in itself. Sargent noted that French public opinion was favourable to an alliance, but an agreement could not be seen as an American spearhead against the USSR. While he also feared a negative reception in America, he agreed with the ambassador that if Britain made her every move contingent on American prior approval, 'our prospects of being able to give a lead to Western Europe will vanish'. If this happened Britain could never hope of being able to deal with the United States and the Soviet Union on an equal footing. A formal alliance would provide a framework for later agreements. Secondly, it would complement the proposed Byrnes agreement, an offer of a 25 year treaty for the demilitarisation of Germany. Sargent saw the idea as being raised at the same time as the control treaty for Germany as it could be argued that an alliance would maximise British and French contributions to their obligations. Thirdly, it would act 'as a first stepping-stone on the long and difficult road towards the establishment of a world security system' and the association of Western European nations. Thus Sargent used the argument that the alliance could help build a Western European bloc for keeping the peace. He felt that if Britain proceeded cautiously then all contexts could be completed; the starting point would be to try to attract French interest as soon as a Government was formed.[45] The idea of a western bloc

proposed in ‘Stocktaking’ clearly remained in the back of his mind. Sargent was thus supportive and hopeful of the idea. Bevin, however, was not. The Foreign Secretary minuted that he had given the idea ‘considerable thought’ but was still ‘doubtful’ about raising it. He wanted to wait and see what the new French Government was like.[46] Sargent fell in line with Bevin, but it was not long before the idea was under discussion again.

Leon Blum, the head of the French caretaker government, approached the British in January 1947. However, he was not seeking an alliance; his country needed more coal. In a letter to Attlee he asked for this and floated the idea of a visit to London. While more coal could not be offered, it was felt that a meeting should be. Sargent was pessimistic about the prospective visit, feeling that despite the ‘psychological reasons’ which meant that Blum's proposal for discussions could not be refused, the conversations would be ‘awkward and sterile’ as Britain had nothing to give the French. Even over an alliance Sargent remained in line with Bevin's view that Britain had to stall until it knew that the new French constitution would give enough political stability to make France a ‘reliable partner’.[47] A further letter to Blum made clear that no coal was available and Sargent recommended that references to an alliance and economic talks should be removed from the draft as these would simply be ‘gilding for the pill that no coal is available’.[48] Bevin agreed and crossed out the relevant paragraph in the draft. But when Blum visited in mid-January no ultimate decision had been taken on the idea of an alliance. There was a desire to remain on good terms with the French, but there was no certainty that an alliance was the best way to do this. Coal remained top of the agenda for the conversations, but Britain still had none to give. But Bevin did not want to send Blum home empty handed. The Foreign Secretary therefore fell back on the suggestions Sargent had advised removing as ‘gilding for the pill’. Thus he proposed the idea of a closer Anglo-French understanding. At the end of Blum's visit on 16 January a communiqué was issued declaring the continuation of economic talks through the Anglo-French Economic

Committee and the negotiation of an Anglo-French alliance. While Blum had failed to obtain the coal he called the meeting for, the other casualty was the idea of an Anglo-French alliance which, as Sean Greenwood correctly identified, now 'bore only a shadow of its former significance'.[49]

Negotiations took place during February and the Anglo-French Treaty was signed at Dunkirk on 4 March en-route to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Moscow. Its signing, conducted in bad weather - Oliver Harvey caught a chill standing in bad weather and was bed-ridden on his arrival in Moscow - symbolised the damp-squib nature of the Treaty.[50] The alliance that was signed was hardly the one either Sargent or Bevin envisioned less than two years earlier. It did not come from strength, but from sympathy for the French domestic situation, a fear of France turning communist and for a show of strength before the Moscow meeting. A growing cold war environment clearly played its part in the signature of the agreement. Nevertheless, the treaty clearly shows the value of Sargent's council to Bevin, as well as their congruence of views in the desire for an agreement and a shared pragmatism in an emerging cold war world.

4. Working to the Brussels Treaty

Alongside their dealings with France, the Sargent-Bevin combination can been seen at work in their shared concern with the Soviet Union and the signature of the Brussels Treaty in March 1948. September 1945 saw the first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London. Hopes that the unanswered questions from Potsdam would be resolved were dashed as the Soviets were aggressive from the outset. Despite these difficulties, Sargent still believed that the USSR wished to collaborate over post-war problems. All this reiterated to him the need for a strong Britain and the need to build the country up as 'the great European power'. Sargent believed that once Britain had this position as a leader of Western Europe the United States and the Soviet Union were 'more likely to respect us and therefore collaborate

with us than they are at present'.[51] Yet despite this desire to remain as a Great Power, Sargent was realistic as to Britain's position on the continent. As 1945 drew to a close, he urged that Britain refrained from interference in Eastern Europe. In November, Sargent had to explain the policy of not making a statement on the Bulgarian elections which saw the Communists secure the joint most seats. The logic was that Britain did not wish to drift into a 'mere policy of pin-pricks' and thus saw no need for a statement unless it would cause a change in Bulgarian or Soviet policy.[52] Bulgaria was important as a buffer state and it was important for the British to recover and hold on to its position there. Sargent did not want to do anything that would make 'this already difficult task still more difficult unless there are really compelling reasons'.[53] Similarly, Sargent advocated the recognition of Tito's position following the elections in Yugoslavia. He believed that it was time to seek to restore normal relations with the country. Bevin adopted this position.[54] While Western Europe was clearly on the agenda as a battleground for British policy, Sargent recognised that Britain had to acknowledge the situation in Eastern Europe and not make things any worse for Britain's already weakened position in the region. Pragmatism was at the heart of the policy towards the Soviet Union pursued by both men.

Throughout 1946, Sargent remained sceptical about the Soviet Union's eventual aims. Within the Foreign Office – now under Sargent's stewardship – the Russia Committee was reformed. Its remit was to review weekly 'the development of all aspects of Soviet policy and propaganda and Soviet activities throughout the world'. While not a part of the committee, Sargent approved of its creation and would fully endorse its activities. Any recommendations made by the committee were made to the department concerned or, more likely, to the Permanent Under-Secretary.[55] When in May the Committee discussed a memorandum by Assistant Under-Secretary Christopher Warner examining the Soviet campaign against Britain and the British response to it, Sargent supported it fully.[56] In the light of the

aggressive Soviet policy, Warner advocated a ‘defensive-offensive’ policy and proposed a propaganda counter-offensive. This potentially meant involvement in the internal affairs of other countries.[57] Sargent followed up with an office circular in which he declared that the Soviets were engaged ‘in a general and long-term political offensive against us’. Britain could not just defend and counter-attack, but must try to anticipate Soviet attacks and consider how to counter them. British policy still needed to abide by the principles of the Anglo-Soviet alliance, but at the same time Britain must ‘expose totalitarianism and communism in all their forms and wherever they may be found’.[58] While Sargent was in favour of open moves against the USSR, Bevin remained more stoic and wanted to see what happened. The Foreign Secretary accepted the analysis of an aggressive Soviet foreign policy, but was not prepared openly to counter it. Sargent, however, remained a proponent of a more active policy. At an internal Foreign Office meeting involving representatives from British missions in Eastern Europe in January 1947, Sargent laid out the two policy alternatives for Britain: a continuance of the policy of ‘resistance to communist influence’ or a relaxation of this policy, accepting Communist dominance and relying on the influence of trade and cultural relations to further western ideas. Sargent almost immediately made this second policy an impossibility by describing it as amounting to appeasement - a highly charged term in the post-war environment - which would diminish Britain’s moral influence and shock the Americans.[59] Bevin later met with the representatives. In the following weeks a memorandum was drawn up regarding the countries in Eastern Europe. The paper endorsed the policy of resisting Soviet domination in Eastern Europe as far as possible. A suggestion was made that Britain could be more active in countering Communist propaganda. However, Bevin was reluctant to take such a course and the comment that the Foreign Secretary was ‘anxious to avoid always being the "official opposition" in Eastern Europe’ appears.[60] While

Sargent and Bevin clearly agreed on the diagnosis of Soviet policy, the Foreign Secretary wanted to see how events developed before becoming too active.

By the end of 1947 an atmosphere of pessimism lay over Anglo-Soviet relations and the future of Europe. Little hope seemed to lie with the upcoming Council of Foreign Ministers. The international situation had worsened with the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan earlier in the year. The Soviet Union had reacted with the establishment of Cominform and instructions to cease co-operation with the European Recovery Programme. Hopes that the Council would reach an agreement for a four-power treaty on Germany which would include an agreement for a provisional German Government were low. For once, Sargent could take a more involved role at the conference as it was in London. Throughout his career, Sargent had an aversion to travelling, something which drew the ire of Cadogan during the war.[61] This meant that he was absent from major conferences held abroad. With it taking place in London, Sargent could advise Bevin on the spot and his hand is evident in the Foreign Secretary's moves between November 1947 and January 1948. As the Conference took the predicted direction with the Soviets raising difficulties, the Permanent Under-Secretary urged that it was time for Britain to take the initiative. This required closer Anglo-American relations. He felt that the United States had 'no clear idea of what to do after the Conference if it ends in a deadlock, and have not yet got accustomed to the idea of having immediate discussions with us and the French' on questions that needed answers. These issues needed to be dealt with 'promptly' to prevent the Soviets taking a lead which Sargent felt would be 'embarrassing' to the Western powers.[62] Bevin was frustrated with the Americans and the French whom he found 'impossible to get real conversations with'.[63] Both Foreign Secretary and Permanent Under-Secretary were on the same lines that the initiative had to be taken while privately expressing frustration at their international counterparts.

Sargent then submitted three papers to Bevin. They included two from himself on the establishment of a provisional German Government and the methods to handle future discussions with the French and Americans. The first paper dealt with the establishment of a provisional German Government. Sargent diagnosed that the problem was that the Soviets wanted agreement on the immediate formation of a Government without revealing the conditions on which they would be prepared to agree to such a plan. Understandably there was a desire for more detail. Sargent urged that it was imperative to make clear that opposition to Soviet Foreign Secretary Molotov's plans was not to prevent the formation of a German Government but on the basis that Molotov 'does not intend to allow a Government to be formed which would have genuine freedom and power to govern'. But behind all this was Sargent's mantra of a need for speed; the formation of a government was an urgent matter. This was true regardless of whether the Conference was a success or a failure. If the Conference broke down Sargent was certain that the Soviets would look to establish a Government in East Germany and subsequently the West could not 'afford in the trial of strength which will then ensue to be left without any responsible central political German body' to bring West Germany up to the standards the Western powers desired.[64] Sargent recognised that a three-power basis was more likely than a four-power one. Nonetheless, he urged speed in the decision.

Simultaneously he penned another paper examining the methods to handle three-power discussions about Germany. The writing of this paper at the same time as the one arguing for the establishment of the provisional German Government indicates that he felt, as the previous paper indicated, that it was more likely that three-power conversations would take place. He pressed that it was time for conversations with the French and Americans in case the Conference collapsed. It was imperative that the western powers could act quickly if this scenario occurred. Speed again emerged as a central theme here. His proposed method

was clear. As soon as the breakdown of the Conference was inevitable Bevin should meet with Marshall and tell him that it was time to begin discussions on a three power basis. At the same time it should be stressed that the French should not feel offended and that Bevin would speak with Bidault. It was a tough balancing act with Sargent envisaging Britain in a facilitator role.[65] The impact of Sargent's papers on Bevin is apparent in a memorandum sent to the Cabinet two days later. The paper, on the possibility of a three-power treaty of German disarmament, argued that the Conference was facing problems 'unlikely to be resolved'. The consequence of a breakdown would be three power conversations beginning with the United States. The memorandum asked for authorisation to proceed on Sargent's lines of speaking to the United States before suggesting the idea to France. The paper also encapsulated Sargent's key argument – the need for speed in discussions and formulation of a treaty.[66] The Permanent Under-Secretary was pushing policy that Bevin endorsed. The Foreign Secretary, who had been cautious in making open moves against the Soviet Union, was now prepared to move.

Following the breakdown of the Council of Foreign Ministers, Sargent and Bevin were eager to proceed quickly. As planned, they met with Bidault and Marshall - just two days after the collapse of the conference. Bevin, who had been reluctant to become publicly anti-Soviet, recognised that a change in tactics was needed. In the conversation with Bidault, Bevin described how Europe was 'divided from Greece to the Baltic and from the Oder to Trieste'. It was the task of Britain, France and the United States to 'save Western civilisation'. This would come about by some sort of 'federation in Western Europe whether of a formal or informal character'.[67] The Foreign Secretary made similar comments to Marshall and also gave the Secretary of State a copy of a secret memorandum showing the views of Molotov and his deputy Vyshinsky following their conversation with certain ambassadors in London. During those discussions the Soviets noted that Eastern Europe was

‘completely consolidated’ and lost to the Western Powers.[68] In words and actions Bevin was being more anti-Soviet. Sargent, following on from his presence at the Council meetings, was present at the meeting with Bidault. The idea of a Western bloc was beginning to take shape. When the French later enquired about the Belgians, Sargent had to reply that the British would consider the suggestion.[69] While the idea of alliances with Belgium and Holland were desirable, the problem was reconciling them with Bevin's conception of a Western Union. Assistant Under-Secretary Ivone Kirkpatrick therefore suggested to Sargent that the best way of attaining the Union would be through an ‘Anglo-French-Belgian-Dutch core bound together by a treaty’. This, he argued, should be communicated to the French if acceptable as soon as Britain was ready.[70] Sargent agreed.[71]

Following his change in approach and having laid his cards on the table with his international counterparts, Bevin launched a domestic assault for his policy. At the start of 1948 the Foreign Secretary unleashed three papers on the Cabinet. One of them, titled ‘The First Aim of British Foreign Policy’, was key. The paper laid out the predicament facing Britain and the way forward, labelling the Soviet Union as the enemy. Pulling no punches, the Foreign Secretary declared that the Soviet Union had ‘formed a solid political and economic block behind a line running from the Baltic along the Oder, through Trieste to the Black Sea’. Prospects of resuming normal relations with nations in this area were unlikely as further Soviet encroachment was probable. It was his opinion that Western Europe needed to ‘organise and consolidate the ethical and spiritual forces inherent in this Western civilisation of which we are the chief protagonists’. This could only be done, he argued, by a union in Western Europe. He expanded on this by explaining his idea of a union involving the nations of Western Europe, Scandinavia, the Dominions and the United States.[72] The Cabinet approved his plan and the Foreign Office set to work. The speed with which progress was made alarmed some, with Sargent having to defend the idea within the Office. One official

was concerned about the lack of co-ordination with the economic side of the Foreign Office on the initial Cabinet paper. The Permanent Under-Secretary replied that Bevin's policy was to create a '"spiritual" union of all countries who believe in certain basic principles and practise a certain way of life'. The economic and political aspects, he argued, were 'subsidiary' in the Foreign Secretary's mind.[73] The key, it appeared, was to form the union.

As the Brussels Treaty moved towards its signature, Sargent pondered the future of the idea. As Bevin had alluded to upon his appointment in 1945, he wanted closer relations with countries on the Mediterranean fringes. By March, Sargent was convinced that the future accession of other nations to the Treaty had to be catered for. Primarily he was thinking of Italy and Germany. His fear was that references to Germany would preclude such a move later on. At a meeting between Bevin, Sargent, Kirkpatrick and Jebb, it was decided to proceed with a treaty which included references to Germany but with a suitably drafted revision article to cover the potential accession of Germany at a later date.[74] Similarly Sargent wondered about the future accession of Italy to the Western Union. While he felt that Italy should eventually become a member of the Union, Sargent believed it was perhaps too soon as Italy might use an early accession to press for conditions such as the waiving of the military provisions of the Italian peace treaty. He recommended that Bevin should tell them that Italian incorporation was in his mind and he hoped that it would give the country some security.[75]

On 17 March, Bevin travelled to Brussels to sign the Brussels Treaty with France and the Benelux countries. The speed at which the Treaty had been signed was remarkable. It was just over two months from Bevin's paper to the Cabinet to signature. Whilst it was hardly the treaty envisioned in the summer of 1945, it was the beginning of a bloc that would work against Communism in Europe. It was exactly what Sargent had said the Foreign Secretary wanted when he defended the policy: it was a spiritual union between nations who shared

certain basic principles. Sargent's own foresight in recognising the future accession of other nations was proved prescient when Italy and Germany later joined the grouping. The ideas of Sargent and Bevin, clear in the immediate post-war period, had reached their zenith. Both had to an extent achieved the western European bloc they sought after. Since the Council of Foreign Ministers in November 1947 they had worked in unison towards a shared goal. There had never been a disagreement between the two over the diagnosis of Soviet policy, but Bevin had been reluctant to countenance open moves against the USSR. The breakdown of the Council and Soviet intransigence persuaded Bevin to change his public policy. The symmetry between chief and advisor is clear in the months leading up to the signature of the Brussels Treaty. Sargent provided the energy and spark that afforded Bevin the opportunity to move in the direction he wanted.

5. The Personal Relationship

The remaining element in the Sargent-Bevin combination was the personal relationship between them. As much as the Foreign Office staff were concerned about the new Foreign Secretary in 1945, Bevin was equally apprehensive about his new charges. During the war he had been a keen proponent of reform to the Foreign Service and had reservations about its staff.[76] He argued that diplomacy moved 'in far too narrow a circle' and was out of touch with society, having recruited from and moved in an exclusive social world. Amongst his other thoughts, he wanted diplomatists to have contact with all strata of society, the appointment of labour attaches at missions abroad and interchanges with domestic departments.[77] Despite these opinions, Bevin came to like the Foreign Office and its staff once he become Foreign Secretary. Even his own calls for reform did not stop him from acknowledging that the staff were as hard-working and efficient as those he had had in the Ministry of Labour.[78] When his own party encouraged him to make sweeping changes to the staffing of the office, he defended his officials.[79] The bond that grew between the staff of the

Foreign Office and their new chief was touching, and is reflected in the relationship between Sargent and Bevin. As has been shown in policy, Bevin took on board Sargent's advice and often acted upon it. While Hugh Dalton suggested that Bevin 'did not think much of Sargent', there was a closeness of view and agreement over key aims of British policy.[80] This closeness is reflected in the strong mutual respect that grew between the two and developed into a friendship.

The personal relationship between the two can be seen in the months after the announcement in late 1948 of Sargent's upcoming retirement. Following the announcement, Bevin spoke with Attlee about Sargent receiving a peerage in recognition for his years of service. The Prime Minister put this off. Bevin reminded him again in February[81] and April 1949.[82] While the honour was never bestowed, it indicates Bevin's regard for Sargent and his service over the years. It was not simply a process but was a cause Bevin readily and personally took up with the Prime Minister. This respect was reciprocated by Sargent after his retirement in early 1949. Following his departure from the Foreign Office after 43 years, Sargent wrote to Bevin to tell him 'how greatly I shall always value the privilege of having served under you during the last three all important years and of being able to watch you at your great work of re-establishing Great Britain as a world Power in the face of every sort of difficulty and discouragement'. Sargent also noted how he wanted Bevin to continue at the Foreign Office.[83] This was a far cry from the concern he expressed following the Labour election victory in 1945. He echoed this line in another letter sent in June 1949 in which Sargent penned: 'Meanwhile I hope you are taking care of yourself, for you are very valuable to the country & all of us. I should say that you have never been more valuable than at the present time when we seem to be entering into a new phase of our post-war problems.'[84] Despite his initial reservations, Sargent had clearly enjoyed working for Bevin and approved of the line of policy the Foreign Secretary was taking. Given the plaudits they gave one

another, it would appear that to suggest that the relationship between the two was frosty is unfitting.

Yet the personal aspect of the relationship can be glimpsed most clearly in the period around Bevin's death in 1951. On his 70th birthday in March, Sargent sent a telegram congratulating his friend on the milestone and his return to the Foreign Office after a period of ill health.[85] The reality of the situation was very different. Bevin was in fact close to death. Yet the now Lord Privy Seal replied that he hoped to see Sargent soon to discuss the world. However, Bevin died a month later. Sargent was clearly disconsolate at the death and wrote a heartfelt letter to Bevin's widow. It is here, in his own grief, that the change from his initially sceptical and suspicious view of Bevin in 1945 is strikingly apparent. Sargent wrote how the Foreign Secretary was 'not only greatly respected & admired but much beloved in the FO'. He added to that that the country had lost 'a great leader', highlighting the reverence in which Bevin was held.[86] This admiration goes some way to explaining the footnote in Alan Bullock's biography of Bevin about how Sargent 'went out his way' to tell him that 'by comparison with any of his predecessors he considered Bevin a great Foreign Secretary'.[87]

Despite their differences in background, upbringing and politics, Sir Orme Sargent and Ernest Bevin formed a strong team. They worked well together, sharing views on Britain's place in the world and how British policy should proceed. Their congruence of views - fundamentally that British policy should be directed by British interests - allowed a partnership to flourish that could have easily failed to work. A strong professional and personal relationship emerged. As interest remains in the policies of the post-war Labour government and in the position of Britain in relation to Europe, there is still work to be done. Understanding the role of the Foreign Office in Bevin's tenure requires much more attention and its individuals offer us a useful prism through which the view the institution. The Foreign Office itself, with all the changes that took place in the immediate post-war years, is in need

of study. It is tempting to view Sargent's short time as Permanent Under-Secretary as simply part of the Bevin period or as an interlude before the tumultuous events of 1949 and the 1950s. He did not have the longevity in post of predecessors such as Vansittart or Cadogan and he did not write about his time like his successors Strang and Kirkpatrick.[88] This analysis has proved that there is more to the 1940s than this. Sargent's time as Permanent Under-Secretary was a critical three year period in which Bevin grew into the role of Foreign Secretary as his own ideas joined with those of his chief advisor. Bevin had his own ideas on Britain's place in the world and while they corresponded to those of his staff, he was not averse from taking advice. Despite these ideas both men had to be pragmatic in an emerging cold war world, meaning that while their initiatives often crystallised, it was not necessarily in the way they had initially envisioned. Nonetheless, this was a time when Foreign Office and Foreign Secretary were in sync as Britain struggled to find its place in the post-war world.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and encouragement with this article.

[1] Lord Gladwyn, The memoirs of Lord Gladwyn (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1972), 175.

[2] Alan Bullock, Ernest Bevin: Foreign Secretary, 1945-1951 (London: Norton, 1983), 72-74.

[3] Kenneth Young (ed), The diaries of Sir Robert Bruce Lockhart, Volume 2 (London: Macmillan, 1980), 474.

[4] Diaries of Lockhart Volume 2, 493.

[5] Piers Dixon, Double Diplomat: the life of Sir Pierson Dixon, Don and Diplomat (London: Hutchinson, 1968), 166.

[6] David Dilks (ed), The diaries of Sir Alexander Cadogan, 1938-1945 (London: Cassell, 1971), 776.

[7] Diaries of Lockhart Volume 2, 493.

[8] Bullock, 75 (fn. 4).

[9] Foreign Office List 1949 (London: Harrison, 1949), 337.

[10] Sir Alexander Cadogan (PUS 1938-1946) became ambassador to the United Nations; Sir Robert Lindsay (PUS 1928-1930) became ambassador to the United States; and Sir William Tyrrell (PUS 1925-1928) became ambassador to France.

[11] Zara Steiner, 'On writing international history: chaps, maps and much more', International Affairs, 73, 3 (1997), 531-546 (536).

[12] Chris Wrigley, 'Bevin, Ernest', Dictionary of National Biography, <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/31872?docPos=1> [accessed 24th July 2017]

[13] Frank Roberts, *'Ernest Bevin as Foreign Secretary', in* Ritchie Ovendale (ed) The Foreign Policy of the British Labour governments, 1945-1951 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), 21-42 (25).

[14] Ibid., 25.

[15] 'Stocktaking After VE Day', 11 July 1945 [Kew, United Kingdom National Archives, Public Record Office], F[oreign] O[ffice] 371/50912/U5471/5471/70.

[16] Sargent minute, 1 Oct. 1945 on Balfour to FO, 9 Aug. 1945, TNA, FO 371/44557/AN2560/22/45.

[17] Roger Bullen and M.E. Pelly (eds), Documents on British Policy Overseas, Series I, Volume V (London: HMSO, 1987), No. 4, Record of a Meeting on 13 August between Mr. Bevin and Foreign Office officials, Aug. 1945.

[18] For example: Sibyl Crowe, Our ablest public servant: Sir Eyre Crowe, 1864-1925 (Braunton: Merlin Books, 1993); Michael Roi, Alternative to Appeasement: Sir Robert Vansittart and Alliance diplomacy, 1934-1937 (Westport: Praeger, 1997); Keith Neilson and T. G. Otte, The Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, 1854-1946 (London: Routledge, 2009).

[19] B. J. C. McKercher, Esme Howard: a diplomatic biography (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Gaynor Johnson, The Berlin Embassy of Lord D'Abernon (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002).

[20] Exceptions include: Anthony Adamthwaite, 'Britain and the World 1945-9: The view from the Foreign Office', International Affairs, 61, 2 (1985), 223-235; John Zametica (ed), British officials and British foreign policy 1945-50 (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1990).

[21] Keith Neilson, 'Orme Sargent, Appeasement and British Policy in Europe, 1933-39', Twentieth Century British History, 21 (2010), 1-28.

[22] Graham Ross, 'Foreign Office Attitudes to the Soviet Union', Journal of Contemporary History, 16, 3 (1981), 521-540; Martin Folly, Churchill, Whitehall and the Soviet Union, 1940-45 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

[23] Victor Rothwell, Britain and the Cold War 1941-47 (London: Cape, 1982), 144-8; John Saville, The politics of continuity: British foreign policy and the Labour Government 1945-46 (London: Verso, 1993), 28-33.

[24] Sir Robert Vansittart, The Mist Procession (London: Hutchinson, 1958), 399.

[25] Bullock, Foreign Secretary, 102.

[26] Roderick Barclay, Ernest Bevin and the Foreign Office, 1932-69 (London, 1975), 82-84; Roberts, 'Ernest Bevin as Foreign Secretary'; William Strang, Home and Abroad (London: Deutsch, 1956), 287-300

[27] Peter Weiler, Ernest Bevin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 144-147.

[28] John Bew, Citizen Clem: a biography of Attlee (London: Riverrun, 2016).

[29] Nevertheless, a great deal of ink has been spent on Bevin's thinking regarding the United States. On Bevin and America see: Martin Folly, '"The impression is growing … that the United States is hard when dealing with us": Ernest Bevin and Anglo-American relations at the dawn of the cold war', Journal of Transatlantic Studies, 10, 2 (2012), 150-166; Ritchie Ovendale, The English speaking alliance: Britain, the United States, the Dominions and the Cold War 1945-51 (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985). The conclusion of Geoffrey Warner suggests that Bevin is to blame for Britain's dependence on America from that time to the present; *Geoffrey Warner, 'Ernest Bevin and Bri*tish Foreign Policy, 1945-*1951'* in Gordon Craig and Francis Lowenheim (eds) The Diplomats, 1939-79 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 103-134.

[30] For more on this see Anne Deighton, The Impossible Peace: Britain, the division of Germany and the origins of the Cold War (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 126-131.

[31] Dean minute, 23 July 1946 on FO Memo, undated, 1946, TNA, FO 371/55572/C8607/101/18.

[32] FO Memo, undated, 1946, Ibid.

[33] Sargent minute, 25 July 1946 on Dixon to Harvey, 14 Aug. 1946, TNA, FO 371/55572/C10674/101/18.

[34] Bevin to Attlee, 14 August 1946, Ibid.

[35] FO Minute Sir O. Sargent, 27 Aug. 1946, TNA, FO 371/55591/C10314/131/18.

[36] Sargent minute, 27 Aug. 1946, Ibid.

[37] Jenkins to Sargent, 30 Aug. 1946, TNA, FO 371/55572/C10648/101/18.

[38] Sargent to Jenkins, 3 September 1946, Ibid.

[39] Sargent minute, 13 Dec. 1946 on FO Minute Mr. Burrows, 13 Dec. 1946, TNA, FO 371/55594/C15651/131/18.

[40] For more on Bevin and France see Sean Greenwood, 'Ernest Bevin, France and 'Western Union': August 1945-February 1946', European History Quarterly, 14 (1984), 319-38.

[41] Duff Cooper to FO, 19 March 1946, TNA, FO 371/59952/Z2780/20/17.

[42] Sargent minute, 3 April 1946 on FO Minute Mr. Harvey, 1 April 1946, TNA, FO 371/59953/Z3744/20/17.

[43] Foreign Office Minute Mr. Hoyer Millar, 5 April 1946, TNA, FO 371/59952/Z3308/20/17.

[44] Ronald minute, 19 Dec. 1946 on Foreign Office Memorandum, 4 Dec. 1946, TNA, FO 371/59911/Z10754/120/72.

[45] FO Minute Sir Orme Sargent, 21 Dec. 1946, TNA, FO 371/67670/Z25/25/17.

[46] Bevin minute, undated 1946, Ibid.

[47] Sargent minute, 5 Jan. 1947 on FO Minute Sir Orme Sargent, 31 Dec. 1946, TNA, FO 371/67686/Z119/119/17.

[48] Hall Patch minute, 4 Jan. 1947 on FO Minute Mr. Hoyer Millar, 4 Jan. 1947, TNA, FO 371/67686/Z269/119/17.

[49] Sean Greenwood, The Alternative Alliance: Anglo-French relations before the coming of NATO, 1944-48 (London: Minerva, 1996), 272.

[50] Harvey to Sargent, 20 March 1947, FO 800/272.

[51] Sargent minute, 1 Oct. 1945 on Balfour to FO, 9 Aug. 1945, TNA, FO 371/44557/AN2560/22/45.

[52] M.E. Pelly, H.J. Yasamee and K.A. Hamilton (eds), Documents on British Policy Overseas, Series I, Volume VI (London: HMSO, 1991), Footnote 1 to Document No. 63, Sargent to Houstoun-Boswall, 23 Nov. 1945.

[53] Ibid., No. 63, Sargent to Houstoun-Boswall, 26 Nov. 1945.

[54] Ibid., No. 57, Bevin to Halifax, 15 Nov. 1945.

[55] 'Terms of Reference', 12 April 1946, TNA, FO 371/56885/N5170/5169/38.

[56] For more on the formation of the Russia Committee and Warner's May memorandum see Ray Merrick, 'The Russia Committee of the British Foreign Office and the Cold War, 1946-47', Journal of Contemporary History, 20 (1985), 453-468.

[57] FO Minute, 7 May 1946, TNA, FO 371/56885/N6092/5169/38.

[58] 'Circular: Committee on Policy towards Russia', 13 May 1946, TNA, FO 371/56885/N6274/5169/38.

[59] FO Minute, 14 Jan. 1946, TNA, FO 371/65964/N710/710/63.

[60] Mayhew marginal comment, 3 March 1947, on Foreign Office Minute, 15 Jan. 1947, TNA, FO 371/65964/N4246/710/63; Foreign Office Minute, Mr C.F.A. Warner to Sir O. Sargent, 2 Apr. 1947, TNA, FO 371/65964/N4248/710/63

[61] The diaries of Sir Alexander Cadogan, 576.

[62] Sargent minute, 8 Dec. 1947 on FO Minute Sir O. Sargent, 8 Dec. 1947, TNA, FO 371/64250/C16198/53/18.

[63] Bevin minute, undated 1947, Ibid.

[64] FO Minute Sir O. Sargent, 8 Dec. 1947, TNA, FO 371/64250/C16198/53/18.

[65] FO Minute Sir O. Sargent, 8 Dec. 1947, TNA, FO 371/64250/C16199/53/18.

[66] Cabinet Paper: Possibility of a Three-Power Treaty on German Disarmament, 10 Dec. 1947, TNA, CAB 129/22 CP (47) 326.

[67] Record of a conversation between Mr. Bevin and M. Bidault, 17 Dec. 1948, TNA, FO 800/447.

[68] Tony Insall and Patrick Salmon (eds), Documents on British Policy Overseas, Series I, Volume X (London: Routledge, 2015), No. 3, Meeting between Mr Bevin and Mr Marshall, 17 Dec. 1947.

[69] FO Minute Sir O. Sargent, 23 Dec. 1947, TNA, FO 371/73045/Z321/273/72.

[70] FO Minute Sir I. Kirkpatrick, 2 Jan. 1948, TNA, FO 371/73045/Z322/273/72.

[71] Sargent minute, 3 Jan. 1948, Ibid.

[72] 'The First Aim of British Foreign Policy' Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 4 Jan. 1948, TNA, CAB 129/23, CP (48) 6.

[73] Sargent minute, 19 Jan. 1948, on FO Minute Sir E. Hall-Patch, 15 Jan. 1948, TNA, FO 371/73045/Z809/273/72.

[74] Jebb minute, 3 March 1948, Ibid.

[75] Foreign Office Minute (Sir O. Sargent), 13 March 1948, TNA, FO 371/73191/Z2376/637/22.

[76] For a summary of the reforms, see: Valerie Cromwell and Zara Steiner, 'Reform and Retrenchment: The Foreign Office between the Wars', in The Foreign Office 1782-1982, ed. by Roger Bullen (Maryland: University Publications of America, 1984), 85-108.

[77] Ibid., 101-102. Also see James Cronin, The Politics of State Expansion (London: Routledge, 1991), 131-133.

[78] Alan Bullock, Ernest Bevin: Foreign Secretary, 1945-1951 (London: Norton, 1983), 97.

[79] See Bullock, 73-74.

[80] Ben Pimlott (ed), The political diary of Hugh Dalton (London: Cape in association with the London School of Economics, 1986), 398.

[81] Bevin to Attlee, 15 Feb. 1949, TNA, FO 800/463.

[82] Bevin to Attlee, 27 April 1949, TNA, FO 800/463.

[83] Sargent to Bevin, 2 March 1949, TNA, FO 800/463.

[84] Sargent to Bevin, 25 June 1949, TNA, FO 800/463.

[85] Sargent to Bevin, 9 March 1951 [Cambridge, Churchill College Archive Centre], Bevin Papers [BEVN] II 6/16.

[86] Sargent to Mrs. Bevin, 15 April 1951, BEVN II 11/4.

[87] Bullock, 75 (fn. 4).

[88] Strang, Home and Abroad; Ivone Kirkpatrick, The Inner Circle: memoirs of Ivone Kirkpatrick (London: Macmillan, 1959).