

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Richard Aldrich

Article Title: Putting culture into the Cold War: the Cultural Relations Department (CRD) and British Covert Information Warfare

Year of publication: 2003

Link to published version:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02684520412331306770>

Publisher statement: None

Putting Culture into the Cold War:

CRD and British covert information warfare

Richard J. Aldrich

Introduction

British wartime diplomats have sometimes been identified as taking an optimistic view of likely Soviet post-war behaviour in the international system.¹ Many, like Christopher Warner, Head of the Northern Department, clung to what some have called the 'co-operation thesis' and resisted pessimistic forecasts which often emanated from the British military – notably Field Marshal Alanbrooke. But not all the wartime diplomats in the Foreign Office were determined to turn a Nelsonian eye to the activities of the Soviets in pursuit of 'co-operation'. In late 1943 the Foreign Office had created a small section to give political direction to the British Council and to manage the political and policy aspects of the growing scale of organised international intellectual, cultural, societal and artistic contacts, with a view to promoting Allied goodwill. By early 1945 this had been renamed the **Cultural Relations Department** or 'CRD' and was being energetically directed by William Montagu-Pollock. Quickly this new department realised that international organisations represented a substantial area of Soviet manipulation and many so-called 'international' organisations, which claimed to be representative of world opinion, were in fact mere fronts that took their orders from Moscow.

Almost by accident, CRD had become a small British front-line unit in a clandestine struggle to prevent Moscow's domination of the world of international movements, federations and assemblies – what would later be called 'the battle of the festivals'. By November 1945, Archibald Clark-Kerr, the British Ambassador in Moscow was urging London to take more action to stem the Soviet practice of obtaining control of international labour, youth and women's and other organisations 'for the purpose of using them as instruments of Soviet foreign

policy'. He predicted 'similar attacks' on women's and students organisations, as well as humanitarian and cultural organisations, and wanted British counter-measures stepped up. Clark Kerr wrote again on 15 December 1945 warning specifically about the Soviet search for an 'instrument for influencing international youth'.² On 21 December 1945 British diplomats in Copenhagen wrote to Montagu-Pollock in much the same spirit, warning that the collapse of Germany and France had left 'a vacuum which, particularly among the younger students, was only too likely to be filled by Russia'.³

Even before the end of the war, CRD in London were already hard at work on this problem, during something of an interregnum in British propaganda activities. The wartime Special Operations Executive (SOE) and Political Warfare Executive (PWE) had been largely wound down in 1945 and would not be replaced until the advent of the more widely known Information Research Department (IRD), created with the agreement of a reluctant British Cabinet in 1948. Interpretations of post war British covert propaganda have focused on the birth of IRD and upon a Whitehall battle to resurrect agencies developed *for war* – namely SOE and PWE.⁴ While the wartime heritage was certainly immensely important, there were other fascinating but neglected influences. In 1945 CRD was at the cutting edge of Britain's information Cold War, focused upon the twin issues of culture and organised youth, working closely with MI5 and to a lesser extent SIS.⁵ CRD grew out of a different heritage – the British Council and agencies developed for cultural propaganda in *peacetime* - harking back to the inter-war period. Cultural propaganda enjoyed a somewhat insubstantial existence, which some have likened to the Cheshire Cat, notwithstanding this, during the early Cold War it proved capable of showing its claws.⁶

It was in the immediate post-war period that some of the future trademarks of British Cold War propaganda, including intervention in British domestic organisations, were established. In mid-1948 British information warfare chiefs in London, together with SIS, met

with the Head of the CIA, Admiral Roscoe Hillenkoetter, and outlined Britain's political warfare programme. The Americans were particularly impressed by Britain's efforts in the area of 'grey propaganda' - efforts that were not publicly acknowledged, but were sufficiently low risk to involve many government departments together with their friendly contacts in journalism, trade unions and so forth. Hillenkoetter carried his briefing papers back to Washington where George Kennan remarked that they represented a sophisticated and mature programme, somewhat ahead of anything the USA had to offer. On the face of it this is surprising, given that IRD had only been in existence a matter of months. It is less surprising when we understand that additional engines were allowing Britain to forge ahead in information warfare during the late 1940s, including CRD.⁷

Arguably CRD represents the first British post-war effort to experiment with creating anti-Communist front organisations, or what might more accurately be called 'state-private networks'.⁸ These early efforts delivered some hard lessons that had strong commonality with the early American experiences in an area eventually taken over by Tom Braden and CIA's International Organisations Division. These included an early appreciation of the weakness and irresolution of genuinely free and independent organisations in the face of activities by better organised communist-controlled groups. They also discovered the difficulties of weaning such groups off their addiction to state funding. Like IRD and CIA, CRD found that its work in the area of counter-communism was conducted in a global arena without clear boundaries, rather than an international arena. Thus, efforts with 'state-private networks' could require them to reach backwards into their own societies and thus to conduct growing intervention in domestic as well as foreign affairs.⁹ These networks are also notable for the prominent role played by women in a manner that is unusual in the landscape of the early Cold War. This may reflect the way in which non-governmental organisations seemed to offer women greater opportunities to

take a leading role in policy-formation, it may also reflect a Whitehall that perceived areas such as cultural, student and youth affairs as an appropriate terrain for women.

The Formation of WFDY

British cultural diplomacy emerged in the 1930s as a result of two initiatives. As Michael Lee has shown, this was represented by the British Council working to increase the numbers of overseas students attending British universities for commercial reasons, and broader efforts via the BBC to counter the efforts of the Italian government to undermine Britain's position in the Middle East through Radio Bari.¹⁰ The creation of the Cultural Relations Department (CRD) itself was a reflection of Whitehall's wartime growth which involved replication. The Foreign Office began the war with seven departments and ended the war with more than twenty. Across Whitehall many new organisations were set up, taking the state into areas of public life upon which it had hitherto had little influence. CRD reflected efforts to manage growing initiatives in an area which increasingly involved symbolic public gestures of solidarity or allusion to common ideals. By 1945, CRD was conceived of as an organisation which, together with the British Council, would manage the growing world of international associations, movements, conferences and exhibitions and other public efforts in the realm of international understanding. It was also required to deal with the cultural aspects of the re-occupation of the European continent and the questions arising out of the creation of the UNESCO organisation. CRD had begun life in 1943 as the 'British Council Section of the Foreign Office', giving more political direction to pre-existing British Council work, and soon began to resist Soviet efforts to manipulate the world of international organisations.¹¹ By early 1945 – with its new name of

CRD - it was talking the lead in attempting to persuade the International Federation of Journalists to set up their headquarters in London.¹²

The bulk of CRD work remained associated with that of giving 'political guidance' to the British Council in a number of areas ranging from UNESCO to the overseas links British learned societies. This reflected the fact that the greater part of the British Council's work was done on the Foreign Office vote. But in 1945 CRD's more specialised work in the area of International Women's and Youth organisations was regarded as being of growing importance because of the danger posed by 'communist infiltration of such movements'. CRD's youth activities were given the highest priority by William Montagu-Pollock the Head of the Department who worked closely with MI5, and later the Foreign Office Russia Committee. Within CRD, day to day youth matters were the responsibility of desk officers like Monica Powell.¹³

In 1945 the area in which CRD most active in the field of youth and student movements in Europe. CRD was particularly irked by the fact that the new Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, had decided to allow a communist-dominated World Youth Congress to take place in London in November 1945. Attlee's decision reflected his wish – like that of many wartime diplomats – to give the Soviets the benefit of the doubt and also reflected his commitment to an internationalist perspective that shared much with the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and placed a strong emphasis on the United Nations.¹⁴ But the World Youth Congress in London had concluded its business by setting up the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), one of the leading Soviet-owned international organisations of the post-war period. CRD and the Home Office had opposed the hosting of the Congress, arguing for a ban on the grounds that it was being manipulated by Moscow in a cynical way. But they then found that the State Department was 'actively supporting the preparatory work' for the Congress, partly because it had the blessing of

an unsuspecting Eleanor Roosevelt. The Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin, smelt a rat and although invited to address the main rally at the Albert Hall, thought it safer to decline.¹⁵

Attlee's new Cabinet had decided to allow the Congress to go ahead in London despite warnings about the strong Communist elements behind it. The Cabinet argued that 'the more foreigners were allowed to visit this country and breathe the air of intellectual freedom in which we live the better', insisting that this would contrast well with the Soviet policy of 'black out' already visible in Eastern Europe. Sir Stafford Cripps, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and his wife, Lady Isobel Cripps, who had long-established interest in youth movements, were especially active in assisting the Congress and thereafter in setting up a funding organisation, the International Youth Trust, which supported the activities of the British Committee of WFDY.

The attitude of Attlee and his Cabinet proved to be naive. The considerable facilities afforded in London for the Congress gave it the appearance of official British blessing and many British youth organisations attended and only to discover that 'effective control of the proceedings was already in Communist hands'. A 'vast' delegation of Soviet youth, with an average age of forty, had arrived a month before the conference to make preparations. By controlling the agendas, framing the motions and 'shouting the others down' they had 'swept the board'. Motions had been passed asserting that conditions in Belsen were nothing compared to those in colonial West Africa and that monstrous British colonialists 'cut off the thumbs of Bombay cotton-workers to avoid Indian competition' with British home cotton production. To add insult to injury two of the three Balkan delegations proved to be armed with briefcases full of counterfeit sterling currency.¹⁶

Signals intelligence material in the form of Venona traffic from 1945 reveals a little of the Soviet effort devoted to this conference. On 10 September 1945, Lt General Pavolov Fitin, Head of INU, the Foreign Intelligence Department of the MGB, sent a telegram to the London station regarding this conference. Although sections of the message have not been broken, it

appears that four of the delegates from the Soviet Union were MGB officers with orders to coordinate efforts with sympathetic delegates from other countries. This Venona material was not available to CRD, partly because of its very limited circulation, and also because inroads into this traffic were painfully slow.¹⁷ Notwithstanding this, CRD has seen enough at the Westminster Congress to know they had been outsmarted by Moscow and were angry. They were determined to prevent a repetition and if possible pay the Soviets back with the same coin. Non-Communist youth organisations in Britain – presided over by their umbrella organisation the National Council for Social Service - were now keen to resist obvious Communist encroachment and CRD were determined to give them every encouragement

CRD Responds

William Montagu-Pollock, Head of CRD, was the leading figure in a counter-campaign against WFDY. The first step was to look closely at the British figures who had taken a leading role in the Westminster Congress and who were now constituted as the British section of the WFDY. In March 1946 he warned his colleagues that the Communist grip of the British section of the WFDY was 'so strong' that they were past saving. Attempting to dissuade these individuals from participation seemed pointless. What CRD needed to do was 'to set up a rival political organisation' so it could intervene in this important field. This analysis in March 1946 led to Britain's first post-war experiment in the world of what has been called 'state-private networks' and the launch of the first covertly run British front organisation, the World Assembly of Youth.¹⁸

CRD teamed up with incensed members of non-communist British youth groups. The key non-official figure was Elizabeth Welton, (sometimes known as Violet Welton) the

Secretary of the Standing Conference of National Voluntary Youth Organisations. She offered to help set up a secret group that would work against the Communists. She was also in close touch with similar-minded groups in Belgium, France, the Netherlands and the USA. She reported that other private anti-communist groups were being set up in Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland. In the late Spring of 1946 she prepared to depart on a tour of Holland, Belgium and France to cement relations with these groups, especially the Union Patriotique des Organisations de la Jeunesse in Paris. But she also confessed to some trepidation. Her European collaborators had warned her that life was dangerous for the opponents of organised Communism on the continent. Recently there had been 'two cases of sudden death by poisoning and a mysterious disappearance of anti-communist organisers' in Europe and everyone was on their guard. Welton was not exaggerating, for by 1948 it was reported that as many as 15 individuals involved in youth work in Denmark had been 'liquidated' by their communist opponents.¹⁹ CRD noted that Elizabeth Welton's connection with the authorities was to be 'kept dark' but she would be given some training and preparation before departing. 'Mr Hollis of M.I.5. is expected to brief her', they noted, in order to give her the benefit of Whitehall's intelligence on European youth movements and the issue of 'who is a Communist and who is not'. Roger Hollis, who had superintended MI5's F Division (surveillance of political parties) and had just taken over the supervision of C Division (security).²⁰

Whitehall was interested in student politics as well as youth affairs and was especially anxious about Communist inroads into the National Union of Students in Britain. Accordingly, CRD teamed up with MI5 and SIS to observe these activities. At a remarkably early stage in the Cold War they decided to take measures, again by trying to create their own counter-groups. Britain's National Union of Students (NUS) played into the hands of CRD because they were short of money. Hoping to attend an international student festival in Prague in August in 1946 they approached the Foreign Office in May 1946 to request a government grant to cover the

costs of their travel. Privately, CRD noted that they were not going to 'finance this clandestine agency of communism', nevertheless, they encouraged further meetings with student leaders to track their activities.²¹

CRD worried that this student festival would result in the setting up of a Soviet-controlled International Students Federation 'in which the communists will hold all the strings', a repeat of what had happened with youth organisations in London the previous year leading to the creation of WFDY. So their first aim was to 'discourage the NUS' from taking part, but they knew it would be difficult as the NUS had 'three near-Communists' on its Executive Committee and had been effectively Communist controlled since 1940. CRD's decision was to warn the NUS off in the first instance, but if the 'worst comes to the worst', and the NUS attended the Conference, CRD resolved 'take fairly rigorous action'. They would have get clearance at a high level from Ministers, but in the worsening international climate of May 1946 they had 'no doubt that it would be forthcoming'.²² Together with MI5, they busied themselves checking the background of the NUS delegation. MI5 asserted that a number of the delegation, including Carmel Brickman, were members of Communist Party, and claimed that A.T. James, the President of the NUS 'had a record of close association with Communist activities'.²³ It was Communists on the NUS Executive who had helped to set up the World Youth Congress in London in November 1945 leading to the creation of WFDY. The WFDY went to hold a further major rally in Prague in 1947.²⁴

SIS took over the business of monitoring youthful British communists from MI5 once such individuals left Britain and reached the continent. In the Summer of 1946, the new 'R5' Requirements section of SIS, which dealt with world communism, tracked the efforts of British Communists, who had been denied visas by the Foreign Office, to reach a meeting of the WFDY in Vienna. Special attention was paid to Kutty Hookham, Joint Secretary of the WFDY and also active on its British Committee. Hookham, something of an old stager in the world of

international organisations, was one of the few British nationals to elude Foreign Office visa restrictions. SIS explained that she had achieved this by first visiting the headquarters of the new WFDY in Paris, then going on to Moscow, and then travelling from Moscow to Vienna. She was then due to travel back in Paris for another WFDY meeting. The Soviets were able to watch British efforts to impede the progress of British WFDY delegates with some clarity, for the SIS officer liaising with CRD on this matter was none other than Kim Philby, Head of R5.²⁵

By July 1946, CRD were ready for action on three fronts. Firstly, to try and create an element more resistant to Communism within the NUS. Second, to try and prevent a British delegation going to the International Student Congress in Prague, and third to set up rival conferences, even rival non-communist youth and student organisations. CRD hoped that their groups would constitute 'a standing perpetual challenge to gang-rule wherever it becomes manifest - whether by Nazi parties or Soviet parties, or by Zionist movements.' CRD urged that if they mobilised properly they could also arrange a great deal of open criticism in the Prague meeting, adding 'we should show these Communist tricksters what world opinion ...thinks of them'.

But there was a great deal of work to be done. In the summer of 1946 the apparatus that CRD needed for countering organised Communism at the international level was not yet there. This was the fault of those who had hastily dismantled Britain's propaganda machinery after the war. Rather unfairly CRD rounded on the overt information services that remained, namely their colleagues in the British Council. The British Council, it complained was busy promoting British culture in a superficial way without proclaiming core British political and social values, and accusing them of 'frivolities with ballet girls and second-rate painters.' In July 1946, CRD was one of the loudest voice in Whitehall urged action 'at a high-level' on political warfare against Moscow. Propaganda had to be 'overhauled' and 'strengthened'.²⁶

In tackling the NUS they were initially baffled by the lack of a way in. CRD's objective was 'the creation of a body of opinion to balance the extremists' within the NUS.²⁷ CRD took a close interest in NUS but the nature of the action taken remains unclear. Sir Patrick Nichols, the British Ambassador in Prague was watching preparations for the International Student Congress there. Nichols thought it would be difficult to block Communist students attending, so instead the tactic should be to somehow get more non-communist students onto the British delegation to balance the communist elements. 'In other words' he said 'we have to choose between infiltration and boycott'. He favoured infiltration as the way forward. Nichols also warned that the British delegates selected for Prague included the familiar Kutty Hookham, whom he called 'an ardent communist'.²⁸

By January 1947, CRD's longer-term project, a rival youth conference in London designed to produce an alternative world youth movement to challenge WFDY was under way. Elizabeth Welton, together with George Haynes, Secretary of the National Council of Social Service, an umbrella organisation of British Youth Groups, were leading the effort. They had held informal discussion with similar elements in the USA, France, Belgium and Holland who 'very much hoped' that Britain would take the lead in this struggle. These individuals requested a 'special' grant to help finance the operation. CRD took the point but were worried that Labour backbenchers would become suspicious and might realise that it was as 'an open attack on W.F.D.Y.' It was important to disguise the nature of the 'international aspect of British youth work' and they warned that the grant application would have to be 'carefully wrapped up'.²⁹

As CRD reached the jumping off point in terms of covert activities, Hector McNeil, the Foreign Office Minister of State with responsibility for the intelligence services, thought it might be wise to seek greater support amongst senior Cabinet ministers for the growing campaign against WFDY. On 19 February 1947 he met with James Chuter-Ede, Home Secretary, and Stafford Cripps, the Chancellor of the Exchequer to show them a range of materials indicating

the extent of Moscow's influence. 'I had a very bad time', reported McNeil, 'neither of them are prepared to accept the evidence of MI5'. Cripps was especially hostile as he was personally and closely involved in supporting the activities of both WFDY and the NUS. Gladwyn Jebb, a senior official in the Foreign Office who had taken over the running of the Russia Committee, was outraged at the treatment of his own minister:

To anyone who does not wilfully blind himself, it must be obvious that WFDY is inspired and controlled by Moscow ... It seems to me grotesque that this bogus body, whose meetings appear to be dominated by elderly Russian Major-Generals, should pose as the only representative of 'democratic youth' everywhere.³⁰

But in 1947 both Stafford Cripps and Lady Isobel Cripps were still adamant that these organisations were free and independent.

Creating WAY

By January 1948, CRD's main project, an International Youth Congress in London was tottering forward, but it was a weakling compared to the vigorous and well-organised WFDY events supported by Moscow. CRD staff attended the meetings of Britain's National Council for Social Services, who were charged with organising the International Youth Congress and who were being funded with small grants from the Ministry of Education. But CRD were dismayed by the indecisiveness of the worthy individuals who staffed it. They came away 'depressed and despairing' for these figures were 'so afraid' of doing anything that might provoke and attack by the better organised WFDY. It was clear that genuinely independent bodies were not going to

lead the way of their own accord, so CRD would have to step up their own intervention and get things going. 'It is essential that we act quickly and boldly now', they concluded. There were further meetings between Montagu-Pollock of CRD and Elizabeth Welton, the toughest and most reliable individual within the British non-communist youth movements collaborator. Elizabeth Welton was not only someone who was incensed by communist infiltration of British youth movements, a colleague also recalls that she was also someone who simply enjoyed cloak and dagger work for its own sake. She was ideal for the tasks that CRD wished to set her. Officials now began to approach a range of British youth organisations privately and 'indirectly' to persuade them to quit WFDY and to join the rival CRD-sponsored International Youth Conference.³¹

In the event, the International Youth Conference – held at Church House in Westminster, London, in August 1948 - proved a mammoth success. CRD measured its success by the extent to which it was attacked in the Soviet press. The experience also confirmed CRD in its tactics of creating new rival bodies rather than attempting to prise existing groups away from WFDY. Recent confrontations between various left and right youth organisations in Europe seemed to show CRD that 'any kind of "Trojan Horse" tactics are useless' and that competing bodies built afresh were more promising. Although NUS had in fact broken away from Communist control by mid-1948 and had left the WFDY later that year, nevertheless the approach of building organisations anew remained CRD's chosen forward path. The International Youth Conference gave birth to 'WAY' or the World Assembly of Youth, Britain's first covertly orchestrated international organisation. Elizabeth Weldon became the Secretary of the British National Committee of WAY. In the same year Britain also set up a proper covert political warfare section, the Information Research Department. But for the last three years it had been CRD and Montagu-Pollock - one of Britain's least known Cold War warriors - who filled the gap.³²

In 1948 one of CRD's abiding anxieties in creating WAY was to avoid a situation in which there were rival British and American competitors to the communist WFDY. In theory this was not a problem for the covert action arm of the CIA – known as OPC - was not really under way until mid-1948. But in practice, all sorts of privateer operations were being run by American private organisations, often with the encouragement of the State Department, the US Army and others. Thus in March 1948, to their dismay, CRD uncovered what appeared to be moves afoot in the USA to create a rival body to the WFDY led by Sturgeon M. Keeney. Keeney was now in Europe and although not an American government official was working out of the American embassy in Paris. CRD had asked their representatives at the British Embassy in Washington to investigate who was 'backing' Keeney. He proved to be a recent graduate of Harvard and son of an American official who living in Rome, but who was 'not attached to the U.S. Embassy there'. Having attended the WFDY Prague meeting of 1947 he had decided to try and set up a counter-group with the encouragement of Robert Smith, Vice-President of the American National Student Association. Keeney was also the National Student Association representative on the National Commission on UNESCO. In 1948 CRD were making active efforts to contact him in order to engage him with the activities of WAY.³³

Central to the successful creation of WAY were the efforts of Bevin and his officials to persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, of the Communist nature of its opponents the WFDY. Ironically, not only was Cripps the most active Cabinet Minister in backing the formation of WFDY in 1945, in 1948 Cripps was the gatekeeper for the additional funds that Bevin needed to support the new British venture, WAY. However, as CRD officials warned Bevin in April 1948: 'Although the evidence supplied by MI5 and others was to us incontrovertible, Sir Stafford has never been convinced and prevented unanimity in the Cabinet Committee which was set up to discuss this question in 1946'.³⁴

In April 1948 Bevin and CRD set out to educate Stafford Cripps. Simultaneously they were working on Lady Isobel Cripps, another leading labour light and key figure in the world of youth movements, to persuade her of the communist nature of WFDY. Initially this involved sending George Haynes the General Secretary of NCSS to the USA to lobby the State Department and also Eleanor Roosevelt. Eleanor Roosevelt was then prevailed upon to approach Lady Cripps about the problems of communist penetration.³⁵ Bevin had several personal meetings with Lady Cripps, parading various witnesses to prove his point. This included a former Secretary General of WFDY, Sven Beyer-Pedersen, who had been expelled for not being sufficiently communist, and who was keen to tell all. Beyer-Pedersen was a crucial witness. In March 1948, CRD officials had debriefed him with George Haynes and Elizabeth Welton in attendance. His account 'coincided with various top secret reports on the organisation' that they had already received, but had added material on personalities and most importantly, was full of drama and had the ring of conviction.³⁶ Bevin argued that WFDY was now 'entirely run by Communists' and set out the NCSS plans for a new and 'genuinely democratic' international youth organisation called WAY. He was careful to stress that he had the support of both Hugh Dalton and Morgan Phillips who were 'very concerned' about this issue. Bevin warned that it would be 'fatal' to get out of step with an emerging Labour Party hard line on the WFDY. Lady Cripps took the point and now began working with Eleanor Roosevelt against the organisation that they had previously supported. Doubts had probably been forming in her own mind since the stridently communist WFDY Congress in Prague in 1947.³⁷ In May 1948 Sir Stafford Cripps resigned from the International Youth Council (the headquarters of the British Committee of the WFDY) and later dissolved the International Youth Trust which he had helped to create and which largely financed the International Youth Council.³⁸

In 1948 CRD hoped that funds for WAY could be made available discreetly through the Ministry of Education, but initially they encountered 'difficulties with their grant regulations'

which did not permit them to fund overseas activities. The Ministry of Education was already subsidising the 1948 International Youth Conference itself through a grant to NCSS. George Haynes of NCSS had told the Foreign Office that if the 1948 International Youth Conference was to produce a permanent body to oppose WFDY - as they had hoped - they would need £9,000 - £10,000. Christopher Warner - who had transformed himself from an apologist for the Soviet Union in early 1945 into one of its most active critics by 1948 - was determined that they should find the money.³⁹ In the event it fell to Bevin to persuade Stafford Cripps to come up with finance. Bevin exhorted Cripps about the importance of setting up 'permanent machinery' and asked him for an initial outlay of £5,000, expecting the rest to come from the USA and other sources. Bevin also asked for advice from Cripps 'as to the channel through which financial assistance should be forthcoming', explaining that there were likely to be objections to the political nature of this grant if it came direct from the Foreign Office. On 3 September, Cripps authorised British government funds for WAY's permanent machinery and secured the agreement of George Tomlinson, Secretary of State for Education that it would be funnelled through his department.⁴⁰ CRD had held talks with the Ministry of Education on 26 July 1948 and had stressed the latter had a 'particular skill for giving support, without doing so conspicuously'. Ministry of Education officials did not take this as a complement and were uncomfortable about being used for overseas activities which were outside their remit simply because this provided a discreet channel.⁴¹ Stafford Cripps himself seems had been placed under considerable pressure by his fellow Cabinet Ministers, but exactly how far Cripps had really abandoned his far-left associates remains in question. As late as 27 July 1948 the redoubtable Kutty Hookham of WFDY, wrote to Cripps thanking him for intervening in Whitehall to secure visas for the latest travels of members of the International Youth Trust.⁴²

Throughout this period CRD worked very closely with MI5 through its Foreign Office link man, A.S. Halford. CRD would often refer obliquely to MI5 as 'Mr Halford's friends'.⁴³

Roger Hollis, Director of MI5's C Division, remained the principal contact for Halford and what CRD primarily wanted from MI5 were for name-traces to be conducted in their registry. On 24 June 1948 Hollis wrote to Halford conveying information about several trace requests on British citizens who had been involved in a recent International Student Service Conference at Rangoon. These included: Dr Kennett, John Spencer, Douglas Aitken, Nancy Richardon (NUS) and Christopher Seton-Watson.⁴⁴ Indeed, by 1948 British officials were working with MI5 on a global basis against WFDY. In July 1948 CRD were offered copies a mass of material sent from the WFDY to the Democratic Peoples Youth League in Burma which had been obtained from the Burmese Special Branch by the local MI5 Security Liaison Office at the Rangoon Embassy.⁴⁵

CRD and the problem of slender means

Front organisations are not cheap to run. Artists, intellectuals and writers often could not be easily co-ordinated by anything except largesse and some proved truculent when this was not available. Accordingly, money was soon an issue for the foot soldiers of CRD and IRD in London. This was certainly the case with the World Assembly of Youth (WAY) which had competed successfully with the Soviet youth front, the WFDY. British government stringency in the early 1950s forced Whitehall to make hard choices and CRD found it hard to defend their project. To their dismay, because American financial support seemed to be forthcoming for WAY, the leaders of this favourite project gradually moved over to working more closely with Washington.

Problems began to loom as early as November 1950. CRD noted that WAY officials were 'touchy' about the money issue. Previously London had given 'considerable financial support both to the International headquarters of the World Association of Youth and to the British National Committee'. IRD and CRD had hoped that this was merely pump-priming money, since the original intention was that WAY should eventually 'stand on its own feet' and be maintained by voluntary subscription from its component organisations. Just like the CIA's Free Europe Committee in Washington, which was also originally intended to become free-standing and self-financing, WAY remained stubbornly dependent on government subventions. But unlike its American equivalents, WAY's impoverished parent could not afford to continue generous subsidies. In what CRD called 'our present financial straits' they began to cast around for possible additional subsidies from NATO.⁴⁶

On 26 November 1951, John Nicholls who superintended all the Foreign Office information departments convened a meeting to consider the future of British clandestine policy in the area of youth movements. It was attended by figures from CRD, IRD and also the Information Policy Department. They agreed that one of their main aims was to provide the youth of Western Europe as a whole with an antidote to Communism. They also resolved to make 'special efforts' in the area of German youth and colonial youth. WAY remained the crucial vehicle for these British projects. But obtaining hoped-for additional allied financial support for WAY was tricky, since both the continental European and American governments were avidly pro-federalist, which London did not like. Optimistically, London hoped to obtain allied funding for WAY, but at the same time to use WAY within European youth programmes to apply a brake to federalist tendencies.

In 1952 they urged 'a maximum British participation' in European Youth activities, but 'aimed at opposing Federal Europe propaganda'. They also worried about the fact that the French and the Americans were now backing a youth programme which the European Movement was

preparing for next year. WAY was working on this project together with the European Movement and International Union of Socialist Youth and a joint secretariat had been set up in Brussels. The WAY representatives on this Brussels Secretariat were the old CRD-sponsored stagers, including Elizabeth Welton, who had previously been Secretary of the British National Committee of WAY, together with Guthrie Moir and Robert Leaper, two of the more 'energetic' members of this Committee. But given the federalist complexion of the wider programme should their task in Brussels be supporting, reporting or undermining? British officials were perplexed and had to seek 'higher guidance of HMG's attitude to the European Movement'.⁴⁷ WAY was consistently used to try and blunt the strong federalist tendencies of American and French backed outfits including the European Movement itself. By January 1955, Lord Hope, Under-Secretary of State at the Foreign Office, was backing WAY in its efforts to secure Consultative Status from the Council of Europe, in direct competition with the European Movement's European Youth Campaign. CRD complained of the 'federalist bias' of the European Youth Campaign which was 'maintained by American funds'. CRD had little doubt about who was really behind the lavishly-funded European Youth Campaign.⁴⁸

CRD and IRD could never obtain enough money from the Treasury for WAY to maintain smooth relations with their proteges, even though strenuous efforts were made. Between 1952 and 1954 both Anthony Eden and Selwyn Lloyd made repeated efforts to resist Treasury cuts in the subsidy to WAY.⁴⁹ In January 1954, Anthony Eden as Foreign Secretary 'made a personal intervention' to try and lever more money for the Treasury to support this project. Eden was joined in this enterprise by the Colonial Office and the Commonwealth Relations Office. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rab Butler, refused to continue the subsidies, which had nevertheless been quite small. Since the launch of WAY in London in 1948, its international organisation had received only £700 a year and its British National Committee, the real engine room of WAY activity, £2,000 per year. There had also been further

ad hoc subsidies to ensure the effective attendance of British delegations at international conferences. British leadership of WAY, an international body with a membership of 60 countries, was a stunning achievement and it had been secured at a bargain price. Guthrie Moir, now the International President of WAY, with whom CRD had 'very close relations' contacted Eden regularly pleading its case. The Second General Assembly of WAY was planned for Singapore in September 1954. The venue had been 'chosen with the encouragement of the Foreign Office' but there was now no money to send a British delegation. This was doubly embarrassing since many other Western European governments now gave subventions to the International Secretariat of WAY and its various national committees 'most generously'.⁵⁰

In May 1954, Ian Page, the British President of WAY, tried scare tactics. Despairing of his sponsors in IRD and CRD, he wrote to the Treasury directly asking for £7,000, enclosing material generated by his communists rivals. The Treasury were indeed 'shaken' and had to concede that their communist competitors 'looked pretty devilish'. But in July, Rab Butler continued to refuse funds. American funding from Ford Foundation or Carnegie remained a possibility, but this was sore point for those in Whitehall looking after Colonial Affairs, no less than European affairs, saw the Americans as rivals. Oliver Lyttelton, the Colonial Secretary warned Eden on 25 June 1954: 'I do not think either of us would want to see the controlling interest in this organisation passing ... to the United States'.⁵¹

By July 1954 relations between CRD and Guthrie Moir were reaching breakdown. The end of CRD-directed money had prompted the Carnegie Commonwealth endowment to withdraw their sponsorship of Singapore, leaving WAY with a \$50,000 shortfall. Moir had become 'very bad tempered' and had begun to leak material to the press about 'inter-departmental struggles' in Whitehall. Eventually in desperation, CRD and IRD turned to 'sources not under Treasury control' to carry the Singapore Conference forward and to get a British delegation there. In practice this meant \$20,000 from the Singapore Government together with a

private subvention from Shell-Mex. The Singapore Government offered its own estimate that without WAY, at least one third of its member organisations would join the Moscow-directed front, the WFDY.⁵²

The issue of longer term funding beyond the 1954 conference remained. Guthrie Moir and his team, who controlled the International Secretariat of WAY, now threatened resignation unless secret British subventions continued. Ivone Kirkpatrick suggested a grant of £5,000 for 1955/6, about a third of all the Foreign Office's meagre allocation for developing 'multilateral co-operation'. This was largely used to pay off previous debts and WAY pointed out that by late 1954 the British delegation was the only delegation in the world that was likely to default on its subscriptions for 1953 and 1954. In February 1955 the Treasury relented. Although the circumstances were somewhat different, nevertheless the grumpy relations between senior WAY figures and their British sponsors bear comparison with the unhappy relations of Jay Lovestone's AFL and their CIA partners during the same period.⁵³

Notwithstanding this, by the mid-1950s support for WAY's International Secretariat was already passing to American organisations with strong government connections, including the Asia Foundation (previously the Committee for a Free Asia), although it is likely that few if any of the WAY leadership were aware of the original source of some of the subventions. When the Singapore Youth Council was chosen to host the next WAY conference in August 1954, it was primarily the Committee for Free Asia, under the local representative Robert Sheeks, who provided the money. Indeed even before the arrival of WAY, it was the Americans who were supporting much of the non-government anti-Communist youth work including sponsoring the launch of a Chinese edition of the Singapore Youth Council's 'Youth World' magazine.⁵⁴

By 1955 the International Secretariat of WAY was becoming a largely American-funded body, receiving subsidies from a range of groups. This began to reflect itself in the leadership. By 1955 the Vice President of WAY was a young American sociology student called Immanuel

Wallerstein, who subsequently went on to become a highly influential International Relations theorist.⁵⁵ Britain's Guthrie Moir, explained that the big change had begun when they obtained \$70,000 from the Ford Foundation for a General Assembly meeting in Ithaca, New York. This had led to the setting up of the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs in New York shortly after. This American funding body had consistently 'invested large sums in WAY' including \$114,000 for the Singapore conference of 1954. The Asia Foundation also put up U.S. \$50,000 in travel grants towards delegates from Asian countries 'which were carefully selected by us in the light of the current political climate'. The Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs in New York was currently providing \$48,000 per annum for WAY's International Secretariat in Paris, including a translation service for its magazine, WAY Forum. John Rennie, the Head of IRD, continued to press for money in 1955, arguing that Britain 'cannot effectively influence the organisation and its activities ... without contributing to its funds', but the inescapable truth was that London had already lost the race for control of WAY as a whole.⁵⁶ But it should be stressed that influence in the councils of WAY was hardly a mechanistic result of funding and many of its international delegates had tired of the strong British presence that had evinced itself during WAY's first five years. Some were keen to encourage a greater variety in WAY's leadership to confirm its genuinely international identity. The French were also keen to resist what they regarded as Anglo-Saxon domination.⁵⁷

During the early 1960s cultural propaganda enjoyed a resurgence. Events in Hungary in 1956 had confirmed the collapse of more aggressive strategies denoted by political warfare and subversion. Moreover the growth of Arab nationalism in the late 1950s had also prompted London to place more emphasis on cultural propaganda.⁵⁸ During the early 1960s CRD was run by Robin Cecil, who had served as personal assistant to Sir Stewart Menzies, the Chief of SIS, both during and immediately after the war. Cecil was active on behalf of WAY and managed to increase Whitehall support, but this was now focused specifically on the British National

Committee of that organisation, rather than the international secretariat of WAY. During the early 1960s government subventions to the British National Committee of WAY rose to about £5,000 per year, partly as a result of favourable representations of their role to a 1960 working party on youth activities in the New Commonwealth.⁵⁹ CRD's avowed purpose was now sustaining the British National Council of WAY as a group that would 'counter the appeal of the communist youth organisations'. Whitehall remained almost the sole source of income for the British National Committee, although not for WAY as a whole. In 1965, when the Treasury attempted to shave its budget marginally, George Thompson, the Minister of State at the Foreign Office, made the usual protests. He stressed their concern about the 'important field of international youth work' and the potential of this organisation as 'a valuable instrument of Her Majesty's Government'. He warned that 'it will fail to fulfil this purpose if we keep it a bare subsistence level.'⁶⁰ But at the end of the 1960s the British National Committee remained a Cinderella organisation compared the other national committees of an international organisation that CRD had effectively created. Officials lamented that the British National Committee 'has always been dependent upon a Government subsidy' and had never developed a diversified funding base. As a result it was in debt and its HQ was 'in a dingy area' next to Euston station. In 1969 it was still receiving £5,000 a year from Whitehall, compared to the Dutch National Committee which received £15,000 from its government and the German National Committee which similarly received £75,000. Nevertheless, it remained active and played a significant role in helping to deal with 3,000 young Czechs stranded in Britain during the 1968 invasion. In 1969 the Treasury kept the subsidy going because they feared that if the British National Committee disappeared then its place would be taken by the Youth Action Council, 'a recently formed organisation with Communist connections'.⁶¹

Conclusion

CRD and its persistent creation - WAY - present us with an interesting phenomena. They point us to towards a more balanced vision of the heritage of British information warfare, alluding to both peacetime cultural as well as wartime influences and precursors. British information warfare in the early 1950s was presided over by a troika of CRD, IRD and the Information Policy Department (IPD), meanwhile they were assisted by a host of other organisations. By the late 1950s, with ideas of 'liberation' proving to be increasingly demode, political and psychological warfare were on the wane, while cultural warfare and 'soft liberation' enjoyed a resurgence. Although CRD enjoyed less of the limelight than its more famous IRD partner, it nevertheless outlived it, continuing its work well beyond the dissolution of IRD by David Owen in 1977. The Cultural Relations Department is still going strong despite much re-shuffling of Foreign Office organisation since 1989. WAY also continues its activities, albeit in a much altered form and primarily directed from Malaysia.

Both WAY and WFDY are interesting as rare examples of Cold War apparatus that were made by women as much as men. Despite the efforts of Cold War historians to refresh their agendas in recent years, the landscape of this conflict remains remarkably devoid of women, with the notable exception of women's organisations and their engagement with the Cold War.⁶² Kutty Hookham was probably the most energetic British figure behind the creation of WFDY and Elizabeth Welton was certainly a dynamic figure behind the creation of WAY. Both Hookham and Welton relished the shadowy nature of some of their work., indeed Welton was often criticised by her colleagues for her excessive enthusiasm for 'cloak and dagger stuff'. Helen Dale was Secretary-General of WAY in the mid-1950s, while Sonia Richardson and Ruth Schachter were also influential at this time. In terms of patronage, the work of Lady Isobel

Cripps and Eleanor Roosevelt were clearly important. Meanwhile the desk officer in CRD with primary responsibility for this area was Monica Powell.⁶³

Neither Britain nor the United States can have claimed to have invented the style of covert cultural and political warfare that resulted in the proliferation of ‘state-private networks’ during the Cold War. This accolade probably belongs to Willi Münzenberg, the mastermind behind much Soviet-inspired united front activity in inter-war Europe.⁶⁴ How far the British and the Americans in the late 1940s were deliberately emulating his tactics is hard to judge. What is clear is that the Soviet cultural apparatus a matter of continual fascination to CRD by the late 1940s. Their attitude was not always one of admiration and they considered many aspects of the Soviet cultural apparatus to be somewhat baroque. In 1946 CRD officials noted that among Moscow’s 50 theatres there numbered ‘The Theatre of the Ministry of Internal Security’ run by the MGB itself. They seemed to lack information what sorts of shows were running at this unique venue.⁶⁵

The persistence of CRD, drawing a line of continuity from the 1930s onwards into the twenty-first century, raises some interesting questions about culture, propaganda and front organisations. Most obviously, one is inclined to ask, ‘where are they now’? Over the last decade, historians have made some notable discoveries about the extent to which many ‘free and independent’ international movements were enmeshed in ‘state-private networks’ during the Cold War. These networks were often clandestine or semi-clandestine and characterised by a complex partnership – albeit sometimes volatile - rather than by simple state manipulation. Surveying the scene for the 1950s, it now seems that many independent international organisation and groups enjoyed substantial state support and some, like WAY, were state creations. Conversely, some commentators working in the area of international relations have made a great deal of the period after 1945 as one characterised by the rise of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and global networks, even speaking of these things as pointing towards

the eventual 'death of the state'. These assertions sit a little awkwardly with what we know now about NGOs in the period 1919-1960. In turn, they might prompt us to wonder what was the real character of NGOs in the later phases of the Cold War and beyond? The answer is likely to remain a matter of speculation for some time.

But now and then we catch a glimpse. In early 1986 George Soros set up the American-based 'Foundation for Chinese Reform and Opening' designed to accelerate the reform process in mainland China. Some would argue that the transnational activities of groups and foundations like this encouraged the reform movements and student societies that found themselves in Tianenmen Square in 1989. Beijing perceived these international foundations that were encouraging reform as vehicles that were being deliberately deployed by Western states to undermine political stability in China. In 1989 the Chinese Ministry of State Security thought it knew what was going on. Unusually, some of the Chinese internal government papers documenting the events of 1989 have now been published and in a report to Party Central of 1 June 1989, written days before the fighting began, the Ministry of State Security alleged that 'four members of the foundation's advisory committee had CIA connections'. Who can say if this is the truth, or else the paranoid vision of one of the last significant authoritarian states? But one suspects that in another thirty years time we will conclude that the influence of states and government officials has not always been on the wane in the face of NGOs or global forces, and that instead the officials found creative ways of bring the state back in.⁶⁶

¹ J. Lewis, *Changing Direction: British Military Planning for Post-war Strategic* (London: Sherwood, 1988); M. Folly, *Churchill, Whitehall and the Soviet Union* (London: Macmillan, 2000). Lewis is strongly critical of what he considers to be a diplomatic myopia, while Folly develops the idea of a 'co-operation thesis' amongst some Foreign Office officials.

2. Clerk-Kerr to London, 26 November 1946, N16816/989/38, FO 371/47935; Clerk-Kerr to London, 15 December 1945, LC6031/1406/452, FO 924/206. The path-breaking work in this area is J. Kotek, *Students and the Cold War* (London: Macmillan, 1996) which focuses upon students. For a wide-ranging analysis of British cultural diplomacy and the British Council see J.M. Lee, 'British Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War, 1945-61', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 9, 1 (1998): 112-34. This paper seeks to focus specifically on youth movements and CRD.

3. Randall to Montagu-Pollock, 21 Dec. 1945, LC 359/191/452, FO 924/449.

4. P. Taylor, *British Propaganda in the Twentieth Century: Selling Democracy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999); P. Lashmar and J. Oliver, *Britain's Secret Propaganda War: The Foreign Office and the Cold War, 1948-1977* (London: Sutton, 1998); R. Smith, 'A Climate of Opinion: British Officials and the Development of Soviet Policy,

1945-7', *International Affairs*, 64, 4 (1988): 635-47.

5. On IRD's early years see H. Wilford, 'The Information Research Department: Britain's Secret Cold War Weapon Revealed', *Review of International Studies* 24, 3 (1998): 353-70; W.S. Lucas and C.J. Morris, 'A very British Crusade: the Information Research Department and the Beginning of the Cold War', in R.J. Aldrich (ed.), *British Intelligence, Strategy and the Cold War* (London: Routledge, 1992), 85-111; P.M. Taylor, 'Puissance, propaganda et opinion publique: les services d'information britanniques et la guerre froide, 1945-57', *Relations internationales*, 55 (1988): 377-94.
6. Lee, 'Cultural Diplomacy', 112.
7. R.J. Aldrich, *The Hidden Hand: Britain, America and Cold War Intelligence* (London: John Murray, 2001), 149.
8. The term is drawn from W.S. Lucas, *Freedom's War: The US Crusade Against the Soviet Union, 1945-56* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000).
9. W.D. Miscamble, *George Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 203-5.
10. Lee, 'British Cultural Diplomacy', 116-7.
11. Change of name of British Council Section to Cultural Relations Department, FO 366/1452.
12. Nash min. 22 March 1945, LC 1242/1242/452, FO 924/204.
13. Montagu-Pollock memo., 19 April 1947, 'Future of CRD', FO 924/594B.
14. R. Smith and J. Zametica, 'The Cold Warrior: Clement Attlee Reconsidered, 1944-1947', *International Affairs* 61, 2 (1985): 237-52.
15. Owen to FO, 20 June. 1945, LC2454/1406/45, FO 924/205; Hookham to Bevin, 23 October 1945, LC5033/1406/452, FO 924/206. Kotek, *Students*, 81.

-
16. Montagu-Pollock, min. 19 February 1946, W6865/524/50, FO 371/54787; Aitken min., 23 April 1946, W6861/524/G, *ibid.*
 17. Viktor to Igor, 14 September 1945, issue 31 December 1956 (previous issue 29 March 1951), HW 15/5.
 18. Brimelow min., 10 March 1946, W6861/524/G, FO 371/54787. On state-private networks see W.S. Lucas, *Freedom's War: The US Crusade Against the Soviet Union, 1945-56*, (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1999).
 19. Cowell min., 4 June 1946, W6864/524/50, FO 371/54787. Kotek, *Students*, 128.
 20. Brimelow minute, 12 June 1946, *ibid*
 21. Cowell min, 6 June 1946, LC2675/21/452, FO 924/383.
 22. Montagu-Pollock min., 27 May 1946, and Lambert min. 30 May 1946, 6784/524/50, FO 371/54787. See also Kotek, *Students*, 39.
 23. Cowell minute, 31 May 1946, 6784/524/50, FO 371/54787.
 24. CRD memo., 'British Participation in an International Student Congress', 28 July. 1946, W8195/524/50, FO 371/54788.
 25. Kim Philby (R5A) to FO, CX.94999/96, 17 July. 1946, W7377/524/50, FO 371/54787.
 26. Cowell min., 5 July. 1946, LC3185/21/452, FO 924/384. See also Kotek, *Students*, 84-5.
 27. Lambert min., 3 July 1946, W8195/524/50, FO 371/54788. Also Bowen min., 2 August 1946, *ibid.*; CRD memo., 'British Participation in an International Student Congress', 28 July 1946, W8195/524/50, FO 371/54788

-
28. Nichols to FO, 14 June 1946, *ibid.*
 29. Hector McNeil min., 10 January 1947, W8186/540/50, FO 371/54788. Also Haynes to Montagu-Pollock, 'Consultation between International Youth Organisations', 3 December 1946, *ibid.*
 30. Kotek, *Students*, 110-1.
 31. Powell min., 2 January 1948, LC20/20/452, FO 924/670; Mason min., 7 January 1948, LC253/20/452, *ibid.*. On grants see Macdermot to COI, 24 February 1948, LC804/20/452, FO 924/672. Two confidential interviews with former members of the World Association of Youth carried out in 1999.
 32. Powell min., 16 January 1948, LC159/20/452, FO 924/670; Minutes of the International Youth Conference chaired by Professor D. Hughes Parry, LC404/20/452, FO 924/670.
 33. Powell min., 18 March 1948, LC1258/20/452G, FO 924/673; British Embassy Washington to CRD, 13 April 1948, LC1643/20/452G, FO 924/675.
 34. Min. to Bevin, 9 April 1948, XXX, FO 924/674.
 35. British Embassy Washington to FO, 13 April 1948, LC1643/20/452G, FO 924/675.
 36. Powell min., 18 March 1948, LC1258/20/452G, FO 924/673.
 37. Bevin to Isobel Cripps, 13 April 1948 and Isobel Cripps to Bevin 2 June 1948, XXX, FO 924/674.
 38. MacDermot min., 18 May 1948, LC1238/20/452G, FO 924/673.
 39. Warner to Williams (Min of Ed.), 8 July 1948, LC 2428/20/452, FO 924/679.
 40. Bevin to Cripps, 30 July 1948, LC 2816/20/452, FO 924/679, Cripps to Bevin 3 September 1948, LC 2816/20/4523, FO 924/679. See also T 220/1210 and 1211.

-
- 41 Ministry of Education minute, 26 June 1948, ED 124/137. See also Tomlinson to Isobel Cripps, 2 June 1948, *ibid*.
42. Hookham to Cripps, 27 July 1948, File 524, Cripps Papers, NC.
43. See for example Powell min., 18 March 1948, LC1258/20/452G, FO 924/673.
44. Hollis (Box 500) to Halford, 24 June 1948, LC2615/20/4526, FO 924/679.
- 45 Glass to Finch, 27 July 1948, LC23041/20/452, FO 924/680.
46. Mayall min., 22 November 1950, L317/48, FO 924/871.
47. Mtg., 26 November 1951, CRL20017/2, FO 924/919; mtg., 1 December 1951, *ibid*.
48. Hope (FO) to Hollis (HoC), 27 January 1955, CRL2006/6, FO 924/1100.
- 49 Eden to Chancellor Exchequer, 8 May 1952, T2220/1210; Selwyn Lloyd to R.A. Butler, 14 July 1954, T220/1211.
50. Moir to Eden, 10 February 1954, CRL20014/4, FO 924/1039; Grant min., 1 March 1954, *ibid*; Haigh min., 1 April 1954, L20012/17, *ibid*.
51. Page to R.A. Butler, 8 May 1954, L20014/27, FO 924/1039; Grant min., 19 May 1954, L20014/30, *ibid*; Lytelton to Eden, 25 June 1954, L20014/43, FO 924/1040.
52. de Zueletta min., 29 July 1954, L20014/55, FO 924/1040; Walsh min., 12 August 1954, L20014/62, *ibid*; Nicholls (Singapore) to FO, 14 August 1954, L20014/68, *ibid*; Haigh minute, 16 Sept. 1954, CRL20004/70, FO 924/1041.
53. Page (WAY) to Haigh, 4 December 1954, CRL20014/85, FO 924/1041; Haigh min, 13 December 1954, *ibid*; Brooke to Hope, 1 February 1955, CRL20014/10, FO 924/1100. See also T 220/1211. On Lovestone and the CIA see the fascinating essay by Anthony

Carew, 'The American Labor Movement in Fizzland: The Free Trade Union Committee and the CIA', *Labor History*, 39, 1 (1998): 25-42.

54. Blum (President CFA) to Staats (OCB), 22 April 1954, Box 86, OCB Records, DDEL.

55. FO 924/1101. Immanuel Wallerstein was Vice President of WAY from 1954 to 1958. Private correspondence.

56. Moir to Hope, 17 March 1955, CRL2004/25, FO 924/1101; Rennie min., 20 May 1955, FO 1110/756.

57. Correspondence with Immanuel Wallerstein, 10 & 11 October 2001.

58. Lee, 'British Cultural Diplomacy', 112-3.

59. Noney memo., 'BNC of the WAY', 2-FD 376/22/01, 16 November 1965, T377/1436.

60. Thomson to Diamond (T), 8 November 1965, T317/1436. Also Williams (BNC WAY) to Cecil, 21 October 1965, *ibid.* The story of the Commonwealth Youth Trust effort can be followed in CAB 21/3161, 5341 and 5489.

61. Treasury memo., 'The British National Committee', 27 May 1969, T317/1436.

62. For example H. Laville, 'The Committee of Correspondence-CIA Funding of Women's Groups 1952-1957', *Intelligence and National Security*, 12, 1 (1997): 104-121.

63. Confidential interviews with three early British WAY members, May 2001.

64. Stephen Koch, *Double Lives: Willi Münzenberg and the Seduction of the Intellectuals* (London: Harper Collins, 1997).

65. 'Some Notes on Cultural Activity in the Soviet Union', 21 August 1946, LC 3981/838/452, FO 924/480.

66. 'Western Infiltration, Intervention and Subversion', Ministry of State Security report to Party Central, 1 June 1989, reproduced in Zhang Liang, *The Tiananmen Papers* (London: Little and Brown, 2001).

