David J. Dunthorn

The Prieto–Gil-Robles Meeting of October 1947: Britain and the Failure of the Spanish anti-Franco Coalition, 1945–50

In October 1947, Indalecio Prieto y Tuero and José María Gil-Robles y Quiñones, two prominent members of the exiled Spanish opposition, met in London. The former, a socialist activist since the age of sixteen, with a reputation for moderation and pragmatism, was by the autumn of that year the dominant figure of the exiled Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE), and, given the pivotal position of the PSOE, of the wider republican opposition. Gil-Robles, a right-wing Catholic clericalist, and former leader of the Confederación Española de Derechas Autónomas (CEDA), was, also by then, the acknowledged spokesman of the monarchist opposition to Franco. The two men's purpose was to agree on a regime which, if acceptable to the British government, would replace the dictatorship of General Francisco Franco y Bahamonde. Their four meetings were arranged with the help of the British Foreign Office. This collusion, as the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs complained at the time, seemed a 'strange case of discourtesy totally out of keeping with the traditional norm of English diplomacy'.[1] But the meetings represented, it will be suggested, a final British attempt to broker an agreement between the republicans and monarchists of the Spanish anti-Franco opposition in the hope of finding a solution to the 'Spanish problem'. Why Britain temporarily departed, in 1947, from a policy of strict non-intervention in Spanish internal affairs forms the subject of this article.

During the four years' German military occupation of France, Spain's neutrality had been strategically and militarily vital for the Allies' war effort. Franco's sympathies went undoubtedly to

European History Quarterly Copyright © 2000 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 30(1), 49–75.
[0265-6914(200001)30:1;49–75;011341]

the Axis Powers, but until he committed himself irrevocably to their cause, it had not been in the Allies' interest to destabilize his regime and thereby precipitate a German advance into Spain. With the lifting of the German threat to the Iberian Peninsula in the second half of 1944, however, Spain 'ceased to interest the Allies as a military factor'.[2] Franco was therefore warned by Britain in January 1945, and by the USA in March, that his wartime help to their enemies and the continuing fascist character of his regime would mean his country's exclusion from the postwar peace settlements and the new world organization.[3] Franco was concerned at Spain's international isolation — confirmed at the UN founding conference of San Francisco in June 1945 and in the Protocol of the Potsdam Conference of 2 August — and made a number of cosmetic changes to his regime. In the summer of 1945 he declared Spain a monarchy, legislation was introduced supposedly guaranteeing a number of domestic constitutional rights, and in Franco's new cabinet of 18 July 1945 the Catholic 'moderate', Alberto Martín Artajo, was appointed Foreign Minister in place of the Axis sympathizer José Félix de Lequerica y Erquiza. However, the vulnerability of Franco's regime was, as he himself suspected, more apparent than real. He knew that neither Britain nor the USA was prepared to intervene directly against him for fear of destabilizing the whole of Western Europe. In the aftermath of Liberation the French government, too, was wary of military adventures, and the USSR, while happy to fish in troubled waters, recognized that Spain fell outside its sphere of influence. Nor had Franco much to fear in the short term from the Spanish opposition. The republicans were scattered and divided, and the majority of monarchists, for the moment at least, seemed ready to collaborate with his regime. Nevertheless, in the long term, the existence of a repressive right-wing dictatorship in post-war Europe, disliked by the international community and challenged by the Spanish opposition, posed a threat to the stability of Western Europe. Spain, in short, was a 'problem'.

It was not surprising, therefore, that in the years immediately after the Second World War the British government found it difficult to formulate a coherent policy towards Spain. Ideally, in place of Franco, Britain would have preferred a moderate, democratic regime.[4] When it came, though, to the practical problem of how to install such a regime, difficulties arose. Another civil war

was out of the question, since Britain had strategic and economic interests in Spain too important to jeopardize. Direct military action with its attendant risk of French and Soviet intervention, not to mention the prohibitive cost, could not be contemplated. The effectiveness of economic sanctions and a rupture of diplomatic relations, moreover, was open to question and British interests were bound to suffer.[5] So in late 1944 the British government adopted a policy of 'pin-pricks': non-intervention combined with occasional criticism of the Franco regime. This, though, as was later recognized by the Foreign Office in March 1946, had little effect upon Franco except to make him 'more obstinate than ever'.[6] If there was to be any chance of the peaceful and successful transition to the moderate regime which it desired for Spain, then the British government, it seemed, had little option but to fall back on the Spanish anti-Franco opposition.

Here, however, more problems arose. By the end of the Second World War the British government had before it not a single, unified, Spanish opposition but, broadly speaking, a choice of four nuclei to which it could turn: the separate republican and monarchist oppositions, each of which existed both inside Spain and in exile.

The emergence of an effective republican opposition inside Spain was always hampered by Francoist repression. Nonetheless, a measure of co-operation between the former Frente Popular parties and organizations was gradually achieved, and in the autumn of 1943 negotiations between libertarians,[7] socialists and republicans for a common anti-Franco front began. These culminated a year later in the founding of the Alianza Nacional de Fuerzas Democráticas (ANFD).[8] Similarly, the republican *émigrés*, cut off from the interior and scattered over some twenty-three countries — though with the political leadership, including Prieto, concentrated in Mexico during the Second World War — also managed a semblance of unity. In Mexico City, after an interval of six years, a government-in-exile was formed in November 1945 under the leadership of the former wartime republican prime minister, José Giral y Pereira.[9]

Monarchist opposition to Franco was less clearly defined. It was, after all, only when it became apparent that the restoration of the Alfonsist monarchy under Franco could no longer be taken for granted that initial monarchist identification with the

nationalist cause had weakened.[10] Never a tight organization, active monarchist opposition in Spain was restricted to a small minority of individuals. Their allegiance went ultimately to the Pretender to the Spanish throne, Don Juan de Borbón y Battenberg, third son of Alfonso XIII, who had become heir to the Spanish throne on the death of his father in February 1941. Don Juan had followed the Spanish royal family into exile in 1931 and spent most of the Second World War in Switzerland before moving to Portugal in February 1946. A small circle of monarchist sympathizers had originally gathered round Don Juan in Lausanne while a separate group, including Gil-Robles, had formed in Lisbon. After Don Juan's move in 1946, Portugal became the centre of the exiled monarchist opposition. With their generally reactionary views, the exiles were often in conflict with the monarchist dissidents in Spain. Don Juan publicly distanced himself from Franco only in January 1944.[11]

Whom was the Foreign Office to choose? There was scant sympathy for the republican government-in-exile. Giral's uncompromising insistence on the restoration of the 1931 Constitution of the Second Republic promised only to perpetuate the divisions of the Second Republic, already associated in the Foreign Office's mind with revolutionary socialism. In the anarchy expected to follow the restoration of the Republic, 'extremist and unfriendly interests', inimical to Britain, it was feared, would come to the fore; any suggestion of British support for the republican 'left', moreover, was bound to rally moderate opinion in Spain behind the Dictator.[12]

There was greater Foreign Office sympathy for the monarchist opposition, especially after the Pretender, in his Lausanne Manifesto of March 1945, publicly committed himself to constitutional monarchy. The truth of the matter, though, was that Don Juan, unaided, was in no position to remove Franco. A successful monarchist restoration depended on Franco's generals, not many of whom shared Don Juan's democratic views or, indeed, were even convinced monarchists.[13] In any case, a monarchy restored by military coup, as Sir Victor Mallet, Britain's Ambassador to Spain, pointed out, was likely to be much further to the right than that envisaged in the Lausanne Manifesto and would, consequently, be expected to encounter resistance from foreign opinion, particularly from France and the USSR. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Ernest Bevin, was also

apprehensive of another Greek imbroglio, with Britain possibly obliged to defend a right-wing monarchist regime against Soviet intervention.[14] The Foreign Office therefore concluded that as neither the republicans nor the monarchists could by themselves constitute a moderate alternative to the Franco regime, this would only be realized through an anti-Franco coalition drawn from the *moderate* elements of both camps.[15]

Moderate members of the monarchist and republican opposition inside Spain had, in fact, reached the same conclusion. The general secretary of the ANFD's first National Committee, Juan José Luque Argente, was — like many libertarians mindful of the fate of anarcho-syndicalism under the Second Republic — a monarchist. Accordingly, when, in the autumn of 1944, several monarchist dissidents in Spain indicated a willingness to begin discussions with the ANFD, he responded positively. As was frequently to be the case, however, police arrests quickly put an end to these initial contacts. Then, in late summer 1945, General Antonio Aranda Mata, the most 'democratic' of the monarchist generals, contacted both the ANFD and Gil-Robles, in exile in Portugal, with proposals for a transition to the monarchy. Once again, arrests of ANFD members in October put a stop to this initiative until Luque, towards the end of the year, finally managed to reopen negotiations with the monarchists through Francisco Herrera Oria, a brother of Angel Herrera, a prominent Catholic propagandist.[16]

At this point mention must be made of the issues at stake in the republican–monarchist negotiations. Whether the Franco dictatorship was to be succeeded by a monarchy or republic was, of course, the fundamental question. The peaceful restoration of a republic against the wishes of the army was inconceivable as was its imposition by military coup. On the other hand, the monarchy could be restored by a coup, or even by Franco himself. However, a monarchist restoration in these circumstances would forfeit international goodwill, leaving Spain as isolated as ever. Despite their misgivings, therefore, the monarchists were forced to agree with the republicans that the choice of regime in Spain had to be decided by the people, through some form of plebiscite. This, though, merely shifted the problem one step back — to the nature of the provisional or transitional regime under which the electoral consultation would be held. Domina-

tion of an interim government by either side during the transitional period would obviously give that side an advantage and possibly prejudice the outcome of the plebiscitary process. It was, therefore, the nature of the transition and the timing of the electoral consultation, rather than the form of the final regime, that was to assume the greatest importance in republican–monarchist negotiations over the next three years.

The ANFD–monarchist negotiations, resumed in December 1945, quickly made progress. On the vexed question of transitional arrangements, verbal agreement was reached that Franco would be persuaded to hand over power to an administration of moderate monarchists and republicans — a Frente Nacional Democrático — to be headed by Don Juan: not in his capacity as king, however, but rather as an impartial Spaniard who had taken no part in the civil war [*sic*]. Don Juan's provisional government would remain in power until a plebiscite, which both sides were pledged to respect, decided the fate of the monarchy.[17]

At a joint meeting of the national executives of the exiled PSOE and socialist trades union organization, the Unión General de Trabajadores (UGT) in Toulouse on 24–25 January 1946, however, it was decided to support the Giral line of unconditional adherence to the Republic rather than the ANFD's search for a coalition with the Spanish right. Furthermore, in a typical change of tactic, the Partido Comunista de España was now calling for a broad anti-Franco coalition of the left, and, as a result, communists were admitted into the ANFD in February 1946. Not surprisingly, the monarchists balked at this and their talks with the ANFD broke down.[18]

After police action in March and April 1946 ANFD–monarchist contacts were interrupted until later in the year. In the meantime, however, the exiled 'Lisbon group' had been alarmed by news of the interior monarchists' concessions to the ANFD. Gil-Robles, in particular, felt that they did nothing to prevent the left's embarking on a revolutionary policy, should the opportunity arise. At this stage, moreover, he still had not ruled out the possibility of a monarchist restoration with the help of the Spanish right. If the latter were not to be alienated, therefore, it was imperative for the Pretender to avoid dangerous concessions to the left. It was therefore vital that the Lisbon group seized the initiative.[19]

The ANFD reconstituted itself on 24 June 1946 and soon

issued a manifesto calling once again for a plebiscite on the future form of the Spanish state, to be followed by elections to a constituent assembly within a specified period. The manifesto served as a basis for the negotiations which resumed in August between Francisco[20] Santamaría, who had since replaced Luque as ANFD general secretary, and the monarchist José Pardo de Andrade. According to their draft agreement, a provisional Gobierno de Reconciliación was to be formed with monarchists and republicans receiving an equal number of seats and with provision for military representation. It was also agreed that there would be a plebiscite within twelve months.[21]

It was at this point that Gil-Robles intervened. After the preliminary agreement, Santamaría left Spain to attend the Second Congress of the UGT-in-exile in Toulouse. In Paris, on his way back from the Congress, he was prevailed upon by Julio López Oliván, a member of Don Juan's secretariat, to travel to Lisbon to discuss the ANFD–monarchist agreement with the Pretender and his advisers. Once in Lisbon, however, where he arrived on 15 October, he was persuaded to accept a number of modifications to the original agreement. After his return to Madrid, he was, not surprisingly, severely reprimanded by the ANFD for exceeding his authority and replaced by Luque as ANFD general secretary. The first four points of the Estoril Agreement, to which Santamaría had assented, were accepted by the ANFD: freedom of religion and the special position of the Catholic religion in Spain, the strict maintenance of law and order, the temporary substitution of the right to strike by compulsory arbitration, and the guaranteed independence of the judiciary together with a commitment to review existing social legislation. It was, though, the fifth point that caused problems; according to this, it was agreed

> To prepare, after a prudent and gradual restoration of legitimate public freedoms, for the holding of a plebiscite by means of which the Spanish people will decide its political future.
>
> However, if as a consequence of factors, which cannot today be foreseen, there came about a *de facto* situation in which the present Dictatorship regime were replaced by the Monarchy or the Republic, the supporters of the other form of government would accept the situation created, and could even collaborate with it, on condition that *a posteriori* its ratification or rectification were sought through the electoral body, and that in the meantime they were given the necessary guarantees for the defence of their ideals, within the limits of the Law.[22]

As fully intended by the Lisbon monarchists, this left open the possibility of a restoration of the monarchy through a military coup or even through Franco himself. It did not escape the ANFD's notice, moreover, that by accepting the fifth point, they might be committing themselves to a right-wing regime, without republican representation and with no guarantee of a subsequent electoral consultation. Santamaría's agreement was therefore rejected by the ANFD on 24 November 1946.[23]

Within a few weeks, however, the ANFD forwarded a second draft agreement to Lisbon, which by conceding equal representation to the republicans, monarchists and the military in a provisional government, in effect accepted a minority republican role. Don Juan's reply, received on 6 January 1947, was non-committal and merely invited Luque to come to Estoril. That month there were more police arrests of ANFD members, and Aranda, too, was banished to the Balearics for two months. When he returned to Madrid in March, he made one last attempt to keep the initiative, informing the ANFD that he would sign the draft December agreement even without Don Juan's assent. Aranda's bluff was called, however, and, on 8 April, the ANFD was informed that without Don Juan agreement was impossible. So, later that month, Luque, who had personally escaped arrest, left Madrid for talks in Portugal. As it happened, the intervention of the British Foreign Office, which had little faith in Luque, prevented him travelling on from Paris, and he returned to Madrid empty-handed. More arrests in May and then November effectively ended any further significant ANFD participation in republican–monarchist negotiations.[24]

When the first real prospect of a republican–monarchist agreement had arisen in December 1945, the Foreign Office had been uncertain how to react. The Ambassador in Spain, Sir Victor Mallet, warned against leaving the moderate opposition in 'mid air', but Isham Peter Garran, the Western Department's expert on Spain, was opposed to abandoning Britain's policy of non-intervention. He doubted the proposed agreement's likely success and, in any case, maintained that it needed to be strong enough to stand on its own feet. He was also concerned that active British support for a monarchist restoration would be misunderstood at home and in the USA and would be criticized by the USSR. As in Greece, Britain would stand accused of trying

to restore the forces of reaction. The Head of the Western Department, Frederick Hoyer-Millar, similarly emphasized that one of Britain's main objectives was to prevent Spain becoming a 'source of dissension' between the major European powers and raised the spectre of Russian intervention in another Spanish civil war, should Britain intervene. In Hoyer-Millar's opinion, precipitate action by the British government also risked prejudicing the ANFD–monarchist negotiations then under way. His views were endorsed by the Permanent Under-Secretary, Sir Alexander Cadogan. Consequently, at a Cabinet meeting of 4 February Ernest Bevin, the Foreign Secretary, confirmed that while he was maintaining 'strong pressure' on Franco to change his regime, it was important that the British government did not appear to favour either republicans or monarchists. When, as has been described, the ANFD–monarchist talks broke down in early 1946, the British government was temporarily spared the need to redefine its policy towards the Spanish opposition.[25]

In 1946, however, this passive approach was to be tested by the internationalization of the Spanish problem. The initial impetus behind this development came from France. Since May 1945 the provisional government of Charles de Gaulle had been experiencing mounting pressure from the French Constituent Assemblies to take action against Franco. As a result, on 12 December 1945, the British and American governments were invited to join France in breaking off relations with Franco. This, the French Foreign Minister, Georges Bidault, argued, would be enough to bring about a change of regime.[26] In the Foreign Office, Hoyer-Millar advised against the French proposal, and the Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, also turned down a suggestion by Philip Noel-Baker, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, for a withdrawal of ambassadors and increased contacts with the republican opposition. The French were informed accordingly.[27]

Nevertheless, pressure from France continued. This led Hoyer-Millar to ponder the inconsistencies in Britain's policy towards the Spanish opposition:

> On the one hand, we are pressing hard, within certain limits, to get Franco out, while on the other we are taking no active steps to encourage the opposition elements to agree on an alternative Government. To be logical, if we are to push Franco out, we should give the Spaniards active help to agree on a substitute; or alternatively, if we are to leave it to the Spaniards alone to find a new Government, we should give them time to do so and should not press too hard

> on Franco in the meantime. But there is quite a risk, I think, that if we continue our present half and half policy — and more particularly if we accentuate it by anything like breaking off relations or recalling our Ambassador we may get the worst of both worlds and achieve just the result we want to avoid — i.e.: the collapse of Franco before any alternative Government is ready, — and create confusion leading probably to civil war.[28]

Hoyer-Millar's conclusion was to reaffirm a policy of steady but not exaggerated pressure on Franco, leaving the Spanish opposition to pursue their own negotiations. Oliver Harvey, Assistant Under-Secretary of State, favoured a more interventionist policy in support of the monarchists, but at a meeting with the two men on 18 February Bevin showed little enthusiasm for Don Juan, and Bidault was informed later that day that British policy had not altered.[29]

After the execution of seven Spanish republicans in Madrid on 21 February, including that of Cristino García Grande, a former distinguished commander in the French Resistance, anti-Franco feeling in the French Constituent Assembly came to a head. Four days later, the British Prime Minister, in the absence of the Foreign Secretary, informed the Cabinet that he was instituting a review of Britain's policy towards Spain in the light of the recent executions to consider whether further steps ought to be taken to 'expedite a change in the present regime'.[30] In Paris the next day, however, the new government of Félix Gouin was forced to act, deciding to close France's border with Spain from midnight of 1 March.[31] At the same time the French Foreign Ministry proposed placing the Spanish question before the UN Security Council. Bevin was alarmed and told the French Ambassador, René Massigli, that the French were making a 'great mistake', especially at a moment when there was a reasonable chance of ending the Franco regime. But in the USA, Dean Acheson, the Acting Secretary of State, was concerned not to leave the French government isolated and so vulnerable to communist influence. He therefore suggested as an alternative to UN involvement a joint declaration on the Franco regime by the French, British and US governments. The Foreign Office saw some merit in the American proposal and at a meeting of the Cabinet of 4 March the Foreign Secretary recommended the declaration as 'expedient'. That day the Tripartite Declaration was sent to Spain.[32]

This ruled out overt intervention in Spain's internal affairs but

warned the Spanish people that their 'full and cordial association' with the victors of the Second World War was impossible as long as Franco remained in power. The declaration then expressed the hope that 'leading patriotic and liberal-minded Spaniards' would find the means to bring about a peaceful withdrawal of Franco and establish a provisional government under which free elections would be held. Provided it instituted a number of basic democratic freedoms, this government would receive 'the recognition and support of all freedom-loving peoples'. The declaration concluded:

> Such recognition would include full diplomatic relations and the taking of such practical measures to assist in the solution of Spain's economic problems as may be practicable in the circumstances prevailing. Such measures are not now possible. The question of the maintenance or termination by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of diplomatic relations with the present Spanish regime is a matter to be decided in the light of events and after taking into account the efforts of the Spanish people to achieve their own freedom.[33]

Contrary to expectations, the Tripartite Declaration did not prevent the Spanish question being brought before the UN Security Council by the Polish delegation in April 1946. There followed several weeks of acrimonious debate in the Security Council which culminated in the General Assembly's resolution of 12 December 1946. Like the Tripartite Declaration this called for

> . . . a government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed, committed to respect freedom of speech, religion and assembly and to the prompt holding of an election in which the Spanish people, free from force and intimidation and regardless of party, may express their will . . . [34]

The resolution stopped short of demanding the total severance of diplomatic relations with the Franco regime, recommending instead only the withdrawal of member states' ambassadors from Spain. British, and American, relief was tempered, though, by the resolution's additional proviso that if 'within a reasonable time' a democratic government were not established, the Security Council should consider 'the adequate measures to be taken in order to remedy the situation'. The Foreign Office assumed that this 'reasonable time' would expire with the next session of the UN General Assembly in the autumn of 1947.

The prospect of direct UN intervention against Spain was alarming. Clearly, failure on Britain's part to implement further UN resolutions on Spain would undermine the authority of the new world organization. On the other hand, any destabilization of the Iberian peninsula ran directly counter to British interests in the Mediterranean, where the Russians, according to Bevin, were only waiting for the chance to move in.[35] On 6 January 1947, moreover, the Cabinet considered the likely effects of economic sanctions against Spain and reached the conclusion that, if the question came before the UN again, Britain should avoid taking the initiative.[36] In April, though, the newly appointed Minister of State, Hector McNeil, suggested a joint appeal by Britain, France and the USA to Spanish Catholics, monarchists, republicans and the army to reach agreement on an alternative government to Franco. His proposal would probably have gone no further, had it not coincided with a similar one from the US State Department. Communicated officially on 10 April, the US plan anticipated the Marshall Plan by promising financial and economic aid to Spain in return for a government formed from the 'liberal elements' in Spain in Franco's place. The advantage of this proposal, from the British point of view, was that it could be used to pre-empt further UN action over Spain.[37] On 11 April the British *chargé d'affaires* in Madrid, Douglas Howard, was therefore informed of Foreign Office thinking:

> Our idea is that we should represent to them [i.e. all the main opposition elements including the army] the urgency of the situation and explain that our obligations towards the United Nations might unfortunately involve us in concrete actions designed to oust Franco which while no doubt prejudicing our material interests, would certainly hit Spain hard. To avoid this situation arising we should hope that between them they would hasten to reach agreement as to the steps to be taken to solve the problem, at least to the extent of forming a shadow Government (and in the case of the Army agreeing to support this Government against Franco). As soon as this Government was available to take over from Franco peacefully and the support of the Army was assured, our three Governments would represent directly to Franco that he ought to withdraw lest as a result of United Nations pressure Spain should suffer serious consequences.[38]

Howard's reply was unenthusastic. He pointed out that as the moderate opposition on the left and right was likely to come together anyway, Anglo–American intervention was superfluous. Further doubts were expressed on 17 April when Mallet,

the former Ambassador to Spain, and Sir Orme Sargent, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, met to consider Howard's views. Their conclusions were taken into account by the Foreign Secretary, then in Moscow, who instructed that policy towards Spain should remain unchanged.[39]

Bevin's instructions notwithstanding, the implications of the American plan continued to receive Foreign Office attention for another two months. In May, for example, John Curle, a Second Secretary in the Western Department, suggested that, rather than intervening directly in Spanish internal affairs, Britain and the USA could 'serve notice' on all Spanish opposition groups, including the republican government-in-exile, that they would support any 'broad based government formed under the ægis of Don Juan', adding, interestingly, that any group wishing to negotiate for inclusion in this government 'should therefore apply to Don Juan at Estoril'. William Hogg, Acting First Secretary in the Western Department, argued further that if Britain opposed UN intervention without presenting any alternative, Spaniards in general would believe that it was British policy to support Franco. This would lessen the prospects of a moderate solution to the Spanish question.[40] Against Curle and Hogg, however, the Deputy Under-Secretary, Oliver Harvey, made clear the principal defects of the American plan, arguing:

> (1) That without his own consent or the consent of his Generals, Franco cannot be peacefully removed. There is no indication that either Franco or his Generals would yield to foreign persuasion.
> (2) That after the public failure of such a scheme the sponsors would suffer a severe loss of prestige and would be ill able to resist demands for more forceful measures.
> (3) That there is little likelihood of foreign pressure bringing about a unified alternative Spanish government. A government presided over by Don Juan would probably be most likely to achieve success inside Spain, but it is improbable that the United States Government or ourselves would wish to sponsor his claims.[41]

The Foreign Secretary endorsed Harvey's views at a meeting of 12 June 1947 in the Foreign Office called to review the whole question. Bevin indicated that he was not prepared to risk retaliatory action against British interests in Spain by an open declaration of support for Franco's opponents. Accordingly on 26 July Washington was informed of Britain's rejection of the American proposal. Thus, British policy remained as described four months

earlier: 'non-intervention tempered by passive encouragement of the responsible opposition to Franco'.[42]

Total inaction, however, was impossible. Public disquiet over Bevin's Spanish policy, though limited in the main to a restive minority of the Labour Party, could not be ignored.[43] More worrying was the continuing possibility of a call from the 1947 autumn session of the UN General Assembly for firmer action against the Franco regime. Consequently, when reports were received that summer of growing support within the exiled PSOE for a republican–monarchist *rapprochement*, the Foreign Office saw an opportunity, albeit slight, for a resolution of their difficulties over Spain. By leaving the initiative for an anti-Franco coalition to Spaniards, the impression of direct Anglo–US interference in Spain's internal affairs, which the McNeil–American plan entailed, was conveniently avoided, and the risk of confrontation with Franco reduced. It also allowed the British government to argue that the formation of a Spanish anti-Franco front rendered an escalation of UN action superfluous.

By the summer of 1947 the direction of republican opposition had shifted from Spain to the exiled PSOE, and to Prieto in particular. Prieto had long been convinced that the republicans, as the defeated party in the Civil War, were totally dependent for their return to Spain on the support of the Western democracies, especially Britain. Since the Tripartite Declaration had made it clear that only a moderate coalition government of the Spanish opposition stood any chance of recognition from Britain and her Allies, republican insistence on the restoration of the 1931 Constitution to Spain to the exclusion of all else was counterproductive. To comply with the Tripartite Declaration Prieto therefore urged a republican–monarchist *rapprochement*. It was not, however, until December 1946 and the UN Resolution on Spain that the failure of the exclusively *republican* strategy was demonstrated and Prieto came into his own.[44] Thereafter, PSOE support for Prieto increased to the point that, at a special Assembly of Regional Delegates in Toulouse on 25–28 July 1947, he finally secured a mandate from his party to begin negotiations with the monarchists. A three-man Special Committee was formed, led by Prieto, and in September it challenged the monarchists to match the PSOE's new found willingness to compromise over the final form of the Spanish state.[45]

For Gil-Robles, however, Prieto's invitation presented a number of difficulties. In contrast to the republicans, many monarchists in Spain collaborated fully with the Franco regime. The task for the monarchist opposition was, therefore, not so much one of reversing the verdict of the Civil War as of coaxing the monarchists of the Spanish ruling élite away from Franco and into actively supporting Don Juan: a 'dynastic' change rather than a social revolution. This, Gil-Robles knew, could not be achieved by a republican–monarchist agreement on Prieto's terms: namely, direct intervention by foreign powers in accordance with the Tripartite Declaration and a plebiscite capable of returning a government of the Left. None the less, Gil-Robles could not ignore Prieto's *démarche*. The publication in April 1947 of Franco's *Ley de Sucesión*, barring a monarchist restoration on any but his own terms, had been publicly repudiated by Don Juan, but the sustained anti-monarchist press campaign which followed had seriously weakened the Pretender's position. So, with the Spanish Right reluctant to abandon Franco, action by the Western democracies, especially Britain, was once again desirable. This, combined with pressure from the British, anxious, as we have seen, to deflect UN action in the autumn, persuaded Gil-Robles to agree to talks with Prieto.[46]

In the four meetings, which took place in London on 15, 17 and 18 October, there was soon substantial agreement between the two men on the question of basic civil liberties: the need to eschew violence, combat communist influence, protect the Catholic Church, pursue a genuine social policy and organize the Spanish state along democratic lines. As was to be expected, however, differences arose over the Tripartite Declaration and the plebiscite. In Gil-Robles' document, which was used as the basis for discussion, the sixth point stated:

> Since the problem of how to get decent political life functioning in Spain is the fundamental one, the question of what processes circumstances will permit for bringing that about may be regarded as a secondary matter. Nevertheless no settlement shall be considered as having a character of permanence until it has been sanctioned by the people.[47]

For Prieto, the question of procedure was far from being a 'secondary matter'. If the choice of regime and its head of state were not to be left to Franco nor the monarchy to be restored by a military coup, there was, in his view, no alternative to the proce-

dure specified by the Tripartite Declaration and the UN Resolution: the establishment, firstly, of a provisional government, secondly the restoration of civil liberties and, finally, elections for the future regime. To guard against the irreversible restoration of a monarchist regime Prieto insisted that the electoral consultation should be held *a priori* and not *a posteriori*.[48]

Gil-Robles totally rejected Prieto's appeal to the Tripartite Declaration. In an interview with Bevin on 17 October, between meetings with Prieto, he proposed instead concerted action by the Tripartite Declaration signatories and the Vatican to find a formula for the replacement of Franco. He also argued against Prieto's plebiscite *a priori*. If, once Franco had gone, a plebiscite were held before the complete restoration of civil liberties to Spain, it would have to be policed by foreign powers and would consequently be dismissed as 'bogus'. Alternatively, if civil liberties were immediately and fully restored, Gil-Robles predicted anarchy. This would benefit only the communists, while the middle classes, the Army and the Church were likely to rally behind Franco. The Army, moreover, would never consent to a plebiscite that could return the defeated of the Civil War to power. Furthermore, Gil-Robles asked, if through unforeseen circumstances, Franco did relinquish power to Don Juan, would the latter then be obliged to refuse it because of a previous commitment to a plebiscite?[49]

This difference was not resolved and the talks ended with both Prieto and Gil-Robles hurriedly leaving London for personal reasons. Unfortunately, the publicity surrounding the talks led both men to harden their positions: Prieto claimed the approval of the Labour Party for his insistence on the Tripartite Declaration and a plebiscite a *priori*. To Foreign Office alarm, Prieto also repeated that economic sanctions were essential to bring Franco down. Gil-Robles, on the other hand, maintained that his purpose in travelling to London had been to repudiate the Tripartite Declaration and added that the right would never be party to a provisional government installed for the purpose of conducting a plebiscite.[50]

Nevertheless, negotiations between the two men were not broken off. An awareness of Franco's strengthening position in a world of increasing east–west tension had in the meantime softened Gil-Robles' attitude, while Prieto, with an eye on the approaching Third PSOE Congress in the spring of 1948, was

also anxious to be able to report some progress. So, in December 1947, Gil-Robles, in Portugal, made contact with Prieto, in Mexico, though the intermediary of a monarchist activist, Félix Vejarano. In March Prieto travelled to France and negotiations continued, again mainly through Vejarano, in the south-western coastal resort of Saint Jean-de-Luz.[51]

After some difficulties over a monarchist proposal for a Regency-Government, in which the republicans would have been mere observers, Gil-Robles finally agreed in May that a plebiscite could be held after the 'gradual restoration of legitimate freedoms'. Some delay was then caused because of disagreement over how to publicize their agreement, with Prieto wanting a single joint *communiqué* but Gil-Robles, apprehensive as ever of the Spanish right's reaction, preferring discreet communications to individual governments. None the less, sufficient progress was made for a republican–monarchist agreement — subsequently known as the Pact of Saint Jean-de-Luz — to be signed on 28 August 1948.[52] On the all important question of the plebiscite, its eighth point bound the signatories

> . . . after the restoration of civil liberties, which will be effected in the shortest time possible that circumstances allow, to consult the nation in order to establish, either directly or through representatives, but in any case by secret vote, to which all Spaniards, of both sexes, entitled to do so will have the right, a definitive political regime. The Government which will preside over this consultation will have to be in its composition and the designation of its members, an effective guarantee of impartiality.[53]

At the end of the month the pact was ratified by the Executive Committees of the PSOE and UGT and arrangements were made for the establishment of a three-man Liaison Committee to continue negotiations.

There was, however, little time for celebration. Unbeknown to the negotiating parties, three days before the conclusion of the Pact of Saint Jean-de-Luz, Don Juan had met Franco on board the Dictator's yacht, the *Azor*, off the coast of San Sebastián in the Bay of Biscay. The impression of a reconciliation between the two men inevitably undermined the republican–monarchist pact. Delays in communicating it to foreign embassies made matters worse, and when, in October, the BBC announced —incorrectly — that Gil-Robles was one of the signatories to the pact, his immediate *démenti* added to Foreign Office confusion.

Admittedly, in March 1949 the agreed Liaison Committee was set up and republican–monarchist negotiations continued, fitfully, for much of the rest of the year.[54] With the Cold War working to Franco's advantage, however, and Anglo–American interest in the Spanish opposition declining, little progress could be made. By July 1949 Gil-Robles was doubtful of further progress and, in November 1950, Prieto finally admitted that his policy of republican–monarchist *rapprochement* had failed.[55]

There is no doubt that the viability of the Pact of Saint Jean-de-Luz was fatally compromised by Don Juan's defection of 25 August 1948. Franco's *Ley de Sucesión,* and its overwhelming approval by referendum in July 1947 — even allowing for electoral manipulation — had evidently brought home to the Pretender the impossibility, as long as Franco remained in power, of returning to Spain on any but the Dictator's terms. Monarchist hopes of Western intervention had been temporarily revived in the summer of 1947 by Britain's interest in brokering the Prieto–Gil-Robles talks, but it soon became clear that Gil-Robles had failed to secure any firm commitment to the monarchist restoration from Bevin while in London. On 27 November 1947, moreover, Don Juan, who was in London for the wedding of Princess Elizabeth, could gauge at first hand the extent of Britain's passivity. During a five minute conversation with Bevin, he received only anodyne assurances that the British government desired good relations with the Spanish people and was anxious to avoid renewed civil war in Spain. Were Franco a patriotic man, Don Juan was told, he would make way for another regime out of a sense of duty. Thus, even with a republican–monarchist agreement closer at hand than at any time since 1939, active British intervention against Franco was unforthcoming. Left with little choice, therefore, but either permanent exclusion from the throne of Spain or some form of compromise with Franco, the Pretender, on the recommendation of certain pro-Franco advisors, chose the latter.[56]

Britain's attitude was therefore decisive to the final outcome of the Prieto–Gil-Robles talks. Within the Foreign Office there was certainly no doubt over the importance placed by the two men on British support. Gil-Robles had made this clear well before his talks with Prieto, in an unofficial conversation in London on 12 July 1947 with William Horsfall Carter of the Foreign Office

Research Department, and again on 17 October when he met Bevin between meetings with Prieto. Horsfall Carter was warned by Gil-Robles that without effective Anglo–American backing the right-wing opposition would lose patience and 'knuckle under to Franco', while the left would be 'thrown into the arms of communism'. On 26 September Prieto, too, had emphasized to Bevin the importance of British support, especially if the coalition government he proposed to form conformed to the Tripartite Declaration and the UN December Resolution.[57]

At their meeting, Bevin did in fact assure Prieto that the British government viewed a republican–monarchist agreement with 'great sympathy' and accepted that it constituted an essential preliminary to the establishment of the sort of interim government envisaged by the Tripartite Declaration. Furthermore, while Prieto's insistence on a plebiscite *a priori* could not be endorsed by the British government, as the army was considered the 'decisive factor' in any change of regime, the right of the Spanish people to be consulted on their country's regime was fully recognized. But that was as far as Bevin was prepared to go. On the question of British recognition of an eventual coalition government, Bevin prevaricated, telling Prieto that the Spanish opposition had first to agree on a coalition government.[58]

After Bevin's interview with Prieto, the Foreign Office considered the implications if a coalition government did emerge from a Prieto–Gil-Robles agreement. If Britain did nothing and there were no 'spontaneous result within Spain', Curle foresaw the final frustration of the moderate opposition, with the consequent spread of communism and the indefinite continuation of Britain's unsatisfactory relations with Spain. Yet again, however, intervention was not the proposed solution. Franco was too secure, backed by the army, the Church and the middle classes. Furthermore, even if the army did remove Franco, their direct replacement of him with Don Juan would prove unacceptable to Prieto and the Socialists. If Franco refused to 'jump through the hoop', Curle warned, intervention would be a 'fiasco' and lead probably to civil war. Hogg, too, warned that the formation of a united opposition government would increase the chances of European disintegration and Russian domination. On 17 October Bevin accordingly told Gil-Robles that while Britain was anxious to recognize and to support any government which proved to have the confidence of the Spanish people, he could not

commit himself yet as to the tactics to be adopted by his government.[59]

Britain's policy towards Spain was further considered in the light of the memoranda Prieto and Gil-Robles sent Curle on their London talks. With direct military intervention and economic sanctions ruled out, Curle reasoned, either the British government accepted the indefinite prolongation of the situation and made the best of it, or it took active steps to encourage the peaceful replacement of Franco by some alternative regime which might result from the Prieto–Gil-Robles discussions. If the first course were adopted, British economic interests and immediate political interests would be preserved, although it would discourage the moderate opposition and strengthen the extremes in Spain. On the other hand, if the second policy were chosen and Franco went peacefully, Britain would be able to do business with a regime orientated towards the West. But, Curle cautioned, even if Franco were removed peacefully, disruptive forces in Spain might still prevail, leading to anarchy and civil war, and if there were resistance to the post-Franco regime, its sponsors would have to retreat. Curle was also concerned that Britain's opposition to economic sanctions and further UN action against Spain, both of which Prieto had called for, might leave the socialist leader feeling betrayed and cause a large section of the left to go over to the communists. Curle therefore proposed that the British government should adopt Gil-Robles' plan: in the event of a Prieto–Gil-Robles agreement, rather than backing economic sanctions and UN action, Britain would sound out the USA on the feasibility of discussions with the Vatican over Franco's removal. If, however, the Pope did not play his allotted part, or Franco refused to go at his instigation, then Britain would have to resign itself to Franco's remaining in power for the foreseeable future.[60]

Until a Prieto–Gil-Robles agreement materialized, however, Britain's policy could stand as it was. Advice from Ponsonby Crosthwaite, now Head of the Western Department, approved by Harvey and Sargent, suggested no more than polite messages to Prieto and Gil-Robles. In any case, Bevin was anxious not to exacerbate further Anglo–Spanish relations already disturbed by Britain's overt involvement in the Prieto–Gil-Robles talks. Accordingly, on 22 November 1947, the Foreign Secretary told the *chargé d'affaires* in Madrid, Howard, that he thought it pre-

mature to consider any action by the Powers and had therefore confined himself to informing Prieto and Gil-Robles that their memoranda on the London talks were being closely studied and that he was encouraged by the large measure of agreement between them. When Prieto next requested a new Tripartite Declaration ruling out recognition of any regime in Spain not sanctioned by the popular will, Bevin refused. A clear indication that no change in policy towards the Spanish opposition was foreseen was the fact that not once did the Foreign Secretary think it necessary to bring the Prieto–Gil-Robles negotiations to the Cabinet's notice.[61]

It was the lifting of the threat of UN action against Spain in the autumn of 1947, however, that finally removed all necessity for Britain to act. When the General Assembly voted on Spain on 17 November, it failed to reaffirm its resolution of 1946. The new resolution merely stated that the General Assembly expressed its confidence that the Security Council would exercise its responsibilities under the Charter as soon as it considered that the situation in Spain so required. Although placed by the President of the Security Council on the provisional agenda of the Security Council for review on 25 June 1948, the Spanish question was not in fact considered until May 1949 when a resolution favouring the return of ambassadors to Spain only narrowly failed to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. On 4 November 1950 the 1946 resolution was finally rescinded and shortly afterwards Britain returned an ambassador to Madrid.[62]

Without the stimulus of impending UN action, British policy towards the Spanish opposition stagnated. Indeed, by May 1948 Crosthwaite admitted that it had run into a 'dead-end' and unless fate cleared the roadblock for them in some unexpected way—for example by Franco's death — he could see no way forward. There was no alternative, Ivone Kirkpatrick, Deputy Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, lamely concluded on the same day, to continuing, 'lest worse befall . . . the admittedly unsatisfactory policy of waiting for something to turn up'. With the resumption of Britain's *attentiste* policy towards Spain, the Spanish anti-Franco opposition simply dropped out of the picture.[63]

The survival of the Franco regime in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War has been attributed, in part at least, to the

inadequacies of the Spanish opposition. It would, certainly, be difficult to ignore the persistent and profound divisions among Franco's opponents. However, as has been shown, the ineffectiveness of the Spanish opposition owed much to the influence and involvement of the western democracies — and above all of Britain.

While the republican impetus for an understanding between the former adversaries of the Civil War had come essentially from Prieto, it was in fact the British Foreign Office that proved decisive in bringing together the two foremost republican and monarchist spokesmen in the autumn of 1947. But once the threat of direct UN action against Spain had passed British enthusiasm for a republican–monarchist agreement cooled. Support for a coalition government, if any, was made conditional upon its prior formation and, as the latter was in turn conditional upon prior British commitment, an unbreakable vicious circle was created.[64] In the final analysis, it was the Foreign Office's reluctance to move from this position that ultimately vitiated the Pact of St Jean de Luz. Britain's apparent readiness to accept coexistence with the Franco regime persuaded the Pretender to the Spanish throne to move towards reconciliation with Franco. With Prieto's strategy a demonstrable failure, the Spanish opposition lost all potential for providing an alternative to the Franco regime. Britain's action in encouraging a republican–monarchist *rapprochement* in 1947 had served only to raise expectations which, in the event, it was unprepared to fulfil.

It remains only to ask whether Britain could have acted otherwise. By late 1947 Anglo–American relations with the USSR had deteriorated to the point that neither democracy could countenance the destabilization of Western Europe. It was precisely this, however, that was threatened that autumn by the possibility of a successful UN call for economic sanctions, or even armed intervention, against the Franco regime — a call which neither the USA nor Britain could have ignored without dangerously undermining the new world organization. In retrospect, British encouragement for a republican–monarchist *rapprochement* does indeed seem a cynical ploy to deflect UN action. Even with full diplomatic recognition, a republican–monarchist coalition government was never likely to win the confidence of the Spanish army, without whose acquiescence Franco's removal was impossible. Nonetheless, the British government was bound to plan for

every eventuality: in 1947 *Realpolitik* dictated the exploitation of the Spanish opposition in Britain's national interest, even if the consequence was the final collapse of that opposition and Franco's survival.

Notes

APG JE	Archives of the Presidency of the Government and Head of State, Madrid
FPI	Pablo Iglesias Foundation, Madrid
MAE	Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Madrid
PRO	Public Record Office, Kew, London

1. Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Proyecto de Nota Verbal*, November 1947: MAE leg. R 3510, exp. 1.

2. Templewood memorandum, 16 October 1944, 'The Allied Attitude Towards the Franco Government', PRO CAB 66/58, W.P. (44) 665.

3. Churchill to Franco, 15 January 1945: PRO PREM 8/106; Roosevelt to Armour, 10 March 1945: *Foreign Relations of the United States* (cited hereafter as *FRUS*), *Conference of Berlin (Potsdam)*, Vol. II (Washington 1960), note 4, 1171–3.

4. See, for example, Churchill's minute, 10 November 1944: PRO FO 371/39671, C16068/23/41; Eden's memorandum, 'Policy Towards Spain', 18 November 1944: PRO CAB 65/58, W.P. (44) 665.

5. For the Spanish appreciation of the British position, see, for example, Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs to all Spain's Ambassadors, 21 August 1945: APG JE, leg. 6, exp. 4, no. 1; Artajo to Alba, 22 August 1945: APG JE. leg. 6, exp. 4, no. 2.

6. Hoyer-Millar's 'Spain', 6 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60354, Z3117/36/41. In January 1945 Franco had been 'warned' about Spain's exclusion from the new post-war world order: Churchill to Franco, 15 January 1945: PRO PREM 8/106.

7. In February 1936 the anarcho-syndicalist Confederación Nacional de Trabajo, Federación Anarquista Ibérica and Federación Ibérica de Juventudes Libertarias had come together to form the Movimiento Libertario Español; whose members were known as 'libertarians'.

8. For a brief account of the ANFD's activities from its creation until the end of 1948, see Foreign Office Research Department, 'The Alianza Nacional de Fuerzas Democráticas', 2 December 1948: PRO FO 371/73360A, Z10440/1027/41.

9. J M^{a} del Valle, *Las instituciones de la República Española en el exilio* (Paris 1976), 86–9, 113–35; J. Tusell, *La oposición democrática al franquismo (1939–1962)* (Barcelona 1977), 93–104; P Garran, Foreign Office Research Department, 'Spanish Republican Refugees: the Present Situation', 17 January 1945, PRO FO 371/49553, Z1065/18/41.

10. Dynastic rivalries separated 'Alfonsists', for whom Don Juan, as the son of Alfonso XIII (1886–1941), was the legitimate heir to the Spanish throne, from 'Carlists' — also known as 'Traditionalists' — who championed the claims of the

descendants of Carlos Isidro (1788–1855), the brother of Fernando VII (1784–1833).

11. H. Heine, *La oposición política al franquismo de 1939 a 1952* (Barcelona 1983), 251–3, 275–83; J.M. Toquero, *Franco y Don Juan: la oposición monárquica al franquismo* (Barcelona 1989), 137–59, 173; Tusell, *Oposición democrática*, 116–20; See also PRO FO Research Department, 'Spain, the Monarchist Cause', 18 May 1945, PRO FO 425/423, Z4002/1484/41.

12. Hoyer-Millar's minute, 9 August 1945: PRO FO 371/49612, Z9229/537/41; Hoyer-Millar's minutes, 1, 7, 28 September 1945: PRO FO 371/49556, Z10747, 10497, 11085/18/41; Garran, 'Policy Towards Spain', 15 February 1946: PRO FO 371/60352, Z2124/36/4; Bevin's note, 4 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60334, Z2225/9/41. A lone voice, Horsfall Carter's, in the Foreign Office Research Department, suggested in December 1945 that, short of recognition, could the government not appoint 'agents' to the Giral government, as the government had done with Robert Hodgson to the Burgos 'government': Horsfall Carter's minute, 7 January 1946: PRO FO 371/49558, Z13594/18/41.

13. For example, on 15 September 1943 only eight of twelve senior generals signed a collective letter calling on the General to consider restoring the monarchy; see Col O.C. Smith Bingham to *chargé d'affaires*, Madrid, 14 April 1947: PRO FO 185/1758.

14. Mallet to Harvey, 5 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49614, Z13581/537/41; Bevin's minute, 28 June 1946: PRO FO 371/60335, Z5223/9/41.

15. Hoyer-Millar's minute, 7 September 1945: FO 371/49556, Z10497/18/41.

16. Heine, *Oposición*, 242–51, 284–95, 327–8; Toquero, *Franco y Don Juan*, 195–230; Tusell, *Oposición democrática*, 152–61; P. Sainz Rodríguez, *Un reinado en la sombra* (Barcelona 1981), 170–3; see also Bowker to Eden, 24 March 1945, PRO FO 425/423, Z4228/233/41.

17. Mallet to Bevin, 1 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49629, Z13177/1484/41; Hoyer-Millar's minute, 13 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49614, Z13730/537/41.

18. Heine, *Oposición*, 330–1, 337, 354–6.

19. *Ibid*., 358–61; J. Mª Gil-Robles, *La monarquía por la que luché: páginas de un diario (1941–1954)* (Madrid 1976), 139–40, 183–4.

20. Santamaría's first name is given as Vicente by the Foreign Office Research Department: PRO FO 371/73360A, Z10440/1027/41.

21. E. Nadal, *Todos contra Franco — la Alianza Nacional de Fuerzas Democráticas 1944/1947* (Madrid 1982) 67–83, 103–31; S. Vilar, *Historia del antifranquismo 1939–1975* (Barcelona 1984) 105–11.

22. Nadal, *Todos contra Franco*, 156.

23. Ibid., 155–63, 190–2.

24. V. Alba, *Historia de la resistencia antifranquista 1939–1955* (Barcelona 1978), 150, 234–46; Gil-Robles, *Monarquía*, 197–8, 387–8; Heine, *Oposición*, 288–92, 329, 351–3, 363–8, 377–81; L. Suárez Fernández, *Francisco Franco y su tiempo*, Vol. IV (Madrid 1984), 128–31; Toquero, *Franco y Don Juan*, 198–205; Tusell, *Oposición Democrática*, 89–93, 149–50, 152–61.

25. Mallet to Harvey, 5 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49614, Z13581/537/41; minutes by Garran, Hoyer-Millar and Cadogan, 5, 7 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49629, Z13177/1484/41; Hoyer-Millar's minute, 13 December 1945:

PRO FO 371/49614, Z13730/537/41; PRO CAB 128/5, C.M. 18 (46) 4, 4 February 1946.

26. The text of the French note of 12 December 1945 is in PRO FO 371/49614, Z13588/537/41.

27. *Documents on British Policy Overseas* (London 1990) Series I, V, 482, note 3; 104.1, 46/1–3; Hoyer-Millar's minute, 13 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49614, Z13730/537/4; Foreign Office to Paris, 21 December 1945: PRO FO 371/49614, Z13532/537/41.

28. 'Spain', Hoyer-Millar's minute, 7 February 1946: PRO FO 371/60350, Z1297/36/41.

29. Hoyer-Millar's minute, 15 February 1946: PRO FO 371/60352, Z2124/36/41; Harvey's minutes, 7, 20 February, Hoyer-Millar's minute, 20 February 1946: PRO FO 371/60350, Z1297/36/41; Harvey's minute, 18 February 1946: PRO FO 371/60350, Z1708/36/41.

30. PRO CAB 128/5, C.M. 18 (46) 2, 25 February 1946.

31. P. Martínez Lillo, *Una introducción al estudio de las relaciones hispano–francesas* (1945–1951) (Madrid 1985), 22.

32. Ambassador in France (Caffery) to Secretary of State, 27 February 1946: *FRUS*, 1946, Vol. V (Washington, 1969), 1043–4; Draft Foreign Office telegram to Duff Cooper, 8 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60354, Z3117/36/4; Hoyer-Millar's minute, 13 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60353, Z2586/36/41; Foreign Office to Paris, 15 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60353, Z2420/36/41; Bevin to Duff Cooper, 19 March 1946: PRO FO 371/60353, Z2736/36/41; PRO CAB 128/5, C.M. 20 (46) 1, 4 March 1946.

33. For the text of the Tripartite Declaration of 4 March 1946 see PRO FO 371/60352, Z2128/36/41.

34. *United Nations. Official Records of the Second Part of the First Session of the General Assembly. Plenary Meetings of the General Assembly (Flushing Meadow, New York)*: 59th Plenary, 12 December 1946, 1198–222.

35. 'Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs', 13 March 1946, Annex: PRO CAB 132/2, D.O. (46) 40.

36. PRO CAB 128/9, C.M. 2 (47) 4, 6 January 1947; Bevin, 'Economic Sanctions against Spain': PRO CAB 129/16, CP (47) 2, 3 January 1947.

37. The Acting Secretary of State to the Embassy in the United Kingdom, 7 April 1947: *FRUS*, 1947, Vol. III, 1067, 1069; 'Summary of Department's Top Secret Telegram No. 1531, April 7, 1947': PRO FO 371/67867, Z3617/3/41; Inverchapel to Foreign Office, 3 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67867, Z3373/3/41.

38. Foreign Office to Madrid, 11 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67867, Z3617/3/41.

39. Howard to Foreign Office, 15 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67867, Z3740/3/41; Mallet's minute, 17 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z3888/3/41; Foreign Office to UK Delegation to Council of Foreign Ministers, Moscow, 19 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67867, Z340/3/41; UK Delegation to Council of Foreign Ministers, Moscow, to Foreign Office, 25 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z4093/3/41; Hoyer-Millar's minute, 29 April 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z4093/3/41; Sargent's minute, 1 May 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z4417/3/41; Inverchapel to Foreign Office, 13 May 1947:PRO FO 371/67868, Z4613/3/41.

40. Curle's minute, 17 May, Hogg's minute, 19 May 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z4613/3/41.

41. 'American Proposals for Joint Intervention in Spain', Harvey's minute: 10 June 1947: PRO FO 371/67869, Z6130/3/41; see also Harvey's minute, 19 May 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z4886/3/41.

42. Sloan's minute, 26 March 1947: PRO FO 371/67867, Z2917/3/41; Harvey's minute, 12 June 1947: PRO FO 371/67868, Z5600/3/4; Hogg's minute, 'Spain', 30 June 1947: PRO FO 371/67869, Z5646/3/41; Balfour to Foreign Office, 31 July 1947: PRO FO 371/67869, Z7132/3/41; Foreign Office to Washington, 20 July 1947: PRO FO 371/67869, Z7004/3/41.

43. Q. Ahmad, *Britain, Franco Spain and the Cold War, 1945–1950* (Kuala Lumpur, A.S. Noordeen revised edn 1995), 186–225.

44. J. Gibaja Veláquez, *Indalecio Prieto y el socialismo español* (Madrid 1995), 312–25.

45. Ibid., 326–33, 390; Tusell, *Oposición democrática*, 175–83; Valle, *Instituciones*, 257–9.

46. Gil-Robles, *Monarquía*, 238–9, 388–96.

47. 'Memorandum by Señor Gil-Robles — Translation', 18 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9382/6677/41.

48. Prieto's memorandum, 19 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9381/6677/41.

49. 'Conversation with Señor Gil-Robles (Spanish Monarchist Leader)', Bevin to Howard, 17 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9162/6677/41; 'Memorandum by Señor Gil-Robles — Translation', 18 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9382/6677/41.

50. 'Prieto–Gil-Robles Talks', Curle, 31 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9201/6677/41; Crossley to Curle, 29 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67871, Z9990/3/41.

51. The course of the negotiations can be followed in Prieto's correspondence with the two other members of the Special Committee, Luis Asúa de Jiménez and Antonio Pérez, kept in the Fundación Pablo Iglesias (FPI), Madrid; this archival material has been extensively used in Gibaja, *Prieto*, 409–12.

52. Ibid., 412–21; Parkes, 'Señor Prieto', 15 June 1948: PRO FO 371/73358, Z5113/1027/41; Horsfall Carter's minute, 30 June 1948: PRO FO 371/73358, Z5146/1027/41; Parkes, 'Señor Prieto', 1 July 1948: PRO FO 371/73358, Z5146/1027/41; Parkes, 'Señor Prieto', 11 September 1948: PRO FO 371/73359, Z7414/1027/41; Crosthwaite, 'Relations between Spanish Monarchists and Republicans', 9 December 1948: PRO FO 371/73360A, Z10214/1027/41.

53. Gil-Robles, *Monarquía*, 410–11.

54. The simultaneous formation of an interior Comité Interior de Coordinación — of monarchists and ANFD members — further confused the picture until, in August, its entire republican membership was arrested and it ceased to function: Howard to Shuckburgh, 28 April 1949: PRO FO 371/79685, Z3429/10155/41; F.E.T. y de las J.O.N.S., 'Información e investigación: boletín de actividades monárquicas', 27 December 1949: APG JE, S.M. Sub.: leg. 63, no. 25.

55. Gibaja, *Prieto*, 423–43; Gil-Robles, *Monarquía*, 265–73, 300–1; Parkes, 'Don Juan's Meeting with Franco', 13 September 1948: PRO FO 371/73363, Z7593/1380/41, 'Report on the Meeting between the King and Franco', no date: PRO FO 371/73363, Z7977/1380/41; Special Commission of the PSOE to British Ambassador, Paris, 6 October 1948: PRO FO 371/73359, Z8130/1027/41; Johnston to Russell, 14 October 1948: PRO FO 371/7338,

Z8384/1380/4; Hankey to Bevin, 1 February 1950: PRO FO 371/89482, WS 1016/6.

56. Dixon, 'Don Juan', 27 November 1947: PRO FO 800/504, SP/47/1; L. Anson, *Don Juan* (Barcelona 1994), 265–70; Gil-Robles, *Monarquiá*, 249, 265–73; Toquero, *Franco y Don Juan*, 163–4, 219.

57. 'Gil-Robles in London', Horsfall Carter, 15 July 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z6765/6677/1; see also Millard to Hogg, 6 September 1947: PRO FO 371/67873, Z8130/16/41; see also Spanish Embassy, Paris, to Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 20 July 1946: APG, JE, leg. 9, exp. 1, no. 1.

58. Curle's brief for Bevin, 16 September 1947: PRO FO 371/6783, Z7379/16/41; Bevin to Howard, 'Conversation with Sr. Indalecio Prieto (Spanish Socialist Leader)', 29 September 1947: PRO FO 371/67873, Z8562/16/41.

59. Minutes by Curle and Hogg, 30 September 1947: PRO FO 371/67877A, Z8524/20/41; Bevin to Howard, 'Conversation with Señor Gil-Robles (Spanish Monarchist Leader)', 17 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9162/6677/41.

60. 'Prieto–Gil-Robles Talks', draft memorandum, Curle, 31 October 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9201/6677/41.

61. Ministry of Foreign Affairs to British Embassy, Madrid, 22 October 1947, *Nota Verbal*: MAE leg. R 3510, exp. 1; *Nota para su Excelencia*, 15 November 1947: MAE leg. R 3510, exp. 1; Crosthwaite, 'Prieto–Gil-Robles Talks', 11 November 1947: PRO PRO FO 371/67908A, Z9382/6677/41; Bevin to Howard, 'Future Regime in Spain: Prieto–Gil-Robles Talks', 22 November 1947: PRO FO 317/67908A, Z9382/6677/4; Prieto to Bevin, 25 November 1947: FPI ALJA 419–35; 'Mensaje del Sr.Bevin para el Sr.Prieto', no date: FPI ALJA 419–35; Curle's memorandum, 'Señor Indalecio Prieto', 5 December 1947: PRO FO 371/67908A, Z10501/6677/41.

62. *United Nations. Official Records of the Second Session of the General Assembly. Vol. 2. 1947*, 118th Plenary Meeting, 17 November 1947: 'Relations of the Members of the United Nations with Spain', report of the First Committee (Document A/479) in Annex 25, 1610–12; *United Nations. Official Records of the Third Session of the General Assembly, Part II. Plenary Meetings, 1949*, 356–66, 456–504; *United Nations. Official Records of the Fifth Session of the General Assembly*, Vol. 1, 1950, 371–81.

63. Crosthwaite's minute, 11 May, Kirkpatrick's minute, 23 May 1948: PRO FO 371/73336, Z3775/84/41.

64. The effect of the vicious circle was made clear to Crosthwaite by Prieto: 'Record of Conversation between Don Indalecio Prieto and P.M. Crosthwaite, Head of Western Department, on March 16th, 1948': PRO FO 371/73358, Z2694/1027/41.

David J. Dunthorn

is Visiting Lecturer in Modern European History at the University of the West of England. He is co-editor, with Christian Leitz, of a forthcoming book, *Spain in an International Context* (Berghahn Books).