LSE Research Online

Article (refereed)

Nigel John Ashton

Harold Macmillan and the "Golden Days" of Anglo-American relations revisited, 1957–63

Harold Macmillan and the "Golden Days" of Anglo-American Relations Revisited, 1957-63[1]

Historians of Anglo-American relations have for the most part had little difficulty in characterizing the premiership of Harold Macmillan between January 1957 and October 1963, as an era of renewed closeness between London and Washington.[2] In one sense this is no surprise. Sandwiched in between the disastrous Anglo-American breach over the 1956 Suez crisis, and the deterioration in relations during the mid-1960s prompted by a combination of the Vietnam war, the British financial crisis and London's abandonment of its defense role East of Suez, the Macmillan era was almost bound to appear rosy in comparison. Robert Hathaway, in his survey of Anglo-American relations since the Second World War, describes the Macmillan years as being those of an 'alliance sustained', sandwiched in between the eras of an 'alliance threatened' during the Suez crisis and an 'alliance depreciated' under Prime Ministers Harold Wilson and Edward Heath. For John Dumbrell, in his recent survey, *A Special Relationship*, the most appropriate starting point for a study of Anglo-American relations in the Cold War and after, is 'the house that Jack and Mac built'. Macmillan's official biographer, Alistair Horne, puts matters even more straightforwardly. These were the years of what was quite simply 'a very special relationship'. Even John Dickie, in his otherwise skeptical survey of Anglo-American relations, *Special No More*, titles his chapter on the Macmillan-Kennedy years 'The Golden Days of Mac and Jack'.[3] Of course, such an interpretation did not only emerge in hindsight. The contemporary protagonists themselves, despite their native skepticism and hard-headedness, could not resist going all misty-eyed when looking back over their joint conduct of Anglo-American relations. Writing to Eisenhower in January 1961 on his departure from office, Macmillan claimed that 'we had I think a deep unity of purpose and, I like to feel, a frank and honest appreciation of each other's good faith….'[4] In his valedictory message to Macmillan after the prime minister had

announced his retirement, Kennedy enthused that 'in nearly three years of co-operation, we have worked together on great and small issues, and we have never had a failure of understanding or of mutual trust.'[5] Macmillan himself later reflected that Kennedy 'seemed to trust me – and… for those of us who have had to play the so-called game of politics – national and international – this is something very rare and very precious….'[6]

But how far are these positive claims about the state of high-level Anglo-American relations during the Macmillan years sustained by a detailed reading of the archival record and the most recent scholarship based upon it? In fact, as soon as we start to scratch the surface of the "golden days" of Ike, Mac and Jack, their reputation begins to tarnish somewhat. To begin with, the simple framing of the period as one in which the breach over Suez was repaired and relations sustained, only for them to be devalued by unwise policy decisions on both sides of the Atlantic in the mid-1960s, has begun to be challenged. Until recently, the broad thrust of the historiography of Anglo-American relations over the Suez crisis was relatively straightforward.[7] British leaders believed they still had the capacity to act independently of Washington in defense of their interests in the Middle East in 1956. The failure of the Suez collusion brought about by the swift American diplomatic and financial response proved them wrong. Suez was thus a "watershed" in Anglo-American relations. Thereafter, according to Scott Lucas, 'Britain paid the price of permanent subservience to American policy.'[8] The new American hegemonic role in the Middle East was mirrored in the promulgation of the Eisenhower Doctrine, which gave the Administration the means to act to protect friendly states threatened with subversion by the forces of international communism. In this new era in the Middle East, Britain was no longer to play the role of Prince Hamlet, but rather, in the words of T. S. Eliot, that of

…an attendant lord, one that will do

To swell a progress, start a scene or two

Advise the prince, no doubt, an easy tool,

Deferential, glad to be of use,

Politic, cautious and meticulous;[9]

As will be demonstrated here, this portrayal of post-Suez Anglo-American relations over the Middle East has not survived the opening of the relevant British and American archives during the last decade and a half. The thrust of the most recent literature is to show the persistence of the British independent role in the region after Suez, the divergence in British and American strategies for dealing with Arab nationalism, and the ineffectiveness of the Eisenhower Doctrine as an instrument for asserting American hegemony in the region.[10] The only significant difference between Macmillan and his ill-fated predecessor Anthony Eden in this respect, was that Macmillan recognized the need at least to keep Washington informed of British intentions, and where possible to coordinate action. But British interests in the region were not to be sacrificed at the altar of Anglo-American relations.

If the causes of the Anglo-American breach over Suez were only partially addressed under Macmillan, what of the contention that relations went quickly downhill under Macmillan's successors in office. It is probably too soon to comment on trends in the historiography of the Heath Government's conduct of Anglo-American relations in the early 1970s in view of the very recent opening of the relevant archives. However, new scholarship on the Wilson Governments of 1964-70 has shown that at the very least, the notion of a rapid deterioration of relations in the second half of the 1960s is now contested. There was much more understanding in Washington of the delicate political path Wilson had to tread in defending US Vietnam policy and striving to maintain Britain's world role than might have appeared at first sight.[11]

If the contrast provided by events before and after the Macmillan era now appears far less sharp, what of the specific historiography of Anglo-American relations during the Macmillan premiership? Here, debate has focused on three main areas: the implications of the 1961 British application to join the European Economic Community (EEC); Anglo-American nuclear cooperation; and London and Washington's handling of Cold War strategy. Of these issues, the European question is probably the most important. In essence the debate over the motives for the Macmillan Government's EEC application resolves itself into a contest between those historians, like Andrew Moravcsik and Jacqueline Tratt, who see economic factors predominating, and others, like Wolfram Kaiser, Oliver Bange and John Young, who place more stress on political factors.[12] Under the political heading, debate has focused in particular on Macmillan's own conversion to the cause of EEC membership, since his personal agency was crucial in bringing about the government's change of course. Both Bange and Kaiser have argued that strong American advocacy of British EEC membership was crucial to Macmillan's change of heart, with Kaiser going so far as to argue in sensational terms that Macmillan's decision was born of a desire to "appease" the United States into continuing special treatment of Britain.[13] The argument advanced here, by contrast, while focusing on the role of Anglo-American relations in Macmillan's change of heart regarding British membership of the EEC, will stress far more his disillusionment with the Anglo-American alliance, and his desire to find an alternative European hedge for Britain's international position.

In the nuclear field, the nub of the historiographical debate concerns the balance between British dependence and Anglo-American interdependence provided, first by the March 1960 Skybolt agreement, and subsequently by the December 1962 Nassau agreement for the supply of the Polaris delivery system.[14] Here, the field continues to be dominated by the report into the so-called "Skybolt crisis", commissioned by President Kennedy and penned

by Richard Neustadt in the wake of the Nassau summit.[15] In essence, Neustadt concluded that the crisis in Anglo-American relations over the cancellation of the Skybolt missile system, on which Britain depended for the continued life of its "independent" nuclear deterrent, was caused by a combination of a failure in communication and a difference in perception of the problem as between London and Washington. While not dissenting from these conclusions in respect of Skybolt, this article shows that the problems in Anglo-American relations crystallized by the Skybolt saga were much more wide-ranging than Neustadt deduced. This is not surprising since British archives reveal that cooperation with his research in London during 1963 was partial at best. Macmillan in particular was cagey and suspicious of Neustadt, noting that 'I do not like this'[16] and that 'the Americans seem determined to write history as fast – or even faster – than they make it. It's like the Time Machine.'[17] The contention advanced here is that, going beyond Neustadt, by the winter of 1962 a broader "crisis of interdependence" had developed in Anglo-American relations, in which the British Prime Minister had effectively lost confidence in the good faith of successive US administrations. This crisis of interdependence provides a link to the final category of historiographical issues concerning the Cold War which arose between 1957 and 1963. For the most part Cold War strategy and crises provided further grist to the mill of Macmillan's disenchantment with the Anglo-American alliance. Disagreements over the civil wars in Laos and Yemen, the Congo crisis, and relations with Cuba before and after the missile crisis all factored into Macmillan's broader sense of disillusionment over relations with Washington. Of the greatest importance here, though, was Macmillan's own independent pursuit of détente with the Soviet Union during 1959-60, and the frustration of his hopes at the May 1960 Paris summit.

If these are the broader historiographical issues raised by this article, two further questions are worthy of brief introductory consideration: why focus on Macmillan's personal

role in Anglo-American relations and why frame this discussion principally from his perspective? In effect the same answer can serve to address both questions. The Anglo-American alliance was from the outset central to Macmillan's conduct of British foreign policy, and he set out his stall as a prime minister uniquely placed to handle relations with Washington. He also made sure that he had close personal oversight and control over the key issues in Anglo-American relations. The fact that he should have arrived at such a state of disillusionment by the winter of 1962-3 seems, therefore, to be even more remarkable and worthy of inquiry.

There is no doubt that Macmillan was suited in terms of his personal background and political experience to play the role of transatlantic bridge-builder. Born into a middle class family in the publishing business, Harold Macmillan's early political drive had been instilled in him by his American mother, Helen "Nellie" Macmillan. The veneer of detachment and languor, which he cultivated to conceal his ambition, seems to have been the product of his subsequent Eton and Oxford education. Among early formative experiences was his time in the trenches as an officer in the Guards Brigade. The carnage he witnessed helped convince him that future conflicts should be avoided at all costs. His role as one of the leading anti-appeasers during the 1930s mirrored his belief that standing up to dictators was the best means to achieve this.

During the Second World War, Macmillan forged crucial transatlantic ties while serving as the British Minister Resident with the Allied Forces in North Africa. The American commander of these forces was none other than Dwight D. Eisenhower, with whom, as president, Macmillan would work again once he became prime minister in 1957. It was also during his time in North Africa that Macmillan witnessed at first hand the personal relationship between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt at the Casablanca conference of January 1943. Macmillan noted that 'I christened the two personalities the Emperor of the

East and the Emperor of the West, and indeed it was rather like a meeting of the later period of the Roman Empire.' For Macmillan, the Churchill-Roosevelt meetings were 'remarkable and romantic episodes' in which great international issues were resolved late at night by the two emperors, normally with the aid of a great deal of alcohol.[18]

It was also in North Africa that Macmillan, according to Richard Crossman, propounded an early version of what, under one name or another, has been a persistent British conceit in rationalizing the workings and purpose of the Anglo-American alliance. During Crossman's first encounter with Macmillan at Allied Forces Head Quarters (AFHQ) Macmillan instructed him thus:

> We, my dear Crossman, are Greeks in this American empire. You will find the Americans much as the Greeks found the Romans – great big, vulgar, bustling people, more vigorous than we are and also more idle, with more unspoiled virtues but also more corrupt. We must run AFHQ as the Greek slaves ran the operations of the Emperor Claudius.[19]

The thrust of Macmillan's analogy was clear. The British were culturally and intellectually more sophisticated than the Americans. This superiority would allow them to manipulate the Americans in a Machiavellian fashion, turning American power to British ends. This 'Greeks and Romans' thesis remained at the core of Macmillan's thinking about Anglo-American relations well into his time as prime minister. In practice, though, there proved to be two principal flaws in it. Firstly, for it to succeed, knowledge of it had to be kept secret from the Americans. This Macmillan himself failed to do, frequently blurting out the idea in public much to the chagrin of his Press Secretary Harold Evans.[20] Secondly, simply put, the 'Greeks and Romans' strategy underestimated the sophistication of the American political leadership

with which Macmillan would work once in office. In fact, in an ironic twist of fate, the increasing British dependence on the United States, particularly in the nuclear and defense fields during Macmillan's term in office, gave the prime minister ample time to reflect that the characteristic which governed the role of the Greeks in the Roman Empire was in fact subordination.

If the 'Greeks and Romans' thesis has about it more than a trace of irony, the same is true of the circumstances which brought Harold Macmillan to office as prime minister. Macmillan, who, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, had been the leading hawk in the British Cabinet over the question of the use of force against Nasser's Egypt during the Suez crisis, was also the first man whose nerve broke in the face of American diplomatic and financial pressure once the military operation had been launched. His stance helped to undercut the position of Prime Minister Anthony Eden and open the way for his own assumption of office at the beginning of January 1957.[21] Far from turning Macmillan away from his conception of the Anglo-American alliance, the Suez crisis in fact seems to have reinforced his 'Greeks and Romans' rationalization. Direct confrontation with the US should be avoided, with the British Government instead working subtly behind the scenes to try to influence US policy in directions favorable to British interests.

At the Bermuda conference of March 1957, Macmillan succeeded at least in re-building a public front of Anglo-American solidarity. This was given tangible expression in the displays of camaraderie he engineered with his old wartime comrade, Dwight Eisenhower. Behind the scenes, though, little was achieved by way of the broader goal of influencing US policy in directions favorable to British interests, particularly in the Middle East.[22] Instead, it was an international crisis which provided Macmillan with his opportunity. During August 1957, fears plagued Washington that Syria might be about to become a fully-fledged Soviet-satellite state. In a bid to thwart this development, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles

agreed to pool efforts with the British in a joint Syria Working Group established during September 1957. The purpose of the group was to examine the options available to Britain and America to block the advance of Soviet influence in Syria through covert action.[23]

It was with the example of the cooperation forged over Syria in mind, that Macmillan responded to the momentous news of the launch of the Sputnik satellite on 4 October 1957.[24] The launch prompted the dispatch of a crucial personal message from Macmillan to Eisenhower on 10 October. In it, Macmillan linked the Syrian experiment with the Sputnik challenge. Arguing that Sputnik had served to bring home the need to pool efforts to meet the formidable Russian threat, the prime minister professed himself to have been:

> tremendously impressed by the work our people have been doing together on the Syrian problem. Here is quiet efficient business-like cooperation such as has not existed since the war. I believe that here we have the key to a great new venture. I would like to see this sort of cooperation continued with a view to our working out together the role of the free countries in the struggle against communist Russia.[25]

In a subsequent diary entry, Macmillan made more explicit the motives that underlay the dispatch of his message:

> The Russian success in launching the satellite has been something equivalent to Pearl Harbour [sic]. The American cocksureness is shaken…. President is under severe attack for first time… Foster is under still more severe attack. His policies are said to have failed everywhere…. The atmosphere is now such that almost anything might be decided, however revolutionary.[26]

Macmillan's "revolutionary" goal was in fact more reactionary in character: to re-establish Anglo-American cooperative machinery, the like of which had existed during the Second World War. This much was hinted at in the reference in his message to Eisenhower about 'quiet efficient business-like cooperation such as has not existed since the war'. Specifically, Macmillan wanted the repeal of the 1946 McMahon Act which blocked the sharing of nuclear information between the US and UK. Readying himself for a tough battle, Macmillan could hardly believe the ease with which his goal was secured once he reached Washington. Eisenhower's own instinct in the wake of Sputnik was to create a new foundation for the Anglo-American alliance, while Dulles wanted to focus more on the Western defense effort as a whole. In the end it was Eisenhower's instinct to build initially on an Anglo-American foundation that won the day.[27]

Not only did Macmillan win Eisenhower's personal commitment to seek repeal of the McMahon Act in respect of the United Kingdom to permit the resumption of Anglo-American nuclear cooperation, there were two other important commitments that Macmillan secured in Washington: one institutional and the other rhetorical. The institutional commitment involved the establishment of a range of Anglo-American Working Groups to tackle not only the resumption of nuclear relations, but also broader Cold War counter-measures in the fields of economics, trade and information, together with regional problems, including Syria, Hong Kong and Algeria.[28] This experiment in institutionalizing Anglo-American consultation was unprecedented in peacetime and, as we will see, its eventual failure was to undercut an important dimension of Macmillan's Anglo-American project.

In respect of the rhetorical commitment which Macmillan believed he had secured from the Eisenhower Administration to the concept of "interdependence", the prime minister was expansive. He told the British Cabinet that the 'Declaration of Common Purpose' to

which he and Eisenhower had signed up at the Washington talks amounted to a 'Declaration

of Interdependence' between the United States and Great Britain.[29] Albeit that this title for the

document had been rejected by the Americans for rather obvious historical reasons, the prime

minister still believed he had secured a rhetorical commitment to the creation of a new form

of Anglo-American alliance. This, according to Macmillan's reading, was to be founded on a

much closer Anglo-American *partnership*, involving a greater pooling of effort, particularly

in the fields of defense research, development and procurement. The goal of this partnership

from the British perspective, would be to conserve scarce British resources by, where

possible, securing an agreed division of labor, whether in weapons development or crisis

management, between London and Washington. To Macmillan's way of thinking, this would

end both wasteful competition in the allocation of Anglo-American defense budgets and

reduce the strain on Britain's over-stretched forces around the globe. It thus fitted in with the

goals of the April 1957 Sandys Defense White Paper. In the declaration itself, this new

Anglo-American partnership was formulated thus:

> The arrangements which the nations of the free world have made for
>
> collective defense and mutual help are based on the recognition that the
>
> concept of national self-sufficiency is now out of date. The countries of the
>
> free world are inter-dependent and only in genuine partnership, by combining
>
> their resources and sharing tasks in many fields, can progress and safety be
>
> found. For our part, we have agreed that our two countries will henceforth act
>
> in accordance with this principle.[30]

The question of the role of rhetoric, though, throws up what is probably the thorniest

of all of the problems the historian has to confront when assessing the outcome of

Macmillan's Anglo-American project. For, in the simplest sense, it is arguable that "interdependence" as understood in Washington meant something rather different from the interpretation placed on it by the British Prime Minister. "Interdependence" was only acceptable to both Eisenhower and Kennedy to the extent that Washington retained ultimate control in its relations with London. Or, as Kennedy put it when discussing in private the question of nuclear sharing within the Western alliance, 'there had to be control by somebody. One man had to make the decision – and as things stood that had to be the American President. He couldn't share that decision with a whole lot of differently motivated and differently responsible people in Europe.'[31] Indeed, one concealed motive underlying Eisenhower's agreement to the resumption of Anglo-American nuclear cooperation may well have been the desire to gain more control over the British program.[32] Certainly, when Macmillan came to contemplate the prospect of a nuclear "bribe" to French President Charles de Gaulle to help facilitate British entry into the European Economic Community during 1961-2, it was Washington's veto over the transfer of any technology that might have a US component that stood in his way. "Interdependence" in the nuclear field during the Macmillan years was to come to look much more like British dependence and American control.

The clash in interpretations of Anglo-American interdependence was nowhere made more painfully apparent to Macmillan than in the field of summitry and détente. Macmillan's pursuit of detente was central to his conception of the waging of the Cold War during the "crisis years". In view of the new Anglo-American partnership the prime minister believed he had forged during his October 1957 visit to Washington, his expectation that the Eisenhower administration would allow him some room for maneuver in seeking a relaxation in tensions with Moscow was not unreasonable. Unfortunately from the prime minister's point of view, the reception which the administration afforded his initiative in this field was far removed from the rhetoric of "sharing tasks" espoused in the Declaration of Common Purpose.

Macmillan's pursuit of détente during 1959-60 seems to have had three main motivations. Firstly, there was circumstance. In the wake of Khrushchev's 27 November 1958 announcement of a six-month deadline for the Western powers to reach agreement with the Soviet Union over the future status of Berlin, Cold War tensions increased markedly. The danger of the outbreak of war in such circumstances, whether by accident or design, was significantly greater, and Macmillan could be forgiven for thinking that a new diplomatic initiative was needed. Secondly, there was political tradition. Macmillan saw himself as the inheritor of Churchill's mantle of summiteer. Albeit that Churchill's pursuit of détente during his peacetime administration of the early 1950s had yielded few dividends,[33] Macmillan still saw a similar role for Britain in changed international circumstances, acting as bridge-builder between the superpowers. Finally, there was electoral calculation. Macmillan had an election to fight during 1959 and the mantle of peacemaker would do his reputation no harm with an electorate that was conscious of the dangers of military confrontation.

In Washington, it was predominantly in these cynical electoral terms that Macmillan's initiative in seeking an invitation to visit the Soviet Union in February 1959 was rationalized.[34] Eisenhower was concerned that the Soviets might try to divide the Western alliance and, in private, wished Macmillan the worst of luck on his self-styled "voyage of discovery" to the Soviet Union. The president hoped that the British delegation would 'come back with their tails between their legs and then we are smart fellows'.[35] Nevertheless, despite some remarkable twists and turns, not least when the staid British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd was dispatched down a chute to spin across a frozen lake in a basket, Macmillan did not return completely empty-handed. Khrushchev implicitly backed away from his six-month deadline for agreement over Berlin when he offered publicly to accept a foreign ministers' meeting in Geneva in April 1959 as a prelude to a summit meeting.[36]

In the wake of his Moscow visit, Macmillan duly secured re-election with an enhanced majority for his Conservative Party in October 1959. Even with the election won, though, he continued his pursuit of détente. Macmillan pinned all of his hopes for success on the four-power summit scheduled to take place in Paris in May 1960. In view of the covert cooperation taking place between Britain and the United States over the use of U-2 spy planes for intelligence gathering missions in Soviet airspace, it is somewhat ironic that the spectacular failure of precisely just such an American mission days before the summit should have scuppered Macmillan's strategy. The prime minister himself had had the foresight to cancel all British U-2 missions in advance of the summit.[37] The CIA, by contrast, had continued its program unabated with disastrous results.

At the summit itself, Macmillan struggled to salvage what he could from the wreckage. His suggestions that Eisenhower could either 'say he was sorry', or better still 'make a formal diplomatic apology',[38] seem to have been a major misjudgment of the president's position. With the credibility of his administration at stake, Ike was unbending in his refusal to give in to Khrushchev's demands, either for the punishment of the perpetrators of the U-2 flight, or for a formal apology. From an Anglo-American point of view, the summit concluded with a symbolic incident. As the summit collapsed on the morning of 17 May, Eisenhower asked Macmillan to accompany him for a ride through Paris in an open-topped car. Macmillan's own interpretation of this was that Ike wanted to show that 'if Khrushchev must break up the Summit Conference, there is no reason to let him break up the Anglo-American alliance....'[39] It may well also have been though that Eisenhower wanted to demonstrate to Macmillan that, despite his own earlier independent excursions, it was the American President who would decide their ultimate joint destination.

The Paris collapse had a profound effect, not just on Macmillan personally, but also on his conception of the role of the Anglo-American alliance in British foreign policy. The prime

minister's belief that the subtle British would be able to guide the hand of the brash Americans like the Greeks and Romans of old had proven to be whimsical in the face of the hard-headed realism of the American President. In the wake of the summit, Macmillan told Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd that it was difficult to see the way forward now that he could no longer 'usefully talk to the Americans'.[40] His Private Secretary Philip de Zulueta also recalled that Paris represented an epiphany for the prime minister, because 'this was the moment he suddenly realized that Britain counted for nothing; he couldn't move Ike to make a gesture towards Khrushchev….'[41] As de Zulueta saw things, the Paris failure was crucial in the development of Macmillan's concept of Europe 'because at the summit it became apparent that he couldn't really by himself bring irreconcilable American and Russian positions closer.'[42] Macmillan's own formulation of the effect of Paris on him was straightforward. It 'was the most tragic moment of my life.'[43]

Although, as we will see, Macmillan continued to use the rhetoric of interdependence even after his Paris epiphany, in reality he now embarked on a new foreign policy strategy. In view of the unreliability of his influence in Washington, Macmillan needed to develop an alternative international power base from which to pursue British interests. This did not mean that Macmillan would abandon the Anglo-American alliance overnight. On the contrary, he sought to maintain it as best he could while at the same time developing his alternative strategy, which involved the pursuit of British membership of the European Economic Community. What the prime minister in effect adopted was a *hedging strategy* in which ties with Washington would be maintained, while at the same time a new power base in Europe was sought. As the use of the term "hedging" implies, Macmillan's strategy was to prove complex in execution and uncertain in outcome.

In the short term, the prime minister's new approach seemed all the more necessary in view of the forthcoming change of administration in Washington. The attempt to offset the

impact on Anglo-American relations of such changes had been one of the goals underlying

Macmillan's pursuit of new administrative structures in the form of the Working Groups

established after the October 1957 talks. Unfortunately for the prime minister, the course and

outcome of the Working Group experiment during 1958 and 1959 had fallen far short of his

expectations. The Syria Working Group, soon renamed the Middle East Working Group, had

produced a plan in December 1957 for joint intervention in Lebanon and/or Jordan should the

pro-Western regimes in either country be threatened by outside subversion. Unfortunately,

thereafter, the process of Anglo-American planning and consultation stalled for reasons which

were to plague the operation of the Working Groups across the whole range of their remit.

Firstly, the US military was very reluctant to tie itself into formal cooperation with the British

for fear that this might limit American freedom of action in any crisis. Secondly, there was

disagreement and competition between the various agencies involved on the US side,

particularly the CIA, State Department and Defense Department. Finally, American

involvement in the Working Groups was affected by a paranoia about secrecy which seems to

have had two main sources. The first was the fear that other Western allies, particularly the

French and West Germans, might find out about the existence of exclusive Anglo-American

planning machinery. The second was a persistent fear about the effectiveness of British

security, dating back to the spy scandals of the immediate post-war years. This American

paranoia about secrecy had been present at the creation of the Working Groups and had

dictated the highest possible security classification which London had subsequently afforded

their work. This in itself produced a somewhat farcical situation in which officials in the

relevant departments of Whitehall who might have had useful ideas or information to

contribute to their work were not security cleared to be told of the Working Groups'

existence.[44]

When planning did restart for possible intervention in the Levant, this only came under the pressure of new circumstances brought about by the civil war which broke out in Lebanon during May 1958. In a further twist of fate which made Selwyn Lloyd's earlier adventures in the Russian basket look positively sedate, the detailed Anglo-American plan for intervention in Lebanon, code-named "Blue Bat", which was then speedily produced, was promptly shelved by Eisenhower when he decided to send US marines into the country unilaterally in the wake of the 14 July Iraqi Revolution. Macmillan's fear that Britain might now seem to be sidelined by American action, an impression which could have a negative impact on her prestige and interests in the region, prompted a subsequent, parallel British intervention in Jordan. Although these operations were contemporaneous they were neither combined, nor in any significant sense "interdependent".[45] In fact, British dependence was once again on display in the form of Macmillan's pleading for US assistance, first in facilitating British over-flights of Israel, and then in meeting the re-supply needs of British forces.

The Working Group experiment also produced limited results in other fields. The Group set up to coordinate covert action in Indonesia in December 1957, was by-passed through direct correspondence between Macmillan and Eisenhower when the question of overt intervention became more pressing in April 1958. The Working Group was evidently too large and unwieldy a forum to permit the making of swift decisions.[46] It was only in the field of information policy, that the Working Group established in October 1957 seems to have operated with any long-term effectiveness. The rest of the structure had in practice atrophied by the final year of the Eisenhower administration. As a Foreign Office brief prepared in advance of Macmillan's first scheduled summit with the incoming President John F. Kennedy acknowledged:

As regards machinery, the system of joint working parties established under the Interdependence agreement of October 1957 never worked very well and is today only active in the Information field. The American governmental system does not easily adapt itself to such machinery. It is probably easier for us to work with and through the State Department, with the parallel arrangements between our respective intelligence services.[47]

Macmillan's response to the failure of his experiment in the institutionalization of interdependence was to fall back on the use of personal diplomacy. But, for this to be effective, he had to try to find a point of contact with the incoming president. The difficulty here was that he did not boast the personal ties with John F. Kennedy that he had been able to exploit with Dwight Eisenhower. Not only that, but Macmillan was concerned about the generation gap between him and the new president, and the possible affect of Kennedy's "Irishness" on Anglo-American relations. Between Kennedy's election victory and his inauguration, a great deal of effort was expended in London on an attempt to forge a new Anglo-American ideological platform, which might arrest the incoming President's attention. As early as 9 November 1960, Macmillan wrote to his new Foreign Secretary Lord Home, expressing the opinion that he would have to build a bridge to Kennedy in the realm of ideas.[48] After a burst of activity in the Prime Minister's Private Office, a paper was produced proposing a wide-ranging political, military and economic reorganization of the Free World.[49] In the event, though, after some further debate within Whitehall, the letter eventually sent by the prime minister to the president-elect was rather more limited in scope. Nevertheless, Macmillan still advocated the reform of the capitalist system so as to ensure full employment and economic growth. 'If we fail in this', he warned, 'Communism will triumph, not by war, or even by subversion, but by seeming to be a better way of bringing people

material comforts.' On the international front, in a bid to pander to what Macmillan perceived to be Kennedy's likely concern with the Third World, the prime minister emphasized the importance of spreading freedom to the 'uncommitted countries'.[50]

After all of the effort that had been expended in London, Kennedy's reply, conveyed by Secretary of State-designate Dean Rusk to British Ambassador Harold Caccia in Washington, proved to be something of a disappointment. The president-elect did not engage in the ideological debate the prime minister had hoped to spark. The only exception was in respect of Macmillan's comments on the struggle for hearts and minds in the Third World. Here, the potential for Anglo-American conflict was implicit in Kennedy's observation that 'the American people have some deep-rooted notions… which make it important for us not to be constantly torn between loyalties to the Atlantic community and our genuine concern for the peoples of other continents.'[51]

If the attempt to forge an arresting ideological platform had yielded few dividends for the prime minister in his efforts to build a bridge to the new president, there remained the hope that he could establish some form of personal rapport with Kennedy during their face-to-face encounters. Macmillan's first meeting with the president was scheduled to take place in Washington at the beginning of April 1961. Careful planning was overtaken by events, though, in the shape of the deteriorating situation in Laos. By the third week of March 1961, Kennedy was close to authorizing intervention by US ground forces to prevent the triumph of the Communist Pathet Lao movement in the Laotian civil war. To bolster the morale of the SEATO nations, and to demonstrate that Laos was a significant concern for the Western alliance as a whole, the president needed to secure a commitment from the prime minister that British forces would also participate in any deployment. As Kennedy saw matters, 'if the British and French aren't going to do anything about the security of Southeast Asia, we tell them we aren't going to do it alone. They have as much or more to lose in the area than we

have.'[52] The result was what amounted to a summons from the president to the prime minister to attend an urgent meeting at the Key West naval base in Florida on Sunday 26 March 1961.[53]

In London, the prospect of military intervention in Laos was treated with horror. There was no enthusiasm within Harold Macmillan's Cabinet for joint action.[54] On the other hand, it was recognized that if the British Government failed to support the new administration in its first major foreign policy test, the consequences for Anglo-American relations could be very serious. Minister of Defense Harold Watkinson wrote to Macmillan that 'military intervention in Laos has always been a nonsense…. There are political advantages in supporting the Americans, and there may be other political reasons for going forward. There are no military advantages in holding small bridgeheads in Laos.'[55] Foreign Secretary Lord Home summed up British views even more succinctly: 'if America after weighing everything decides to go in, I fear we must support them but the prospect is horrible.'[56]

In these circumstances, there can be little surprise that the initial encounter between Kennedy and Macmillan at Key West was at best uneasy. Both men were nervous, with Macmillan 'apprehensive… as to whether the President would think he was a funny old man who belonged to the distant past and couldn't understand the problems of the day.' Kennedy by contrast was concerned as to how the prime minister would measure him up as against his predecessor, and Macmillan's personal friend, Eisenhower.[57] The business sessions at Key West did little to relieve the tension, with Kennedy pressing Macmillan to commit himself to joint intervention in Laos should the situation deteriorate further. On his way to lunch during a pause in discussions, Macmillan's press secretary heard him muttering 'he is pushing me hard but I won't give way.'[58] The meeting culminated in a tense exchange with Kennedy asking 'if all fails *and* a take-over of Laos appears imminent *and* a formal request from the Royal Lao Government is made, *and* if a limited plan has been drawn up, is it your judgment

that we should respond militarily to the Lao appeal?' Thus pinned down, Macmillan could not

wriggle any further. 'It is my personal judgement that we should', he replied. 'However, I

must carry the Cabinet. I think I can.' Kennedy's own closing remark was unequivocal: 'we

must respond', he said.[59]

The Key West exchanges reflected once again the problems involved in the operation

of interdependence from the British perspective. In a crisis, the American reaction was

characterized more by the search for control in its relations with London, than by a spirit of

partnership. This was nowhere better reflected than in the bluntly stated approach agreed by

the president for handling Macmillan at Key West: 'tell the British to modify their present

position.'[60] The irony of the situation was made all the greater by the hedging strategy on

which Macmillan had now embarked. At Key West, he had been forced to concede a British

commitment to act jointly with the Americans over Laos. The rationale underpinning this was

the need to preserve influence for London in its relations with Washington. At the same time,

however, precisely because of his experience at Paris, which had brought home to him the

limitations of the influence London could exert on Washington in a crisis, Macmillan was

planning a turn towards Europe. Still, until he could secure, first the agreement of his cabinet,

then the support of his party, the backing of British public opinion, the acquiescence of the

Commonwealth countries and finally the agreement of the existing members of the EEC,

Macmillan could not count on the success of his European project. In the interim, he was

forced to take a great risk to preserve his relations with Washington.

In the event, Macmillan was to be delivered from the need to contribute British forces

to a hopeless war in Laos by Kennedy's own increasing skepticism about the hawkish advice

he was receiving from the CIA and the Pentagon in the wake of the Bay of Pigs fiasco.[61] His

meeting with Kennedy in Washington during April 1961 seems to have been less tense in

character, while the president's brief stopover in London on the way back from his disastrous

encounter with Khrushchev in Vienna in June, laid the foundations for a personal relationship which was genuinely warm. Macmillan's pose as the worldly-wise elder statesman, willing, when called upon, to offer reassurance and advice, while at the same time mocking the absurdities of international politics, seems to have struck a chord with Kennedy. Certainly, it was this role that Macmillan would reprise time and again during both their face-to-face encounters and their telephone conversations.

This latter observation points us towards the first of two main instruments Macmillan would use in his pursuit of personal diplomacy during the Kennedy years. In the summer of 1961, the first secure scrambler telephone, linking the White House to Macmillan's temporary base in Admiralty House, was installed. The American designed KY-9 was an experimental device, which worked on a push-to-speak basis somewhat like a radio telephone. It was a cantankerous machine, which was frequently out of operation but, until November 1962, when it was replaced by the somewhat more reliable British designed "Twilight" telephone, it still represented an important new facilitator of personal diplomacy at the highest level. The limitations of coordinating action in a crisis between the prime minister and president when the two were obliged to speak over an open phone line, as had previously been the case, had been nowhere better illustrated than in Eisenhower and Macmillan's response to the 14 July 1958 overthrow of King Feisal of Iraq. In a crucial phone conversation that evening, Macmillan had felt obliged to resort to a bizarre form of code in a bid to get across to Eisenhower the fact that a request for military intervention had been received from King Hussein of Jordan, the surviving Hashemite monarch, who was now entitled to claim leadership of the Iraqi-Jordanian Arab Union. Macmillan had told the president that 'we have had a request from one of the two little chaps – one is gone and the other is there – we do not really know the final reports, but the second one is going on alone. We have this request. His being deputy gives him a legal right over the whole. What are we going to do?'[62] Evidently

the only person fooled by Macmillan's description of Hussein and Feisal as 'two little chaps' was Eisenhower himself, who later recorded in his memoirs that 'I had to smile at Harold's efforts at code over the telephone – "We have had a request from the two little chaps", meaning Hussein and Chamoun.'[63]

In any event, the scrambler phone gave the prime minister a direct secure link to the president, which the two men could also exploit in circumstances where they wanted to bypass their respective bureaucracies. This was particularly important for Macmillan, who, when trying to pin down the details of a new initiative over the nuclear test ban in the spring of 1963, noted that it was vital to get the final text settled with the president and his White House advisers 'before the State Dept & Pentagon rats get at it'.[64] By this stage the prime minister had had enough experience of the workings of the Washington bureaucracy to be suitably cynical about its likely impact on his personal diplomacy. Kennedy too saw advantages in the device, noting that 'I find this new method of communication very helpful, and I am able to endure the suspicion it arouses among Ambassadors and State Department officials with equanimity and even pleasure.'[65]

If the scrambler telephone represented a new departure in Anglo-American diplomatic relations, Macmillan also exploited a much more traditional channel to try to further his personal diplomacy in Washington. The role of British Ambassador to Washington, David Ormsby Gore, in Anglo-American relations during the Kennedy years was truly deserving of that much-contested epithet "special". Ormsby Gore's unique access to the president was a product both of his friendship with Jack and Bobby Kennedy which dated back to pre-war years in London and also of JFK's high regard for his judgment.[66] Indeed, the president had gone so far as to advocate Ormsby Gore's appointment as ambassador to Macmillan when they had met for the first time at Key West.[67] Ormsby Gore's ready access to the president, which was of both an official and unofficial character, is mirrored in the claim of one

commentator that, apart from when the president was abroad, there were only three or four weekends during the ambassador's tenure and Kennedy's presidency when the Ormsby Gores were not with the Kennedys.[68]

During his official exchanges with the president, Ormsby Gore proved to be remarkably effective, not only in getting the prime minister's case heard, but also in securing concrete changes in American policy where British interests were directly affected. There are many examples that could be chosen to illustrate this point, but perhaps the clearest case is that of the series of interventions Ormsby Gore made with Kennedy during the early months of 1963 over the terms of the Polaris sales agreement. Against the wishes of Defense Secretary McNamara, Ormsby Gore persuaded the president that Britain should pay no more than a 5% surcharge on the final purchase price of the missiles as a contribution towards America's huge research and development costs. This was a remarkably good deal from the British perspective.[69]

If the selection of an ambassador with exceptional access to the president, together with the development of new secure means of communication acted as facilitators of Macmillan's personal diplomacy during the Kennedy years, the question must still be asked as to what tangible results Macmillan was able to achieve through these channels? Macmillan's record here was certainly not barren of all achievement. Perhaps the greatest measure of success was reserved for an area in which the president seems to have shared the prime minister's own concerns, that of the search for a nuclear test ban treaty.[70] Although Kennedy's handling of the question was altogether more cautious than that of Macmillan, an approach dictated both by the constraints of US domestic and bureaucratic politics, nevertheless, in the spring of 1963, Macmillan was able to exploit his personal channels to the President in order to kick-start the apparently stalled process of negotiation. The role of David Ormsby Gore as a facilitator was once again crucial here. In the first instance, it was the

ambassador's positive estimate of the president's likely response to a new initiative on Macmillan's part that led the prime minister to dispatch a fresh appeal for action on 16 March 1963.[71] When a rather prosaic, negative response, drafted in the State Department, arrived from Washington, it was Ormsby Gore who once again advised Macmillan to 'return to the charge with the President and get the argument back on to the higher plane which was typified by your own letter.'[72] Macmillan therefore sent Kennedy a further message on 3 April. This time, instead of simply sending the State Department's suggested reply to the prime minister, Kennedy chose to bypass the bureaucracy and instead discussed Macmillan's draft for a proposed message to Khrushchev with the prime minister via the secure scrambler phone on 11 April.[73] It was clear that on this occasion Macmillan's initiative had provided the president with a good excuse to wrest control of the negotiating process away from the State Department and back into his own hands. As National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy commented when forwarding the spurned State Department draft to Macmillan's Private Secretary Philip de Zulueta, 'this document has no formal standing and in the White House we rely on you to protect us from the wrath of our learned colleagues.'[74]

Although Khrushchev's formal reply to the joint Kennedy-Macmillan letter, delivered on 8 May, was largely negative in character, Macmillan encouraged the president to seize on the one positive element of the message, the suggestion that high-level Anglo-American representatives might come to Moscow to discuss matters further.[75] This chimed in with Kennedy's own instinct that an opportunity existed for détente in East-West relations at this point, mirrored in his 'peace speech' delivered at American University on 10 June. The result was the dispatch of American and British emissaries to Moscow in the second half of July. During the final negotiations, the role of the British representative, Lord Hailsham, was essentially that of a bystander to what was a US-Soviet deal. Indeed, Hailsham's role between that of his American counterpart Averell Harriman and the Soviet negotiator Andrei Gromyko

was so limited that at one point he apparently commented 'if whatever was said was agreeable to them, clearly it would be agreeable to him.'[76] Macmillan had been pressed by Kennedy in advance of the negotiations to agree that Hailsham would support the American position on any points of disagreement with the Russians, showing once again the limitations imposed on British freedom of action by the American desire for control at crucial junctures.[77] But, if interdependence took on a more familiar guise in terms of the British role at the Moscow talks, the test ban saga did at least represent one concrete dividend that Macmillan could boast for its pursuit through personal diplomacy. There remains a kernel of truth in the president's congratulatory telegram to the prime minister after the successful conclusion of the negotiations in which he commented that 'more than once your initiative is what got things started again.'[78]

But, if Macmillan could boast some success in the field of nuclear testing, in the broader arena of defense interdependence the experience of Anglo-American relations during the Kennedy years bore out many of the fears that had haunted Macmillan since his May 1960 epiphany in Paris. This was all the more ironic, since the initial indications as to the likely course that defense interdependence might take under the Kennedy administration were somewhat more positive than had been expected in London. On a visit to Washington in March 1961, the British Minister of Defense Harold Watkinson found the new Defense Secretary Robert McNamara keen to pursue "interdependence". Eliminating wasteful duplication in the Western defense effort fitted in with McNamara's own drive for rationalization and cost efficiency at the Pentagon. Two memoranda were signed by Watkinson and McNamara. The first expressed the need for greater coordination in defense research and development and confirmed the deal struck by Macmillan with Eisenhower at the Camp David summit of March 1960 for the supply of the American Skybolt missile to Britain. Skybolt, which would be carried by the UK's V-Bomber force, was intended to act as

the future delivery system for the British nuclear deterrent. The second memorandum signed by McNamara and Watkinson laid down the terms of reference for a joint study of possible areas of coordination.[79]

In line with the earlier experience of the Anglo-American Working Groups, though, the practical implementation of deals agreed at the top level proved to be problematical. Not only that, but the underlying differences in the perception of interdependence as between London and Washington soon came into the open. When Watkinson came to review the progress of interdependence a year later he had to admit that the results had been discouraging. Once development work had been started on a project in the US, he noted, the vested political, industrial and financial interests involved meant that it was unlikely to be curtailed in favor of a British rival. The American proposal that greater efforts should be made to dovetail future research and development planning held great pitfalls for Britain. 'Viewing this proposal dispassionately', Watkinson argued, 'it may well be that what the Americans mean by "interdependence" might be held by some parts of British industry to be "dependence", because of the enormous preponderance of power, money and resources on the American side.'[80]

From the American perspective, the whole question of "interdependence" looked very different. A Pentagon briefing paper prepared for Macmillan's April 1962 trip to Washington argued that what the British were trying to arrange was a 'horse trade' in which the US would open up the NATO market to British equipment by withdrawing some of its own weapons from sales competitions in exchange for a British commitment to do likewise. This amounted, in the Defense Department's estimation, to 'an arbitrary division of the market'. The US understanding of interdependence was different: 'we prefer competition as a means of selection, while the UK would prefer a negotiated division of effort.'[81] Despite substantial pressure from the prime minister, who warned that 'a one-sided dependence by us on you

would be politically and economically unacceptable',[82] the president stuck to the same line as the Defense Department. British firms, Kennedy argued, should compete for specific projects on the same basis as their American counterparts.[83] But, as the Cabinet Secretary Norman Brook commented in a memorandum to Macmillan:

> If the competitions were run fairly, this might be a logical policy – though,
> even then, it would be a misuse of language to call it 'interdependence' or
> even 'complementarity'. But all previous experience suggests that British
> firms will have a pretty small chance of winning anything valuable in this
> sort of competition conducted under American rules.[84]

During the summer of 1962, two specific controversies brought Anglo-American relations close to breaking point over the question of interdependence. First, there was the successful American sales pressure exerted on NATO countries to lead them to purchase the American *Sergeant* surface-to-surface missile instead of the British designed *Blue Water* system.[85] The result of this was that in August 1962, the British Government was forced to cancel the *Blue Water* program at considerable cost, leaving Macmillan fuming.[86] On top of the *Sergeant-Blue Water* fiasco during the same month came the extraordinary crisis in Anglo-American relations caused by the US decision to sell *Hawk* missiles to Israel. Macmillan was furious.[87] His immediate assumption was that the administration had duplicitously violated an earlier Anglo-American agreement not to sell such weapons without prior consultation, in order to undercut the sales chances of the British *Bloodhound* system. He immediately dashed off what amounts to one of the most extraordinary personal messages ever sent by a British Prime Minister to an American President:

I cannot believe that you were privy to this disgraceful piece of trickery. For myself I must say frankly that I can hardly find words to express my sense of disgust and despair. Nor do I see how you and I are to conduct the great affairs of the world on this basis…. I have instructed our officials to let me have a list of all the understandings in different parts of the world which we have entered into together. It certainly makes it necessary to reconsider our whole position on this and allied matters.[88]

Although it quickly became apparent that the administration had taken its decision on the basis of its own reading of regional politics, coupled with domestic political considerations in the shape of the looming mid-term elections, Macmillan's bitterness proved enduring. By the beginning of October he was still brooding on it, telling Foreign Secretary Lord Home that:

I am bound to say the whole episode is a very distasteful one. I hope you will leave Rusk under no illusion. It is not the importance of the matter but the complete falsity with which he and the American Administration have approached it which sticks in one's throat. How can we ever have any confidence again in anything they say to us?[89]

In the interim, Macmillan had warned the new British Minister of Defense, Peter Thorneycroft, who was about to depart for his first encounter with McNamara, about his broader concerns over the functioning of interdependence:

When I launched 'interdependence' with President Eisenhower, I think he

personally was sincere. But lower down the scale, his wishes were ignored.

So it is with President Kennedy. The disgraceful story of Sergeant and still

more discreditable story of Hawks for Israel prove this. Your predecessor

stood up to Macnamara [sic] well. But we still had hopes the Americans

would play fair. I fear this is beyond their capacity. I think you should make

it clear to them that we are not 'soft' and are quite well aware of the facts.

Americans respect strength and rather admire a 'tough' attitude. If only we

can 'get into Europe' we shall, of course, have a much stronger position.[90]

This last observation brings us back to the development of the hedging strategy on which Macmillan had embarked in the wake of the Paris summit. A further reason for his sense of frustration by the autumn of 1962 was that, although he had largely succeeded by this point in squaring the domestic politics of the EEC application, the problem of French opposition remained. At the Champs summit of 2-3 June 1962, Macmillan had gone about as far as he could in hinting to de Gaulle that he was disillusioned with the Anglo-American alliance and wanted to develop an alternative European power base. The prime minister began by noting that 'Britain had a great friendship for the United States but in 20 years time Britain would be relatively weaker even than she was now by comparison with the United States.' In response to de Gaulle's assertion that 'Britain did not seem ready politically speaking to prefer Europe to the United States', Macmillan argued that 'there was not a great popular feeling for the American alliance in Britain.' While stressing that he did not want to abandon friendship with the United States altogether, the prime minister argued that 'he understood and sympathized with President de Gaulle's irritation with some aspects of United States

policy….' In order to promote a more equal Atlantic alliance, Macmillan advocated the pooling of Anglo-French nuclear forces. This would create a 'solid European organization'.

Macmillan's blandishments at Champs failed to overcome de Gaulle's suspicions. While the British had 'evolved greatly' they were not yet ready to help in building Europe because 'the idea of choosing between Europe and America is not yet ripe in your heart….'[91] During their 16 December 1962 meeting at Rambouillet, de Gaulle, with his domestic position now strengthened as a result of the electoral victory of his supporters, made his opposition to British entry even plainer: 'it was not possible for Britain to enter tomorrow and … arrangements within the Six might be too rigid for the United Kingdom.' Macmillan for his part expressed himself 'astonished and deeply wounded' by de Gaulle's comments. 'After all this great effort the President now appeared to take the line that there could never be an effective Europe.'[92] By December 1962, then, it was clear that Macmillan's hedging strategy was close to breakdown.

Somewhat ironically, just as Macmillan's chances of developing a European hedge to the Anglo-American alliance receded, broader developments in respect of relations with Washington only came to make it seem more necessary. These developments comprised the administration's decision to cancel the Skybolt missile system, alongside the deterioration in Anglo-American relations over a collection of international problems including the Congo crisis, the Yemeni civil war, and the Cuban trade embargo. The Congolese, Yemeni and Cuban questions can be dealt with rather more briefly than Skybolt, although differences over the Congo were to form a sub-plot to the Anglo-American confrontation at Nassau between 19-21 December 1962.

Over the Yemen, the American interest in promoting better relations with the Nasser regime in Egypt came into conflict with the British interest in protecting the newly formed South Arabian Federation, incorporating the Aden Colony and Protectorate. As a somewhat

Machiavellian memorandum written by Macmillan himself on 12 December 1962 revealed,

the British refusal to fall in with the American strategy of recognizing the Nasser-backed

Republican regime in Yemen was governed by considerations of both interest and prestige.[93]

Under the latter heading, it was important to avoid the impression that London's policy in the

region was dictated by Washington. The administration's plan, launched in December 1962,

to resolve the Yemeni conflict through the disengagement of outside parties was thus to be

undermined in part by the continuing British refusal to grant recognition to the Republican

regime in Sana'a.[94]

Over the Congo crisis, British and American approaches had diverged further and

further during 1961-62. The British believed that any firm action by the United Nations to end

the secession of the mineral-rich Katangan province of the Congo might serve to destabilize

the fragile Central African Federation, which they had established to the south. They were

also worried by the potential implications for their other colonial possessions of either the

imposition of economic sanctions or the intervention in force by the UN in Katanga. For the

Kennedy Administration, the Katangan question was framed much more in the context of the

development of the Cold War in Africa, and the need to bolster the authority of the US client

and leader of the central Congolese Government, Cyrille Adoula. By December 1962, after

the failure of repeated attempts to forge a common Anglo-American front, the administration

was to break with the British over the crisis, and back the UN's action to reintegrate Katanga

by force.[95]

Over Cuba, although the missile crisis of October had been negotiated without any

open Anglo-American disagreement, the same could not be said of longer-term policy

towards the Castro regime.[96] Even before the missile crisis, there had been considerable

tensions between London and Washington over the British Government's refusal to curtail

trade with Cuba. This issue proved to be a running sore in Anglo-American relations with

Macmillan adamant that 'there is no reason for us to help the Americans on Cuba.'[97] Kennedy for his part made it clear to British Foreign Secretary Lord Home that 'he simply couldn't understand why we could not help America by joining in an embargo on trade.'[98] Divisions over the issue were symptomatic, both of a difference in perception of the Castro regime, and also of deeper Anglo-American disagreements over the utility of a strategic embargo on trade with Eastern Bloc countries.[99] The prime minister's conclusion from these exchanges was that 'we are in a rather bad period with [the] US. This is sad and may do us both harm.'[100]

If relations seemed "rather bad" in October 1962, there was to be no such typical British under-statement about the extent of the crisis which broke between London and Washington the following month. Subsequent analysis of the Skybolt saga, which reached its denouement at the Nassau summit of 19-21 December 1962, has been dominated by Richard Neustadt's report commissioned by the president in its aftermath.[101] Neustadt's report remains a remarkable piece of work, which offers a lucid and persuasive account of the origins and development of the Skybolt crisis, the broad lines of which most subsequent historians have chosen to follow.[102] Nevertheless, the interpretation advanced here, suggests that the terms of reference for the Neustadt report were simply too narrowly framed to do full justice to the extent of the crisis in Anglo-American relations precipitated by Skybolt's cancellation. Neustadt himself, in the introduction to the published version of his report, recently began the work of elucidating the deeper differences in perception between London and Washington, which form the essential context for the confrontation at Nassau.[103]

In essence, as a result of a difference in perception of the operation of Anglo-American interdependence during the five-year period since the Declaration of Common Purpose, British trust in American good faith had broken down. The sharing of tasks promised in October 1957 had come to seem more like the American dictation of terms, the "genuine partnership" more like British dependence. It is in these emotive terms that the belief in

London that the cancellation of Skybolt might be part of an American plot to undermine the British nuclear deterrent must be seen. The danger of a lasting rupture in Anglo-American relations over the issue was thus real.[104] As Macmillan himself put it when discussing the agenda for the Nassau conference, 'if we cannot reach an agreement on a realistic means of maintaining the British independent deterrent… an agonising reappraisal of all our foreign and defence policy will be required.'[105]

The threat of a broad rupture in Anglo-American relations was to prove to be Macmillan's key weapon at Nassau. When coupled with a warning about the domestic political vulnerability of his government it proved to be of sufficient weight to prompt Kennedy to disappoint the so called "Europeanists" within his administration, such as Under-Secretary of State George Ball, who genuinely wanted to see an end to Britain's independent nuclear role. Indeed, it was at high noon for the fate of the British nuclear deterrent on 20 December, that Macmillan deployed this weapon of last resort. Faced with another unacceptable American draft covering the terms for the British Government's independent use of a replacement Polaris nuclear force to be purchased from the US, Macmillan sounded the following warning: 'this was too important a matter for ambivalence and it was no good trying to paper over a disagreement which was serious…. Much as he regretted it if agreement was impossible, the British Government would have to make a reappraisal of their defence policies throughout the world.'[106]

In a suitable irony, the problem of maintaining the appearance of independence for the British nuclear force was now resolved through resort to an escape clause that was nothing is not ambiguous: 'The Prime Minister made it clear that except where Her Majesty's Government may decide that supreme national interests are at stake, these British forces will be used for the purposes of international defence of the Western Alliance in all circumstances.'[107] Macmillan's view was that the wording of the clause had preserved for the

British Government the right to use its nuclear forces in the ultimate defense of British national interests.[108] In practice, the degree of independence the agreement granted remains untested more than forty years later. Writing to Kennedy on Christmas Eve, Macmillan argued that it would come to be seen as 'a historic example of the nice balance between interdependence and independence which is necessary if Sovereign states are to work in partnership together for the defence of freedom.'[109] British public opinion was evidently less convinced. A Gallup Poll published on 10 January 1963 showed that 65% of those interviewed thought that Britain depended too much on the US, while 78% believed that she was no longer treated as an equal partner in Washington.[110]

If Macmillan maintained a public face of enthusiasm about the agreement, in private he was much more skeptical. He warned Defense Minister Thorneycroft of his concerns that the Administration might renege on the agreement secured at Nassau, and stressed that the Americans would have to be 'kept to the mark' in the follow up technical negotiations.[111] The State Department's subsequent attempt to draft a 'Memorandum of Understanding' to act as a sort of cover note to the Polaris agreement had the prime minister fulminating: 'how can the Americans *insist* on altering an agreement to which they have put their signature. If some shyster American lawyers try a new game, I will appeal to the President and/or to the Public.'[112]

Although the Polaris deal was eventually pinned down broadly to British satisfaction, in the interim de Gaulle had delivered the veto of the British application to enter the EEC which Macmillan had been expecting since his failed encounter with the General at Rambouillet. In the wake of de Gaulle's 14 January 1963 press conference, Macmillan's strategy of seeking a European hedge to compensate for the unreliability of Anglo-American interdependence collapsed. In his diary, Macmillan was candid about the disaster:

> All our policies at home and abroad are in ruins. Our defence plans have
>
> been radically changed from air to sea. European unity is no more; French
>
> domination of Europe is a new and alarming feature; our popularity as a
>
> Government is rapidly declining. We have lost everything, except our
>
> courage and determination.[113]

Macmillan had thus come back full circle in his foreign policy by January 1963, to a compromised Anglo-American alliance the like of which he had inherited in the wake of Suez. His pursuit of Anglo-American interdependence during his premiership had been undermined by a number of different factors. The most fundamental was a difference in perception of the relationship as between London and Washington. Macmillan saw the October 1957 Declaration of Common Purpose as the foundation for a new sort of partnership, to which Britain would make a significant, albeit secondary, contribution. Eisenhower and later Kennedy both sought greater control in their relations with London, and did what they could to limit the prime minister's scope for independent action on the world stage, particularly in respect of East-West relations. Neither was receptive to Macmillan's understanding of the implications of interdependence in the field of defense research, development and procurement. Arguably, the American understanding of interdependence was a more hard-headed, realistic reading of the power relationship between the two countries in this field, with the US defense budget dwarfing that of Britain by a factor of ten to one by 1963.[114] But this alone was not what determined the US approach. The struggle between different agencies in Washington, which had helped scupper the Working Group experiment and the rivalries, inertia and pursuit of particular interests within the Washington bureaucracy also worked against Macmillan. Personal diplomacy could circumvent some of these difficulties, but the deeper structural problems remained. If, at the beginning of his

premiership, Macmillan had cast himself in the Churchillian role of the Emperor of the East, it was clear by the end of his premiership that the emperor's robes had unraveled. Macmillan was left trying to stitch himself together an altogether more humble garment from the remnants of the Anglo-American alliance.

---

[1] The term "golden days" comes from John Dickie's *Special No More: Anglo-American Relations: Rhetoric and Reality* (London: 1994), 105.

[2] This observation applies to all textbook descriptions of Anglo-American relations during the Macmillan years of which I am aware. See for example: Christopher J. Bartlett, *The Special Relationship: A Political History of Anglo-American Relations since 1945* (London: 1992); John Dickie, *Special No More: Anglo-American Relations: Rhetoric and Reality* (London: 1994); Alan P. Dobson, *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century: Of Friendship, Conflict and the Rise and Decline of Superpowers* (London: 1995) John Dumbrell, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After* (Basingstoke: 2001); Robert M. Hathaway, *Great Britain and the United States: Special Relations Since World War II* (Boston: 1990); Ritchie Ovendale, *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century* (Basingstoke: 1998); David Reynolds & David Dimbleby, *An Ocean Apart: The Relationship between Britain and America in the Twentieth Century* (London: 1988). For further general works which also come to a favorable assessment of the Macmillan era in this field see Alistair Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986* (London: 1989); Richard Lamb, *The Macmillan Years: the Emerging Truth* (London: 1995); William Roger Louis, & Hedley Bull, (eds.) *The Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations Since 1945* (Oxford: 1986). For a skeptical counter-blast see W. Scott Lucas, 'The Cost of Myth: Macmillan and the Illusion of the "Special Relationship"' in Richard Aldous and Sabine Lee, *Harold Macmillan: Aspects of a Political Life* (Basingstoke: 1999), 16-31.

[3] The quotations from Hathaway, Dumbrell, Horne and Dickie are all from the tables of contents of the works cited in note 2 above.

[4] Quoted in Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 279.

[5] Quoted in Dickie, *Special No More*, 105.

[6] Quoted in Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 304.

[7] Studies addressing the Suez crisis completed before the main archival sources for the post-1956 era were opened include the following: Anthony Adamthwaite, 'Suez Revisited', *International Affairs*, 64/3, Summer 1988; David Carlton, *Britain and the Suez Crisis* (Oxford: 1988); Chester Cooper, *The Lion's Last Roar: Suez 1956* (New York: 1978); Howard J. Dooley, 'Great Britain's "Last Battle" in the Middle East: Notes on Cabinet Planning during the Suez Crisis of 1956', *International History Review*, 11/3, 1989; Steven Freiberger, *Dawn Over Suez: The Rise of American Power in the Middle East, 1953-57* (Chicago: 1992); Peter L. Hahn, *The United States, Great Britain and Egypt, 1945-56: Strategy and Diplomacy in the Early Cold War* (London: 1991); Diane Kunz, *The Economic Diplomacy of the Suez Crisis* (London: 1990); Keith Kyle, *Suez* (London: 1991); Richard Lamb, *The Failure of the Eden Government* (London: 1987); William Roger Louis & Roger Owen, *Suez 1956: the Crisis and its Consequences* (Oxford: 1989); Kennet Love, *Suez: The Twice Fought War* (Toronto: 1969); W. Scott Lucas, *Divided We Stand: Britain, the US and the Suez Crisis* (London: 1991); Donald Neff, *Warriors at Suez: Eisenhower Takes America into the Middle East* (New York: 1981); Hugh Thomas, *The Suez Affair* (London: 1966)

[8] Lucas, *Divided We Stand*, 324.

[9] T. S. Eliot, *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*.

[10] For revisionist approaches to post-Suez Anglo-American relations in the Middle East see: Nigel John Ashton, *Eisenhower, Macmillan and the Problem of Nasser: Anglo-American Relations and Arab Nationalism, 1955-1959* (Basingstoke: 1996); and 'A Great New Venture?

Anglo-American Cooperation in the Middle East and the Response to the Iraqi Revolution, July 1958', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 4/1, March 1993; Robert McNamara, *Britain, Nasser and the Balance of Power in the Middle East, 1952-1967* (London: 2003); and Matthew Elliot, 'Defeat and Revival: Britain and the Middle East', in Wolfram Kaiser and Gillian Staerck, (eds.), *British Foreign Policy, 1955-64: Contracting Options* (Basingstoke: 2000). For recent re-interpretations of the origins and significance of the Eisenhower Doctrine see: Salim Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism: The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East* (Chapel Hill: 2004); and Ray Takeyh, *The Origins of the Eisenhower Doctrine: the US, Britain and Nasser's Egypt, 1953-57* (New York: 2000). On the independent British intervention in defense of Kuwait in 1961 see: Mustafa Alani, *Operation Vantage: British Military Intervention in Kuwait, 1961* (London: 1990); Nigel Ashton, 'Britain and the Kuwaiti Crisis, 1961', *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 9/1, 1998; Simon Smith, *Kuwait, the al-Sabah and Oil* (London: 1999); Maurice Snell-Mendoza, 'In Defence of Oil: Britain's Response to the Iraqi Threat towards Kuwait, 1961', *Contemporary British History*, 10/3, 1996. For the continuing British role in the Gulf and South Arabia during the late 1950s and 1960s see: Glen Balfour-Paul, *The End of Empire in the Middle East: Britain's Relinquishment of Power in Her Last Three Arab Dependencies* (1991); W. Taylor Fain, 'John F. Kennedy and Harold Macmillan: Managing the "Special Relationship" in the Persian Gulf Region, 1961-63', *Middle Eastern Studies*, 38/4, 2002; Spencer Mawby, 'Britain's Last Imperial Frontier: The Aden Protectorates, 1952-59', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 29/2, 2001; Tore Tingvold Petersen, 'Crossing the Rubicon? Britain's Withdrawal from East of Suez, 1964-1968: A Bibliographic Review', *International History Review*, 22/2, 2000; Jeffrey Pickering, *Britain's Withdrawal from East of Suez: The Politics of Retrenchment* (Basingstoke: 1998). It should be noted that Ritchie Ovendale is one scholar whose conclusions, based on post-Suez archival research, are very different from those drawn here. Ovendale argues that there was a

smooth "transfer of power" from Britain to the US with the Macmillan Government willingly relinquishing its leading role. See *Britain, the United States and the Transfer of Power in the Middle East, 1945-1962* (Leicester: 1996); and 'Great Britain and the Anglo-American Invasion of Jordan and Lebanon in 1958', *International History Review*, 16/2, May 1994.

[11] For studies which present a more positive picture of Anglo-American relations under Wilson see: John Young, *The Labour Governments, 1964-1970, Volume 2: International Policy* (Manchester, 2003); 'Britain and LBJ's War, 1964-1968', *Cold War History*, 2/3, April 2002; and Saki Dockrill, *Britain's Retreat from East of Suez* (Basingstoke: 2002); 'Forging the Anglo-American Global Defence Partnership: Harold Wilson, Lyndon Johnson and the Washington Summit, December 1964', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 23/4, December 2000. For more skeptical treatments see: Sylvia Ellis, 'Lyndon Johnson, Harold Wilson and the Vietnam War: a Not So Special Relationship?' in Jonathan Hollowell, *Twentieth Century Anglo-American Relations* (Basingstoke: 2001); Kevin Boyle, 'The Price of Peace: Vietnam, the Pound and the Crisis of the American Empire', *Diplomatic History*, 27/1, January 2003; John Dumbrell and Sylvia Ellis, 'British Involvement in Vietnam Peace Initiatives, 1966-1967: Marigolds, Sunflowers and Kosygin Week' ibid. Further recent studies of important aspects of Anglo-American relations during this period include: John Dumbrell, 'The Johnson Administration and the British Labour Government: Vietnam, the Pound and East of Suez', *Journal of American Studies*, 30/2, 1996; Alan Dobson, 'The Years of Transition: Anglo-American Relations, 1961-67', *Review of International Studies*, 16/3, 1990; Jeremy Fielding, 'Coping with Decline: US Policy Toward the British Defense Reviews of 1966', *Diplomatic History*, 23/4, 1999; Matthew Jones, *Conflict and Confrontation in South East Asia, 1961-1965: Britain, the United States, Indonesia and the Creation of Malaysia* (2002); Diane Kunz, 'Somewhat Mixed Up Together: Anglo-American Defense and Financial Policy during the 1960s', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 27/2, 1999; William Roger Louis,

'The Dissolution of the British Empire in the Era of Vietnam', *American Historical Review*, 107/1, 2002; Glen O'Hara, 'The Limits of US Power: Transatlantic Financial Diplomacy under the Johnson and Wilson Administrations, October 1964 – November 1968', *Contemporary European History*, 12/3, 2003.

[12] Oliver Bange, *The EEC Crisis of 1963: Kennedy, Macmillan de Gaulle and Adenauer in Conflict* (Basingstoke: 2000); Wolfram Kaiser, *Using Europe, Abusing the Europeans: Britain and European Integration, 1945-63* (Basingstoke: 1996); Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice For Europe: Social Purpose and State Power From Messina to Maastricht* (Ithaca: 1998); Jaqueline Tratt, *The Macmillan Government and Europe: A Study in the Process of Policy Development* (Basingstoke: 1996); John Young, *Britain and European Unity, 1945-1992* (Basingstoke: 1993).

[13] Kaiser, *Using Europe, Abusing the Europeans*, 108.

[14] Key sources on Anglo-American nuclear relations during the Macmillan years include: John Baylis, *Ambiguity and Deterrence: British Nuclear Strategy, 1945-1964* (Oxford: 1995); Timothy J. Botti, *The Long Wait: The Forging of the Anglo-American Nuclear Alliance, 1945-1958* (New York: 1984); Ian Clark, *Nuclear Diplomacy and the Special Relationship: Britain's Deterrent and America, 1957-1962* (Oxford: 1994); Jan Melissen, *The Struggle for Nuclear Partnership: Britain, the United States and the Making of an Ambiguous Alliance, 1952-1959* (Groningen: 1993); John Simpson, *The Independent Nuclear State: The United States, Britain and the Military Atom* (London: 1986).

[15] Richard E. Neustadt, Report to the President, 'Skybolt and Nassau: American Policy-Making and Anglo-American Relations', 15 November 1963, Folder Richard E. Neustadt, Skybolt and Nassau, Box 322, National Security File, Staff Memoranda, John F. Kennedy Library (hereafter JFKL). For the published version of the report see Richard E. Neustadt, *Report to JFK: The Skybolt Crisis in Perspective* (Ithaca: 1999).

[16] Minute by Macmillan, 24 July 1963, PREM11/4737, UK Public Record Office, Kew, Surrey (hereafter PRO).

[17] Annotation by Macmillan, report of a meeting between Neustadt and Bligh, 1 August 1963, ibid.

[18] Harold Macmillan, *The Blast of War, 1939-1945* (London: 1967), 242-3.

[19] Crossman quoted in Anthony Sampson, *Macmillan: A Study in Ambiguity* (London: 1967), 61.

[20] Harold Evans, *Downing Street Diaries: The Macmillan Years, 1957-1963* (London: 1981), 112.

[21] This thesis is pushed much further by David Carlton, *Britain and the Suez Crisis* (Oxford: 1988), 31, 48.

[22] For discussion of the Bermuda conference see: Ashton, *Eisenhower, Macmillan and the Problem of Nasser*, 114-21; and Michael Dockrill, 'Restoring the "Special Relationship": The Bermuda and Washington Conferences, 1957', in Dick Richardson and Glyn Stone (eds.) *Decisions and Diplomacy: Essays in Twentieth Century International History* (London: 1995), 205-23.

[23] Ashton, *Eisenhower, Macmillan and the Problem of Nasser*, 122-39; Stephen Blackwell, 'Britain, the United States and the Syrian Crisis, 1957', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 11/3, 2000, 139-58.

[24] For a detailed discussion see Robert A. Divine, *The Sputnik Challenge* (New York: 1993).

[25] Macmillan to Eisenhower, 10 October 1957, PREM11/2461, PRO.

[26] Harold Macmillan Diary [hereafter HMD], 23 October 1957, quoted in Matthew Jones, 'Anglo-American Relations After Suez, the Rise and Decline of the Working Group Experiment, and the French Challenge to NATO, 1957-59', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 14/1, March 2003, 53.

[27] Briefing paper for the Washington conference, undated [October 1957], Box 74, White House Central File, Confidential Series, Subject Sub-Series Dwight D. Eisenhower Library [hereafter DDEL], Abilene, Kansas; Meeting with the President, 22 October 1957, Box 2, White House Office, Office of the Staff Secretary, Subject Series, State Department Sub-Series, DDEL.

[28] For more detail on the Working Groups see Ashton, *Eisenhower, Macmillan and the Problem of Nasser*, 136-9; and Jones, 'Anglo-American Relations After Suez', 49-79.

[29] Cabinet Conclusions, 28 October 1957, CAB128/31 Part 2, PRO.

[30] Declaration of Common Purpose, 25 October 1957, quoted in Harold Macmillan, *Riding the Storm, 1956-1959* (London: 1971), 756-9.

[31] Memcon with the President, 27 April 1963, Folder Memcons US, Box 20A, Richard E. Neustadt Papers, JFKL.

[32] For this thesis see Andrew Pierre, *Nuclear Politics: The British Experience with an Independent Strategic Force, 1939-1970* (London: 1972). The debate about US motives is nicely summarized in John Baylis, 'Exchanging Nuclear Secrets: Laying the Foundations of the Anglo-American Nuclear Relationship', *Diplomatic History*, 25/1, Winter 2001, 55-61.

[33] For Churchill's summitry see John W. Young, *Winston Churchill's Last Campaign: Britain and the Cold War, 1951-1955* (Oxford: 1996); and Klaus Larres, *Churchill's Cold War: The Politics of Personal Diplomacy* (New Haven: 2002).

[34] Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 121.

[35] Richard Aldous, 'A Family Affair: Macmillan and the Art of Personal Diplomacy', in Richard Aldous and Sabine Lee, *Harold Macmillan and Britain's World Role* (Basingstoke: 1996), 18-19.

[36] Whether Khrushchev's offer was prompted by Macmillan's visit or the tough stand taken by the Eisenhower administration remains a matter for debate. See the comments by Sir

Bernard Ledwidge in John P. S. Gearson, 'British Policy and the Berlin Wall Crisis, 1958-61', *Contemporary Record*, 6/1, Summer 1992, 134.

[37] Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 225-6.

[38] Harold Macmillan, *Pointing the Way, 1959-1961* (London: 1972), 208.

[39] HMD, 17 May 1960, quoted in Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 229.

[40] Macmillan to Lloyd, 24 May 1960, FO371/152128, PRO.

[41] Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 231.

[42] Quoted in Michael Charlton, *The Price of Victory* (London: 1983), 237.

[43] Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 231.

[44] Ashton, *Eisenhower, Macmillan and the Problem of Nasser*, 136-7.

[45] For contrasting views of these two operations see Nigel John Ashton, 'A Great New Venture? Anglo-American Cooperation in the Middle East and the Response to the Iraqi Revolution, July 1958', *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 4/1, 1993; and Ritchie Ovendale, 'Great Britain and the Anglo-American Invasion of Jordan and Lebanon in 1958', *International History Review*, 16/2, 1994.

[46] For more detail on the role of the Indonesia Working Group see Matthew Jones, 'Maximum Disavowable Aid: Britain, the United States and the Indonesian Rebellion, 1957-58', *English Historical Review*, 114/459, 1999, 1179-1216.

[47] 'Washington Talks: April 1961: Coordinated Action in Defence of Free World Interests', Brief by the Foreign Office, 20 March 1961, CAB133/244, PRO.

[48] Macmillan to Home, 9 November 1960, M.389/60, PREM11/3599, PRO. See also HMD, 11 November 1960, dep.c.21/1, 127.

[49] De Zulueta to Macmillan enclosing 'A Possible Approach', 4 November 1960, PREM11/3599, PRO.

[50] Macmillan to Kennedy, 19 December 1960, T.736/60, PREM11/3326, PRO.

[51] Caccia to Macmillan, 3 January 1961, Washington telegrams numbers 19 and 20, ibid.

[52] Memorandum from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (Nitze) to Secretary of Defense McNamara, 23 January 1961, *FRUS, 1961-63*, XXIV, 26-7.

[53] Macmillan put it thus: 'the President, in his telephone message, had been very insistent…' (Macmillan, *Pointing the Way*, 335).

[54] Focusing on the South Vietnam, Peter Busch, in *All the Way with JFK? Britain, the US, and the Vietnam War* (Oxford: 2003), has presented a very different view of the dynamics of Anglo-American relations over Indochina in this period. But Laos was the key issue during 1961-2, and the British government's decision to dispatch a very small military advisory mission to South Vietnam in 1961 was no more than a sop to try to make up for its reluctance to become engaged in Laos.

[55] Watkinson to Macmillan, 30 March 1961, T.193A/61, PREM11/3280, PRO.

[56] Home to Macmillan and Butler, 28 March 1961, Bangkok telegram no.234, ibid.

[57] These views as to their personal apprehensions were expressed by David Ormsby Gore (Lord Harlech), later British Ambassador to Washington, and a close friend of both Kennedy and Macmillan (Lord Harlech, 1964 Oral History, JFKL).

[58] Evans, *Downing Street Diaries*, 145.

[59] Memcon, Key West, Florida, 26 March 1961, Folder UK General 3/1/61-5/15/61, Box 170, National Security File, JFKL. The British records of the discussions can be found in PREM11/3280, PRO.

[60] Memorandum for the Record, 21 March 1961, *FRUS, 1961-63*, XXIV, 95-6.

[61] Peter S. Usowski, 'Intelligence Estimates and U.S. Policy toward Laos, 1960-63', *Intelligence and National Security*, 6/2, 1991, 376-7; Michael Beschloss, *Kennedy versus Khrushchev: the Crisis Years, 1960-3* (New York: 1991), 161; Timothy N. Castle, *At War in*

the Shadow of Vietnam: US Military Aid to the Royal Lao Government, 1955-1975 (New York: 1993), 35-6.

[62] Record of a telephone conversation between the prime minister and the president, 10.30pm, 14 July 1958, PREM11/2387, PRO.

[63] Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Waging Peace* (London: 1966), 273. Chamoun was President of Lebanon.

[64] HMD, 13 April 1963, dep.d.49, p.51.

[65] Kennedy to Macmillan, 6 April 1962, T.187/62, PREM11/4045, PRO.

[66] Horne, *Macmillan, 1957-1986*, 307.

[67] Macmillan, *Pointing the Way*, 339.

[68] Dickie, *'Special' No More*, 111.

[69] Ormsby Gore to Macmillan, 26 January 1963, T.54/63, PREM11/4148, PRO; Ormsby Gore to Thorneycroft, 2 February 1963, Washington telegram no.382, PREM11/4149, PRO.

[70] For a recent, detailed study of this question see Kendrick Oliver, *Kennedy, Macmillan and the Nuclear Test Ban Debate, 1961-1963* (Basingstoke: 1998).

[71] Macmillan to Ormsby Gore, 12 March 1963, T.123/63, PREM11/4555, PRO; Ormsby Gore to Macmillan, 14 March 1963, T.126/63, ibid; Macmillan to Ormsby Gore, 16 March 1963, T.131/63, ibid; Macmillan to Kennedy, T.130/63, ibid; HMD, 15 March 1963, dep.d.48, 118; Harold Macmillan, *At the End of the Day, 1961-63* (London: 1973), 456-64.

[72] Ormsby Gore to Macmillan, 28 March 1963, T.151/63, PREM11/4556, PRO.

[73] Record of a Conversation between the prime minister and President Kennedy, 5.15pm, 11 April 1963, ibid.

[74] Bundy to de Zulueta, 10 April 1963, Folder UK Subjects, Macmillan Correspondence, 2/1/63-4/15/63, Box 173A, National Security File, JFKL.

[75] Macmillan to Ormsby Gore (enclosing Macmillan to Kennedy), 20 May 1963, T.223/63, PREM11/4557, PRO.

[76] Sir Solly Zuckerman, Oral History, 17-18, JFKL.

[77] London to State, 12 July 1963, *FRUS, 1961-63*, VII, 796; Kennedy to Macmillan, 10 July 1963, T.299/63, PREM11/4559, PRO; Macmillan to Kennedy, 11 July 1963, T.300/63, ibid.

[78] Kennedy to Macmillan, 26 July 1963, PREM11/4560, PRO.

[79] Memcon, US-UK Defense talks, [post-dated] 27 March 1961, Folder UK Subjects, Macmillan Visit 1/61-5/61, Box 175, National Security File, JFKL; Watkinson to Macmillan, 21 March 1961, Washington telegrams nos.726, 727, 728, PREM11/3715, PRO.

[80] Watkinson to Macmillan, 'Interdependence', 13 February 1962, PREM11/3779, PRO.

[81] Prime Minister's Visit to Washington, April 27-29, 1962, Position Paper, Weapons Research and Development, 21 April 1962, Folder UK Subjects, Macmillan Briefing Book, 4/27/62-4/29/62, Box 175, National Security File, JFKL.

[82] Macmillan to Kennedy, 19 June 1962, FO371/166311, PRO.

[83] Kennedy to Macmillan, 28 June 1962, Folder UK Subjects, Macmillan Correspondence, 5/23/62-10/21/62, Box 173, National Security File, JFKL.

[84] Brook to Macmillan, 'Interdependence', 5 July 1962, PREM11/3779, PRO.

[85] For a broader study which illuminates the relationship between the American-West German and the British-West German military-financial "offset" agreements of the early 1960s see Hubert Zimmermann, *Money and Security: Troops, Monetary Policy, and West Germany's Relations with the United States and Britain, 1950-1971* (Cambridge: 2002), especially 179-89.

[86] Macmillan, *At the End of the Day*, 335-6.

[87] The existing literature on the Hawk missile deal treats this principally from the perspective of US-Israeli relations rather than Anglo-American relations. See: Abraham Ben-Zvi, *Decade*

of Transition: Eisenhower, Kennedy and the Origins of the American-Israeli Alliance (New York, 1998), 97-129; and *John F. Kennedy and the Politics of Arms Sales to Israel* (London: 2002); and Warren Bass, *Support Any Friend: Kennedy's Middle East and the Making of the US-Israeli Alliance* (New York: 2003), 144-85.

[88] Macmillan to Kennedy, 16 August 1962, T.406/62, PREM11/4933, PRO.

[89] Macmillan to Home, 1 October 1962, T.479/62, ibid.

[90] Macmillan to Thorneycroft, 4 September 1962, PREM11/3779, PRO.

[91] The British records of the Champs meeting are in PREM11/3775. See also, Constantine A. Pagedas, *Anglo-American Relations and the French Problem, 1960-1963: A Troubled Partnership* (London: 2000), 210; N. Piers Ludlow, *Dealing With Britain: The Six and the First UK Application to the EEC* (Cambridge: 1997), 121.

[92] Record of a Meeting at the Chateau de Rambouillet at 10am on Sunday 16 December 1962, PREM11/4230; Ludlow, *Dealing With Britain*, 195-7; Macmillan, *At the End of the Day*, 354-5

[93] Memorandum by Harold Macmillan, 'United Kingdom Recognition of the Yemen Regime', 12 December 1962, PREM11/4356, PRO. For further discussion of Anglo-American relations and Yemen see: Christopher Gandy, 'A Mission to Yemen: August 1962 – January 1963', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 25/2, 1998; W. Taylor Fain, 'Unfortunate Arabia: The United States, Great Britain and Yemen, 1955-63', *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 12/2, 2001; Simon C. Smith, 'Revolution and Reaction: South Arabia in the Aftermath of the Yemeni Revolution', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 28/3, 2000; Spencer Mawby, 'The Clandestine Defence of Empire: British Special Operations in Yemen, 1951-64', *Intelligence and National Security*, 17/3, 2002.

[94] Exasperation with the British role in undermining the disengagement plan is nowhere more clearly expressed than in Bob Komer's suggestion to Kennedy on 20 September 1963 that the

Administration should 'beat up [the] UK to stop shafting us' (Komer to Kennedy, 20 September 1963, *FRUS, 1961-1963*, XVIII, 710-13).

[95] For a detailed treatment of British policy and Anglo-American relations over the Congo see Alan James, *Britain and the Congo Crisis, 1960-3* (Basingstoke: 1996).

[96] For further discussion of Anglo-American relations and the Cuban missile crisis see Len V. Scott, *Macmillan, Kennedy and the Cuban Missile Crisis: Political, Military and Intelligence Aspects* (Basingstoke: 1999); James G. Hershberg, 'Their Men in Havana: Anglo-American Intelligence Exchanges and the Cuban Crises, 1961-62', *Intelligence and National Security*, 15/2, 2000; Peter Boyle, 'The British Government's View of the Cuban Missile Crisis', *Contemporary Record*, 10/3, 1996; Gary Rawnsley, 'How Special is Special? The Anglo-American Alliance during the Cuban Missile Crisis', *Contemporary Record*, 9/3, 1995.

[97] Macmillan to Home, 1 October 1962, PREM11/3689, PRO.

[98] Home to Macmillan, 1 October 1962, ibid.

[99] For a fuller discussion of Anglo-American relations and Cold War trade issues during this period see Ian Jackson, *The Economic Cold War: Britain and East-West Trade, 1948-63* (Basingstoke: 2001).

[100] HMD, 3 October 1962, dep.d.47, 39-41.

[101] Richard E. Neustadt, Report to the President, 'Skybolt and Nassau: American Policy-Making and Anglo-American Relations', 15 November 1963, Folder Richard E. Neustadt, Skybolt and Nassau, Box 322, National Security File, Staff Memoranda, JFKL.

[102] For example, although some valuable refinements are offered, the basic lines of approach of Donnette Murray's study, *Kennedy, Macmillan and Nuclear Weapons* (Basingstoke: 2000) are those laid down by Neustadt.

[103] See his reflections on Macmillan's exchanges with McNamara earlier in 1962 in Richard E. Neustadt, *Report to JFK: The Skybolt Crisis in Perspective* (Ithaca: 1999), 136.

[104] This stands in contrast to Marc Trachtenberg's view of an essentially choreographed crisis at Nassau (*A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963* (Princeton, 1999), 362).

[105] Macmillan to Ormsby Gore, 14 December 1962, T.616/62, PREM11/4147, PRO.

[106] Record of a Meeting at Bali-Hai, The Bahamas, 12.30pm, Thursday 20 December 1962, ibid. For the US record see Memcon, Nassau, 10am, 20 December 1962, *FRUS, 1961-1963*, XIII, 1111-12.

[107] Statement on Nuclear Defence Systems, 21 December 1962, quoted in Macmillan, *At the End of the Day*, 554-5.

[108] Macmillan to Butler, 20 December 1962, CODEL 24, PREM11/4147, PRO.

[109] Macmillan to Kennedy, 24 December 1962, T.635/62, ibid.

[110] London to State, 11 January 1963, Central Decimal File, 741.00/1-1163, RG59, USNA.

[111] Macmillan to Thorneycroft, 26 December 1962, M.343/62, PREM11/4147, PRO.

[112] Macmillan's annotation, Wright to Bligh, 15 February 1963, PREM11/4149, PRO.

[113] HMD, 28 January 1963, quoted in Macmillan, *At the End of the Day*, 367.

[114] The UK's total defence expenditure in 1963 stood at $5.2 billion as against $52.2 billion for the US (Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (London: 1988), 384).