BRITISH INTELLECTUALS IN THE AGE OF TOTAL AND NUCLEAR WARFARE

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Humanities.

2014

VICTORIA GLASS

SCHOOL OF ARTS, LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

Table of Contents

Word Count: 83,270

Abbreviations

AWP	Association for World Peace
BUF	British Union of Fascists
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CID	Committee of Imperial Defence
Cmd	Command
CND	Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
CPGB	Communist Party of Great Britain
DRPC	Defence Research Policy Committee
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
HC	House of Commons
HL	House of Lords
LHL	Liddell Hart Library
LSE	London School of Economics
MAUD	Military Application of Uranium Detonation
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
NACA	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NDRC	National Defense Research Committee
NSC	National Security Council
OR	Operational Research
TNA	The National Archives
TUC	Trade Union Congress
WAPWG	World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government

Abstract

This research examines British intellectual debates on warfare throughout the mid-20th century. The thesis identifies different discourses that emerged as a result of the changes in international relations and military technology at this time. It posits that intellectual contribution on the whole had a more significant impact than many historians have previously accredited. The thesis examines the work of specific intellectuals that made significant and detailed input into these debates and identifies their role in framing these discourses, as individuals and as part of a larger intellectual community. It also highlights the involvement of these intellectuals within the state apparatus and links their intellectual contribution to their role in government.

The subject of war and its perception by intellectuals is conspicuously absent in the historiography on British intellectuals. Some of the most important studies of British intellectuals, including Stefan Collini's *Absent Minds*, have engaged only slightly or not at all with the intellectual discourse surrounding international relations and warfare. This thesis attempts to fill this gap for the middle of the 20th century and demonstrates that warfare became a prolific and highly visible part of the contribution of intellectuals to British life.

Recent literature has attempted to discuss the British state as a warfare state, rejecting arguments on British declinism. The thesis engages with this debate, and while it focuses on Britain's approach to warfare, it also challenges the interpretation of Britain as either a welfare or a warfare state. The study of intellectuals does not feature heavily within this historiography on British warfare. While historians, such as David Edgerton, engage with specific intellectuals and their writings, a discussion of intellectual discourse does not appear within these analyses. This thesis argues that intellectuals as a group developed ideas and arguments on warfare and the British state in conjunction with one another, creating an intellectual discourse which influenced political decision making and public opinion.

The thesis also examines a more modern understanding of the intellectual: the expert. Using both scientific and military thinkers, the thesis explores how experts became intellectuals in response to the growing threat of warfare and the rise of a military-industrial complex. Using intellectuals that conform to the classic definition alongside expert intellectuals, the thesis highlights the importance of analysing both groups as part of the larger whole, and discusses the similarities and differences between the works generated by these intellectuals.

The thesis spans the years from 1932 to 1963 and discusses the continuities between intellectual debates across this period. The post-war years and the nuclear conflict feature heavily within this analysis, but the thesis highlights the importance of the 1930s in influencing later intellectual perceptions of the nuclear age and the fight against communism.

The majority of this research resulted from sources published within the public domain including monographs, newspaper and periodical articles, public speeches and radio broadcasts. The research also uses the personal archives of the individual intellectuals and political documents from the time, including papers from the Ministry of Defence located in the National Archives, Defence White Papers and the Hansard House of Commons official reports.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Acknowledgements

I owe many thanks to my supervisors Dr. Till Geiger, Professor Stuart Jones and Dr. Pedro Pinto for all their help. Their support and guidance has helped me throughout these years and I could not have finished the PhD without all their hard work on my behalf.

I am indebted to the AHRC for their funding grant which allowed me to finish the thesis and helped facilitate the research undertaken for the PhD.

I would like to thank my examiners, Professor Holger Nehring and Dr. Max Jones, for agreeing to assess the thesis. Their positive attitude during the viva made what could have been a nerve-wracking and difficult experience into a stimulating and interesting discussion. Their thoughts and insights into the thesis were extremely thought-provoking.

My thanks also go to all the archivists who helped me during my many research trips. In particular those at the Royal Society and the Liddell Hart Library for all their hard work. I would also like to thank Elizabeth al Qadhi for allowing me into her home and letting me examine her father's papers, without which Chapter Three of the thesis would not have been possible.

Lastly my thanks go to my family and friends who have supported me over the last four years and who were always keen to listen to my ideas and help me work through any problems. I would like to dedicate the thesis to my parents, Anne and Ian, for their continued and unwavering love and support.

<u>Introduction</u>

> War can do many things, but it cannot end war. No peace can be a conclusive peace: it is beyond the wit of man to draw a treaty of peace which will make it impossible for war to recur between Britain and either her present enemies or her present allies. The destruction of militarism cannot be attained by a military triumph: war is the creator, the sustainer, and the reason-for-existence of militarism. The rights of Nationalities, far from being placed on an unassailable basis by war, are at present wiped out by it.[1]

The passage above derives from the start of the book, *International Government*, written by the political theorist and intellectual Leonard Woolf, published in 1916. *International Government* set out Woolf's views on the importance of an international governing body to help prevent future warfare. As an intellectual Woolf had a major impact on public and political opinions. His book helped those in Whitehall develop their ideas on the international structure of League of Nations. Through Woolf's work and in consultation with him, Lord Bryce and Lowes Dickinson drew up the first blueprints for the League of Nations.[2]

Historiography surrounding the founding of the League of Nations highlights the importance of great statesmen such as Woodrow Wilson, Lord Cecil, Lord Balfour and Jan Smuts.[3] While undoubtedly these men played a pivotal role in its formation, the influence of men such as Leonard Woolf mostly fades from the history books.[4] When examining the history of war many intellectuals such as Woolf have had a profound impact on political thinking. Yet much of the history of war has ignored intellectual contributions in favour of political action.

The aim of this thesis is to bridge this gap, exploring the ideas of public intellectuals on the nature of warfare and how they fit into wider public debate.

---

[1] Leonard Woolf, *International Government: Two Reports* (Westminster: Fabian Society, 1916), p. 1.
[2] Janet M Manson, 'Leonard Woolf as an Architect of the League of Nations,' *The South Carolina Review* (2007): p. 4.
[3] Examples include: Patricia Clavin, *Securing the World Economy: The Reinvention of the League of Nations, 1920-1946* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Susan Pedersen, 'Back to the League of Nations,' *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007); F. S. Northedge, *The League of Nations: Its Life and Times 1920-1946* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1986); Donald S. Birn, *The League of Nations Union 1918-1945* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).
[4] One notable exception includes Ruth Henig who quotes sections of Woolf's work in her book which compiles important works that influenced the League: Ruth B. Henig, ed. *The League of Nations* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1973), p. 24.

The Ideological Backdrop of the Thesis

The changes in warfare that occurred during from the 1930s had a major impact on the understanding of the state, and this transformation disrupted the traditional liberal parliamentary discourse that had emerged in 19th-century Britain. The collapse of the capitalist economic system in the 1930s and the rise of nationalism across Europe brought an end to the laissez-faire system that had defined the previous century.[5] In its place new ideas emerged that encouraged state intervention and promoted state control in order to maintain economic and political order.

The political developments within Britain can be understood by examining what W. H. Greenleaf has described as the shift from a libertarian political tradition to a collectivist one.[6] The liberal system in the 19th century conformed to the libertarian tradition, characterised through laissez-faire policies that limited state intervention on the economy. By the late 19th century this system could no longer support the growing desire for welfare reform. Politicians from within the Liberal Party integrated collectivism into the British liberal system. This change brought a consensus of positive political action and a move from a negative to a positive conception of liberty. The need to help those in the lowest economic classes brought about new legislation on housing, pensions and employment.[7]

The collectivist model pushed liberalism away from individualism and accepted the need for social freedoms. The role of the government was central to this understanding, and political legislation heralded and enforced these new ideas. This gave the government a mandate for using political action to improve the lives of its citizens and to campaign for social improvement and mobility.[8] In the early years of the 20th century this trend was characterised through the writings of intellectuals such as L. T. Hobhouse and J. A. Hobson. Their critiques of earlier forms of liberal capitalism represented the move

---

[5] Mark Clapson, *The Routledge Companion to Britain in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 347-348.
[6] W. H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition*, 4 vols. (London: Methuen, 1983).
[7] W. H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition: The Ideological Heritage*, vol. II (London: Methuen, 1983), pp. 142-169.
[8] Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition*, II, pp. 240-254.

towards a new form of liberalism that used state intervention as a means to increase economic prosperity and improve social conditions.[9]

This new trend has been characterised as "New Liberalism" by Michael Freeden and other scholars.[10] Freeden's work in the late 1970s exposed the lack of understanding and study on the liberal transformation that occurred from the late 19th century. This gap within the both philosophical and historiographical circles is even more apparent when one examines the impact new liberalism had on British cultural and political trends during the 20th century. Freeden attempts to move analysis of liberalism from the writings of John Stuart Mill and T. H. Green and develop a more complex understanding of liberalism in the early 20th century. He argues "it is the new liberalism of the turn of the century which appears to have gained the upper hand over its rival ideologies, conservatism and socialism."[11] These changes help explain the welfare reforms that transformed the state over the century, and provides a platform to help explain the ideological currents in Britain that did not conform to conservatism, classic liberalism or socialism.[12]

Liberalism as a political theory was seen by many to be outdated and too intrinsically linked to the laissez-faire policies of the previous century. A conceptual understanding of the shift within liberalism did not permeate public discussion at this time. By the 1930s many intellectuals turned to socialism to help explain the growing need for social and political intervention, and felt a planned economy could solve the massive economic crisis within capitalism. Those that did not conform to this growing trend had a difficult time promoting their intellectual theories and arguing for a liberal platform became increasingly difficult to justify. Many British intellectuals sought to merge the freedoms espoused by liberalism into a socialist model of society.

---

[9] These include: L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1911); J. A. Hobson, *The Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy* (London: P. S. King & Son, 1909).
[10] Michael Freeden, *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978); P. F. Clarke, *Liberals and Social Democrats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978); Stefan Collini, *Liberalism and Sociology: L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England, 1880-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Avital Simhony and D. Weinstein, eds., *The New Liberalism: Reconciling Liberty and Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[11] Freeden, *The New Liberalism*, p. 1.
[12] Freeden, *The New Liberalism*, pp. 25-32.

In the years following the Second World War arguments were put forth that interest in political philosophy and ideology as a tool of analysis had waned.[13] The 1950s saw a backlash against the subject area and it was not until the early 1970s and John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice* that interest in this field was rekindled.[14] Political theory and a belief system based on ideological principles were replaced by practical political analysis. Rodney Barker's study on political ideas argues: "There was a belief in the pragmatic politics of economic efficiency and advancing overall living standards as opposed to any contest between high socialism and pure libertarianism".[15] These ideological trends help explain the challenges Britain faced on an international level and their actions at this time.

Peter Laslett, one of the founders of the Cambridge School of the history of political thought, wrote in 1956: "For the moment, anyway, political philosophy is dead. […] Faced with Hiroshima and with Belsen, a man is unlikely to address himself to a neat and original theory of political obligation."[16] These words formed part of the introduction to a book edited by Laslett on political philosophy in an attempt to create interest in the subject and encourage its renewal. This was the first in a series of edited books entitled *Philosophy, Politics and Society*.

In the next volume Isaiah Berlin challenged this common assumption, when he asked 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?'[17] He argued against the idea that only studies of empirical hypotheses had value and believed that society would always ask the type of questions set out in political theory. He concluded by suggesting:

> It is a strange paradox that political theory should seem to lead so shadowy an existence at a time when, for the first time in history, literally the whole of mankind is violently divided by issues the reality of which is, and has always been, the sole *raison d'être* of this branch of study.[18]

---

[13] Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties* (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960).

[14] The 1980s also saw a continued revival with the works of Jürgen Habermas in Germany and Michael W. Doyle in the United States: Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, 2 vols. (London: Heinemann, 1984); Michael W. Doyle, 'Liberalism and World Politics,' *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4 (1986).

[15] Rodney S. Barker, *Political Ideas in Modern Britain: In and after the Twentieth Century*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 180.

[16] Peter Laslett, ed. *Philosophy, Politics and Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1956), p. vii.

[17] Isaiah Berlin, 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?,' in *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, ed. Peter Laslett and W. G. Runciman (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962).

[18] Berlin, 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?', p. 33.

Here Berlin obviously refers to the ideological conflict of the Cold War. While Laslett may have been right when he stated that no great philosophical works to rival that of Hobbes or Marx occurred during this time, the very nature of events such as Hiroshima led intellectuals to think about the nature of society.

The thesis supports Berlin's analysis and uses the concept of war as a means to unpick some of the more important debates on ideology from Britain's intellectuals. While not political philosophers, these intellectuals discussed the changes in warfare and the ideological shifts within Britain and the wider world. Debate emerged from different aspects of the intellectual community over the nature of freedom in a liberal society, the threat of nuclear warfare, and the dangers imposed by increasing military power.

Laslett and Berlin characterise this thinking as political philosophy and political thought respectively. These are just two of the many classifications that can be used. J. G. A. Pocock argues that more often historians have moved from analysing the history of political thought to the history of political discourse.[19] It is the latter in particular that informs this thesis for a number of reasons. By using the term discourse the thesis moves away from terminology that is mainly associated with academic thinking and allows for a much broader conception which incorporates ideas from across different sections of British life. Political thought often refers to either one individual writer or the history of a group of writers and their impact. While the thesis uses individuals, it is more concerned about the interrelationship between them and how their combined writings created a picture of warfare that impacted public and political opinion. The thesis will therefore look at the evolution of particular discourses, such as a scientific discourse or a utopian discourse, to help examine the overarching intellectual contribution of the period. Pocock describes discourse as "drawing on a number of diversely originating "languages" and arguments".[20] It is the 'language' of each group and the arguments of those within it that this thesis examines to articulate a discourse.

---

[19] J. G. A. Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 1-34.
[20] Pocock, *Virtue, Commerce, and History*, p. 8.

The Framework

The thesis is primarily concerned with the two major conflicts Britain engaged in during this time: the fight against fascism and the fight against communism. Within these boundaries the thesis examines debates on freedom, including the socialist challenge to capitalism and the nature of totalitarianism. It also examines the debates on the rise of technology and the "military-industrial complex". This includes the development of a nuclear age and brings up questions on whether the increasing power of the military limited freedom within the West.

The thesis will be organised into five chapters. The first three chapters examine mainstream political and philosophical debates. These intellectuals played an important role in influencing public and political opinion. Many worked as advisors to the government and some went on the work directly as MPs. They took part in political activism, organising mass movements and leading influential organisations. The latter two chapters examine scientific and military experts who used their specific skills and understanding to comment on Britain's approach to warfare.

Through the analysis of these ideas, the thesis examines several major questions. It will ask who the major intellectual influences were on the debate on warfare. In identifying these it will examine their ideas and what role they played in intellectual debate and policy making. The thesis tries to assess how the changes in warfare influenced intellectual thinking. It will examine how the ideological perspectives on the role of war and democracies altered in a nuclear world and highlight major strands of thinking that influenced how these debates were framed, including liberalism, socialism and utopianism. The latter two chapters examine the continuities and differences between expert discussion and mainstream discussion, and how working within the state influenced the thinking of these intellectuals. The thesis also seeks to examine how their ideas played out in the larger public discussion on warfare and which events in particular had the most significant impact.

The divide between mainstream and expert intellectuals mirrors the period of transition between the older 19th-century approach to intellectuals and the more modern understanding of the public intellectual. By the 1930s intellectuals as a group within

society had been well established within British politics.[21] Writers, journalists and academics helped develop public opinion through the written word.[22] Their main object was to engage with political debates and lead public discussion. As Stefan Collini demonstrates, these intellectuals gave priority to moral ideals and their public engagement urged others in society to improve their ethical considerations. Collini therefore describes them as 'public moralists'.[23] They published their ideas as books and within newspapers and periodicals. As the 20th century progressed new media forms, including radio and television, provided alternative ways of transmission.

At this time expert intellectuals came to play a much larger role in public discussion and their advice became more important to political officials. Christian Fleck argues "the new kind of intellectual now became known as the 'knowledge worker'".[24] The public demanded 'the truth', even if they rarely enjoyed hearing it. This resulted in experts taking on the role of intellectuals, as their seemingly greater knowledge provided the required expertise to satisfy the modern audience.[25] Scientific and military experts had an important role in public debate on war. Many of these intellectuals took part in government work, either directly or in some advisory role. Their role as paid experts helped shape their understanding of warfare and the state.

The thesis divides these two categories using the terms mainstream and expert intellectuals, partly to demonstrate the difference in the professions of these intellectuals and partly to distinguish the difference in their outlook on war. Mainstream intellectuals primarily understood war as one component of the international situation and often argued that changes in international relations could end war for good. Their aim therefore was to abolish war. Expert intellectuals in contrast primarily saw war as a systemic part of international relations. Their goal was to stop war and bring about peace but did not necessarily see the goal of their work as a permanent peace or an argument for major international change.

---

[21] Uday Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), pp. 1-2; Julia Stapleton, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain since 1850* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), pp. 11-32.
[22] Christian Fleck, Andreas Hess, and E. Stina Lyon, eds., *Intellectuals and Their Publics: Perspectives from the Social Sciences* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), p. 2.
[23] Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
[24] Fleck, Hess, and Lyon, *Intellectuals and Their Publics*, p. 4.
[25] Fleck, Hess, and Lyon, *Intellectuals and Their Publics*, pp. 1-16.

Yet despite these differences a great deal about these intellectuals remained the same. Most notably the intellectuals within the expert category continued the tradition of 'public moralists'. Scientific intellectuals in particular felt extremely concerned over the production of weapons of mass destruction and their writings consistently discussed the moral implications of modern warfare and the scientists' role in developing new technology and their ethical responsibilities.

The nuclear age had a similar impact on the whole of liberal intellectual discussion, and the moral dimension of intellectual thinking turned to discussing the ethical dilemma of using these weapons and how to safeguard the world from a nuclear holocaust. A new urgency emerged and many intellectuals started to question if the current international situation could keep the people safe. A nuclear war had the potential to not only create the devastation seen after the previous two wars but end civilisation altogether. The increased threat brought increased concerns about the stability of the British government and their ability to help Britain adapt to this period of increasing international instability. Chapters One and Four will engage with ethical arguments on nuclear weapons, Chapter Two will highlight the desire amongst intellectuals to form a world government and abolish nuclear arms, while Chapter Five will engage with military arguments that questioned whether the current government had the ability to successfully fight a war against the Soviets.

The change in the requirements of intellectuals resulted in part from the rise of the 'cult of the expert' in the mid-20th century. This rise coincided with the technological race of the Cold War and experts came to play an increasingly large role in determining how to use the new technology. A number of historians have charted this rise. These scholars all discuss the importance of the changes in technology as a precursor to the increasing importance of expert opinion in the mid-20th century.

Previous historiography on expertise has helped provide the thesis with a framework for analysing how experts interacted with the state and how others have understood this rise. Kerstin Brückweh, Benjamin Ziemann, Dirk Schumann, Richard F. Wetzel's edited volume provides a detailed look into the role of expertise in numerous aspects of the

modern world.[26] The chapter by Peter Becker is particularly relevant to this thesis.[27] Becker discusses the claims of neuroscientists to an expertise that allows them to engage with debates on criminology within both academia and the public sphere. "As scientists, they claim superior authority in criminology debates because of their data; in the media they appear as public intellectuals and proclaim the need for reform of society".[28] Becker also discusses the greater demand for their expertise from politicians and the media. The latter two chapters of the thesis, in particular Chapter Four, will chart the rise of a similar phenomenon from within scientists and military experts on warfare in the mid-20th century. These chapters will demonstrate the increasing desire of experts to use their understanding to speak out on the political realities of war and reform British politics.

Timothy Mitchell's *Rule of Experts* examines Egyptian culture in the mid-20th century.[29] Mitchell's book tells the story of politics and modernity in Egypt by challenging his reader to move away from antiquated ideas on colonialism and imperialism. Mitchell shows how Egypt "manufactured a world that appeared as natural resources versus technology, bodies versus hygiene, men versus machines, the river versus human ingenuity."[30] His analysis integrates human agents and technology and provides a useful framework to explore the technological rise alongside human agents as a means to assess changes in warfare.

Within Britain debate has arisen over the role of science and technical experts within institutions such as the civil servants and the military in the 20th century. David Edgerton challenges the traditional idea that civil servants had classical educations and contributed little to the emerging technocratic evolution. He provides case studies of civil servants that rejected such assumptions, as well as highlighting the many technical experts that worked with the civil service and the military.[31] Edgerton argues that Britain's approach to warfare, which he labels 'liberal militarism', defined the British state. He examines

---

[26] Kerstin Brückweh, Benjamin Ziemann, Dirk Schumann, and Richard F. Wetzel, eds., *Engineering Society: The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies, 1880-1980* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
[27] Peter Becker, 'The Neurosciences and Criminology: How New Experts Have Moved into Public Policy and Debate,' in *Engineering Society: The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies, 1880-1980*, ed. Kerstin Brückweh, et al. (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).
[28] Becker, 'The Neurosciences and Criminology', p. 120.
[29] Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity* (London: University of California Press, 2002).
[30] Mitchell, *Rule of Experts*, p. 51.
[31] David Edgerton, *Warfare State: Britain, 1920-1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 108-116.

state institutions and claims that the sections devoted to war were well-funded and equipped with technical experts and cutting-edge technology.[32]

Edgerton's book stands in opposition to traditional historical narratives of British declinism and the focus on the welfare state. Such works include Correlli Barnett's arguments on the excessive priority given to welfare in Britain in the post-war years.[33] Barnett argues that there was no "industrial general staff of professionals to plan and execute the remaking of British industry [...] there was only the civil service".[34] He argues the civil service were given power with no responsibility. These men were academically able with literary backgrounds from top universities but had no real world experience. His argument suggests the civil service was a remnant of an elitist establishment which was not suited for post-war Britain. Edgerton's work helped provide a backdrop for the conception of a warfare state in which this analysis stands.

The role of experts has also been discussed in relation to the United States. Fred Kaplan's work on the RAND Corporation examines the importance of defence intellectuals within the Pentagon in the 1960s and 1970s.[35] These intellectuals who worked for RAND helped develop America's nuclear strategy and had a major impact on defence policy. Their expertise on the scientific side of nuclear theory gave them the authority to discuss the nuclear situation from a broader perspective and gained the respect of those in power. Kaplan discusses their integration into the policy making through the role of advisors and consultants. He argues that by the 1970s "their insight [was] elevated to an almost mystical level and accepted as dogma."[36]

The importance of technical expertise in the post-war years, especially in relation to warfare, resulted in a dramatic increase in intellectual discussion from experts. These intellectuals created a new form of discourse which often ignored the ideological foundations of more mainstream thinking and examined international relations using a realist perspective. This included threat assessments on the effects of nuclear war and the need to maintain a balance between the geo-political interests of both sides. This type of

---

[32] David Edgerton, 'Liberal Militarism and the British State,' *New Left Review* 185(1991).
[33] Correlli Barnett, *The Lost Victory: British Dreams, British Realities, 1945-1950* (London: Macmillan, 1995); Correlli Barnett, *The Audit of War: The Illusion and Reality of Britain as a Great Nation* (London: Macmillan, 1986).
[34] Barnett, *The Lost Victory*, p. 183.
[35] Fred M. Kaplan, *Wizards of Armageddon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).
[36] Kaplan, *Wizards of Armageddon*, p. 11.

thinking often influenced other intellectuals and provided a critical perspective on the technical ability of the British state.

<u>The Outline</u>

The first three chapters discuss mainstream political and philosophical thinking. The first chapter examines some of the broad debates that occurred at this time, often related to ideological concerns. It highlights the changes throughout this period and demonstrates how fundamental assumptions on the nature of the state altered as a consequence of warfare. It picks out three major strands of thinking: socialism, liberalism and pacifism. These ideologies created different assumptions about the state and put forth different ideas on future developments. This chapter will, however, display the underlining similarities based on the foundation of British liberty. An intellectual discourse emerged during this time resulting from the changes from the Second World War and the Cold War. This discourse focused on the importance of freedom and the need to implement policies to maintain it.

The second chapter focuses on a specific discourse that, while present in the inter-war years, became more prominent in the post-war years. The desire for world government (in a form that will be classed as 'utopianism') increased as a result of the Second World War and the development of nuclear weapons. This form of internationalism differed from that which appeared in the aftermath of the First World War. As Mark Mazower argues:

> The League of Nations embodied a paradox: it spoke the language of the brotherhood of man but existed as the result of a military victory. Like the older Concert of Europe, which it defined itself against, it was the instrument of a triumphant alliance of Great Powers and a means to preserve their domination of Europe – and their values – into the peace.[37]

While the architects of the League accepted the existence of nations, the discourse in the post-war period argued for nothing less than a centralised world governing body. This discourse formed at a time politicians put national self-interests above international co-operation, creating a competing dialogue. The promise of the League of Nations had not survived the 1930s and the debate surrounding the new United Nations held none of the

---

[37] Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London: Allen Lane, 2012), p. 154.

previous optimism.[38] In the academic world, the voice of critics such as E. H. Carr had discredited the concept of utopianism.[39] Despite a lack of utopianism in mainstream discussion, a surprising number of intellectuals had come together to campaign on this topic to counter the threat of nuclear war and encourage the abolition of warfare altogether. Thinkers like William Beveridge, who had previously looked at issues of welfare on a national level, focused their efforts on this international campaign to counter the threat of total annihilation.

The third chapter takes a different approach from the previous two. Instead of examining a group of intellectuals, it focuses on one specific thinker: John Strachey. As a case study for the thesis, Strachey provides an excellent example of an intellectual who studied warfare in-depth for over three decades. While not the most influential or famous of the subjects, Strachey presents a unique case when it comes to public debate and his own personal understanding of war and society. During the 1930s Strachey became one of the most renowned and respected communist intellectuals, producing numerous publications including *The Coming Struggle for Power* (1932), *The Menace of Fascism* (1933), and *Hope in America* (1938).[40] His problems with imperialism led him to see capitalism as the main precursor of warfare. His own thinking underwent several changes from the late 1930s. The Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact and the British Communist Party's (CPGB) support of the Soviet Union created disillusionment with communist institutions and he began to focus his ideas on social democracy. By 1945 he had renounced communism and was elected a Labour MP under Attlee. His work on warfare gained him the position of Secretary of State for War between 1950 and 1951. His book, *On the Prevention of Warfare* (1962), became one of the most influential works on nuclear warfare of the time.[41] The examination of his work brings together many of the topics discussed in the previous two chapters and allows the thesis to explore these issues in greater depth.

The next two chapters of the thesis move away from philosophical thinking and highlight two discourses that emerged from expert intellectuals. Chapter four focuses on

---

[38] A. J. P. Taylor, 'Look Back at the Fifties: Backwards to Utopia', *New Statesman and Nation* 59, 2 January 1960, pp. 5-6.

[39] Edward Hallett Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (London: Macmillan, 1939).

[40] John Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power* (London: Gollancz, 1932); John Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1933); John Strachey, *Hope in America* (New York: Modern Age Books, 1938).

[41] John Strachey, *On the Prevention of War* (London: Macmillan, 1962).

the role of scientific intellectuals. The rise of technological warfare during this period gave scientists a far greater role in the process of waging war. From the 1930s the government brought academic scientists to work for the state on developing technology to help prepare for war. Some of Britain's most distinguished scientists such as A. V. Hill and P. M. S. Blackett worked on the radar project in the 1930s. During the war the government employed scientists to develop new methods of warfare and academic scientists worked alongside the military to accomplish these goals. During the Cold War the integration of scientists into the government became more pronounced. In 1963 the Minister of Science, Lord Hailsham, argued:

> the education of the modern scientist is not only protracted and complicated, but almost as expensive as the tools he employs. He is increasingly dependent on the patronage, in some form, of Government.[42]

The majority of scientific government spending went towards the defence budget.[43] As a result a great many of British scientists worked on matters of defence. The chapter will show that the development of warfare, and the integration of scientists into the state, led to a new type of discourse and created a strong drive towards political activism within British scientists.

The final chapter will discuss the role of military intellectuals. It will examine how they understood the British state and how they used their military expertise to analyse warfare in relation to politics. This chapter will study the discourse that emerged at this time that challenged the role of liberal democracies in a world of total and nuclear warfare. It will merge ideas within all five chapters on the role of the state and examine how different perceptions of the Cold War altered intellectual understanding.

The thesis brings together ideas from a range of different intellectuals who all wrote from within an intellectual community. Their ideas all influenced each other and the opinions of the public. Throughout the chapters we can see the connections they demonstrated and how they worked together to create an open forum for debate and political change.

---

[42] Quintin McGarel Hogg, *Science and Politics* (London: Faber and Faber, 1963), p. 14.
[43] Hogg, *Science and Politics*, pp. 14-15.

Contribution to Knowledge

The thesis gives a detailed account of the different debates that occurred on the topic of warfare throughout this period. It highlights the major impact these debates had on political action and public opinion, and demonstrates the importance of warfare as a major topic for British intellectuals. The first three chapters highlight some of the most influential of Britain's intellectuals and establish the depth of their discussion on warfare and the importance these intellectuals placed on these topics. The questions they addressed on warfare were part of the great social and political questions of the day. In the 1930s these included the rise of fascism and the move towards rearmament and a second war, and from the 1940s these included the evolution of a Cold War and the creation of nuclear weapons. As weapons of war became more technologically advanced, the dangers and fear within Britain rose in accordance. These changes were reflected in intellectual discourse and this discourse helped disseminate these questions across Britain and abroad.

Despite this detailed and developed discourse on international relations and warfare, previous historiography of intellectuals in Britain does not engage with this topic or highlight the ideas that emerged on these extremely important topics of debate. Stefan Collini provides one of the most important and influential works on British intellectuals in which he engages with some of the most important intellectuals of the 20th century. [44] Yet when discussing great thinkers such as George Orwell, H. G. Wells and Bertrand Russell, all of whom discussed the role of ideology and warfare in great depth, these topics do not feature as part of his analysis. Julia Stapleton's work discusses the political dimension of Britain's intellectuals. Yet when examining figures such as John Strachey she focuses exclusively on socialist ideology rather than his dedicated fight against fascism. [45] These works lack engagement on topics that impacted international relations and in particular, arguments on the nature of war.

The lack of engagement with warfare comes across throughout the historiography on British intellectuals. [46] This thesis demonstrates the importance of warfare as a precursor

---

[44] Stefan Collini, *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[45] Stapleton, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain since 1850*, pp. 79-90.

[46] See also: Julia Stapleton, 'Political Thought and National Identity in Britain, 1850-1950,' in *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750-1950*, ed. Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore, and Brian Young (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Julia Stapleton, 'Cultural Conservatism and the Public Intellectual in Britain, 1930-70,' *The European Legacy* 5, no. 6 (2000); Fleck, Hess, and

for some of the most challenging and important social issues of the time and examines questions that British intellectuals engaged with and developed in great depth. As a result the thesis argues that these topics on the subject of warfare should be included in the study of British intellectuals. The debates on warfare were often integrated into topics on ideology and the nature of statehood, and should be examined alongside these topics within scholarship on British intellectuals.

The intellectuals who engaged with these questions did not conform exclusively to the traditional model of the intellectual, which is the model historians most often use when identifying intellectuals. The intellectual that arose during the 20th century, Fleck's 'knowledge worker', also played a large role in developing an intellectual discourse on war. Yet as David Edgerton points out, mainstream intellectuals saw specialist intellectuals as narrow-minded and ignored their contributions.[47] As a result histories of expert intellectuals are limited and focus on particular individuals not the field as a whole. The importance of technology on warfare during this time brought about a rise in experts speaking out to the public about the dangers of war and providing interpretations which challenged government thinking. The thesis identifies two different groups of expert intellectuals and discusses their relationship with the wider intellectual community. It highlights the similarities between their work and the work of the traditional intellectual, those that Collini describes as 'public moralists'. In doing so the thesis argues that both types of intellectuals should be examined in historiographical studies of intellectuals and they should also be examined as part of the larger intellectual community within Britain.

There is a similar gap in the historiography of warfare. In recent years historians have attempted to frame the understanding of the British state in relation to the technological changes in the 20th century. Particular attention has been paid to the role of warfare in developing new technology and its impact on the state. In this debate historians such as Edgerton and Till Geiger have highlighted the role of specific thinkers and discussed their contributions to these developments.[48] Edgerton in particular uses a variety of these intellectuals throughout his analysis of the warfare state. These include the scientists

---

Lyon, *Intellectuals and Their Publics*; Thomas William Heyck, 'Myths and Meanings of Intellectuals in Twentieth-Century British National Identity,' *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 2 (1998).

[47] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, p. 194.

[48] Till Geiger, *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War: The Political Economy and the Economic Impact of the British Defence Effort, 1945-1955* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004). Geiger uses intellectuals including John Strachey, J. F. C Fuller and Richard Crossman within his analysis.

Blackett and C. P. Snow; military thinkers Basil Liddell Hart and J. F. C. Fuller; and political theorists E. H. Carr and Richard Crossman. This work, however, looks at these intellectuals as individuals and analyses their contributions in relation to their chosen fields.

The thesis highlights the interaction between these intellectuals and demonstrates the community that developed within Britain. The thesis will show how intellectuals from varied backgrounds came together and built a framework for the discussion of war. Scientists, politicians and military theorists have traditionally featured in different historiographical studies. This thesis highlights their interactions, such as Blackett (a scientist), Strachey (a politician) and Liddell Hart (a military theorist) referencing each other's work and using it to frame their own ideas.

The intellectual community formed within Britain from both mainstream and expert intellectuals should be examined as a feature within the history of British warfare. The thesis contributes to the existing literature on intellectuals by bringing these groups together, whereas historians have previously examined them separately. While different discourses emerged from different groups of intellectuals, together they form an overarching intellectual discourse that focused on freedom in a warfare state. These intellectuals drew inspiration and ideas from one another and by examining their arguments together, the thesis demonstrates the wider discursive issues that influenced intellectual arguments and in turn influenced public and political debates.

The Method and Scope of the Thesis

In order to explore this topic, the thesis employs a methodology primarily based on a case-study approach. Each chapter examines a group of intellectuals (excepting Chapter 3 which deals with a single individual) who engage with specific debates and ideas on warfare and help identify specific discourses that ran throughout intellectual discussion. The intellectuals chosen are all regarded as some of the most influential intellectuals of their time and helped frame the debates in which they participated. These intellectuals not only discussed warfare but they helped shape the discourse in which warfare was discussed. Alongside this the intellectuals within the thesis all provided detailed and important contributions to the debates on warfare. In order to ensure that the thesis

engaged with the most challenging and detailed debates, all the subjects chosen had substantial contributions to discussions on war and made an important impact on political and public opinion.

When writing this type of thesis, it is important to ask how one defines the concept of 'warfare' and how one analyses it. This brings up two main questions: the actual definition of war and which aspects should be included in the analysis. The thesis will define war as: "an actual, intentional and widespread armed conflict between political communities."[49] It excludes civil war but accepts the 'Cold War' as a period of raised tensions with the expectation of a global war, with limited wars interspersed over this time. As the title suggests, it is interested in 'total' or 'nuclear' warfare. 'Total' warfare is classed as a war that encompasses a large number of nations from a wide geographic space and affects all aspects of life within these nations, not just professional soldiers. 'Nuclear' warfare refers to the period following the atomic bombing of Japan when the use of nuclear weapons became part of the strategy of war.

The thesis approaches the topic by analysing the perception of warfare and the debates that ensued. To do so it utilises the ideological approach to warfare developed by Martin Ceadel.[50] Ceadel's model highlights five different ideologies of war and peace: militarism, crusading, defencism, pacific-ism, and pacifism. Ceadel describes Britain (and England in particular) as a semi-liberal culture, fusing together conservatism, Protestantism, and a laissez-faire political economy.[51] As a result there developed a culture that wavered between defencism and pacific-ism. Pacific nations believe war can be abolished through reform, but accept the need for a military defence. Defencist nations believe the best way to maintain peace comes from a strong defence. The two ideologies have a similar conception of war and defence but defencism strives towards the more realistic goal of war prevention over creating a permanent peace.

The thesis uses this approach to help examine the changes in Britain from the 1930s. The inter-war years and the development of the League created a strong pacific drive within Britain. The Second World War and the Cold War brought a more realist stance to

---

[49] Brian Orend, 'War', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/war/>.
[50] Martin Ceadel, *Thinking About Peace and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
[51] Ceadel, *Thinking About Peace and War*, pp. 176-179.

British thinking and the drive towards protecting themselves and developing their own nuclear capabilities showed a change towards defencism over pacific-ism.

The thesis examines the years between 1932 and 1963. It will follow existing historiography which separates this time frame into three sections. The first occurs in the second half of the inter-war years between the years 1932 and 1939. George Peden's analysis separates the inter-war years into two periods. Between 1919 and 1932 "economic problems and the absence of pressing dangers to national security led to reductions in the armed forces".[52] From 1932 until 1939 "the darkening international situation gave defence preparedness increasing political priority."[53] The thesis will start by focusing on the latter half of the inter-war years when political tensions resulted from the competing discourses of rearmament and appeasement.

Following this it moves onto the years between 1939 and 1945 when issues of warfare focused entirely on the on-going conflict. The thesis will then turn to the post-war years. Historians have organised the Cold War into different periods. The beginning of the 1960s is often used to signal the end of the 'start' of the Cold War and into the period of crises and détente.[54] The period up to this point was arguably the most important for intellectual debate. The need to frame new ways of thinking and the fear and uncertainty of the 1950s created discussion on the possibility of nuclear war. The thesis will examine the events of the Cold War up to the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

The thesis aims to understand the change in intellectual discourse over time. The most important historical event that altered perception occurred in 1945 with the destruction of the atomic bombs over Japan. This led to the development of a new type of warfare predicated on the use of nuclear weapons. As a result one of the main contributions of thesis is to examine the change in discourse from a non-nuclear world in the 1930s to the nuclear world of the 1940s and 1950s. A great deal of this discussion took place from 1945 and the thesis will focus primarily on this period, using the earlier years to provide a contrast. Arguably the thesis could have started in 1945, but in doing so it would lack

---

[52] George Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy: From Dreadnoughts to Hydrogen Bombs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 98.
[53] Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy*, p. 98.
[54] *The Cambridge History of the Cold War* breaks the three volumes up into two periods: Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Origins*, vol. I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Crises and Détente*, vol. II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

adequate contextualisation to help explain the changes in the post-war years. The debates in the 1930s examined the development of totalitarian governments, ideological divisions and the importance of internationalism as a means of limiting warfare. These ideas became central to the discussions in the post-war years in relation to the Cold War and the nuclear era. As a result, understanding the thinking of the 1930s is essential for the understanding of the debates in the post-war years and the thesis aims to use both time-frames to generate a more cohesive conception of intellectual discourse on warfare.

The Historiography

The thesis contributes to two different historiographical discussions. Firstly it links in to previous studies which have examined how intellectuals engaged with a specific idea or theme. The thesis follows a similar methodological structure as these works, using intellectual analysis to examine a specific concept and discuss the impact of this concept on policy making and wider public debate.

Ben Jackson examines the concept of equality within the British Left during the 20th century.[55] Through this study he attempts to "deepen our understanding of the ideological influences on Britain's political trajectory in the twentieth century."[56] Jackson focuses on intellectuals as agents who used the ideal of equality to promote change. In doing so he explores Britain's political landscape and how intellectuals influenced change. This approach was especially helpful in formulating the methodology of this thesis. Jackson's work provided a methodological approach that helped explore intellectuals as agents of change and integrate the events of warfare with the ideals surrounding its use.

Understanding how intellectuals use ideology is also central to the thesis. Both Tony Judt and Neal Wood undertake similar analyses and focus directly on intellectuals and communism.[57] Wood examines intellectuals within the CPGB, their involvement in the political process, and their treatment by the wider echelons of the Party. His work not

---

[55] Ben Jackson, *Equality and the British Left: A Study in Progressive Political Thought, 1900-64* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
[56] Jackson, *Equality and the British Left*, p. 1.
[57] Tony Judt, *Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals, 1944-1956* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Neal Wood, *Communism and British Intellectuals* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1959).

only examines how intellectuals affected the Party but how the Party altered the intellectuals involved. His study focusses on the importance of politics, both within and outside the Party, and how intellectuals dealt with the political reality of their involvement. Judt's analysis frames the question through a different perspective. When examining communism in France he interprets the impact of the ideology on intellectual thought as a whole, rather than just communist intellectuals. He focuses on the most prominent intellectuals at the time to examine their relationship with communism as an ideology and in relation to the events within the Eastern Bloc. Judt looks at those intellectuals that showed sympathy for communism in theory and practice before the rise of anti-communist sentiments following the Hungarian Uprising in 1956. His argument posits that this aspect of intellectual discussion has been ignored as a result of the backlash against communism. Both studies have provided a useful approach to examining the role of ideology on intellectual thought. Judt's in particular provided an important framework for analysing the impact of an idea on the overall discourse generated by intellectuals, which this thesis does with regards to warfare.

All three studies identify a major influence on intellectual thought and examine its effects. This thesis uses a similar framework, arguing that the events of war had a major influence on intellectual discussion and helped shape their wider thinking. This literature also has a distinct focus on the Left of political thought. Intellectual discussion at this time became dominated by Left-wing ideas and intellectuals from the Left tended to speak out in favour of change, which helps explain why the historians focus on their thinking. Yet this thesis, while still principally examining intellectuals on the Left, will broaden its approach to include other ideas from within mainstream British thinking.

Secondly the thesis also makes an intervention in recent literature on British warfare. This scholarship seeks to understand the British state's development as a result of 20th-century warfare. It challenges previous assumptions on declinism and gives an alternative narrative to earlier historiography which focuses on welfare reforms. The thesis engages with these works in using war as a means to examine the British state. The analyses in these studies provide the backdrop for the historical framework of the thesis and help contextualise the intellectual discussion.

Till Geiger and George Peden have examined the impact of warfare, focusing on the British political economy.[58] Peden attempts to incorporate an economic analysis into the military history of Britain. His work examines the majority of the 20th century, starting with the existing arms and naval race from the 19th century and charting the years up to 1969. He seeks to challenge traditional military historical ideas, proving that the state's ability to finance military expenditure became the driving force behind military decision making rather than just warfare and tactics. Peden moves through the decisions and highlights the political and military basis for their implementation, showing the underlying economic determinants. During the Cold War, he considers the Treasury's role in military production and the development of nuclear weapons. While Peden does not discount the importance of international situations as a prerequisite for defence spending, his argument looks at the lack of foresight brought about by harsh economic problems that led to changing defence spending in the inter-war years. This had dramatic effects on the post-war years when the adversarial nature of the international structure forced the British government to focus more on defence.

His work succeeds in integrating economic considerations to the more traditional analysis of military history. Yet his study fails to examine economic decision making beyond military spending, which would help provide a more rounded account.

Geiger's work focuses on how the British state adjusted to the end of the Second World War and the onset of the Cold War. In doing so he links the problems of defence expenditure with the wider problems of the post-war period. He pays particular attention to the relationship between Britain and America, and the issues of rearmament in 1950.[59] His work succeeds in evaluating the impact of defence spending and adding to the overall historiography on the British political economy in the years leading up to the 1957 Defence White Paper.

David Edgerton and Peter Hennessy have both discussed the influence of warfare on the British state and attempted to highlight effects which have previously been ignored. Hennessy's analysis looks at the 'secret state' that emerged in the Cold War.[60] He focuses on the role of the secret services and their activities to safeguard Britain during a

---

[58] Geiger, *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War*; Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy*.
[59] Geiger, *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War*, see in particular chapters 2, 3 and 8.
[60] Peter Hennessy, *The Secret State: Preparing for the Worst, 1945-2010* (London: Penguin Books, 2010).

time of massive international unrest. The Joint Intelligence Committee, which directed all these organisations, coordinated a massive enterprise that remained undisclosed from the public. The book examines their actions and how they interacted with all other aspects of the British state. Hennessy discusses the existence of this aspect of the British state but his analysis does not look at the consequences or effects on the state and society.

These questions are addressed by Edgerton who argues against the traditional description of Britain as pacific and declining. He demonstrates the genius of British technological advances, and promotes the idea that Britain chose to wage war in 1939 and did so as a first-class power.[61] Following this period, the post-war years have often been described as a period of declinism when Britain focused on the welfare state.[62] He gives a strong rebuttal to these ideas and highlights the numerous measures Britain took towards the path of warfare. This includes large defence spending, the rise of technical expertise in the civil service, and the rise of a scientific-industrial complex. In doing so he has attributed the label of 'warfare state' to Britain. His analysis examines the influence of the militant aspect of liberalism and discusses how this impacted the decisions made by political and military leaders. In doing so he presents a strong rebuttal to the idea that Britain ignored defence spending and focused on building a welfare state.

Yet this also presents some problems. Firstly Edgerton examines the large amount of spending on defence without examining its success. While he demonstrated the existence of a warfare state as he understood it, he did not fully explore how successful it was at achieving the goals of the British government.

Secondly Edgerton, along with Peden and Hennessy, focus predominantly on Britain and in doing so, exclude important historical developments. Their work fails to fully consider the importance of international institutions such as NATO that were essential to understanding British warfare development during the Cold War. In some respects this thesis also runs the risk of excessive focus on Britain, but it attempts to contextualise British debates within larger debates and examine the similarities and differences between debates in different nations. The thesis will pay particular attention to the

---

[61] David Edgerton, *Britain's War Machine: Weapons, Resources and Experts in the Second World War* (London: Penguin Books, 2012).
[62] For an historiographical overview of this literature see: Edgerton, *Warfare State*, pp. 1-14.

debates in America due to the linguistic similarities and the close relationship between intellectuals in both nations.

In some respects this work stands alongside Edgerton's, insofar as it acknowledges the existence of warfare as a major component of the state, and supplements Edgerton's account with a discussion of the intellectual narrative on warfare and the British state. Yet Edgerton's classification of Britain as a 'warfare state' also presents some problems. Edgerton's definition of the state remains centred around the government and institutions directly connected to it. At times he seems to deconstruct the British state into two separate entities. The term warfare state, in Edgerton's narrative, stands in opposition to the conception of Britain as a welfare state typically depicted as central to the understanding of Britain by historians in the 20th century. Yet by dividing the conception of the state in this way, Edgerton creates an artificial divide that does not transmit to the realities of British statehood.[63] The very nature of a state creates links between every aspect that may be separated by aims but can never be separated into distinct entities. This implies an economic determinism that ignores the nature of statehood – either we put our resources into developing a warfare state or a welfare state. Those that helped develop the welfare state were also responsible for the rearmament programme and the technological developments that defined British warfare. It is interesting to note that William Beveridge, the man who heralded the British welfare state, became involved in the progression of British warfare directly after 1945 and took an active interest in the nature of British statehood in relation to warfare.[64]

In discussing the welfare/warfare debate Edgerton undertakes a discussion of what constitutes statehood without discussing why his criteria are important and why they help the construction of British statehood. What is it about these factors that link warfare to the state in such a way as to label it a 'warfare state'? The nature of the state is not discussed nor is the link between warfare and the state. This is a common fallacy that occurs throughout the historiography. These scholars use the definition of a 'warfare state' outright or imply its existence without fully developing the concept or asking how we really define the term. Calling Britain a warfare state implies any number of things. Edgerton uses the concept to describe an economic and technical drive that is not presented in welfare accounts of Britain and is written directly to contrast these

---

[63] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, pp. 59-107.
[64] Beveridge's work post-1945 will be examined in Chapter 2.

accounts. This contrast appears both within his arguments and within the terminology welfare/warfare. This is one specific interpretation. Other uses of the term warfare to describe a state can include militancy, autocracy, imperialism or other types of democratic defencism. Far greater elaboration is needed than simply the use of this phrase.

The thesis will address the British state in relation to their increased militancy and technological drive while examining a broader conception of Britain and the multiple facets that made up the state and the nation as a whole.

Chapter One: Warfare and British Liberty

Introduction

In 1947 Hanson Baldwin, the military editor of the *New York Times*, asked the question: "How can we prepare for total war without becoming a 'garrison state' and destroying the very qualities and virtues and principles we originally set out to save?"[65]

This particular point has been widely discussed in the US but has failed to have a significant impact within British historiography. The expansion of the "military-industrial complex" during the Cold War drew criticism from American intellectuals and politicians, becoming known as the 'garrison state'. Michael Hogan's *A Cross of Iron* studies this transformation and the subsequent debates.[66] Aaron Friedberg gives a different interpretation in which he argues that the mistrust of state power embedded within US culture and politics stopped it from becoming a fully-fledged garrison state.[67] This cultural concern was the reason why their intellectuals and politicians were so vocal in expressing their fears. It is also perhaps this reason why Britain, a nation whose liberal heritage was founded on imperialism, was less vocal about the rise of a powerful state and the loss of liberal freedoms. In Britain, Peter Hennessy starts to tackle these issues by discussing the secretive response of the British state to the Cold War, but Hennessy's work only examines the changes and does not discuss the implications for British liberty or public response. Yet, as this chapter will show, there was a growing debate, even before the Cold War, by intellectuals on the danger military institutions posed to freedom to Britain. This chapter also ties in directly with the arguments in Chapter Four, which examines the debate on the changes in science and the threat this posed to liberty.

The use of intellectuals within historiographical studies of war has thus far remained limited to discussing single theories or examining the impact of a specific person on the government. As David Edgerton argues, most intellectual history has been "dominated

---

[65] Quoted in: Michael J. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 1.
[66] Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*.
[67] Aaron L. Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

by assumptions linked to declinism and welfarism."[68] This first chapter brings together a range of intellectual ideas and highlights the links between intellectuals with opposing ideologies and understanding of the state. Often when discussing intellectual thought, (and almost always when discussing warfare,) these intellectuals have been categorised and discussed separately. These categories often conform to ideological positions such as socialism and pacifism. The chapter examines the different ideas that emerged during this time and the major influences that altered this thinking. In doing so, it will demonstrate the links between these diverging ideas. This in turn demonstrates that there was an overarching intellectual discourse based on the belief in liberal freedoms and the desire to maintain these freedoms in a time of ideological change and growing authoritarianism.

This chapter analyses this discourse of those intellectuals that conformed to the traditional model of an intellectual – writers, scholars and political thinkers.. Stefan Collini argues that this type of intellectual must have a cultural authority derived from an occupation associated with intellectuals alongside a willingness and proficiency at speaking out to the public. The occupation of the intellectual is particularly important to the definition and the contrast between the intellectuals discussed in this chapter and the expert intellectuals of the latter two chapters.

Those conforming to the traditional model – the mainstream intellectuals – will be examined in this chapter. This will not provide an inclusive analysis of intellectual thought but examine a group of Britain's leading intellectuals who made major contributions to the debate on warfare. The chapter will set up some of the major ideas that will be investigated more comprehensively throughout the thesis including the role of ideology, technology and statehood on the debates on warfare.

The term 'mainstream' is used deliberately to separate those intellectuals that argued within the framework of the British liberal tradition as opposed to those that took radical, minority positions. While radical positions are important to the understanding the whole of intellectual discussion, the thesis focuses on the mainstream thinking that examined the most important and influential debates. In using the term 'British liberal tradition', the chapter looks at intellectuals that tried to affect change from within the present system. These intellectuals embraced the liberal rights within Britain and wished

---

[68] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, p. 10.

to adapt the democratic system, rather than creating an entirely new system based on the ideologies of the far-Left or far-Right. As a result this chapter examines intellectuals who promoted a range of thinking including socialism, liberalism and pacifism.

Yet to merely assign one of these categories to these intellectuals would be to misinterpret their ideas. Michael Freeden has discussed the problems of mislabelling types of thinking within one major ideological position:

> The first is a tendency to gather under one label elements of ideological belief that differ on some important aspects, or that cover a wide range of positions that cannot always coexist. […] The second is to assume that ideologies are mutually exclusive and hence to insist that there are irreconcilable distinctions that permanently separate one ideology from another.[69]

The terms liberal, socialist and pacifist are used loosely to help distinguish different strands of thinking, but many of these intellectuals discussed a range of ideas that changed over time.

British intellectual thought in the 18th and 19th centuries mainly adopted liberal and conservative ideologies. The first decades of the 20th century saw a move towards the Left, with thinkers such as Hobhouse and Hobson promoting a 'liberal socialist' ideology. This combined the values of liberalism with the economic trajectory of socialism.[70] The rising unemployment and social unrest of the 1930s drew greater numbers of British intellectuals towards socialism. Some moved towards a strong Marxist position, but the majority maintained a socialist stance, that encouraged the peaceful dissolution of capitalism while advocating freedom and equality. All the intellectuals in this chapter advocated a liberal position to some extent. As Freeden argues, even those such as Harold Laski and G. D. H. Cole who adopted socialist ideologies, "were at times within the left-liberal tradition in all senses save that of self-awareness."[71]

---

[69] Michael Freeden, *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought 1914-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), p. 2.
[70] Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition*, II, pp. 160-169; Freeden, *The New Liberalism*, pp. 1-54.
[71] Freeden, *Liberalism Divided*, p. 14.

This change also brought a wave of pacifism to British thinking in the inter-war years.[72] The pacifist ideals had similarities to the liberal internationalist stance and pacifist intellectuals supported the League in their peacekeeping efforts. Both ideologies saw the League as the important institution for the preservation of peace. The war against the Nazis altered pacifist thinking, diminishing its influence and creating a discourse of just warfare to counter the pacifist creed.

The first section of this chapter will use the major changes in the socialist discourse, particularly with regards to the Soviets, to highlight the influence of warfare on intellectual thinking. Despite the arguments of scholars such as Freeden,[73] most historiography of the interwar years focuses on socialism as the most noteworthy ideology within British politics. The rise of socialism did have major implications for British politics after the war, and the ideas generated in the inter-war years helped shape this political evolution. It is for this reason that this chapter will start by analysing socialist ideas and then discuss how they fit into broader mainstream debates. In the inter-war years socialists blamed war on capitalism and warfare became a topic within a much larger discussion on the nature of statehood and economic prosperity. Yet the events from 1939 forced socialist intellectuals to find new ways to understand the international situation. Their ideas had revolved around the Soviet Union as an example of the prosperity of socialism. This altered due to the Soviets actions in allying with the Nazis and their expansionist policies during the Cold War. These intellectuals could no longer view imperialism and war as the purview of capitalism. In discussing this change, the chapter will highlight the impact of warfare on intellectual beliefs. The intellectuals discussed include E. H. Carr, G. D. H. Cole, Victor Gollancz and Harold Laski.

The chapter will then discuss the role of the state in intellectual discussion. It will focus on the arguments for freedom and examine how intellectuals challenged the state with regards to liberal freedom. Many intellectuals expressed concern over the rise of military expenditure and the loss of individual and social liberties. These arguments will be discussed in relation to socialist thinking and the debate on economic planning as a constraint to liberty. This section will also showcase the work of C. E. M. Joad, and Friedrich Hayek along with the socialist intellectuals.

---

[72] Martin Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980).

[73] Freeden, *The New Liberalism*.

The changes in the British approach to warfare resulted in part from the development of a nuclear age. The chapter will lastly examine responses to nuclear weapons as a specific concern and discuss how pacifism manifested in the nuclear era. It will examine different approaches to unilateralism and discuss how warfare influenced these debates. For this section the work of Gollancz and Bertrand Russell will be used to highlight different strands of pacifism.

Mainstream thinking on warfare was extremely abundant at this time. This chapter selects a group of intellectuals who all made a significant impact on intellectual debate and whose ideas helped frame the debates in Britain. Many also played an important role in shaping political ideas and worked alongside the government to affect change. They all wrote extensively on the topic of warfare and made an important contribution with original ideas. These intellectuals all worked within a larger framework, working together to encourage debate and engaging with the public through shared works.

The work of these intellectuals will be examined and used to illustrate how warfare created fundamental changes to understanding the state and highlight the importance of liberty throughout these wide and varied discussions.

Part 1 – The Changes in Socialism

> In the main British intellectuals had always been Liberal or Conservative. […] As time passed the politics of the intellectual moved leftward to socialism and communism. What began as a political awakening became a great radicalization.[74]

The late 1920s and early 1930s provided the perfect setting for this radicalization, with mass unemployment and social unrest sweeping across Britain. Intellectuals questioned the viability of capitalism and the social inequalities it created. As a result a large section of British intellectuals turned towards socialism as the answer to these problems. This section will explore socialist thinking and highlight how the build-up to war from the 1930s influenced intellectual debate. In particular it will discuss how intellectuals responded to the growing antagonistic relationship with the Soviet Union. By picking out this debate, this section will demonstrate the significance of war on ideological assumptions and the impact this had on socialist arguments.

---

[74] Wood, *Communism and British Intellectuals*.

Traditionally Marxist theorists had always blamed the problems of war on capitalism.[75] The First World War helped cement this view, and British socialists described it as a conflict between imperial capitalist powers.[76] They argued that the creation of a global socialist system would destroy imperialism and make war unnecessary. This belief was intrinsically linked to the growing prosperity of the Soviet Union and the belief that their socialist system had succeeded where capitalism failed. The rise of fascism within Italy and Germany brought great concern to many on the British Left. Fascism provided another example of the deterioration of democratic capitalism. Yet rather than the progression towards socialism, Germany had moved towards an even more dangerous system that had all the problems of capitalism and none of the liberal rights of a democracy.

These two arguments defined socialist thinking on warfare. Yet over the following decades events surrounding the Soviet Union would help shape an alternative socialist discourse based on a foundation of British liberal freedom coupled with socialist economic policies.

In 1937 Cole published a book, *The People's Front*, which examined the dangers of fascism.[77] Cole advocated a libertarian socialist position. This type of ideology accepted the need for communal property but wanted to eliminate the massive bureaucratic way of maintaining collectivism that plagued the Soviet Union. His career focussed mainly on his academic work in Oxford and through this he became a public intellectual. He wrote for periodicals such as the *New Statesman* and numerous publications for the Left Book Club.[78]

The People's Front argued that society's progression, which the British people had once taken for granted, was in serious danger if they did not work to ensure its preservation. Fascism was the greatest threat to liberty and the continuation of the British way of life.

---

[75] Vladimir Lenin, 'Socialism and War,' in *Lenin Collected Works* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1964), pp. 295-338; Joel Geier, 'Socialism and War,' *International Socialist Review*, no. 8 (1999).
[76] See: Edward Hallett Carr, *Conditions of Peace* (London: Macmillan, 1942), pp. 4-9; John Strachey, *Why You Should Be a Socialist*, Revised ed. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1944 [1938]), pp. 49-56.
[77] G. D. H. Cole, *The People's Front* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1937).
[78] His most prominent work was published from the 1930s and comprised a range of books including: G. D. H. Cole and Margaret Cole, *The Condition of Britain* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1937); G. D. H. Cole and Raymond Postgate, *The Common People, 1746-1938* (London: Methuen, 1938); G. D. H. Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1953).

At its core fascism relied on military conquest to survive and thus continually maintained an autocratic hold over its people, denying them liberties in order to encourage the build-up of arms. The British government had started re-arming and embracing the fascist solution – war.[79] His answer to avoid war lay in greater collective security and allying with the non-fascist powers. The main problem with this idea came from the Right's refusal to align with the Soviet Union. To preserve peace and create such an alliance the government needed to change. To do so he argued "we need a People's Front."[80] His argument clearly saw warfare as a result of aggression from the Right, particularly from the fascist states, but also from conservative aspects within Britain who would rather destroy democracy than allow socialist forces to gain popularity.

Like Cole, Laski also saw many problems with the National Government, and the Conservative Party in particular. Laski's career started him on the path of an academic and public intellectual, and then moved towards politics. He became a socialist in the late 1920s and argued for a peaceful move towards a socialist system. His work examined socialism through both historical and political frameworks. In the 1930s he worked at the London School of Economics but continued to publish books and newspaper articles on socialism and warfare. As a public intellectual and a leader of Left-wing thought in Britain, he joined with John Strachey and Victor Gollancz to form the Left Book Club in 1936. He was a member of the Labour Party National Executive Committee and was the Labour Party chairman in 1945. The economic problems of the 1930s led him towards a more pessimistic view of capitalism and he became increasingly convinced that democracy would not survive.[81] The growth of fascism in Germany increased these fears. At this point he merged his liberal ideas with Marxism and turned towards the Soviet Union as an example of a new system of government that might provide the solution to the problems in the West.[82]

In mid-1939 Laski had two main objectives: to prevent another war and stop Germany from annexing more of Europe. He blamed many of the current problems with Germany on the decisions of Conservative government, going back to the Manchurian dispute in

---

[79] Cole, *The People's Front*, pp. 141-152.
[80] Cole, *The People's Front*, p. 183.
[81] Harold Joseph Laski, *Democracy in Crisis* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1933).
[82] Michael Newman, 'Laski, Harold Joseph (1893–1950)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34412, accessed 28 May 2014].

1931-32.[83] At this time Japan invaded Manchuria and took it from the Chinese. The dispute led to Japan leaving the League of Nations and the start of a period of Japanese imperial expansion.[84] The dispute was seen at the time and in subsequent historiography as the first major failing of the League and one of the turning points that eventually led to its collapse. A. J. P. Taylor argued that:

> In later years the Manchurian affair assumed a mythical importance. It was treated as a milestone on the road to war, the first decisive "betrayal" of the League, especially by the British government. In reality, the League, under British leadership, had done what the British thought it was designed to do: it had limited a conflict and brought it, however, unsatisfactorily, to an end.[85]

Subsequent scholarship has debated the issue of blame and how much culpability the League members had for these events. Karen Mingst has argued that sometimes collective security simply does not work, and that disputes such as Manchuria and Ethiopia were not worth a war for the countries involved.[86]

Laski put forth the opposite view and assigned the blame to Britain's government. He argued that in the years between 1932 and 1939 Britain continued to capitulate, which led to the Munich Agreement in 1938.[87] Laski saw this as a betrayal of the League in order to save themselves, arguing that Britain had a nationalistic agenda that overrode their international obligations. Although undated, this piece was clearly written in response to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact on 23 August 1939 but before the Nazi invasion of Poland on 1 September. Laski addressed the pact and sided with the Soviets over the Conservative government (although once war broke out his opinions altered). While he condemned the pact itself, Laski argued that "it was taken in direct result of the massive evidence which appeared to support the conclusion that the National Government would, if it possibly could, do a deal with the Fascist powers […] at the expense of the Soviet Union."[88]

His solution suggested dealing with the causes of warfare rather than the symptoms. This required recognising that the old world was dying and embracing change. Laski argued

---

[83] Harold Joseph Laski, Untitled text. Date unknown but written in the days after 23 August and before 1 September 1939. Labour History Archive, LP/LAS/38/3/2, p. 1. As the text is unpublished it is likely that the start of the war made it irrelevant before he had time to publish it.
[84] Meirion Harries and Susie Harries, *Soldiers of the Sun: The Rise and Fall of the Imperial Japanese Army 1868-1945* (London: Heinemann, 1991), pp. 161-163.
[85] A. J. P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War* (London: Hamilton, 1961), p. 64.
[86] Karen A. Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Norton, 2001), p. 155.
[87] Laski, Untitled text, p. 1.
[88] Laski, Untitled text, p. 2.

that the European powers, including the Soviet Union, needed to form a union that eliminated national sovereignty and pooled defences and a planned economic structure. This would destroy fascism and prevent another global war.[89]

The discussion on internationalism dominated debate on war in the 1930s. Most socialists promoted this doctrine as the first step towards a permanent solution to war. They saw the Kellogg–Briand Pact of 1928, whose signatories agreed to use alternative methods other than war to resolve conflicts, as a precursor to greater advances. Laski's internationalism conformed to what E. H. Carr described as "quasi-pacifism" – the desire to stop war but with the contingency of self-defence.[90] In Ceadel's model this aligned with a pacific stance.

Carr was a left-wing writer, historian and prominent public intellectual throughout this period. He was best known for his book, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, in which he presented the first realist argument for international relations.[91] Carr promoted this type of thinking, although he also brought up the problems of classifying acts of 'self-defence' in contrast to acts of aggression. In agreement with Laski, Carr argued that members in the League had a political obligation to uphold their responsibilities.[92] Whilst giving his inaugural lecture at the University of Wales in 1936, Carr spoke about his belief in capitalism as the main cause of war and implied that the National Government today would act aggressively if they had means to do so.[93]

The writing of these intellectuals in the 1930s shows several common themes. They all feared fascist expansionism, which led to fears about the stability of Britain and the actions of the Right-wing Conservative government. They also believed in the prosperity of the Soviet Union and the need to use this system as a model for economic prosperity.

The 1939 Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact shifted the priorities of socialist thinkers, forcing many to question their support of the Soviet Union and re-evaluate many of their strongest anti-war convictions. These socialists supported the Allies in their fight against

---

[89] Laski, Untitled text, pp. 3-4.
[90] Edward Hallett Carr, *Public Opinion as a Safeguard of Peace* (Bungay: R. Clay, 1936), p. 5.
[91] As an historian Carr is also known for his seminal work on the Soviet Union, which resulted in a 14 volume work on Russia from 1914 to 1929. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*; Edward Hallett Carr, *A History of Soviet Russia*, 14 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1950).
[92] Carr, *Public Opinion as a Safeguard of Peace*, p. 10.
[93] This speech was then reprinted in *International Affairs* and published as a pamphlet: Carr, *Public Opinion as a Safeguard of Peace*.

fascism once war had broken out, believing that war was the better option than a fascist takeover of Europe. In doing so they initially worked against the dictates of the Soviets.

Officially the CPGB, alongside the Communist Parties in other countries, followed Stalin's stance that the war was a product of imperialism and that the workers should not support either side. The directive, given by the Communist International (Comintern) on 24 September 1939, ordered the CPGB to oppose Britain's war with Germany. This led to the removal of the Party's General Secretary, Harry Pollitt, who opposed this stance.[94] Earlier in 1939 Pollitt had published a booklet in which he argued:

> To stand aside from this conflict, to contribute only revolutionary-sounding phrases while the Fascist beats ride rough-shod over Europe, would be a betrayal of everything our forebears have fought to achieve in the course of long years of struggle against capitalism.[95]

Pollitt stood behind his words in spite of the Comintern's directive, although he remained loyal to the Party and was forced to later retract his views. He was thus reinstated as General Secretary.[96]

Laski challenged the CPGB and their support for the Soviet Union. In 1940 Laski argued that its refusal to support the Allies was based on faulty reasoning. He used this quotation from Pollitt to start his pamphlet. He believed that "the defeat of Britain and France would be far more than a defeat of their governments merely; it would be a grave set-back, irreparable for a long period, to the cause of working-class advance".[97] Laski differentiated the imperialism of the capitalist states and the imperialism of the fascist ones. In Germany, he argued that fascism had created a new type of imperialism where the worst aspects of British imperialism were standard for German imperialism. By not supporting the Allies, the socialists were condoning these atrocities.[98] He did not directly renounce socialism or the Soviet Union but accepted Britain and France as the lesser evil and the lesser threat to democracy.[99]

---

[94] Kevin Morgan, *Harry Pollitt* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), pp. 108-109.
[95] Harry Pollitt, quoted in: Harold Joseph Laski, *Is This an Imperialist War?* (London: Labour Party, 1940), p. 2.
[96] Morgan, *Harry Pollitt*, pp. 112-117.
[97] Laski, *Is This an Imperialist War?*, p. 3.
[98] Laski, *Is This an Imperialist War?*, pp. 4-6.
[99] Laski, *Is This an Imperialist War?*, p.10.

Alongside Laski, Gollancz also took part in challenging the CPGB. Gollancz was best known for his publishing company Victor Gollancz Ltd, set up in 1927 to publish pacifist and socialist works, which then expanded into fiction in the 1930s. Gollancz also engaged in a mix of intellectual writing and political campaigning, including helping to set up the Left Book Club in 1936 and choosing the book each month for the club. Throughout the Second World War he promoted peace and co-operation. He also worked for the Anglo-Soviet Public Relations Committee, and campaigned for unity between these two nations as well as a continued friendship once the war had ended. During the war he spoke out on the Soviet betrayal and the Nazi atrocities towards the Jewish people.[100] His writings from the late 1930s and the problems of Nazism highlight Gollancz's struggle to accept his desire to rid the world of Nazism alongside the need for war to ensure this result.

Shortly before the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact he published a pamphlet which strongly argued for an alliance with the Soviets. This, he felt, would prevent Germany from attacking Britain and prevent another major war.[101] In 1941 Gollancz, joined with Strachey and George Orwell to produce the book, *A Betrayal of the Left*, (along with a preface by Laski), in which they criticised Soviet policy and their stance in the war.[102] Gollancz believed that the Left should support the war as the lesser of two evils because "the *worst thing of all*, the ultimate disaster, death to all working class hopes and possibilities, would be a Hitler victory."[103]

This book was one of many produced during the war by socialist intellectuals, discussing the problems of warfare and their hopes for the future. Many of these were joint endeavours, in which these intellectuals came together to publish their arguments on the future of the British state.

In 1940 Cole participated in a joint work alongside Laski, journalists Hamilton Fyfe and Leonard Barnes, and Labour politicians Richard Crossman and Konni Zilliacus.[104] *Where Stands Democracy?* examined the role of British democracy in a wartime

---

[100] Ruth Dudley Edwards, *Victor Gollancz: A Biography* (London: Gollancz, 1987), pp. 350-377.

[101] Victor Gollancz, *Is Mr. Chamberlain Saving Peace?* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1939), pp. 12-14.

[102] Victor Gollancz, George Orwell, and John Strachey, *The Betrayal of the Left: An Examination & Refutation of Communist Policy from October 1939 to January 1941*, ed. Victor Gollancz (London: Victor Gollancz, 1941).

[103] Victor Gollancz, *Where Are You Going? An Open Letter to Communists* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1940), p. 6.

[104] Both Crossman and Zilliacus were elected as MPs in 1945.

State.[105] It was published by the Fabian Society and highlighted different arguments from the Left and engaged with broader public opinion on these issues.

Both Laski and Cole expressed their thoughts on war as a force for social mobility. On the whole Cole expressed a more politically extreme form of socialism to Laski, suggesting revolution as a means to bring about change. He also had less acceptance of the political system within Britain and heavily criticized its participants. He believed that previous leaders had spearheaded policies of appeasement to stop the social changes that war might bring.[106] While Laski had become more critical of the Soviet pact with Hitler than he had been in 1939, Cole still refused to blame Stalin. He did, however, express doubts about the Soviet Union and the lack of freedom it granted its citizens.[107]

Laski argued that the war required quick decision making, contrary to the usual democratic process. To achieve this, greater unity was needed, both within government and within the nation as a whole:

> A democracy wages war the more successfully the more equal is the recognised interest of citizens in its functioning. From this I infer the conclusion that the unity of our nation will be more fully maintained the more we move in the direction of an equal society […] nothing lifts the morale of a democracy like ours in wartime as the use of great authority for the great social changes that are inherent in the very logic of the democratic idea.[108]

Laski supported British democracy in the hope that change would bring greater social stability and equality.

Despite some different views, *Where Stands Democracy?* has a much narrower intellectual scope than other similar works, not only because the intellectuals themselves all held similar ideological views but because they wrote during the war. Their arguments as a result focused on the effect of the war and the future of Britain as a result. Laski suggested that the war required Britain to unify and equalise whereas Cole took a stronger line making it clear that the people must not fight to preserve the status

---

[105] Harold Joseph Laski, Hamilton Fyfe, Leonard Barnes, R. H. S. Crossman, G. D. H. Cole, and Konni Zilliacus, *Where Stands Democracy? A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society* (London: Macmillan, 1940).

[106] G. D. H. Cole, 'The Decline of Capitalism,' in *Where Stands Democracy: A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society* (London: Macmillan, 1940), p. 121.

[107] Cole, 'The Decline of Capitalism', pp. 123-124.

[108] Harold Joseph Laski, 'Government in Wartime,' in *Where Stands Democracy: A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society* (London: Macmillan, 1940), p. 42.

quo but to rid the world of capitalism and bring about a new age within Britain. Cole also displayed sympathy for Stalin's actions even when he disagreed with them. This included their alliance with the Nazis and their actions during the Korean War. In response to Korea, Cole clearly objected to the actions of both the Soviet Union and the United States, although put most of the blame on the US. He stated: "I do not like Communism; but I like even less reactionary landlordism backed by foreign force against the will of the people."[109] Here Cole reacted to US containment policies by likening them to imperialism. These feelings also transmitted to Mao's communist revolution in China. In 1951 Cole argued his socialist ideology would lead him to support China over Britain in the event of an escalation over Korea.[110]

Socialist intellectuals became more wary towards the Soviet Union as the Cold War progressed. Their previous arguments that socialist states did not go to war became less certain as the Soviets continued to expand their domination over the East and knowledge of their brutal methods spread. The events of 1956 show a major turning point for British intellectuals.

Up until this point some intellectuals such as Carr had made excuses for actions of the Soviet Union which denied their people civil liberties and rights.[111] Khrushchev's speech, given in secret in February 1956, leaked to the Western press in June. Those in Britain read the full speech from the pages of the *Observer* under the headline: 'Russia's 20 Years of Terror'.[112] The speech condemned Stalin's purges of the army and the Party, and his cult of personality. Revisionist historians have discredited Khrushchev's speech for inaccuracies and questioned his motives.[113] Arch Getty, one of the first revisionist historians who challenged the argument that Stalin succeeded on the force of his personality, claims Khrushchev's actions were "almost entirely self-serving".[114] Yet at

---

[109] G. D. H. Cole, 'As a Socialist Sees It', *New Statesman and Nation* 41, 3 February 1951, p. 121.

[110] Cole, 'As a Socialist Sees It', pp. 120-121.

[111] Edward Hallett Carr, *Democracy in International Affairs* (Nottingham: University College, 1945).

[112] 'Russia's 20 Years of Terror', *Observer*, 10 June 1956, p. 1.

[113] This historiography includes: J. Arch Getty, *Origins of the Great Purges: The Soviet Communist Party Reconsidered, 1933-1938* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Robert W. Thurston, *Life and Terror in Stalin's Russia, 1934-1941* (London: Yale University Press, 1996); Geoffrey Roberts, *Stalin's Wars: From World War to Cold War, 1939-1953* (London: Yale University Press, 2006).
Between 1986 and 1987 an historiographical debate over the 'totalitarian' versus the revisionist stance occurred within *The Russian Review*. For a discussion of this historiography see: Matthew Rendle, 'Post-Revisionism: The Continuing Debate on Stalinism,' *Intelligence and National Security* 25, no. 3 (2010): p. 4.

[114] Getty, *Origins of the Great Purges*, p. 217.

the time it had a major impact on the image of the Soviet Union and their actions in the inter-war years.

Khrushchev's speech resulted in not only disillusionment from Marxists in the West but also those within the Soviet bloc. One of the most important results of this occurred in October 1956 with the uprising in Hungary.[115] The brutal methods used by the Soviet army added to the concerns of the British intellectuals. Despite the almost universal consensus of disapproval in the West towards the actions of the Soviet Union in Hungary, Western intellectuals became fascinated by these events. Some because it validated their dislike of Marxism and justified the anti-communist stance of Western foreign policy, and others because it created a clearer understanding of Soviet policies and the contrast between an idealised form of socialism and the actual reality of the East.

During the war in 1941 Cole had discussed the integration of Hungary into the Soviet Union. He argued that after the war:

> Soviet forces will be in a position to sweep back over a large part of Europe. In that event, is it not most likely that the problems of Poland, and of the Balkans, and of Hungary, will be solved by their inclusion as Soviet Republics within a vastly enlarged State based on the U.S.S.R.? […] I, for one, should regard this as a far better solution than any return of these States to their past condition[.][116]

At this point, Cole blamed Stalin for the problems with Soviet policy rather than criticising the system itself.[117] Even when discussing the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, Cole accepted this as the inevitable outcome of the Allies' refusal to co-operate with the Soviets.[118] He also predicted (at least partly) Hungary's later status as a satellite state of the Soviet Union from 1947.

By 1957 he had become far more critical of the Soviet Union and could no longer frame the discussion in terms of the problems of capitalism. At this time he argued that "nearly all Socialists seem to agree in condemning the Soviet intervention in Hungary as wrong and morally indefensible."[119] He accepted that part of the responsibility for the uprising fell on the Soviet Union for their exploitation of Hungary, and on Hungary's Communist

---

[115] Noel Barber, *Seven Days of Freedom: The Hungarian Uprising 1956* (London: Macmillan, 1973), pp. 48-49.

[116] G. D. H. Cole, *Europe, Russia and the Future* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1941), p. 15.

[117] Cole, *Europe, Russia and the Future*, p. 15.

[118] Cole, 'The Decline of Capitalism', p. 123.

[119] G. D. H. Cole, 'Reflections on Hungary', *New Statesman and Nation* 53, 12 January 1957, p. 36.

Party for their unpopular policies. He also deliberately distanced himself from the communists and discussed the difference between communism and socialism. He argued that "for anyone who is not a Communist, the imposition of Soviet rule on Hungary by armed force is both a crime and a most serious blow to the cause of World Socialism."[120] In more general terms he stated that:

> Democratic Socialists, unlike Communists, believe in the rights of man. […] We do not believe that only proletarians, or only workers in any sense, have rights, or that class-enemies can legitimately be suppressed, or liquidated by a proletarian dictatorship.[121]

While Cole had always labelled himself a democratic socialist, these ideas contrasted to his earlier affiliation and positive appraisal of the Soviets.

While the ideas of these intellectuals all differed, they shared some common themes. When discussing warfare, the underlining principle for socialist thinkers revolved around the need to secure British freedom and rights. This conception of freedom coincided with non-socialist thinking. The actions of the Soviet Union played a major role in moving socialist discourse away from Marxism and towards the mainstream conception of British liberal freedom. The resulting discourse highlighted a determination to ensure the freedom of the British people and protect them from the dangers of fascism and later authoritarianism.

Part 2 – Freedom and the State

Socialist thinking fell into a larger mainstream debate on the dangers of war to British freedom. This included the fear of a more powerful military and the use of nuclear weapons.

In some parts of intellectual discussion the relationship between freedom and the British state was explored more directly. This section will focus on liberal arguments that analysed the threat to British liberty and how intellectuals perceived the new security policies that were implemented at this time.

---

[120] G. D. H. Cole, 'World Socialism and the Hungarian Crisis,' *World Socialist* 2, no. 2 (1957): p. 1.
[121] Cole, 'World Socialism and the Hungarian Crisis', p. 1.

In the inter-war years the internationalist creed had dominated intellectual thinking. For socialists liberal internationalism marked a stepping stone to a socialist international transformation; for liberals it marked the first stage of an international consensus for peace. From the late 1920s disarmament became the most important discussion point by liberal internationalists. At this time the pacifist creed was extremely prevalent within this discourse, and the desire for universal disarmament underpinned much of this campaign.[122] Support for pacifism diminished and the rise of tensions between East and West left many to question the pacific nature of liberal states.

The failure of the League brought about a change in perspective within liberal thinkers and many moved towards a form of realism. In the US realists such as Hans Morgenthau took centre stage in the debate on international relations.[123] The liberal thinking of the 1920s and 1930s could not explain the bi-polar world of the 1940s and the nuclear age of the 1950s. The Cold War destroyed the faith in internationalism and national interests and defence took precedence. Critiques of liberal internationalism and its perceived idealism helped shape the discourse of the 1940s.[124] Many British intellectuals reacted strongly to this change, either by letting go of their own idealism or becoming even further entrenched within an idealist ideology. Throughout these discussions, the role of freedom remained central and intellectuals questioned the ability of the state to protect its people while still preserving their liberal values. These debates generated two different strands of thinking: some believed that warfare destroyed the civil liberties of a nation while others felt that totalitarian states threatened liberty to the point that war was the only way to protect it. As the fight against the Nazis then turned to a fight against the Soviets, arguments shifted to reflect new interpretations.

In the 1930s C. E. M. Joad was one of Britain's most eminent pacifists and through his work he helped spearhead the political campaigns against war. He became a public figure in the 1930s when he released two books popularising philosophy.[125] During the war he appeared as a prominent intellectual on *The Brains Trust*. His fame and influence on public opinion led the *Sunday Dispatch* to describe him as "Britain's most famous

---

[122] Michael C. Pugh, *Liberal Internationalism: The Interwar Movement for Peace in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 26-68.

[123] Andrew J. Williams, *Liberalism and War: The Victors and the Vanquished* (London: Routledge, 2006), pp. 54-55.

[124] Carr's critique in particular helped shape this type of thinking: Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.

[125] C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Modern Thought* (London: Faber & Faber, 1933); C. E. M. Joad, *Guide to Philosophy* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1936).

philosopher".[126] While his most significant work came from mainstream moral and religious philosophy, he also took part in political activism. He hated fascism and was a staunch pacifist, which led to activism against military fighting and the belief that the loss of liberty would be preferable to major warfare. The 'King and Country' debate that took place in February 1933 at the Oxford Union became one of the most influential and famous debates on pacifism in Britain. Joad was invited as an outside speaker to argue for the motion: "That this house will in no circumstances fight for its King and Country".[127] His inspirational defence of pacifism helped pass the motion by 275 votes to 153. The debate made a large impact domestically and internationally. The press and House of Commons discussed their defence of the Soviet Union and anti-patriotic stance. The new Nazi government used the debate to demonstrate the weakness of liberal Britain.[128]

Joad grappled with his pacifist beliefs in the late 1930s in response to the conflict with Germany. He continued to advocate in favour of collective security up until 1937, long after most pacifists had abandoned hope. Ceadel argues that from 1938, in line with pacifists such as Clifford Allen, "Joad made the same transition from idealist to realist arguments".[129] From his work between this time and the outbreak of war, it is clear that he struggled with the topic of violence and the need to prevent a Nazi conquest of Europe.

In 1938 he discussed the arguments on the Left and their desire to destroy Nazism. He claimed:

> For the Left is to-day imbued by a bitter hatred of Fascism in general and of Nazi Germany in particular. […] I believe the arguments to be fallacious and the conclusion in which they issue – that we should fight to prevent a German occupation of Czechoslovakia – mistaken.[130]

He then went on to argue that a war against Germany would only end the same way the previous one had, with a temporary reprieve that would again escalate into violence. He argued: "We [the Left] denounced the Versailles Treaty when it was made, and have clamoured for its revision ever since. Why, then, should we be so put out, when that

---

[126] C. E. M. Joad, 'Professor Joad on War and Peace', *Sunday Dispatch*, 17 January 1943.
[127] Motion referenced in: Martin Ceadel, *Semi-Detached Idealists: The British Peace Movement and International Relations, 1854-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 294.
[128] Martin Ceadel, 'King and Country Debate, 1933: Student Politics, Pacifism and the Dictators,' *Historical Journal* 22, no. 2 (1979): p. 397.
[129] Ceadel, *Semi-Detached Idealists*, p. 362.
[130] C. E. M. Joad, 'On Not Fighting Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 15, 26 March 1938, p. 516.

which we have so urgently demanded, has occurred?"[131] While Joad did not present an argument in sympathy with Hitler's aggression, he accepted the need to allow that aggression to continue in order to prevent another war.

Joad's ideology, while once socialist, had evolved into liberalism by this point. He argued forcefully for the preservation of freedom through the democratic process. He criticized socialist ideals, highlighting the unlikelihood of those in power during the dictatorship of the proletariat ever giving up their power.[132] In contrast to the socialist position, he did not argue war was a consequence of capitalism, instead seeing it as a consequence of dictatorships. Joad argued that dictators used war as a means to maintain control:

> War is the most effective method of inducing uniformity of feeling, of ironing out differences and silencing criticism. Hence dictators, even when they dare not go to war, will keep the possibility of war ever before the people, and by making them a prey to the emotions of fear and suspicion and hatred, by inducing in them a condition of inflamed aggressiveness and alarmed loyalty, encourage the more primitive aspects of man's nature at the expense of the more recently evolved. Thus the effect of dictatorship is to militate against the progress of man.[133]

Quite clearly his argument pertained directly to 20th-century warfare and specifically to fascism in opposition to democratic states.

Joad did not believe war solved anything, and the only way to deal with it was to create other methods of solving international disputes. Specifically he argued that aggressive states caused war, and thus to prevent war these states needed a political transformation. In other words, democracies did not go to war unless provoked.

The political debates of the time drove Joad to engage further on the topic of warfare and try to promote his belief in the irrationality of war and prevent another war. This cumulated in the book *Why War?*, which he published shortly before war broke out.[134] He defended his position against the Left's arguments on the inevitability of war with Germany. He discussed the Munich Agreement and argued against the idea that we should have stopped Hitler from taking Czechoslovakia the previous year and prevented

---

[131] Joad, 'On Not Fighting Fascism', p. 517.
[132] C. E. M. Joad, *Liberty to-Day* (London: Watts & Co, 1938 [1934]), pp. 82-85.
[133] Joad, *Liberty to-Day*, p. 160.
[134] C. E. M. Joad, *Why War?* (Harmonsworth: Penguin, 1939).

Germany from increasing their military power. In many respects this book represented a last desperate attempt by Joad to avert a war he knew would shortly break out. His argument revolved around the idea that a war would be so uncontrollable and unthinkable in the modern era that we must not declare one. The prospect of war overrode the fear of a fascist expansion.

The Second World War had a significant impact on Joad's views on warfare, as it did with many other pacifists, and reversed his opinions. He described this change and the reasons why: "A conscientious objector in the last war, an incessant writer and speaker against war during the whole of the intervening armistice, I am yet convinced that this war must be fought until it is won." His reasoning: "if the Nazis win, they [the values of freedom] will be not merely endangered but destroyed so completely that Europe will enter a new Dark Age".[135] After the war Joad acknowledged that in abandoning pacifism he could not easily go back. He supported a unilateralist position for Britain but acknowledged the difficulty in promoting an absolutist mentality towards contemporary international relations. Instead he appealed to the UN to act as a mediating body and urged Britain to become an international negotiator to prevent further conflicts.[136]

Joad's understanding of freedom contrasted sharply with the socialist interpretation, but this type of discussion dominated intellectual thinking at this time. One such example of the contrast between socialism and liberal capitalism occurred at the beginning of the war between Cole and William Beveridge on the nature of freedom and how freedom related to the current conflict. The series entitled: *This Freedom: A Discussion between Sir William Beveridge, K. C. E. and G. D. H. Cole* comprised of six weekly radio talks, starting in December 1939 and ending in February 1940.[137] The discussion revolved around economic freedom, which highlighted their main point of contention, but both accepted the need for social development to give the poorest of society true freedom. Cole made the interesting point that freedom did not always come from political policies, and that the citizens of Russia felt personal freedom from creating their own socialist state, even if they were not free in the political sense or free in the way that British people would accept. Cole also made the point that the belief in freedom was so

---

[135] C. E. M. Joad, 'I was a Life-Long Pacifist but Hitler Changed My Mind', *Standard*, 13 August 1940.
[136] C. E. M. Joad, 'The Politics of "Keeping Out"', *New Statesman and Nation* 39, 3 June 1950, p. 628.
[137] For a transcript of part of these talks see: G. D. H. Cole Archive, Nuffield College Oxford, A1/37/1-11.

important to the British people that no economic circumstances would create the desire to live in a fascist state.[138]

Cole's point on the differences between different states was part of a much larger debate on the nature of statehood. Part of this debate centred on the ability of different states to wage war. The scientific discussion on this topic will be analysed in Chapter Four, in which scientific intellectuals argued that the freedom in democratic states allowed scientists to develop their ideas without state interference.

In the first months of the war Laski engaged with this topic by discussing the efficiency of democracies versus totalitarian regimes. He argued that the dissent within the democratic system stopped them from waging war as effectively as their authoritarian enemies. In contrast to the scientific debate, Laski highlighted the lack of freedom in Britain and the need to change the system to create a more effective war campaign. He also discussed the differences between Germany and Britain and believed that the British system had the potential for true freedom. In contrast to the authoritarian model, Laski argued that the government needed to effect changes that would increase equality within Britain to bring the country closer together. Greater domestic unity would then lead to a more concentrated war effort.[139] Both the scientists and Laski believed that freedom would help the war effort and a free people would work harder to defend their nation.

Laski continued to call for the need for greater equality as the war progressed. In *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time* he examined what he described as the 'counter-revolution' of fascism and the need to combat it. The book put forth an argument for systemic changes and a move away from the old, capitalist state to a social democratic one. Despite its title Laski did not argue for a socialist revolution and the overthrow of the government, and in fact felt that without deliberate and careful action such a revolution would soon occur.[140] He believed that winning the war would not solve anything unless changes occurred and greater equality created. Fascism could still overtake Britain if the people were dissatisfied. One of the benefits of the war came from central planning, which demonstrated how the government could prevent

---

[138] Cole Archive, Nuffield College, A1/37/5/2.

[139] Laski, 'Where Stands Democracy', pp. 3-5; 41-42.

[140] Harold Joseph Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1943), p. 37.

unemployment.[141] As a socialist Laski argued that this was the way to bring about equality and the satisfaction of the people.[142]

Carr also grappled with similar issues, discussing the role of freedom and democracy within a socialist state. In a lecture given in Nottingham in 1945 (which was later published in pamphlet form), Carr discussed the meaning of democracy and argued that to call the Soviet Union democratic was just as valid as giving the label to the Western nations. He justified this by defining democracy as anti-aristocratic, which defined the Soviet Union.[143] In examining the Soviet system he felt that Britain could learn a lot from the changes over the last few decades. When reviewing Carr's speech, Laski also took up this line of reasoning, arguing that Britain was not a true democracy.[144] Yet he also acknowledged the problem within intellectual debate and attempts to combine approval of the socialist state with their authoritarian nature. He made the distinction between a democratic society and a democratic government. The former looked at a society where all citizens accepted that maximum satisfaction for everyone could not be achieved through a class-based society. The latter looked at a government that was chosen freely by the people. Britain, Laski argued, fulfilled the latter but not the former whereas the Soviet Union did the opposite: it worked on a classless basis but did not allow its citizens to freely elect their leaders. Laski argued that both sides needed to be addressed when tackling this aspect of intellectual debate.

The argument on the benefits of central planning to a democratic system was extremely prevalent with British socialists at this time. In response Friedrich Hayek published a strong refutation which espoused classic liberal thinking on the nature of freedom. Hayek's work, *The Road to Serfdom*, started out as a polemic on the perils of totalitarianism and state control.[145] Its popularity and influence brought it into mainstream public debate, resulting in a shortened version published by *Reader's Digest* and a cartoon version first published in *Look* magazine, both printed in 1945.[146]

---

[141] Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, p. 160.

[142] Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, pp. 179-186.

[143] Edward Hallett Carr, *Democracy in International Affairs* (Nottingham: University College, 1945).

[144] Harold Joseph Laski, 'What is Democracy?', *Manchester Guardian*, 27 April 1946, pp. 4-6.

[145] Friedrich A. von Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1944).

[146] Both the shortened version and the cartoon version can be seen in: Friedrich A. von Hayek, *The Reader's Digest Condensed Version of The Road to Serfdom* (London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1999).

Readers' Digest published the condensed version on the front of their magazine with the caption "One of the Most Important Books of Our Generation".[147]

Most scholarship on Hayek examines his work from the perspective of political and economic philosophy. Hayek's work has become associated with the rise of neo-liberalism during the Thatcher and Reagan years. As a result historians have focused almost exclusively on his economic theories and role in promoting neo-liberalism, with far less emphasis on Hayek's influence in the earlier years of the Cold War.[148]

The Road to Serfdom has many different aspects within it. These include a critique of Keynesian economics and an argument on statehood in modern times. Hayek never directly addressed the ongoing war nor the aspects of warfare that had led to the rise of fascism and communism. Yet the book, written and published during the war, cannot be understood without this historical backdrop.

Hayek starts in his introduction by arguing against the intellectuals and politicians that strove for socialism. He asks:

> Is there a greater tragedy imaginable than that in our endeavour consciously to shape our future in accordance with high ideals, we should in fact unwittingly produce the very opposite of that we have been striving for?[149]

By supporting the socialist desire for freedom, these people are actually working to destroy it:

> It was the prevalence of socialist views not the Prussianism that Germany had in common with Italy and Russia – and it was from the masses and not from the classes steeped in the Prussian tradition, and favoured by it that National-Socialism arose.[150]

His argument centred on the idea that planning always required a select few individuals to decide the direction a society went, and they chose which ideas and economic trends to follow. Everyone else within the society had to accept their lead and were not free to decide how to live their own lives. The most significant problem with this arrangement came from the fact that those in charge did not know everything nor were they able to

[147] J. Blundell, 'Looking Back at the Condensed Version of the Road to Serfdom after 60 Years,' *Economic Affairs* 24, no. 1 (2004): p. 34.
[148] For a look at the historiography on Hayek see guide to further reading in: Edward Feser, *The Cambridge Companion to Hayek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
[149] Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 4.
[150] Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, p. 7.

predict the future. The danger, he argued, came as a result of the British people becoming more accepting of some form of socialism and planning, and once they travelled down that road there was no going back. Any form of planning would always lead to the loss of freedom. As a result Hayek puts both socialism and fascism into the category of 'totalitarian'.

His work had such a large impact on the intellectual and political community that a condensed version was written a year later for the general public.[151] The reception of his book had a great deal to do with the war. His book became a major influence on the evils of totalitarianism within the Cold War discourse that equated Nazism with the Soviet Union. Melissa Lane argues "it has been received as part of a formulation of a pan-collectivist conception of totalitarianism – tarring British and American wartime ally Stalin with the same socialist label as Hitler".[152] Those at the time saw the book as a denunciation of wartime planning. While Hayek may not have intended to deliver this message, his argument and date of publication made this the obvious assumption.

His book targeted socialist parties and provided a warning against their aims of central planning.[153] It affected British socialists who had used the war to justify central planning as a viable economic approach and challenged claims such as the ones put forth by Laski that planning for the war had rid Britain of unemployment. His book responded to the debates at the time which argued in favour of maintaining wartime planning after the war had ended.[154] Hayek demonstrated the problems and evils of such a system. As one of his reviewers pointed out: "It is impossible to make effective war without it [planning] and, therefore, whatever the evils associated with it, they must be accepted to obviate a worse evil – military defeat. But in times of peace we are under no such obligation."[155]

His work also had a direct influence on British politics. In his first campaign speech in 1945, Churchill used Hayek's arguments against Attlee and argued against state

---

[151] Hayek, *The Reader's Digest Condensed Version of The Road to Serfdom*.
The Reader's Digest chose which sections of the book to keep within this version with Hayek's approval.
[152] Melissa Lane, 'The Genesis and Reception of *The Road to Serfdom*,' in *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography*, ed. Robert Leeson (Hampshire: Macmillan, 2013), p. 44.
[153] Friedrich A. von Hayek, Stephen Kresge, and Leif Wenar, *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 108.
[154] See Bruce Caldwell's introduction to: Friedrich Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents: The Definitive Edition*, ed. Bruce Caldwell, vol. II, The Collected Works of F. A. Hayek (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 8-9.
[155] A. C. Pigou, 'The Road to Serfdom by F. A. Hayek,' *The Economic Journal* 54, no. 214 (1944): p. 218.

planning. Attlee responded and criticised Churchill's and Hayek's arguments.[156] Rather than helping Churchill, this speech actually did more damage. He argued that Labour would introduce "some form of Gestapo" to implement their planning policies.[157] When asked about his opinion, Hayek stated that "I don't regard it as impossible. [...] this phrase of "a gestapo" was in that speech used so much against him at the time".[158]

The Second World War altered public debate, and the liberal international discourse of the inter-war years had shifted towards more nationalistic arguments. Yet for some intellectuals the failure of the League did not signal the end of their international goals. These intellectuals did not fully accept Hayek's arguments that liberal states helped freedom prosper, and asked questions on the relationship between the British state and the freedom of its people in light of the Cold War. These arguments centred on the threat to liberty brought about through the increasing military strength in the British state.

In 1946 Joad highlighted the military policies that had remained from the war. In particular he argued against the continued use of conscription in times of peace. He questioned the need to restrict the liberty of British citizens in order to maintain British prestige and prepare for a war in which British civilisation would die.[159] Joad argued for disarmament and international conflict resolution through the UN. He also objected to the strong nationalist drive with the Church and their acceptance of just warfare. He stated:

> It is probably too much to expect that military men should read such books as Fuller's *Armaments and History*, or Liddell Hart's *The Revolution in Warfare*, but not, I suggest, that clergymen who write Reports should do so. And if they did, they would realise that "the torment of the dilemma" which is presented to them by the necessity of defending our way of life by compelling vast numbers of young men to learn to kill one another is now academic.[160]

Joad refers to books published that same year by the military intellectuals discussed in the final chapter of this thesis. Fuller and Liddell Hart discuss the change in warfare that resulted from the atomic bomb, and Joad referred to their arguments that another world

---

[156] Jeremy Shearmur, 'Hayek, The Road to Serfdom, and the British Conservatives,' *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 28, no. 3 (2006): p. 309.

[157] Winston Churchill, *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897-1963*, ed. Robert Rhodes James, vol. VII (London: Chelsea House, 1974), pp. 7169-7174.

[158] Hayek, Kresge, and Wenar, *Hayek on Hayek*, p. 107.

[159] C. E. M. Joad, 'The Churches, the Quakers and the Atom', *New Statesman and Nation* 32, 30 November 1946, pp. 394-395.

[160] Joad, 'The Churches, the Quakers and the Atom', p. 395.

war would differ from previous wars. Joad argued that greater numbers would die but mass armies would not be necessary. In doing so he used the expertise of the military thinkers to help formulate his ideas and to back up his claims. One of the main arguments put forth by the military intellectuals promoted the idea that the military elites were backwards thinking and not able to understand the new realities of war. Joad's words suggest he agreed with this assessment.

By 1950 Joad had become more concerned about another world war. His arguments responded to the detonation of the Soviet bomb in 1949 and the rearmament policies in reaction to the Korean War. He suggested a change in British policy towards what he described as 'realist pacifism'.[161] This policy would positon Britain as an international mediator and signal to the Soviets that they would get rid of their atomic arsenal and would not fight in a war between the superpowers. Joad continued to suggest a more proactive role of the UN to settle international disputes and create bodies such as an international civil service to aid this endeavour.

Joad's arguments clearly responded to the growing nationalism within British politics and the government's determination to involve Britain in a conflict with the Soviets. His arguments on the nature of conscription bring out the philosophical side of this debate that questioned the subordination of individual liberty to the security and freedom of the state as a whole.

Victor Gollancz also contributed to this debate. Gollancz believed that the Cold War would erode the values of freedom and individuality from Western society as states became consumed with the fear of communism and another war. Gollancz outlined several different problems that had occurred as a result of the war against fascism and the new conflict with the Soviets. He argued that Britain had become too consumed with national issues and that the Americans would only help with international interests to benefit themselves.[162] The war had intensified nationalism across Europe. He argued that this type of ideology "makes one set of people hate another set that they haven't the smallest real occasion for hating: it leads to jealousy, expansionism, oppression, strife, and eventually war."[163]

---

[161] Joad, 'The Politics of "Keeping Out"', p. 628.
[162] Victor Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1946), pp. 30-31.
[163] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, p. 58.

He believed that justice had become more barbaric. The Nuremberg Trials provided just one example in which the victors tried the losers, ignoring the fact that they were also guilty of some of the crimes in question.[164] The atomic bomb, in particular, he argued constituted a war crime and its use lost the Allies all moral superiority.[165]

In examining recent events that threatened Western values, Gollancz also discussed future events and the possibility of a move towards greater restrictions and more illiberal policies as the conflict against communism continued and escalated. In particular he worried that the United States would become less liberal if communism became stronger in Europe.[166] Gollancz understood that the fear of war created more restrictions and allowed states to curtail freedom. His words in 1946 foresaw many of the problems of McCarthyism in the following years.

One of the problems he highlighted about the Cold War resulted from an ideological difference on warfare between the Soviet Union and the West. While he did not believe they wanted another war, he also pointed out that the Soviet Union:

> doesn't contemplate it [war] with the horror that we and the Americans feel at such a possibility. To begin with there is still at the back of her mind the fixed Marxist tenet that sooner or later the final show-down between the socialist and the capitalist world is inevitable: and next, a war of atom bombs in say four or five years' time would damage her far less than ourselves[.][167]

The next war, which incidentally occurred four years later in Korea, amplified these fears. In response he wrote to *The Times* pleading with British statesmen to find a new method of negotiation, appealing to their humanity and Christian brotherhood. After *The Times* refused to publish it, he turned the letter into a pamphlet and was absolutely determined, without much success, to make as big an impact on public opinion as possible.[168]

Both Joad and Gollancz discussed the same problem from two different angles. Joad highlighted the practical results of an increased military while Gollancz discussed the problems that could arise from fear of war and the demonization of the enemy. Both men highlighted the threat to liberty brought about because of the Cold War. These threats

---

[164] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, pp. 72-74.
[165] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, pp. 75-76.
[166] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, p. 200.
[167] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, p. 106.
[168] Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, p. 584.

not only created a tangible lack of freedom through measures such as conscription, but fear and paranoia allowed greater illiberal policies to be implemented. While measures to determine loyalty in Britain did not come close to the depths seen in the US, the Cold War did encourage the British government to take actions against their own employees, compiling large databases of information on their people to determine their ideological affiliations.[169] For a democratic state, this constituted a large invasion of privacy and the restriction of liberties.

In *The Dilemma of Our Times* Laski suggested that the close relationship between the US and Britain meant that the increasing lack of liberties brought about from the Cold War in the US would also have an impact on British policies. There is some evidence that he had a point. Fear of communism resulted in greater restrictions to employees in Whitehall. One MP went so far as to regularly petition Attlee to form a British version of the Committee for Un-American activities, although Attlee always refused.[170]

Laski's argument was published posthumously in 1952. He started writing the book in 1943 but altered it in 1949 to include new ideas on the Cold War.[171] This work demonstrated the evolution of his ideas as a result of new perspectives on both the Soviet Union and the nature of democracies in relation to war.

In contrast to his other work on war, *Dilemma* focused less on Britain and Europe and more on the United States and their relations with the Soviet Union. Laski had spent considerable time examining America's democratic system. He supported the New Deal in the 1930s,[172] but became increasingly disillusioned with their politics under Truman.[173] In 1948 he argued that big business had corrupted the United States and that the Red Scare had curtailed liberty.[174]

This new attitude came across within *Dilemma* and also highlighted a far less favourable approach to the Soviet Union. He equated the two nations together, discussing the ways

---

[169] Hennessy, *The Secret State*, pp. 82-83.
[170] Hennessy, *The Secret State*, p. 96.
[171] Harold Joseph Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1952).
[172] Harold Joseph Laski, *The American Presidency: An Interpretation* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1940).
[173] Newman, 'Laski, Harold Joseph'.
[174] Harold Joseph Laski, *The American Democracy: A Commentary and an Interpretation* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1948).

both limited freedom and acted undemocratically.[175] He argued that both states allowed fear to consume their ideas and politics, which led to the current problems.[176]

While Laski may have started this book during the Second World War, by 1950 he had transformed it into a critical assessment of the superpowers. His earlier views on the progressive nature of both nations had vanished and he highlighted the strong authoritarian and anti-liberal characteristics. Rather than allowing social and economic issues to dictate their progression, both states had allowed their hostilities and fear to direct their policies. Laski felt that if this fear led to war it would be catastrophic for Britain. He argued that men such as Churchill were ignoring the dangers of war in order to increase Britain's international prestige, and in doing so were creating policies that would eradicate democracy.[177] Here Laski linked the arms race and increasing power of the military to the destruction of liberal freedoms. In preparing for war, he argued that Britain would have to implement policies such as universal national service.

It is clear that he blamed a great deal of these problems on the US and Soviets. He argued "we are in the midst of an international civil war".[178] At first glance this seems a contradiction in terms, but Laski was not talking about the military conflict of the Cold War. Instead he meant a conflict between former allies whose fears had consumed their thinking and forced them into a tide of nationalism and the refusal to tolerate anything that differed from their own ideals. He argued that our former convictions that liberal freedoms were the right path had dissolved in this time of fear and uncertainty: "Even great words like 'equality' and 'fraternity' have fallen from their high estate".[179] By engaging in the Cold War, the US had helped bring these fears to other nations and forced them into this conflict.[180]

The role of the US in pressuring Britain into the Cold War became an important aspect of debate both at the time and in contemporary historiography. Michael Hogan argues that the Marshall Plan was part of America's means to create "an integrated Europe and

---

[175] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, pp. 13-27.
[176] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, pp. 199-202.
[177] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, pp. 39-49.
[178] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, pp. 18-19.
[179] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, p. 19.
[180] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, p. 41.

a fully multilateral system of world trade."[181] British leaders, however, refused to accept these plans and the Americans settled for co-operation rather than integration. Till Geiger highlights the pressure put on Britain by Washington and their efforts to accommodate these demands during the Korean War.[182] In doing so Geiger discusses the problems this caused in the technical development of the British state.

In 1956 Cole discussed the rising defence expenditure in Britain and the problems this caused the British people. With regards to Korea, he argued: "When, under American pressure, the scale of projected defence expenditure was twice drastically increased in 1950 and 1951, it soon became apparent that the additional strain was past all bearing."[183] His argument revolved around the increase in defence expenditure between rearmament for the Second World War and current rearmament. He cited figures that showed Britain spent £382 million in 1938-9 in comparison to £1597 million in 1954. As well as the "crippling burden on the whole economy", Cole also discussed the "scrounging" of men from civilian employment to military service.[184] As an economic treatise, Cole's book set aside the political questions on conscription but he did mention the ethical objection of forcing obedience training and military discipline onto the population. Cole clearly believed that conscription was a serious breach of civil liberties brought about because of warfare.

This section has highlighted the fear present within British intellectuals that war would infringe on liberal freedoms. While many of these intellectuals agreed that war against the Nazis was the only option to prevent a catastrophe, most became alarmed by the increasing authoritarian measures of the Cold War. This period brought forth questions on the nature of statehood and how the British state would survive and continue to remain a liberal nation.

---

[181] Michael J. Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 21.
[182] Till. Geiger, 'The British Warfare State and the Challenge of Americanisation of Western Defence,' *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d histoire* 15, no. 4 (2008): p. 356.
[183] G. D. H. Cole, *The Post-War Condition of Britain* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956), p. 307.
[184] Cole, *The Post-War Condition of Britain*, pp. 307-308.

Part 3 – Dangers of Nuclear War

Alongside these questions arose a parallel discourse on the technological advances of war. From 1945 the emergence of nuclear technology dominated intellectual discussion on warfare. Questions arose on the dangers of this new technology and a new form of pacifism emerged to counter the increased dangers. This section will use the writings of two intellectuals, Bertrand Russell and Victor Gollancz, to examine different aspects of unilateralist thinking.

Gollancz and Russell's work fall into a range of different categories. Both men have been described as liberal, socialist and pacifist at different points of their careers. Russell himself never categorised his work through a definitive label. In his autobiography he described his attempts at aligning his ideas to one particular philosophy as "self-deception".[185] In relation to warfare, Gollancz's ideas fell into a liberal framework, with strong pacifist trends in his later work.

During this period Russell split his time between his philosophical work and his work as a political and intellectual activist. As the Cold War progressed he became more focused on campaigning for peace and unilateralism. His strong anti-communist stance put him in favour with mainstream thinking and the British government, especially between 1945 and 1950. His work during the Cold War included writing the Russell-Einstein Manifesto in 1955 which started the Pugwash movement, forming the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in 1958, and forming the Committee of 100 in 1960. All of these organisations helped promote an anti-nuclear message. The Committee of 100 in particular rallied against the government and engaged in illegal activities to support their cause.

Russell's ideas underwent numerous transformations, although throughout his life he maintained a strong desire to protect the world from the horrors of war. In previous years he had maintained a strong pacifist stance on warfare but the introduction of atomic weapons in 1945 radically altered Russell's arguments. The Cold War brought out a more militant side to Russell's thinking, to the point where he argued that the United States should engage in a pre-emptive war with the Soviet Union before they could build

---

[185] Bertrand Russell, *Autobiography* (London: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1998), p. 260.

their own nuclear weapons.[186] In the 1930s, however, he had argued against another war even if it meant surrendering to Germany.[187] Alan Ryan, one of his biographers, argues this was Russell's "most far-reaching case for 'defeatism' or pacifism that he ever made".[188] Andrew Bone and Michael Stevenson who edited his writings between 1935 and 1938 on this topic entitled the work: *How to Keep the Peace: The Pacifist Dilemma*.[189] Russell's primary concern lay in preventing another world war which he believed would end European civilisation.[190]

Within these writings Russell also demonstrated the importance he placed on the values that made Britain a civilised nation. He discussed the importance of maintaining liberal principles and an internationalist stance. In 1935 Russell upheld the values of the League and denounced those in Britain who wished to adopt an isolationist approach.[191]

Russell reacted straight away to the atomic bombing of Japan and sought to understand the political implications. Within a few days of the event he had published his opinion that the atomic bomb could destroy civilisation. His outlook became extremely fatalistic and he expected another war against the Soviets, possibly ending with London's obliteration.[192] This pessimism then transformed his understanding of warfare. During the Second World War he had reluctantly accepted the need for conflict in order to stop the Nazis, losing his earlier belief in absolute pacifism. This in turn gave way to a desperate desire to avert a nuclear war. Ronald Clark, one of his biographers, has stated: "There is no doubt that the salvation of the human race from a nuclear holocaust was the last great attachment of Russell's life".[193] During the period when the US had domination over atomic weapons Russell addressed these fears through the belief in a pre-emptive war against the Soviets. He believed that as soon as the Soviets had achieved their own atomic bombs a war would break out. Striking against the Soviets before this could happen would avert an even more deadly world war.[194] His fear of

---

[186] Bertrand Russell, Ronald Kasrils, and Barry Feinberg, *Bertrand Russell's America*, vol. II (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1973), pp. 3-13.
[187] Bertrand Russell, *Which Way to Peace?* (London: Michael Joseph, 1936).
[188] Alan Ryan, *Bertrand Russell: A Political Life* (London: Allen Lane, 1988), p. 127.
[189] Bertrand Russell, *How to Keep the Peace: The Pacifist Dilemma, 1935-38*, ed. Andrew G. Bone and Michael D. Stevenson, vol. 21, The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell (London: Routledge, 2008).
[190] Russell, *How to Keep the Peace*, 21, pp. 24; 32; 41; 133.
[191] Russell, *How to Keep the Peace*, 21, pp. 5-6.
[192] Ronald William Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell* (London: Cape, 1975), p. 518.
[193] Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell*, p. 517.
[194] Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell*, pp. 517-530.

annihilation overrode his earlier pacifism to such a degree that the two discussions are hardly recognisable as having been written by the same person.

His move away from pacifism brought him into mainstream thinking and gave him greater respectability. He became a far more active part of British political campaigning and his intellectual reputation helped augment his political role. In 1948 he was invited to give the first Reith Lectures, in which he spoke about *Authority and the Individual*.[195] His work at this time, however, did not inspire the confidence of all his readers. Some felt bemused by the change in his approach to warfare. In 1949 Joad commented on "the metamorphosis of the reputation of Bertrand Russell" and his argument in the Reith Lectures.[196] He wrote:

> It would, of course, be idle to deny that as he has become more accepted, Russell's views have become more acceptable. Thus, he now entertains "high hopes" for the future of mankind and finds hitherto unsuspected virtues in war.[197]

It is understandable why Joad felt confused by Russell's ideas. The dangers of warfare had increased and yet his stance on war had lessened. Joad ended the article with the words:

> Why should it be supposed that American domination could be achieved without a war with Russia in which the worst of the contemplated effects of war might well occur, is not clear. Nor, then, are the grounds for Russell's optimism.[198]

Throughout the lectures Russell had maintained his belief in individuality and liberty but his stance on warfare had altered in response to the destruction of Nazism and the development of atomic weapons. Joad's comment about Russell finding "virtues in war" is perhaps rather ungenerous. Russell's desire to protect human life had not diminished but the development of atomic bombs had caused his arguments to shift. He now saw a nuclear war as the ultimate evil and accepted distasteful alternatives in order to prevent what he saw as an almost certain eventuality. Joad himself had argued a similar position against the Nazis.

---

[195] Bertrand Russell, *Authority and the Individual: The Reith Lectures for 1948-9* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949).
[196] C. E. M. Joad, 'The Atom, the State and Bertrand Russell', *New Statesman and Nation* 38, 23 July 1949, p. 100.
[197] Joad, 'The Atom, the State and Bertrand Russell', p. 100.
[198] Joad, 'The Atom, the State and Bertrand Russell', p. 100.

Within a few months of the Reith lectures the Soviets successfully detonated their atomic bomb, forcing Russell to revise his arguments. A pre-emptive war would no longer work as a safeguard for peace. By 1954 Eisenhower had officially agreed with the conclusions Russell and other intellectuals had surmised from the nuclear situation, calling a preventive war "an impossibility today".[199] Within Britain, however, such a statement did little to persuade intellectuals that Western governments were serious in the desire to prevent nuclear war. As Cole argued:

> It is false logic to argue that because the danger of immediate war has become less with the growth of popular consciousness of what it would involve […] it is the right course to push on with atomic and thermo-nuclear armament in order to make the prospect of war still more terrible.[200]

The debate over nuclear weapons in Britain became central to defence thinking at this time. Britain had developed atomic weapons in 1952 despite considerable objections from major players within the state. One of the nation's chief scientific administrators, Henry Tizard, had argued that the desire to build these bombs stemmed from pride and Britain was no longer in a position to act as a Great Power.[201] While Tizard's arguments gained significant support, he failed to convince the Chiefs of Staff. Chapter four will develop the arguments of scientists such as Tizard on the technological changes affecting warfare.

In July 1954 Churchill had authorised the building of hydrogen bombs, publically releasing the information in February 1955.[202] The failure of the Suez Crisis increased public and political desires to build an independent nuclear deterrent and restore the national pride that had been wounded in the conflict. The 1957 Defence White Paper followed these events, which altered defence strategy to rely heavily on an independent deterrent.[203]

These occurrences had major implications for intellectual thought on the bomb. For Left-leaning thinkers the continual electoral success of the Conservatives, culminating in

---

[199] Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1954: Containing the Public Messages, Speeches, and Statements of the President, January 1 to December 31, 1954.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 2005), p. 192.
[200] G. D. H. Cole, 'On the Brink or Over', *New Statesman and Nation* 48, 27 November 1954, p. 682.
[201] John Baylis, *Ambiguity and Deterrence: British Nuclear Strategy, 1945-1964* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), p. 86.
[202] G. Spinardi, 'Aldermaston and British Nuclear Weapons Development: Testing the 'Zuckerman Thesis',' *Social Studies of Science* 27, no. 4 (1997): p. 555.
[203] 1956-57 [Cmnd. 124] Defence Outline of Future Policy.

the imperialist attempt to control the Suez Canal, had left them with feelings of frustration and impotency. Many of these intellectuals were also shocked by the Hungarian Uprising at this time and the brutality of the Soviet Union. This led to a drive for political activism which became realised with the creation of the CND.[204]

For Russell, the new international climate led to a strong desire for disarmament and international government.[205] Part of Russell's new found optimism resulted from the belief that the increased dangers would force the governments of the world to take warfare more seriously and stop a war before it had the chance to start. In 1955 he stated: "Never before, since there first were organised States, has there been any real possibility of abolishing war. Such a possibility does now exist."[206]

While he might have become more optimistic about this possibility, he understood that it would not happen unless major change occurred. This required change not only to defence policy but to thinking about nuclear warfare in general terms. He argued that an international détente, in which both sides agree to destroy their weapons, would be the first step to true peace.[207] Russell used his intellectual prominence to urge politicians to see things his way. He was also not afraid to say what he really felt. One notable example, which occurred in March 1958, resulted in an argument in the *Times* between Russell and Labour MP Emanuel Shinwell, the former Minister of Defence.[208] This exchange, labelled an argument rather than a debate because of the insults within, started with Shinwell discussing "superannuated philosophers like Bertrand Russell" in the House of Commons.[209] Shinwell denounced Russell's unilateralist position and the idea that philosophers like Russell should have more respect on defence matters than politicians. He argued that if war broke out between the superpowers Britain would be involved, and getting rid of their nuclear weapons would not change this or make any significant difference.[210] Russell responded by calling Shinwell "a juvenile politician" and criticising politicians' ability to understand defence matters. He then stated "I should advise Mr. Shinwell to retire from politics and study theoretical physics. When he has

---

[204] Richard Taylor and Colin Prichard, *Protest Makers: The British Nuclear Disarmament Movement of 1958-1965, Twenty Years On* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1980), pp. 1-6.

[205] Bertrand Russell, *Detente or Destruction, 1955-57*, ed. Andrew G. Bone, vol. 29, The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell (London: Routledge, 2005).

[206] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 26.

[207] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, pp. 33-34.

[208] Shinwell worked as Minister of Defence from February 1950 to October 1951.

[209] HC Deb, 27 February 1958, vol 583, cc576.

[210] HC Deb, 27 February 1958, vol 583, cc577.

understood the subject, his opinions will perhaps become worth listening to".[211] Their grievance on policy resulted from a debate on whether Britain should adopt unilateralism. Russell's arguments on the lack of expertise of politicians suggests he saw Shinwell as a representative of Britain's political elite, many of whom supported Britain's nuclear programme.

Russell's determination to change this thinking came across in the following years. He started with the creation of the CND in 1958. In 1959 he followed this up with a book on unilateralism.[212] *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* expressed his vexation not only with the political leaders' actions over the arms race but also the general public's approval and support of nuclear weapons. He likened it, and what our response should be, to the Black Death, and arguing that as with disease ideological and racial factors do not come into the equation.[213]

The book expounded everything the new organisation stood for: a sensible approach to nuclear weapons and a rational oppositional stance. Kingsley Martin, the editor of the *New Statesman,* described the book as "a reasonable and practicable alternative to brinkmanship."[214] This more reasoned approach contrasts sharply with his pacifism of the 1930s. This book captured Russell's frustrations with the nuclear sentiments of the majority of the West and the aggressive stance of the liberal nations. Part of Russell's analysis centred on the development of military technology and the ensuing affects. He was especially critical of America's resolution to continue the arms race by developing more effective weapons and delivery systems. He discussed some of more extreme examples of US thinking in order to highlight the absurdity of their position, including the desire to launch rockets from the moon or even Mars and Venus.[215] He argued these actions would increase the likelihood of war and also destroy the US economy.

The book explored the problems with the West's justification for nuclear arms and the reasons why disarmament conferences and even disarmament itself was not enough to guarantee a nuclear war would not come to pass. Although writing for the CND, Russell did not put forth a strong unilateralist argument but suggested practical measures to help

---

[211] Bertrand Russell, 'How to Fight Back', *Times*, 4 March 1958, p. 9.
[212] Bertrand Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1959).
[213] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, pp. 1-3.
[214] Kingsley Martin, 'Nuclear Sense', *New Statesman and Nation* 57, 10 January 1959, p. 50.
[215] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, pp. 8-9.

stabilise the international situation, such as getting rid of the veto within the UN Security Council.

In direct contrast to Russell, the changes in military technology at this time saw an increased drive towards pacifism within the writings of Victor Gollancz. His journey during the Second World War gave him a more spiritual outlook and increased his pacifist ideals. Rather than blaming the Germans, he sought to absolve the people for the crimes of their leaders. He also continued his intellectual career alongside his political activism for human rights and world peace into the 1950s. Gollancz's pacifism grew in response to these atrocities, and the addition of nuclear weapons only added to his fear and horror. He drew closer to religion and spirituality and consequently his work in the post-war years comes across as quite esoteric.

Gollancz had not always espoused the pacifist creed and did not describe himself as one until 1952.[216] His work in the 1940s concentrated on discussing the role of liberty and the state. His writings, however, show a strong move towards this mentality in the years following 1945. In his own words he believed: "I wasn't a pacifist until I sufficiently *wanted* to be a pacifist".[217] This desire did not manifest until Gollancz had fully embraced morality as the foundation of his ideas on warfare. By 1957 his arguments had shifted towards an absolutist form of pacifism. His acceptance of this philosophy coincided with the development of the hydrogen bomb and his arguments were far more radical than the majority of political campaigners of this time. In April 1957 he argued against the campaign to stop the testing of nuclear weapons. When asked to join the campaign he told the organiser that he would have to publically state he thought only total disarmament would serve and he was willing to risk the enslavement or destruction of Britain to achieve this disarmament.[218]

Shortly afterwards the CND was set up but Gollancz was not asked to join the committee for fear that he would push the organisation to adopt an extreme form of pacifism and antagonise the Labour Party. This rejection devastated Gollancz but he accepted the invitation to become a sponsor and attempted to urge them towards his views from outside the committee. Many responded negatively, seeing Gollancz as out

---

[216] Text relating to the Association for World Peace. Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick, MSS.157/3/AW/1/60.
[217] Gollancz, quoted in: Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, p. 594.
[218] Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, p. 652.

of touch with the present youth movement, many of whom wished to avoid the pacifism of the campaigns in the 1930s.[219] Frank Parkin discusses the importance of the youth to the rise of the CND in the 1950s. He makes the point that many of the intellectuals who had embraced communism as young radicals in the 1930s did not become a major force within the CND. "Most simply remained aloof and uninvolved, but some, like Strachey and [Stephen] Spender, were hostile to the Campaign."[220] Gollancz proved one of the exceptions but his form of radicalism did not engage well with the youth of the 1950s who wanted "to mirror the political temper of the times."[221]

Gollancz then turned his attention to writing a book on the nuclear situation and promoting his pacifist views. *The Devil's Repertoire*, devoid of his socialist ideology, sought to put the existence and dangers of nuclear weapons into a spiritual and religious context, in what he believed to be the first of its kind. He argued that no justification could ever sanction our having or using these weapons so there was no use trying to give one. Gollancz, in a similar manner to Russell, saw the futility and imprudence of treating the Soviets as the ultimate enemy and using this mind-set to defend the dangers of the arms race and the horrors of nuclear war.[222] His views on the Soviets had not changed from his writing in *Our Threatened Values*, but he now accepted that slavery and the destruction of liberal values were preferable to the total annihilation of nuclear warfare.

A. J. P. Taylor felt it brought nothing to the unilateralist cause, and his biographer Ruth Edwards suggests many of his colleagues "felt that Victor had lost touch with reality".[223] After the failure of this book, Gollancz stopped campaigning on the topic of nuclear war and spent his remaining years on other humanitarian issues.

These two discussions on unilateralism highlight the importance of nuclear warfare as an instigator of change within intellectual discussion. Pacifism in the inter-war years had revolved around the belief in the League of Nations. In the post-war years belief in just-warfare had diminished the power and appeal of pacifism, and those philosophers that continued to espouse such thinking turned towards unilateralism as the basis for their

---

[219] Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, pp. 52-54.
[220] Frank Parkin, *Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), p. 99.
[221] Parkin, *Middle Class Radicalism*, p. 99.
[222] Victor Gollancz, *The Devil's Repertoire, or Nuclear Bombing and the Life of Man* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1958), pp. 141-143.
[223] Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, pp. 657-659.

discussion. One argument within this section developed a practical approach to the realities of nuclear war whilst the other discussed the moral implications. Both highlight how the debate on freedom evolved and became magnified by the dangers of nuclear warfare. Russell highlighted the dangers of military technology and the pervasive aspect of military power while Gollancz highlighted the moral atrocities created through the use of these weapons and the danger of future warfare.

Conclusion

This first chapter has shown that major international events played a large role in shaping intellectual discourse, and in particular challenged ideological assumptions from the inter-war years.

Several key trends were highlighted within this discussion including the importance of freedom within mainstream intellectual arguments, and the impact warfare had on this debate. The liberal values of freedom were central to all mainstream intellectual debates from a range of ideologies. As warfare progressed, many intellectuals became increasingly wary of the dangers to British freedom from the reactions to warfare. The growth of military expenditure; the continued war policies during peacetime; and the increasing cultural fear mongering all helped shape this discourse.

The chapter brings out a collective mainstream discourse that ran throughout intellectual debate in Britain. While different intellectuals had alternative ideas and solutions, they spoke within a broader discursive field. The socialist intellectuals in particular became more integrated into mainstream thinking as the Cold War progressed and their arguments remained part of the broader intellectual approach to warfare and liberty.

This adds to the existing historiography on these debates in the US. While the discussion in Britain was not as forthright as was seen in America, these worries underpinned mainstream intellectual debate in Britain and became central to thinking on warfare.

Arguments laid out in this chapter are not designed to be inclusive of all intellectuals or beliefs, but to give a general overview of the challenges war presented and its effects on the writings and ideologies of Britain's intellectuals. The chapter also ended with a brief

discussion on unilateralism. The nuclear age had a significant effect on intellectual discourse; unilateralism being just one response to this problem. The intellectuals discussed in this chapter were mostly active in the first half of the 20th century and thus spent more time on the growth of fascism than nuclear warfare. The following chapters will go into further detail on the nuclear age, discussing political, utopian and scientific responses to this change. The importance of technology became an increasingly prominent issue within intellectual discussion, which differs from the philosophical discussion within this chapter. The importance of freedom, however, remained central to all aspects of intellectual debate and this issue continued to trouble intellectuals throughout the nuclear age.

Chapter Two: "Backwards to Utopia"

<u>Introduction</u>

The title for this chapter is taken from an article in the *New Statesman* written by A. J. P. Taylor in 1960 as part of a larger series: 'Look Back at the Fifties'.[224] In the article Taylor argued that everyone was disillusioned but actually had very little reason for these feelings:

> After the First World War, everyone believed in the League of Nations; and it did not work. After the second war, no one believed in the United Nations; and it is working very well. We are entering Utopia backwards, constantly surprised that the future turns out so much better than we expected.[225]

He then followed this by arguing that the 1950s showed us that "Belief is over."[226]

Taylor highlighted the common trend at this time towards a lack of idealism and belief in a better future.[227] This chapter will show that Taylor was not quite as alone as he perceived. Many other public intellectuals held the same type of ideals but were surrounded by a world that ignored such thinking and remained firmly within their sphere of cynicism. The goal of these intellectuals was nothing less than utopia, even if they tried extremely hard not to classify it as such.

Liberal theorists, who had often lacked a strong voice in previous years, became more prominent within both public intellectual discussion and political activism due to the threat of nuclear war. This chapter will explore the rise of a new type of anti-national thought, which it describes as 'utopianism', within intellectual debate in the nuclear age. It will examine why many intellectuals began to explore the ideas of a world government as the solution to a nuclear catastrophe and how this threat influenced their ideas on the structure and role of the state. Despite the role of international organisations such as the UN and NATO, nationalism became the prevailing reaction within Britain to the Cold War threat. British interests lay in protecting their nation, maintaining their status as a global power and eventually becoming a nuclear force. In 1947 Ernest Bevin, the Foreign Secretary, stated that Britain's first foreign policy aim was to create an

---

[224] Taylor, 'Look Back at the Fifties', pp. 5-6.
[225] Taylor, 'Look Back at the Fifties', p. 5.
[226] Taylor, 'Look Back at the Fifties', p. 5.
[227] Bell, *The End of Ideology*.

independent 'Third Force' to maintain their national strength and "develop our own power and influence to equal that of the United States of America and the USSR."[228] The desire to strengthen British power remained a top priority throughout the 1950s for the British leadership. For many intellectuals, however, the rise of a nuclear age posed the greatest threat the world had ever known to not only liberty but the very existence of civilization. Despite the climate of nationalism and cynicism within Britain, many turned to internationalism and a desire for world government as the solution. Not only does this suggest that their fear of nuclear warfare overrode any ideological beliefs that they may have held but it also shows that this group of intellectuals felt the traditional model of society and the state could no longer stand up to the challenges of the modern era.

This differed from the response to the First World War seen throughout the inter-war years. Whilst global warfare had embedded itself into the whole of society, this did not drastically change intellectual response to the state. War became a substantial political issue and internationalism became the solution. This heralded the League of Nations as the response of the liberal states, which many intellectuals embraced in their efforts to prevent war. The League did not, however, fundamentally alter the national governments or the nature of international law. The League's power came through nation states and its authority held only as long as those states chose to embrace it, as seen by its collapse in the 1930s. The failure of the League to prevent a second global war demonstrated the need for a more powerful international body less dependent on the cooperation of nation states. The drive for world government after 1945, as the embodiment of this ideal, showed a much larger shift in intellectual discussion that attempted to alter the very nature of statehood and international relations.

One explanation for this shift in British thinking could be the result of the change in Britain's role in world politics and the deterioration of Britain's power base. Without their global empire and authority as a world leader, British intellectuals embraced the idea of these major alterations more readily. In the inter-war years without the threat of a nuclear holocaust and whilst they remained one of the three major world powers, they had little incentive to adopt this more radical stance and fight for the elimination of statehood.

---

[228] Bevin quoted in: Baylis, *Ambiguity and Deterrence*, p. 68.

Alternatively, it could have resulted from a more potent form of liberal internationalism. David Engerman has argued that the Cold War saw a rise in "Manifest Destiny" ideals that originated with Locke.[229] As a result the Cold War became deeply ideological and liberal thinkers wished to spread their vision around the globe. Desire for a liberal world government could signal a more advanced form of this thinking.

As an academic theory, utopianism came across within both socialist and liberal internationalism during the first half of the 20th century. E. H. Carr set out the most prominent conceptualisation of utopianism around this period in 1939.[230] He produced one of the most important contributions to the realist international relations theory, which attacked the idea of utopianism within this discipline. For Carr: "The utopian is necessarily voluntarist: he believes in the possibility of more or less radically rejecting reality, and substituting his utopia for it by an act of will."[231] In particular he wrote in opposition to utopian international relations scholars such as Alfred Zimmern and Arnold Toynbee.

In Carr's description on international politics the role of warfare became paramount. He argued:

> The teleological aspect of the science of international politics has been conspicuous from the outset. It took its rise from a great and disastrous war; and the overwhelming purpose which dominated and inspired the pioneers of the new science was to obviate a recurrence of this disease of the international body politic.[232]

The utopian vision within this field resulted directly from the desire to end war by means of a world government that would transcend national conflicts.

In 1945 the idea of an international government was not new to political debate. Both socialist and liberal thinkers had previously entertained utopian ideas although utopianism had more prominently been associated with socialism in the 19th and 20th

---

[229] David Engerman, 'Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1962,' in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, ed. Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), p. 21.
[230] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*.
[231] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, p. 16.
[232] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, p. 11.

centuries.[233] Yet the growing trend in the late 1940s and 1950s lacked an ideological basis. The main justification came from a desire to protect all of humanity and avert a global war. As a result desire for an international government became not only an intellectual trend but also a political movement that spanned across all aspects of mainstream political thought.

Friedrich Hayek suggested that part of the popularity of socialism at this time came from its utopian ideals. He wrote "socialist thought owes its appeal to the young largely to its visionary character; the very courage to indulge in Utopian thought is in this respect a source of strength to the socialists".[234] This conception of 'utopianism' merely implies theories that bring together internationalism to form a world government. It was in this sense that utopianism became popular after 1945 but without the socialist justification.

Socialist theorists did not, on the whole, join with this new intellectual trend. While internationalism was a fairly standard part of the socialist doctrine, socialist intellectuals tended to speak out less on the prospects of a world socialist revolution during the Cold War. The disillusionment with the Soviet Union and the growing need to distance themselves from this affiliation took many socialist theorists away from their international roots and made this type of revolution not only unlikely but also undesirable. Men such as John Strachey embraced realism and pragmatism in order to deal with their changing allegiances and disenchantment with a socialist state that no longer epitomised their hopes and ideals. Daniel Bell suggests that the premise to his book *The End of Ideology* "closes the book, intellectually speaking, on an era, the one of easy "left" formulae for social change."[235] He supports the pursuit of utopian thinking, but without the trap of left-wing ideological promises.

Many intellectuals that did not promote socialism started to adhere to utopian thinking in a way that had not been seen even during the height of the League of Nations. Hayek believed intellectuals had a profound influence on public opinion and their ideas helped shape the direction of society. As an outspoken opponent of socialism and any form of planning, he was troubled by the intellectual community's long-standing fascination

---

[233] Thomas P. Linehan, *Modernism and British Socialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 43-64.

[234] Friedrich A. von Hayek, 'The Intellectuals and Socialism,' *The University Chicago Law Review* (1949): p. 428.

[235] Bell, *The End of Ideology*, p. 405.

with socialism. He appealed to those intellectuals that shared his values to mimic the success of the socialists and advocate a utopian doctrine. This, he believed, would help ensure freedom and the survival of liberalism. The West needed a utopian doctrine to follow and aspire to, but to advocate such views required courage:

> What we lack is a liberal Utopia, a program which seems neither a mere defense of things as they are nor a diluted kind of socialism, but a truly liberal radicalism which does not spare the susceptibilities of the mighty (including the trade unions), which is not too severely practical, and which does not confine itself to what appears today as politically possible. We need intellectual leaders who are willing to work for an ideal, however small may be the prospects of its early realization […]
>
> The main lesson which the true liberal must learn from the success of the socialists is that it was their courage to be Utopian which gained them the support of the intellectuals and therefore an influence on public opinion which is daily making possible what only recently seemed utterly remote. Those who have concerned themselves exclusively with what seemed practicable in the existing state of opinion have constantly found that even this had rapidly become politically impossible as the result of changes in a public opinion which they have done nothing to guide.[236]

Many intellectuals attempted such a challenge.[237]

Hayek was not the only scholar to question the existence of utopian ideals in the 20th century. Historians analysing the subject look at the 19th century as the last epoch of utopian idealism.[238] These works, however, look at the decline in utopian thinking in political philosophy. This chapter will argue that within the intellectual community the desire to end war encouraged a wave of utopian sentiment and desire to unite the nations of the world to end warfare altogether. In contrast to political philosophers, these intellectuals actively tried to enact their visions through political campaigning, using intellectual discussion to support this desire.

---

[236] Hayek, 'The Intellectuals and Socialism', pp. 432-433.
[237] Although there is no evidence that Hayek's work had any direct correlation with this change.
[238] Frank Edward Manuel and Fritzie P. Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1979); Krishan Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991).

Part 1 – The History of Utopian Thought

This type of utopian vision linked directly to internationalism. Internationalism within both liberal and socialist thinking developed throughout the 19th century. It was not until the First World War that the Great Powers made a serious attempt to form some type of international system of governance directly in response to the new developments in warfare. The emergence of total warfare shifted political thinking and major support for an international governing body evolved. While the League emerged through the idealism of Woodrow Wilson and others alongside him, it also never moved beyond the pragmatism of international politics. The desire for international law developed alongside the desire for national self-determination within liberal thinking.

The aftermath of the Second World War did not bring about these types of changes within the political realm. The Cold War brought forth American dominance and inter-dependence between the Western states. The creation of the United Nations had none of the idealism seen in earlier years and nobody believed the UN had the power to prevent another world war. At first the creation of nuclear arms had the potential to bring about an international coalition to prevent any one state from holding this type of power. Instead the exact opposite transpired. The failure of the Baruch Plan and the passing of the McMahon Act in 1946 brought an end to these ideas and ensured US hegemony over atomic arms. The subsequent arms race saw a strong nationalism emerge with nuclear weapons becoming the de facto indicator of political power in this new landscape.

Yet at the same time the emergence of nuclear weapons inspired a group of intellectuals to revive the internationalism of the 1920s into a new form with a new purpose. Desire for world government in order to stop a nuclear war developed from 1945 as a political movement spearheaded by numerous intellectuals. The greater threat brought about a more ambitious form of internationalism. While liberal internationalism in the interwar years had strains of utopianism within it, this new movement brought these ideas to the forefront of their arguments and campaigns.

Mark Mazower has traced the history of what he describes as "secular internationalist utopias".[239] From the early 19th century ideas on multilateralism emerged within European thinking. In the 20th century the League and the UN symbolised the most

---

[239] Mazower, *Governing the World*, p. xiii.

prominent attempts to actualise this vision. Mazower gives a detailed account of these attempts, tracing the formation of the League and UN and discussing the thinking of those responsible. While Mazower does comment briefly on the discussion amongst US intellectuals and their desire for world government, his analysis focuses on the progression of international statehood.[240] He does not examine the political drive to form a world government during the Cold War or the intellectual response in Britain.

After the Second World War, intellectual discussion focused on the desire to try to eliminate war. For some the belief in a world government stemmed from a lack of faith in the new UN, especially with regards to the limits created by a veto override in the Security Council. As long as this existed many intellectuals remained sceptical that both sides could ever come to a permanent solution for peace. For others the opposite held true: the UN epitomized the first step in their quest to unite the nations of the world. Some argued for a body that only dealt with international concerns and left the existing national structures in place. Others wanted full world government, while other groups argued for a federal system. These systems would hopefully erase the nationalistic drive towards warfare. Alternative proposals also included a federal or united Europe, partly to stop another European war and also as a way to ensure Europe's defence following the loss of their political dominance. Many proponents not only used the written word to engage in debate on the benefits of changing the state but also actively campaigned on these issues. This type of political campaigning demonstrated their seriousness and their desire to take their ideas beyond the realm of theoretical discussion and actively try to implement change.

The problem many intellectuals found came from the disbelief in the possibility of such schemes and dismissal by their listeners. The writers and campaigners that argued for some type of world government understood the problems the world would face when trying to implement such policies and they did not believe it would be easy or quick. They argued that to achieve these results governments must start now and push the world in this direction. Disbelief and dismissal would always lead to failure and negative results, and the real possibility of a catastrophe.

Most of these writers and political campaigners reassured their public that their ideas were not utopian, and their language often came across as defensive when justifying

---

[240] Mazower, *Governing the World*, pp. 232-239.

their reasoning. The fact that they all brought this issue up suggests that many of their audience saw their ideas in exactly this light, and then dismissed them as a result.

The concept of utopianism, as distinct from a specific ideological definition, describes a non-place.[241] As Michael Jacobsen and Keith Tester have stated, utopia is:

> a way to approach the all too human being-in-the-world. It is a journey to that which is not-yet, a commitment to the possible even when only the probable or even the impossible might seem overwhelming.[242]

A utopian philosophy seeks "to alter the social order on a fundamental, systemic level."[243] In modern popular culture the term has become synonymous with a perfect fictional world. One obvious implication being that such a world could never exist and should remain in the world of fiction and not serious politics. For British culture in the mid-20th century the most significant examples of utopianism came across through the works of H. G. Wells including his two books: *A Modern Utopia* and *Men Like Gods*.[244] Wells famously became obsessed with utopianism and the desire for a world state. This led critics to argue that he became increasingly totalitarian in his views in his later years.[245]

Wells spoke out on many political issues including those surrounding the problems of warfare.[246] Yet for all his political convictions, his writing was clearly fictional and he did not ask his readers to envision this type of world as a real solution to the political challenges of the day. The intellectuals examined in this section did precisely that, and in doing so asked the public and the political leaders of both Britain and the rest of the world to forcefully advocate this extreme position and implement changes with the intention of building this type of world community.

---

[241] The term was first used by Sir Thomas More: Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. George M. Logan and Robert M. Adams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

[242] Michael Hviid Jacobsen and Keith Tester, eds., *Utopia: Social Theory and the Future* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

[243] Michael D. Gordin, Helen Tilley, and Gyan Prakash, eds., *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), p. 2.

[244] H. G. Wells, *A Modern Utopia* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1905); H. G. Wells, *Men Like Gods* (London: Cassell, 1923).

[245] Joad, *Liberty to-Day*, pp. 86-87.

[246] See for example: H. G. Wells, *The Shape of Things to Come: The Ultimate Revolution* (London: Hutchinson, 1933). Here Wells speculated on the next two centuries. He discussed the problems within Europe and predicted another world war, followed by a benevolent dictatorship and eventual utopian paradise.

While Wells was looking to highlight the positive aspects of utopianism, the 20th century also saw a much darker vision within popular culture: dystopia. Gordin, Tilly and Prakash describe this as "a utopia that has gone wrong, or a utopia that functions only for a particular segment of society."[247] This came in the form of books written by George Orwell, specifically *Animal Farm* and *1984*, and *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley (which was written as a parody to Wells' ideas).[248]

These books all describe a dystopian world where the ideas of utopianism are warped and used to control and subjugate the people. All three books tied in to the political issues of this time and discussed the problems of totalitarianism that dominated political thinking. *Animal Farm* was written as an allegory of the Soviet Union, designed to symbolise the Soviet Union's distortion of freedom and equality. *1984* derived from Orwell's fear that Britain would be taken over by fascism or communism with the destruction of its liberal democracy. The State within the book highlighted the worst aspects of these regimes and the lack of freedom within them. It became so popular that the term 'Orwellian' came into popular culture to symbolise an oppressive State. *Brave New World*, unlike Orwell's work, was not written directly in response to totalitarianism but rather the fear of the Americanization of Europe. Yet the influence of numerous political regimes of this time comes through its characters. The novel highlighted the problems with capitalism and socialism, and primarily argued that utopian visions would lead to disaster.

The popularity of this type of fiction and political commentary marred the image of a utopian society and made it harder for intellectuals to put forth serious arguments for utopian theories. The links between utopianism and totalitarianism were particularly relevant during this time. Marxism portrayed a utopian vision classified as communism; the Soviet Union created a massive centralized state that threatened to subjugate and convert the rest of the world; and the fascist powers wished to conquer the world in the name of Aryanism. These issues, alongside the disbelief against this type of idealism, made it increasingly difficult for intellectuals to promote a serious argument for world government. Despite these challenges the intellectuals within Britain made numerous attempts to do so to combat the threat of a nuclear war.

---

[247] Gordin, Tilley, and Prakash, *Utopia/Dystopia*, p. 1.
[248] George Orwell, *Animal Farm* (Anstey: Charnwood, 1945); George Orwell, *1984* (Stockholm: Atlantis, 1949); Aldous Huxley, *Brave New World* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1932).

The overwhelming success of Carr's realist theories highlights the general mood at this time towards international relations. With the destruction of the League of Nations and the build up towards another global war, internationalism within both liberal and socialist circles had waned. Disillusionment with the idea of an international peace-keeping body pushed intellectuals and scholars away from utopian visions, which became seen as unrealistic and impractical.

Yet the development of a nuclear world which further altered perceptions of warfare brought forth a renewed desire for global government as a way to prevent a global catastrophe. The belief in practical and realistic solutions prevailed in mainstream political and cultural thinking, but within the British intellectual community utopian theories grew and developed.

Within the wider context, this growth took place in an environment of nationalism. While the creation of the UN had the potential to re-invigorate internationalism, the reality proved otherwise. British antagonism towards the Soviets even before the end of the war made negotiations difficult. While the British elites subscribed to the idea of internationalism as a means to prevent a future war, they did not envision a world state and rejected any ideas that seemed too close to this concept.[249] British hatred of communism made the idea untenable. These feelings only amplified once the war ended and the Cold War emerged.

From as early as 1946 we can see the shift within the British government towards the Soviets. The fear of communism and the belief that relations between the West and East would become adversarial came through both sides of the political spectrum. In May Bevin told the Cabinet that the Soviet threat might outweigh that posed earlier by the Nazis. British foreign policy followed this route and aligned with the United States and NATO. While standing by their allies and trying to gain a closer relationship with Washington, the British state also promoted their own interests and started planning an independent nuclear programme.[250]

At no point did British leaders put any real thought to utopian ideas. A pragmatic and mistrustful atmosphere permeated Whitehall. The idea of a world alliance to prevent a

---

[249] Mazower, *Governing the World*, pp. 206-213.
[250] Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy*, pp. 299-230.

nuclear war did not enter into serious political discussion and any suggestions along these lines were shot down and ignored. The government did not see the post-war international ties as anything other than a way to serve British interests. The economic downturn prompted the government to cut spending but this warred with the desire to maintain international influence to perverse their waning power. The 1946 Defence White Paper highlighted these post-war aims and discussed the limits now placed on the government and the desire to demobilise.[251] While engaged in promoting peace through the UN, the British state did not have total confidence in their ability to do so and planned their defence around the need to present "tangible evidence of our intention and ability to withstand attack."[252]

The campaign to create a world government by various British intellectuals occurred within this atmosphere amongst the majority of politicians and the government. As a result their ideas contrasted with the majority of political views and they found it hard to gain a sympathetic audience. These did not, however, stop them from campaigning and expressing their desires and beliefs.

Part 2 – Intellectuals and World Government

William Beveridge presents one of the most interesting cases of intellectual thinking and political campaigning. Beveridge's most notable contribution to British politics came from his ideas on social insurance which became the blueprint for the welfare reforms of the 1940s.[253] After its publication his political life altered course. He joined the Liberal Party and won a seat in the House of Commons in 1944 but lost it a year later. Following this he became a Peer in 1946 and later became the leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Lords. He used both public forums and his role in the Lords to promote his ideas on warfare and became involved in several organisations, including those devoted to the establishment of a World Authority as a means of eradicating war.

Beveridge's fame and historical significance, both during his lifetime and in contemporary times, comes from his biggest achievement: the welfare state. Despite

---

[251] 1945-46 [Cmd. 6743] Statement Relating to Defence.
[252] 1947-48 [Cmd. 7327] Statement Relating to Defence.
[253] William Henry Beveridge, *Social Insurance and Allied Services: The Beveridge Report* (London: HMSO, 1942).

criticisms, his work provided the foundation for a political initiative that has defined British domestic policy into the new century. Yet Beveridge's own views suggest he felt that the promotion of peace was his most important task and his most defining work.[254] Unfortunately his work on this issue did not achieve the results he desired nor has it received any historical recognition.[255] José Harris, in her biography of Beveridge, devotes one page to his "preoccupation with world government", describing him as "frankly and defiantly Utopian", but fails to discuss anything further on his years of political activism.[256]

This gap in Beveridge's history could have resulted from the influence of his earlier disapproval of utopian ideals. Yet a more likely explanation lies in the importance and success of his work up to 1945 which formed his public image to the exclusion of anything else. His work in the last two decades of his life should not be ignored, even if it never achieved any specific results. As a political activist, Beveridge chose to devote himself to a worthy cause and put a great deal of effort into that campaign. Up to the mid-1940s his work had focused primarily on ways to improve the lives of the underprivileged within Britain and put no emphasis on this type of internationalism. After successfully helping to further embed welfare into the political consciousness, he then turned towards the eradication of warfare as a cause.

Preventing another war became his most pressing political objective after 1945, and he used intellectual activism as a means to campaign on this matter. He utilised a number of forums to promote his message including the House of Lords, international speaking tours, and the wider intellectual community that spoke out and campaigned on this issue. He joined with other intellectuals including notable scientists and politicians at conferences and events dedicated to promoting world government.

After the *Beveridge Report* he took on the new challenge of warfare. In 1953 he argued:

> Eleven years ago in the Beveridge Report I listed five giants for attack – Want, Disease, Squalor, Unemployment and Ignorance. Today we face greater evils: Goliath War and Goliath Slavery. Today the inhabited world has become two feverishly armed camps. Today tyranny has returned with a

---

[254] '…For Settled Peace', *Future Magazine*. The London School of Economics Archives (LSE): BEVERIDGE/7/81.

[255] Despite his own words and strong convictions, when writing his autobiography he stopped at 1945. William Henry Beveridge, *Power and Influence* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1953).

[256] Jose Harris, *William Beveridge: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 466-467.

completeness and a savagery never compassed by the Kings and Emperors of the past.[257]

His solution lay in a federal world government, which slowly emerged through his public engagement over the 20 years following the war's end.

His words help identify not only his shift in priorities but the shift in his understanding of the world in this new age of warfare. The threat of global war remained in the inter-war years but for Beveridge tackling his "five giants" took priority. From 1945 the new threats had created "greater evils" and he began to campaign on international issues rather than national ones. Not only had his focus moved towards foreign policy but the threat of atomic warfare had altered his conception of nationalism. No longer could the state protect its people from the new dangers and so Beveridge turned to an international government as the solution to facing these problems.

In 1945 he published his book *The Price of Peace* which set out his commentary and ideas on the reasons for war and how to deal with it.[258] The concepts within this book gave a precursor to his later work on establishing world peace. While this book does not go that far, Beveridge brings out the idea of an international law enforcement body designed to prevent states from being able to wage war. He highlighted the problems of international anarchy as the primary cause of war and suggested a powerful international arbitration force to deal with this anarchy.[259] States would use this body rather than war to settle disputes.[260] Beveridge also highlighted a number of critical responses to this type of thinking and the arguments these critics made against the rationality of eliminating international anarchy.[261] He presented a sensible suggestion on how to slowly start this process as the conclusion to the book:

> The first aim in planning the organisation of the world after the war is to make it as certain as we can that the United States, Soviet Russia and the British Commonwealth, should always keep together in a union, not for world domination, but for world order and for the security of smaller nations as well as large nations. If that aim cannot be realised, then it is even more

---

[257] Beveridge, *Power and Influence*, p. 357.
[258] William Henry Beveridge, *The Price of Peace* (London: Pilot Press, 1945).
[259] Beveridge, *The Price of Peace*, pp. 50-61.
[260] It should be noted that the book was written and published before the creation of the United Nations, although Beveridge made it clear in the following years that the existence of this body did not meet his desires for this type of international body.
[261] Beveridge, *The Price of Peace*, pp. 63-79.

necessary that the United States and the British Commonwealth should keep it together.[262]

In the very last section he did categorize his ideas as utopian and criticized those that would deride him for such thinking. He argued: "The choice is no longer between Utopia and the world our fathers knew. The choice is between Utopia and Hell."[263]

He wrote the book for both a political and public audience and tried to encourage the reader to understand the problems of international anarchy and then present an international body as a possible solution. While these ideas clearly correlated with his political campaigning in the following years, they also presented a much less ambitious and controversial indicator of Beveridge's views. His words speaking to a general audience did not fully engage with the utopian vision he clearly believed in and later fought for. Within *The Price of Peace* Beveridge limited his ideas to policies which could be more easily implemented. These policies, such as an international police force, once put in place could help lead the world towards an international form of government but Beveridge did not explicitly state this here. He left out any ideas with specific utopian connotations.

He displayed his utopian tendencies through membership of several organisations designed to promote world government and world peace. These included the Parliamentary Association for World Government; the British Parliamentary Group for World Government (in which he worked as one of the Vice-Presidents); and the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government (WAPWG).

These organisations campaigned mainly through published materials and conferences. Several Parliamentary Conferences on World Government were organised by The Parliamentary Association for World Government in which Beveridge participated as one of the notable speakers. In 1955 WAPWG organised the World Conference of Scientists in which Beveridge participated alongside scholars including Bertrand Russell, Mark Oliphant and J. D. Bernal. This conference led to the publication of a book by Beveridge and Russell along with Professor Alexander Harrow and MP Henry Usborne, entitled *The Bomb: Challenge and Answer*.[264] The book discussed the threat of

---

[262] Beveridge, *The Price of Peace*, p. 86.
[263] Beveridge, *The Price of Peace*, p. 87.
[264] Alexander Haddow, Bertrand Russell, William Henry Beveridge, and Henry Usborne, *The Bomb: Challenge and Answer* (London: Batsford, 1955).

nuclear energy on the world and the consequences of nuclear war, and then went on to discuss world government as a solution to warfare and the present dangers.

All four men had expertise in their respective fields and were considered authorities on these issues. Harrow and Usborne discussed scientific and political problems respectively, while Russell and Beveridge looked at the more theoretical side of envisioning a new world order. Beveridge's contribution described a World Federation, which characterized his beliefs. Rather than argue directly for one single governing body Beveridge had always proposed a federal system that maintained individual states and their autonomy but demolished their ability to fight each other. In the British Parliamentary Group for World Government's 1952 Manifesto, they described such a relationship as that of England and Scotland when they merged together, or an actual federal system similar to the United States.[265]

Beveridge entitled his chapter of the book 'Conditions of Peace'. In it he discussed the biggest requirement Britain (and the world) faced at the present time: security from war. War itself, he argued, resulted from power-hungry leaders stirring up nationalism as a way to maintain their control, along with their inability to comprehend the realities of war. He proposed a federal system as a solution, giving each state two governments: a world federal government to maintain peace, and one to govern each nation. The supra-national government's only role would be to prevent war; all other power would remain with the national governments. He criticized the UN and argued it failed at a systemic level – in particular the use of the veto destroyed its ability to prevent war. He desired immediate change to push the world towards this type of system, and urged the British people to fight for peace and the British Parliament to take measures in favour of this scheme.

On the final page of the chapter he told his reader: "Let no one deride this Proposal for Britain as visionary."[266] He then asked Parliament to take the first step even if other nations refused. Clearly his suggestions both from the perspective of the time and in hindsight should be classed as visionary.[267] Yet he wished to disassociate his ideas with

---

[265] Archived at LSE: BEVERIDGE/7/69.
[266] Haddow et al., *The Bomb*, p. 84.
[267] Using Beveridge's own language, the term visionary merely suggests that he proposes an idealistic vision of the future, but does not try to use the term visionary as a means to provide an opinion on the validity of his ideas.

any type of idealistic label, knowing that it would lead many to mock and ignore his ideas as impractical and unrealistic. Once given this label the chance of success would undoubtedly have gone from limited to negligible. In order to be taken seriously as an intellectual, Beveridge felt that his words needed to sound practical and realistic, even if they did not conform to either term.

We can also see his ideas reflected in his political activities in the 1950s. He promoted his ideas on world government in the House of Lords. In May 1958 he called for:

> The need for some form of world government which shall substitute justice for war in the relations between nations, and to urge Her Majesty's Government to formulate proposals for meeting this need, designed to abolish war without restricting in any other respect the self-government of each nation or the free co-operation of nations for any peaceful purpose; and to move for Papers.[268]

When discussing these ideas within the political realm he chose to centre his thoughts on an American book published that year entitled: *World Peace through World Law*.[269] The book called for a revision of the UN charter. These changes included vote allocations based on population; replacing the Security Council with an Executive Council without the power of veto; and disbanding all the world's military forces and replacing them with an international police force.

He urged his fellow politicians to at least think about his ideas even if they would not accept them:

> I do not ask Her Majesty's Government to accept all the propositions in this book, or any of them; but I ask them, and I ask every person who takes this problem of war seriously—and no sane man can avoid taking it seriously—to study this book and to make up their mind what they will accept or what they will not accept in what it says, or whether they have an alternative. That kind of scheme, or some alternative like it, is the one way to combine two desires common to all people of all nations in the world: one, to have peace; and, second, to have their own self-government and their own way of life.[270]

---

[268] HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc305.
[269] Grenville Clark and Louis Bruno Sohn, *World Peace through World Law* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958).
[270] HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc309.

In this debate he was joined most notably by Lord Bertrand Russell and Lord Salisbury. The latter undertook the adversarial position which mirrored the views of the Government, arguing that:

> Successful centralised government, whether that government be national or international, is possible only on one of two bases: first, dictatorship by a minority; secondly, the voluntary subordination by every member and every section of the community of their personal interests to the interests of the community as a whole, and a consequent willingness by all to accept the decisions of the majority, even if that decision goes against them in matters which affect them personally […]

> I am therefore driven reluctantly to the conclusion that, though considerable advances are now possible, and I hope will be made, in the economic and social fields, similar advances in the political field are bound to be slow. I say that with all deference to the noble Lord, Lord Beveridge, who I think was a little more optimistic in that respect than I am. No Summit talks or other initiatives, however desirable in themselves—and I am not questioning their desirability—are likely to alter that fact. I am afraid that failure to recognise this would only, for all of us, pave the way to disappointment and disillusion. Those, as I see it, are at present the hard facts of the world situation.[271]

Unsurprisingly Russell strongly supported Beveridge's ideas and his appeals for contemplation and a more optimistic approach. To the critics he replied:

> Why waste time over what will not come for generations, perhaps for centuries? The answer to that is very simple. If it does not come for generations, it will not come at all, because there will be no human beings left. This is the only method by which we can get any kind of security for the continuation of the human species.[272]

Within all of his ideas on world government Russell's motivation stemmed foremost from the threat of the hydrogen bomb. In this particular speech he emphasized this explicitly:

> The reason why a World Government has become so much more necessary than it ever was before is entirely connected with nuclear weapons. Your Lordships will recall that when gunpowder was invented it came into a world in which there was internal anarchy in every country […] The power in the central Government was provided by gunpowder, and it took a hundred years for the central Governments of England, France and Spain to establish themselves with the help of gunpowder. Gunpowder put an end to internal anarchy; to-day the hydrogen bomb should put an end to international

---

[271] HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc319-320.
[272] HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc332-333.

anarchy in the, same sort of way, only we cannot afford a hundred years, because the weapon now is too dangerous.[273]

Beveridge did not limit his work on this issue to Britain. He undertook numerous international visits and promoted his ideas in the public arena in these countries. On his tour of Australia and New Zealand he emphasized the threat of Soviet totalitarianism and the need to create a federalized government to deal with this. In a press conference in Luxemburg in 1948 he argued that the campaign for a united Europe was not enough and that "World Government is essential."[274]

Russell's efforts took an even more radical stance, arguing directly for a world governing authority. His work lay on the foundation of a certain belief of nuclear war and the absolute necessity of stopping such an event. He spent the majority of his time working through the scientific community in order to appeal to political leaders for change.

Russell's fear of war can be seen in his writings throughout his life. His pacifism led him to argue for some extreme and unconventional views.[275] His 1936 book *Which Way to Peace?* supported the idea of a Nazi occupation as a better alternative than a second world war.[276] While the Second World War brought an end to Russell's belief that occupation was preferable to war, the nuclear age only exacerbated his fears on a global holocaust. The War did, however, teach him the danger of totalitarianism. His dislike of the Soviet Union, which stemmed almost from its conception, led Russell to merge his anti-war views with the desire to maintain a free West.[277]

Alan Ryan has suggested that his call for world government in the 1930s was merely a way to highlight "how far the League of Nations was from being it."[278] While this may have been his ultimate intention, given his support for this idea in the following years and his campaigning for such an organisation, it seems erroneous to dismiss his beliefs

---

[273] HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc334.

[274] Notes by Lord Beveridge for Press Conference Luxemburg, 10 September 1948. Archived at LSE: BEVERIDGE/7/55.

[275] For example, his lecture in 1942 that proposed a Platonic dictatorship as the only way to save society once the war had ended, led to his dismissal from the Barnes Foundation.

[276] Russell, *Which Way to Peace?*

[277] Bertrand Russell and Nicholas Griffin, *The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell: The Public Years, 1914-1970* (London: Routledge, 2001), Letter 479.

[278] Ryan, *Bertrand Russell*, p. 147.

no matter how unlikely the outcome. While, in contrast to other intellectuals, the rise of a nuclear age did not fundamentally affect Russell's views, it did spur him into action and amplify his concerns. What might have started as a feeble suggestion to change the nature of statehood in the 1930s became a major campaign to end all forms of nationalism in the 1950s.[279]

Russell's utopian ideas during the Cold War stemmed most significantly from the threat of war but his early writings showed a great deal of his political sociology as the backdrop to this thinking. *The Scientific Outlook* (1931) discussed the possibility of a dystopian society brought about by the docility of the populace, the megalomania of political officials, and the power of propaganda over people's lives.[280] Science, he foresaw, might on the one hand enrich and advance society, but on the other might give those with excess power and little morality the ability to enslave others.[281]

He brought up the desirability of a world state as the solution to the major economic, political and social problems of a scientific world. Most importantly this provided a solution to war:

> For it is only in the direction of an organized world State that the human race can develop unless it abandons scientific technique, and it will not do this except as the result of a cataclysm so severe as to lower the whole level of civilization.
>
> The advantages to be derived from an organized world State are great and obvious. There will be, in the first place, security against war and a saving of almost the whole effort and expense now devoted to competitive armaments.[282]

He continued to maintain the desire for a world state over the proceeding decades.

Russell's anti-establishment views had dominated the majority of his political career and the years following the Second World War did not differ. He strongly opposed Britain's quest to become a nuclear power and fiercely argued against the US's foreign policy.[283]

---

[279] The only exception was his reaction to the Vietnam War, which prompted a campaign of national self-determinism in light of America's actions.

[280] The book was so similar to *Brave New World* that Russell believed that Huxley had stolen his ideas from *The Scientific Outlook*. See: Ryan, *Bertrand Russell*, p. 136.

[281] Bertrand Russell, *The Scientific Outlook* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931), pp. 209-268.

[282] Russell, *The Scientific Outlook*, p. 219.

[283] Russell was especially outraged by the war in Vietnam and in response set up the Russell Tribunal, an international body made up of representatives of 18 countries, which sought to discover if the United States had violated international law in Vietnam. The representatives were made up of a mix of

He helped organise and establish numerous organisations designed to oppose warfare, nuclear weapons and the militarization of science. When the CND was established in 1957-8 he became its first President; he laid the foundations for the Pugwash Conferences, set up by Joseph Rotblat in 1957, through his joint letter with Albert Einstein two years before;[284] and he founded his own peace organisation in 1963: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation.[285] All three organisations have survived into the present day. Like the CND, Russell's foundation focuses on nuclear warfare although it has a broader platform, campaigning against war in general as well as social injustice and human rights violations.

The Pugwash organisation specifically focuses on science and brings together scientists, intellectuals and politicians from around the globe to discuss major security problems. In the fight against nuclear weapons, scientists themselves led the way.[286] Many scientists joined in the fight for world government, and Pugwash resulted from Einstein's and Russell's quest to unify the world. Einstein himself had argued for world government from 1945 and felt the UN would fail in keeping the peace because it maintained the absolute sovereignty of nation states.[287] The threat of nuclear warfare took centre stage in the creation of Pugwash and the destruction of all nuclear weapons was originally its raison d'être. In his speech at the first Pugwash Conference Russell stated:

> Almost exactly two years have passed since the statement was issued signed by the late Albert Einstein, some nine other colleagues and myself, drawing attention to the dangers that would face humanity if another world war were to break out with the almost certainty of the widespread of nuclear weapons […]
>
> The two years that have elapsed since that statement was issued have not seen any fundamental change in the situation. In fact the stock piles of nuclear weapons have increased […]
>
> The present meeting […] represents a meeting, for the first time, of leading scientists coming from many countries, and representing all shades of

---

intellectuals, academics, politicians, and political activists. These types of tribunals have continued into the present day.

[284] Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein, 'The Russell-Einstein Manifesto,' *Pugwash*, 1955, http://www.pugwash.org/about/manifesto.htm. The Manifesto asked world leaders to help deal with the nuclear problems by seeking peaceful solutions to the international conflict.

[285] It is interesting to note that when Russell set out to create this manifesto he was determined to gather a group of Noble Laureates in physics, headed by Einstein. Russell was convinced that without the prestige of these scientists, and Einstein in particular, the manifesto would have no chance of prompting change.

[286] See Chapter Four for an in-depth analysis.

[287] Joseph Preston Baratta, *The Politics of World Federation: United Nations, UN Reform, Atomic Control*, vol. One (Westport: Praeger, 2004), pp. 143-144.

political opinion, who have seriously considered the dangers of an atomic war and are concerned with what they can do to avert it.[288]

The desire to bring scientists closer together for the aim of peace and co-operation correlates with Russell's ideas on science as the driving force of modern progress and possibly its greatest threat. The participation of scientists in government as part of the war effort and in the development of nuclear weapons encouraged more scientists to engage with politics and fight the growing arms race. As Chapter Four will demonstrate, this participation drew scientists into the public sphere and convinced many to speak out on the dangers and moral objections to military technology. Pugwash was one such avenue for scientists to discuss these threats and the rise of nuclear weapons. Pugwash quickly expanded to include politicians from around the globe with interests in understanding the consequences of scientific warfare. Its work was internationally recognised in 1995 with the Noble Peace Prize.[289]

Some of his more noteworthy acts include his participation in the Committee of 100, where he campaigned outside the Ministry of Defence in 1961. He also wrote letters directly to Heads of Governments on the issues of warfare. In the late 1950s he wrote to Khrushchev and Eisenhower and then lamented on their refusal to understand the issues and propensity to demonize the other side.[290] During the Cuban Missile Crisis he wrote directly to Kennedy, Khrushchev, Macmillan and Castro urging compromise. Both Kennedy and Khrushchev replied and Russell ended up playing a role in the negotiations.[291] The perception of the importance of his telegraphs, which urged a summit, varied both at the time and in the subsequent historiography.[292] Kennedy rebuffed Russell's overtures but both Russell and some of the press at the time felt his letters helped avert a catastrophe.[293]

Russell's participation in the fight against nuclear weapons comes across within this variety of political campaigning but also throughout his numerous speeches and publications in the post-war years. He started such arguments with a speech in the House

---

[288] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 343.

[289] The award was given jointly to the Pugwash Conferences and to its co-founder Joseph Rotblat.

[290] He received responses from both parties. Khrushchev responded directly while Eisenhower's letter was answered by John Dulles, the US Secretary of State.
Bertrand Russell, 'Bertrand Russell Replies', *New Statesman and Nation* 55, 5 April 1958, pp. 426-427.

[291] Ryan, *Bertrand Russell*, pp. 201-202.

[292] For an historiographical analysis and defence of Russell see: A. Seckel, 'Russell and the Cuban Missile-Crisis,' *Russell: The Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies* 4, no. 2 (1984).

[293] Russell's released a book detailing views on his participation: Bertrand Russell, *Unarmed Victory* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1963).

of Lords only three months after the US detonated the atomic bombs on Japan.[294] Again his words spoke directly to his convictions of science as the main catalyst for the future and the dangers thereof:

> All that must take place if our scientific civilization goes on, if it does not bring itself to destruction; all that is bound to happen. We do not want to look at this thing simply from the point of view of the next few years; we want to look at it from the point of view of the future of mankind. The question is a simple one: Is it possible for a scientific society to continue to exist, or must such a society inevitably bring itself to destruction?[295]

Russell's earlier conviction in the totality of the destructive capacity of warfare helped him to grasp the danger of nuclear weapons even before the invention of thermonuclear devices. Ryan has argued Russell "was one of the first laymen to come to terms with the existence of nuclear weapons."[296] This speech in November 1945 certainly captured the danger in ways that few perceived this early on:

> It is not enough to make war rare; great and serious war has got to be abolished […] otherwise man will drop out and the planet will perhaps be happier without us, although we cannot be expected to share that view.[297]

He urged international control over atomic weapons and energy but did not bring in the possibility of world government in the way some of his earlier and later work did.

While others saw nuclear weapons as a sign of war and destruction, he also saw the possibilities of a nuclear world as the catalyst for world government and peace. By the 1950s he started to reach out to the public on these ideas. He started with the suggestion of UN reform, evolving into an international governing body which would have the monopoly on weapons. His writing provided numerous examples of this argument. In 1956 he published an article discussing the idea of a setting up a commission to look at how the UN could be reformed and how to create a worldwide arbitrary body to settle international disputes.[298] He acknowledged the sceptical and incredulous reaction he might receive and suggested that:

---

[294] HL Deb 28 November 1945 vol 138 cc68-137.
[295] HL Deb 28 November 1945 vol 138 cc89.
[296] Ryan, *Bertrand Russell*, p. 176.
[297] HL Deb 28 November 1945 vol 138 cc89.
[298] Article republished in: Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, pp. 20-22.

> Such proposals may sound Utopian and will certainly remain so until international tensions are relaxed, but I think that a little reflection will show the impossibility of preserving the human race by any less drastic method.[299]

Russell was right to perceive that his ideas would not always be taken seriously. This type of reaction can be seen in how Russell was treated by those in the publishing world. While some organisations clamoured to publish his work, others refused to print such ideas despite Russell's eminence as a philosopher and his mainstream political appeal in the post-war years. The *New York Times* rejected an article he wrote in September 1956 entitled *Pros and Cons of Nationalism* and it remained unpublished for six years.[300] Most of the article looked at the negative aspects of nationalism, with Russell characterizing it as "disastrous" and "a grave evil".[301] He then used the article to expand on ways nationalism encouraged and promoted political domination and warfare, and suggested a world governing body as a way to destroy nationalism and end these problems. The editors of the *New York Times* felt that the article was "more of an essay on Internationalism" than on nationalism and refused to print it.[302]

In some respects one can easily understand his concerns that his readers would sneer in disbelief at his ideas. On occasion his suggestions moved away from the 'unlikely but perhaps possible' category into full scale wishful thinking. His paper *How to Avoid a Nuclear War* starts off by discussing changing the UN into a World Authority and ended with the following words:

> The hydrogen bomb, while it has brought unprecedented dangers, has also justified unprecedented hopes. Never before […] has there been any possibility of abolishing war. […] I think few people realise that, if the fear of war were removed, the world could quickly become a paradise. […] I see in my mind's eye a great wave of happiness sweeping over the human race as the old night of hate and fear becomes dispersed. I see a new Golden Age the like of which has never been known since history began.[303]

This correlates with Russell's belief in the magnificence and danger of scientific advancement, and this impassioned speech clearly highlighted his most fervent hopes without any censorship. The article itself, written for *Everybody's Weekly*, followed after two previous overtures in 1955 from this magazine to write on other topics. Russell

---

[299] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 21.
[300] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, pp. 282-288.
[301] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, pp. 285; 288.
[302] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 282.
[303] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 26.

refused both times and made it clear he only wished to write on the problems of nuclear warfare.[304] This particular subject was the most important to Russell and the article he eventually wrote for them clearly demonstrated this passion. The magazine, a London weekly tabloid, was printed in both Britain and the United States and, as a tabloid, appealed to the mass audience. This type of writing shows such a contrast with his words to a political audience which could be attributed to his taking a more serious stance for the latter, but also demonstrated his unwillingness to put forth his more fervent beliefs in the political arena due to doubts of acceptance.

The development of nuclear weapons brought all of Russell's utopian ideals to the forefront of his political thinking. Despite examples of writing that could charitably be described as idealistic, he gave his audience other reasons for a backlash against his ideas. Unlike Beveridge who described a world government that accepted some state autonomy and individual rights, Russell's ideas often came across as authoritarian and even war mongering. His argument in the years between 1945 and 1949, when the United States held a monopoly on atomic weapons, fell into this category. Russell argued that the United States should take the lead in forming a world government to stop any other state from producing these weapons. This included the destruction of any country attempting to do so.[305] He described such a world as "less Utopian and less desirable, but still preferable to the total obliteration of civilized life."[306] These extreme ideas suggest many things about Russell's mind-set at this time. The fear of nuclear weapons, and his belief in the ultimate destruction of civilization as a consequence, pushed away his pacifism and in its place formed a willingness to commit atrocious crimes in order to safeguard the future.[307] It shows a rather unusual form of internationalism, putting his and other countries at risk, under what could only amount to American hegemony.

When discussing the practical side to international relations he downplayed his idealistic dreams and made it clear that, despite similarities with other unrealistic ideas of international unity, his could succeed. In a rather arrogant display in 1948 he contrasted his own ideas with others and argued:

---

[304] Russell, *Detente or Destruction*, 29, p. 23.

[305] Russell, Kasrils, and Feinberg, *Bertrand Russell's America*, II, pp. 3-13.

[306] Bertrand Russell, 'The Bomb and Civilization', *Forward*, quoted in: Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell*, p. 518.

[307] In the following years Russell tried to downplay and ignore his ever having spoken these ideas. See: Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell*, pp. 517-530.

> I suggest that this way of unification is one which the course of events is quite likely to bring about, whereas all other schemes for world federation that I know of are in some degree Utopian, and postulate on the part of large populations actions which seem contrary to normal political impulses.[308]

He shared the disparaging view of utopianism, despite clear evidence of beliefs that follow this type of thinking both in his earlier years and in the following years. He clearly wanted to disassociate himself from such a label and be taken seriously.

This desire makes sense considering he had taken the stage with two of Britain's most distinguished nuclear physicists, Mark Oliphant and P. M. S. Blackett, to give a series of lectures that were published the following year.[309] Both worked on the MAUD Committee, the organisation that preceded the Manhattan Project. After this Oliphant continued his work in America as a member of the Manhattan Project and Blackett received a Nobel Prize that same year.

Russell's contribution, entitled 'Values in the Atomic Age', set out a plan to create a world government with a monopoly on force. Perhaps one of the reasons he did not feel his ideas were utopian came from the harsh realities of what he advocated. Not only did he acknowledge that in creating this type of government it could damage freedom, but he also accepted, however reluctantly, a war to stop Russia from taking over.[310]

Once Russia had succeeded in gaining the atomic bomb in 1949, these views no longer made sense. When one side held the bomb then an atomic war would force the other's surrender and prevent future problems. Now such a war would do exactly what Russell feared, especially once the United States created thermonuclear weapons. Prevention was necessary and world government even more essential to achieve this.

The 1950s saw a duality to Russell's arguments. On the one hand he remained faithful to his belief in world government. Sometimes this took on a federalist stance but more often than not saw him arguing for the complete yielding of national sovereignty. On the other hand nuclear warfare brought out the realist in Russell. The continuing arms race,

---

[308] Bertrand Russell, 'Values in the Atomic Age,' in *The Atomic Age: Sir Halley Stewart Lectures, 1948* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949), p. 102.

[309] Mark Oliphant, P. M. S. Blackett, R. F. Harrod, Bertrand Russell, Lionel Curtis, and D. W. Brogan, *The Atomic Age: Sir Halley Stewart Lectures, 1948* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949).

[310] Russell, 'Values in the Atomic Age', pp. 98-103.

as well as calamities such as the Hungarian Uprising and the Cuban Missile Crisis, pushed Russell to advocate more moderate policies – those he realistically felt could promote change rather than his more extreme ideas on the nature of international politics. The fact that he promoted these ideas suggests that he acknowledged that a change in the nature of statehood, no matter how many times he argued this would work as he wished, would never persuade those that mattered.

His larger monographs published over this decade displayed both sides and emphasised different aims. In 1954 his work *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* first discussed ethical systems and moral obligations, and then applied this thinking to the realm of politics.[311] He concluded the book with two chapters devoted to warfare and how to ensure a stable peace. Within these chapters he argued for a better relationship with Russia as a precursor to developing a world government. War with Russia would destroy any chance of political change. If Russia won, the totalitarian regime that would follow would preclude the possibility of a better future. If they lost, the resulting bitterness would prevent them from considering this type of change which would require trust and friendship.[312] He followed this argument by defending the necessity of world government and the need for both superpowers to give up their sovereignty and independence. He was not complementary of either side, calling them both fanatics, arguing that they fed on each other's fanaticism. He believed giving up their sovereignty would prevent future wars.[313]

His epilogue entitled: 'Prologue or Epilogue?' easily summed up his thinking: either mankind would destroy itself or would find a way to bring forth a better future. Here he stated:

> When I allow myself to hope that the world will emerge from its present troubles […] I see before me a shining vision: a world where none are hungry, where few are ill, where work is pleasant and not excessive, where kindly feeling is common, and where minds released from fear create delight for eye and ear and heart. Do not say this is impossible. It is not impossible.[314]

---

[311] Bertrand Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1954).
[312] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, pp. 222-227.
[313] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, pp. 228-233.
[314] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, p. 238.

> Those who are to lead the world out of its troubles will need courage, hope and love. Whether they will prevail, I do not know; but, beyond all reason, I am unconquerably persuaded that they will.[315]

The utopian and idealist comes through directly in his words. This contrasts greatly to the ideas he presented five years later in *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare* in 1959.[316] Those years had seen the Hungarian Uprising, the Suez Crisis, the Cuban Revolution, and the creation of the Warsaw Pact. The actions of both sides had further alienated and outraged Russell. As the title suggests, he laid out his thinking on nuclear weapons, and his frustration with ideological differences and petty disputes came through clearly. At this point his intentions suggest unilateralism was his main objective rather than the creation of a world state.

His book argued that both sides should set aside their differences and join together to combat the menace of nuclear warfare. The problems created in such an eventuality would affect everyone and thus ideology became meaningless.[317] He suggested the popularity of nuclear weapons arose out of the fear induced insanity of the majority of the Western population, and the blatant stupidity and arrogance of their leaders.[318] The book had no intention of arguing for a global solution; it merely pointed out the problems with the current situation and the incorrect assumptions made to justify it.

Yet even while writing a frank and entirely rational argument against nuclear weapons designed to sway the general population and support the CND, Russell still upheld his utopian ideals. He argued against disarmament describing it as "a palliative rather than a solution."[319] The solution to nuclear warfare could only be the full scale destruction of all nuclear weapons. He knew, however, that as the international situation stood this could never become a reality; neither side would ever trust each other enough to give up their weapons and promising not to fire them gave no guarantees, especially once war broke out. He suggested, instead, a federal solution and imposing an international body

---

[315] Russell, *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*, p. 239.
[316] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*.
[317] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, pp. 1-3.
[318] Discussion on the insanity of nuclear arms became popular from the mid-1950s. Such arguments can be seen throughout the literature of time. Good examples of these can be seen in the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, in which Russell also published these ideas: Bertrand Russell, 'Only World Government Can Prevent the War That Nobody Can Win,' *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 14, no. 7 (1958). For a discussion on irrationality within democracies: Bryan Douglas Caplan, *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).
[319] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, p. 35.

with an international armed force.[320] On the surface this ignored anything that sounded utopian and merely suggested a more advanced version of the UN. Yet in reality these suggestions constitute only a milder, more presentable version of his views on world government.

The 1960s brought further revisions to his arguments. By the end of 1959 he no longer saw the value and effectiveness of Pugwash and the CND as public protest movements.[321] The near disaster in Cuba in 1962 gave him further reasons to mistrust those in power and emphasized the idea that their tactics would lead to a catastrophe. Part of this was mollified the following year with the Partial Test Ban Treaty, but not nearly enough to placate his fears. In 1961 he published his final treatise on nuclear warfare: *Has Man a Future?*[322]

This work led straight on from *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. The conclusion 'Prologue or Epilogue?' became the title for the first chapter of this new work. In doing so he started directly by letting his reader know that his views had not significantly changed in the intervening seven years. This introduction had nothing to do with the current problems but instead drew on a scientific and social scientific history of humanity to frame the backdrop of his argument: that despite all our mistakes the human race deserves saving.

By framing the argument in such a way he immediately tried to present his words as a reasonable scientific argument, drawn from facts and a rational basis. He then went on to discuss the evolution of the nuclear age, bringing him once again to the conclusion that in order to save humanity we must turn towards a world government for the solution. The book had a much more scientific basis than some of his other works and used the science of the atomic age, interwoven with historical events, to help explain how the world had changed.

Russell discussed the obstacles to world government that resulted primarily from the strong nationalistic sentiment that had grown over the last two centuries. Such feelings, he argued, espoused the belief in national freedom which in reality merely allowed nations to harm others and defend such harm. He suggested that the idea that the British

---

[320] Russell, *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*, pp. 53-59.
[321] Clark, *Life of Bertrand Russell*, pp. 568-569.
[322] Bertrand Russell, *Has Man a Future?* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1961).

believed 'Britons never, never, never shall be slaves' justified their right to commit crimes against other nations.[323]

Overall the tone of the book comes across as rather bleak and defensive. Russell's frustration with the current international situation clearly flows through his words. The language used supports the view that he felt his earlier words had gone unheeded. His arguments looked at the objections to his ideas and obstacles to overcome rather than providing positive reasons to implement them, unless stopping the destructive of the human race could count as positive.

These feelings did not, however, prevent him from further activism and attempts to implement change and alter public and political perceptions. Shortly after he attempted his intervention during the Cuban Missile Crisis and wrote up his account for public consumption.[324] Whilst entering his ninth decade he continued his work, focusing on the problems in Vietnam. In 1967 he released the book *War Crimes in Vietnam* in tandem with setting up the Russell Tribunal to provide a public forum to assess the legalities of America's actions.[325]

Part 3 – The Utopian Solution to World Peace

Beveridge and Russell helped lead the charge for these campaigns, and they were joined by other British intellectuals who put forth ideas on the rise of a world government and explored the growing problems of nationalism.

Victor Gollancz became another major public intellectual to espouse the vision of world peace. His political work and campaigning featured predominantly in the 1930s and during the Second World War. In the following years his writing moved away from political issues towards philosophy. He did, however, remain an active political campaigner, and focused on promoting his pacifist views, which had been cemented by

---

[323] Russell, *Has Man a Future?*, p. 83.

[324] Russell, *Has Man a Future*; Russell, *Unarmed Victory*.

[325] Bertrand Russell, *War Crimes in Vietnam* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1967). This organisation, more formally known as the International War Crimes Tribunal, was set up by Russell to campaign against the war in Vietnam. It brought together 25 people associated with peace organisations, many with major accomplishments in the fields of peace and human rights, to form a tribunal committee to debate the legalities of America's war. The organisation has had subsequent tribunals since and remains active today.

the war and the Holocaust. In 1951 he helped found the Association for World Peace (AWP) and he became involved in the CND in 1958.

The AWP came into existence as a result of a letter he wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* on 12 February 1951.[326] In the letter he criticized the war in Korea and the "branding" of China as the enemy. He called for a conference with Russia and help for the starving. He wanted "to see our own country, by the size of its proposed contribution, challenging the world to a new kind of rivalry, a rivalry in the works of peace."[327] He ended the letter with the plea:

> May I ask through you, sir, that all who are in agreement with this letter should send a postcard with just the word 'Yes' and their name and address to me […] I do not guarantee any action of any kind but if the response is large enough something might possibly come of it.[328]

Within a few weeks, and alongside a follow up letter to the press, he received approximately 10,000 replies.[329] As a result he helped set up the AWP and remained its chairman until October 1952. The organisation aimed to promote world peace, facilitate the independence of states under colonial rule, and acted to help eliminate world hunger and poverty.

Unlike others with similar views, Gollancz's drive for world peace did not come primarily as a result of the fear of nuclear weapons but the fear of the destruction of liberal values and freedom. In 1946 he set out a discussion on this problem in *Our Threatened Values*.[330] Gollancz saw the problems of a divided world exacerbating existing issues of human rights and poverty. By categorizing states into allies and enemies based on their ideology, the Great Powers ignored the problems of the ordinary people and increased their suffering.

In this book we can see the start of his ideas on world peace as a response to his growing pacifist convictions. He argued for the rights of each person without reference to their country or creed. He claimed "the government is failing or very largely failing to put

---

[326] Victor Gollancz, 'Working for Peace', *Manchester Guardian*, 12 February 1951, p. 4.
[327] Gollancz, 'Working for Peace', p. 4.
[328] Gollancz, 'Working for Peace', p. 4.
[329] Edwards, *Victor Gollancz*, p. 619.
[330] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*.

into practice, and even into speech, the belief that national 'interests' must always be over-ridden by considerations of the international good."[331]

By the 1950s this view had not altered significantly. On the issue of war and peace he wrote:

> First I regard the Soviet regime as, in nearly every aspect, the worst in the world today. Secondly, while I am sure that the Soviet Union does not desire war, I am equally sure that her policies in international affairs constitute by far the greatest menace, at the present time, to world peace.[332]

The aims of the AWP clearly differ from organisations which promoted world government. Both, however, strove to end warfare for good and the AWP's aims were no less idealistic. The effects of warfare and the threats to Western ideals incited Gollancz to speak out on the need for change. His disillusionment with the Labour Party encouraged him to take action and campaign on these issues. Once in power Gollancz felt that Labour had abandoned their international beliefs and continued to oversee a government that cared only for themselves. Their propaganda against the people of unfriendly nations and the Korean War cemented this idea.

Part 4 – The Challenge to Utopianism

Some intellectuals, when faced with the realities of nuclear warfare, turned to idealistic concepts of world government but it would be wrong to think that this change occurred universally amongst British intellectuals. The previous chapter demonstrated the move away from absolutism and idealism within many British socialists. The following chapter will also discuss the work of John Strachey who moved away from idealism and internationalism.[333] Richard Crossman provides another example. Crossman, while not having a problem with the concept of utopianism, strongly believed in the concepts of national self-determination and maintaining nation states.[334] It is in the work of E. H. Carr, however, that we find one of the fullest rebuttals of utopianism.

---

[331] Gollancz, *Our Threatened Values*, p. 30.
[332] Undated typed document. Most likely written in 1952. Warwick Modern Records Centre: MSS.157/3/AW/1/60.
[333] For an in-depth commentary, see Chapter Three.
[334] He expressed this in an article written in 1950 and reprinted in: R. H. S. Crossman, *Planning for Freedom* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1965), pp. 151-157.

The influence of realism as a discipline in International Relations theory is a testament partly to the importance and success of *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. At the time it had wide ranging consequences on the outlook of international relations and provided a hard blow to the concept of idealism and utopianism as a mode of analysing these relations. The intellectuals described by this chapter as utopians fall in line, at least in part, with Carr's understanding. The intellectuals themselves, however, often rejected the label and connotations that came with it. To their minds reality was not being unheeded, merely altered through planned reconstruction. While none of the intellectuals discussed here brought up Carr directly, there was every possibility that their rejection of the label utopianism came at least partly from the influence of his ideas and the lack of acceptability the term held within the intellectual community in the post-war years.

One of Carr's suggestions on why they derived these conclusions came from the difference between intellectuals and bureaucrats. He argued:

> It is in the nature of things that the intellectual should find himself in the camp which seeks to make practice conform to theory; for intellectuals are particularly reluctant to recognize their thought as conditioned by forces external to themselves, and like to think of themselves as leaders whose theories provide the motive force for so-called men of action.[335]

Part of this critique came from the optimistic and idealistic response to the First World War. The belief in a supra-national organisation which could prevent war stopped politicians and intellectuals from analysing the reality of international politics. Instead they focused on end results which would not necessarily prevail:

> The passionate desire to prevent war determined the whole initial course and direction of the study. Like other infant sciences, the science of international politics has been markedly and frankly utopian. It has been in the initial stage in which wishing prevails over thinking, generalization over observation, and in which little attempt is made at a critical analysis of existing facts or available means. In this stage, attention is concentrated almost exclusively on the end to be achieved.[336]

Carr believed when choosing to analyse reality, an intellectual should never fall for this type of illusion. The fervent desire for something does not translate into its coming into being. This is true when looking at a utopian future. "Few people do desire a 'world-state' or 'collective security', and that those who think they desire it mean different and

---

[335] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, pp. 19-20.
[336] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, pp. 11-12.

incompatible things by it.[337] The intellectuals that chose to embrace a utopian vision after the Second World War did so with the weight of realism hanging over their ideas and prejudicing their audience. Yet they clearly felt the exact opposite: that if enough people believed that action could be taken then society could change. The aspect that binds their views together with Carr's is the insistence that their ideas are not utopian. The fact that belief and action can achieve results, these intellectuals argued, came from the fact that their ideas were plausible and workable rather than idealistic and utopian. They tried to prove their ideas did not fall into this type of model, even if they conformed exactly to the problems Carr outlined.

While there are numerous types of utopianism than the ones discussed here, those that desire a unified world for the purpose of maintaining peace fall under the label of international relations. In saying this, however, they do not necessarily conform precisely to the utopianism Carr is arguing against. His problem stems from a utopian understanding of the forces within international relations, rather than the desire to create a utopian system. Yet these desires do seem to contradict the realist forces of anarchy (and are in fact deliberately trying to destroy them) that Carr felt were necessary for the understanding of the international system. When it came to the prospect of forming this type of system, Carr did not rule it out in *Twenty Years'* but merely added that "those elegant superstructures must wait until some progress has been made in digging the foundations".[338] These superstructures refer to international organisations designed to bring order and unity such as the League of Nations. At this time the League had collapsed and failed at its primary objective, and the UN had yet to be formed.

By 1945 Carr himself had not ruled out the existence of such an institution. In his book *Nationalism and After* Carr descried the evils seen within nationalism, examining how the nation became more important than the people within it; the totalitarian nature of conscription; and nationalism as the motivator for warfare.[339] He did point out, however, that the nationalistic fervour that had overtaken the world from 1914 had receded in recent years. The current war showed less signs of nationalism (at least on the side of the Allies) and the years after it would not follow the same path as the years after 1918. At the end of the book he disparaged idealistic dreams of a world authority but suggested

---

[337] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, pp. 13-14.
[338] Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, p. 307.
[339] Edward Hallett Carr, *Nationalism and After* (London: Macmillan, 1945).

that the best way to gain security and social justice lay "in a balanced structure of international or multi-national groupings".[340]

Despite the problems seen during the Cold War, Carr maintained these views and released the book again in 1968 without any revisions. In the postscript (seen in both editions) he proposed closer relations between Britain and Western Europe, as well as trying to bring these countries together. "Common economic planning, as well as joint military organization, will alone enable western Europe, Britain included, to confront the future with united strength and confidence."[341]

Part 5 – The Political View

While officially the British government promoted a nationalist stance, it is interesting to note that ideas on world government did not come exclusively from the intellectual realm. A political movement started by Churchill emerged in the late 1940s dedicated to uniting Europe.

The campaign had two main objectives. The first related to finding a solution for the international problems facing the world in the aftermath of the war. In particular he wished to avoid another war. The second looked further into the future and fell into similar patterns to the intellectuals discussed in this chapter. The desire for a united Europe to evolve further as a platform for world government underpinned his words. In his first speech on the issue he concluded by stating "The creation of an authoritative, all powerful world order is the ultimate aim towards which we must strive."[342]

His main purpose in calling for a united Europe was to create a power bloc to compete with the Soviet Union and the United States. Including the Empire and Commonwealth he called these blocs "the four main pillars of the world Temple of Peace."[343] Despite his words seemingly putting each bloc on equal footing, this campaign undoubtedly came in part as a response to the weakening of Britain and the deterioration of her empire. Europe had the potential to stand up to the United States and the Soviet Union but its

---

[340] Carr, *Nationalism and After*, pp. 69-70.
[341] Carr, *Nationalism and After*, p. 73.
[342] Winston Churchill, *Europe Unite: Speeches 1947 and 1948* (Cassell, 1950), p. 85.
[343] Churchill, *Europe Unite*, pp. 79-80.

fractured and weakened state in the wake of the war made this impossible. Churchill aimed to promote British power through this strategy and take the lead within Europe.

The campaign's origins started as early as 1930 and developed during the war when Churchill argued for a United States of Europe, in opposition to US opinion and dissent from the Foreign Office.[344] In May 1947 he, along with Duncan Sandys, founded The British United Europe Movement. His message came across most prominently at a speech given at The Hague in May 1948.[345] Here he called for "nothing less than the union of Europe as a whole".[346] His main argument for this political change was "Freedom from Fear" from the problems caused by "nationalistic ambitions" and "ideological fanaticism".[347]

In other speeches given on this topic he suggested that his motivations also lay beyond merely uniting Europe and moving towards a utopian framework. He argued:

> Without a United Europe there is no sure prospect of world government […] If, during the next five years, it is found possible to build a world organisation of irresistible force and inviolable authority for the purpose of securing peace, there are no limits to the blessings which all men may enjoy and share. Nothing will help forward the building of that world organisation so much as unity and stability in a Europe that is conscious of her collective personality and resolved to assume her rightful part in guiding the unfolding destinies of man.[348]

Yet in contrast to the ideas of the intellectuals who promoted these arguments, Churchill clearly did not truly embrace the concept of world government. At the same time he started this campaign he continued to support his imperialistic agenda and promoted the East-West divide with his famous 'iron curtain' speech.

His detractors also doubted his convictions in these ideas and his commitment to anything other than the future of Britain and the Empire. Many intellectuals on the Left, who had always associated Churchill with imperialism, spoke out on his hypocrisy. In

---

[344] Klaus Larres, *Churchill's Cold War: The Politics of Personal Diplomacy* (London: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 54.
[345] See: Churchill, *Europe Unite*, pp. 310-317.
[346] Churchill, *Europe Unite*, p. 314.
[347] Churchill, *Europe Unite*, p. 316.
[348] Churchill, *Europe Unite*, p. 85.

1939 before the outbreak of war,[349] Cole accused Churchill and his supporters of holding the position of the far right of the Conservative Party and only willing to fight fascism as long as it was in the interests of the British Empire and would not strengthen communism.[350] He later reiterated this sentiment after Churchill had helped to defeat fascism.[351] During the war Laski argued that Churchill's desire to annihilate the enemy blinded him to the problems facing British freedom.[352] After the war he accused him of being the architect of the Russian containment policy, and called him a traditionalist that only cared about the Empire.[353] His ideas for a united Europe, Laski argued, were designed "to keep the Russians behind the line of Vistula."[354]

Conclusion

The change in the nature of warfare in the nuclear age brought about a major shift in intellectual thinking on ways to tackle the growing threat. New ideas emerged that indicate that a growing group of intellectuals no longer believed that the British state could protect its people and their values from the present dangers. Fear of the Soviet Union, mistrust of the American government and the destruction of the British international power base all helped increase these concerns.

These intellectuals started to posit a new type of intellectual system which reduced or eliminated the power of nation states. The internationalist debate of the inter-war period now shifted towards a more encompassing concept of international relations that linked states together far more closely than the treaties and goodwill of the 1920s. Intellectuals such as William Beveridge and Bertrand Russell turned towards this campaign to promote their fears on the consequences of nuclear weapons and their desire to encourage change at the political level. This became particularly difficult in the post-war climate of nationalism and scepticism that pervaded British politics and culture.

---

[349] Although the article, taken from Cole's private archive in Nuffield College Oxford, is only dated c.1939, the content suggests that it was written before war broke out.
[350] G. D. H. Cole, 'In England Now', 1939, pp. 5-8. Cole Archive, Nuffield College, A1/70/7/1-13.
[351] G. D. H. Cole, *A History of the Labour Party from 1914* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948), p. 319.
[352] Harold Jospeh Laski, 'Mr Churchill's Conception of Victory', *New Statesman and Nation* 23, 11 April 1942, pp. 235-236; Laski, *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*, pp. 140-178.
[353] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*. The book was published in 1952, two years after Laski's death. He originally wrote it during the war in 1943 and then made major revisions over the years leading up to his death. The language in this section suggests that it was written during the Cold War.
[354] Laski, *The Dilemma of Our Times*, p. 43.

Traditionally this period has been associated with a lack of ideology and idealism. The Cold War brought realism to the forefront of political thinking and the strong ideological trends of the inter-war years had waned. Within academia, scholars commented on the lack of ideology and the deterioration of political theory.[355] While not disputing these trends, this chapter emphasises an alternative discourse that emerged as a result of the Cold War among British intellectuals. This challenges the argument that idealism had died and demonstrates the growing movement towards utopianism at this time.

This chapter also highlights the growing desire to initiate political activism as well as publish the written word as a means of exacting change. This shift towards a more politically active form of intellectual campaigning links to discussion on scientific intellectuals within chapter four who became more politically active as a result of their role in the warfare state.

---

[355] Berlin, 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?'; Bell, *The End of Ideology*.

Chapter Three: John Strachey: A Case Study in Intellectual and Political Discourse

Introduction

> [The nuclear] bomb did not make itself. Human beings made it. I cannot help recalling those words of that great British physicist Professor Aston, who adjured us "not to interfere with the angry atoms". We did interfere with them, perhaps inevitably, perhaps even rightly, but now that we have done it, what matters is that the peoples of the world should realise what it means to live in a world where the power of almost ultimate destruction is for the first time in history in human hands.
>
> That realisation matters in terms of practical politics, because things which may have been chimerical, fanciful, Utopian before that realisation may become hard practical politics after it.[356]

John Strachey MP spoke these words in 1954 in the House of Commons. They summarised Strachey's intellectual life and his interest in warfare. Starting out as a Marxist, Strachey's philosophy evolved into social democracy. In the inter-war years he had devoted his time to understanding the economic changes of the modern world. By the 1960s the problems of nuclear warfare had become his first priority. This chapter will examine this evolution and look at how his political career shaped his intellectual interests.

In an obituary Lord Boothby wrote of Strachey: "He will not go down to history as a great parliamentarian; but he was one of the great political thinkers and teachers of our time and on that far more secure foundation his fame will surely rest."[357] It is perhaps the attitude that his intellectual eminence far outweighed his political career that has influenced the subsequent literature on Strachey. As a result scholars have focused on his intellectual career and the importance of his ideological shifts. Michael Newman and Noel Thompson have both written biographies of Strachey which highlight the intellectual and ideological aspects of his work.[358] Thompson specifically considered Strachey an intellectual, and his biography focuses on his writings and ideological stance. Newman's account is part of the series *Lives of the Left* which produced a collection of biographies on left-wing intellectuals and politicians. For this reason Newman's account focuses on Strachey's role as an MP and in shaping the economic

---

[356] HC Deb, 05 April 1954, vol 526, cc62.
[357] Lord Boothby, 'Mr John Strachey', *Times*, 17 July 1963, p. 15.
[358] Michael Newman, *John Strachey* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989); Noel Thompson, *John Strachey: An Intellectual Biography* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993).

discourse of the Left. This chapter will focus on Strachey's ideas on warfare and attempt to demonstrate the impact of his time in office on his intellectual ideas. These features help explain the shifts in his arguments, the impact of the nuclear conflict in his later years, and the development of a more pragmatic and realist stance.

As a young intellectual with a mistrust of elitism, Strachey gravitated to absolutist visions of statehood which became fully fledged Marxism by the 1930s. By the late 1930s Strachey had incorporated the ideas of Keynes into his philosophy and foresaw a means to save capitalism. These thoughts, alongside his disillusionment with the Soviet Union, led him to abandon Marxism and drew him towards a more mainstream social democratic stance. He then stood for Parliament and later became the Secretary of State for War during the first part of conflict in Korea. This role altered his arguments and he became more pragmatic in his stance on warfare. As the 1950s progressed and nuclear warfare became the most important aspect of international relations, Strachey started to develop arguments on how to prevent such a war and deal with the international crisis. His ideas promoted the balance of power between the superpowers and rejected unilateralism.

The chapter will demonstrate the impact of political expertise in framing Strachey's later thoughts and the desire for a more conciliatory approach to international politics. It will chart the events of the Korean War and the Anglo-American relationship, which were key aspects of Strachey's political life. Firstly it will ask how Strachey's political life impacted on his intellectual outlook, and secondly why his views on warfare changed so significantly within this time period. In relation to the thesis as whole, this chapter looks in-depth at some of the ideas presented in the previous chapters. It specifically focuses on the role of ideology and absolutism, and the importance of nuclear warfare as a prerequisite for intellectual transformation. It also highlights the importance of government work on formulating intellectual ideas, which will also be examined in the next chapter.

As an intellectual Strachey became known as one of Britain's most renowned thinkers, both for his work on socialism and for his analysis of the nuclear situation. The influence of his work, both at home and abroad, came across through the reaction of the intellectual community. His later works in particular received great respect and adulation. A few examples include the words of the Cambridge historian Professor

Denis Brogan. He described Strachey's *End of Empire* as "an extremely acute, unbiased, well-informed and, above all, sagacious and courageous study of a great current problem".[359] In the United States, *On the Prevention of War* received great acclaim. The journalist William Shands Meacham suggested "Readers may disagree with some of Mr. Strachey's theories. Even the dissenters must agree that he had brought a first-rate mind to the study of facts."[360]

The thesis examines the contribution of a wide selection of intellectuals. By devoting an entire chapter to one intellectual, the thesis is giving Strachey more attention than any other subject. Yet as a case study, Strachey's work on warfare outweighs many other intellectuals' and his ideas help extrapolate the arguments in the previous chapters not only through his writings but through his own personal transformation and career trajectory. His work also helps examine the difference between intellectuals and politicians, as a member of both worlds, when it comes to thinking and acting on matters of warfare.

Strachey's intellectual career started from a young age. His father, who owned and edited the *Spectator*, introduced him to intellectual discussion. He started his professional life working for this periodical but soon became disillusioned with the British upper-class and turned towards socialism in his early twenties, writing for the *New Leader*, an Independent Labour Party journal in 1923. His career combined both political commentary and activity. He failed to gain a seat in the House of Commons as a Labour candidate in 1924 but went on to campaign with Oswald Mosley for more expansionist economic policies to provide incentives to manufacturers and help the working class.[361] This included political campaigning and publishing his first major work *Revolution by Reason*.[362] In 1929 he became an MP but resigned from the Labour Party the following year in opposition to the government's refusal to implement more radical economic policies. Together with Mosley he formed the New Party in 1931 but left soon afterwards due to Mosley's turn to fascism. He continued as a political activist at this time, becoming the Treasurer of the National Anti-War Council in 1932. This

---

[359] D. W. Brogan, 'Re-thinking Imperialism', *Encounter* XIV, May 1960, p. 75.
[360] William Shands Meacham, 'Man's Habit of War: Stabilized Power Minimizes Danger', Unknown American Newspaper. John Strachey Historical Manuscripts Archive, other publications c1956-62.
[361] Michael Newman, 'Strachey, (Evelyn) John St Loe (1901–1963)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36337, accessed 2 May 2014].
[362] John Strachey, *Revolution by Reason: An Account of the Financial Proposals Submitted to the Labour Movement by Mr. Oswald Mosley* (London: Leonard Parsons, 1925).

organisation brought together many on the far-Left to campaign for peace. In his role Strachey wrote pamphlets and gave speeches in national demonstrations alongside other campaigners including MPs Aneurin Bevan and James Maxton, and Marxists including Harry Pollitt.

Despite being rejected by the CPGB as an unreliable intellectual, Strachey worked throughout the 1930s as a Marxist writer, producing numerous volumes including *The Coming Struggle for Power* and *The Menace of Fascism*.[363] In 1936 he joined with Victor Gollancz and Harold Laski to form The Left Book Club and published several works through this organisation including *The Theory and Practice of Socialism*, which was the club's most successful publication.[364]

His intellectual belief in Marxism started to diminish by the late 1930s and he turned towards a Keynesian economic model. In 1940 he officially broke off his affiliation with the CPGB. Over the next two years he reconciled the emotional fallout of this decision and decided to return to the Labour Party. This break resulted not only from his move away from Marxism as a philosophy but also due to the actions of the CPGB during the war. Their support for the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact challenged Strachey's patriotism and his pronounced anti-fascism. He volunteered as an Air Raid Protection Warden in 1940 and was accepted into the Royal Air Force in 1941. Here his standing as an intellectual brought him to the position as a public relations officer and he gave numerous public addresses in support of British war policy.[365]

Following this he successfully ran as an MP candidate for the Labour Party in the 1945 General Election. Attlee appointed him as Minister of Food in 1946 and the Secretary of State for War in 1950-51. His time as Secretary of State for War in particular brought a new perspective to Strachey's writing. The direct involvement in the events of Korea and the difficulties of political life challenged Strachey's intellectual outlook and he became more conscious of the problems of international relations. After his time in government ended with the Labour defeat in 1951 he retained his position as a back-bench MP and focused on his career as an intellectual. From 1956 to his death in 1963 he was appointed to Labour's front-bench and dealt with various issues of defence.[366]

---

[363] Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power*; Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*.
[364] John Strachey, *The Theory and Practice of Socialism* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1936).
[365] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 81-82.
[366] Newman, *John Strachey*, p. 155.

Between 1956 and 1962 he published a set of three works: *Contemporary Capitalism*, *The End of Empire* and *On the Prevention of War*.[367] His most pressing issue became the Cold War and the growing concern over a nuclear war. *On the Prevention of War* promoted American deterrence policies and gave a realist perspective on the nuclear stalemate.

The chapter will firstly examine the shifts in his ideas in the late 1930s, discuss the progression within his ideas and ideology, and examine the influence of his time in office. The chapter will pay particular attention to the Korean War and the changes to defence policy from 1957. This discussion will explore the influence his political life had on his intellectual trajectory and how this work impacted on his discussion of nuclear warfare.

Focusing on Strachey's understanding of warfare, the chapter will not attempt to dissect his ideological stance. Previous studies of Strachey, in particular Thompson's intellectual biography, have given in-depth accounts of Strachey's understanding of socialism. Instead this chapter will question how far the politics of war influenced Strachey's ideological transformation. Such changes include a move from a utopian form of socialism to social democracy based on a realist perspective. The move from socialism to social democracy is less surprising than the move from utopianism to realism. As realism accepts an anarchical interpretation of international relations, his later ideas show an entirely different understanding of state interactions.

His earlier work promoted an absolutist ideology that desired a world-wide socialist revolution. The 1929 crash destroyed his hope for democracy and he moved from a liberal socialist perspective to a Marxist one.[368] In 1932 he argued: "the death of capitalism and the substitution of another economic system in its place, will leave no single side of life unaltered."[369] His conviction in the destruction of capitalism led to a utopian desire for a revolution on a global scale. His words clearly encapsulate a utopian vision, believing a socialist revolution would be the start of a "glorious epoch" in history.[370] By the 1950s Strachey had abandoned the desire for global revolution and

---

[367] John Strachey, *Contemporary Capitalism* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1956); John Strachey, *The End of Empire* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1959); Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*.
[368] Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*, pp. 28-41.
[369] Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power*, p. 155.
[370] Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power*, p. 155.

concentrated on smaller, more feasible changes. In 1962 he used a balance of power analysis to discuss the best way to achieve peace. His theories used international law but accepted the existence of nation states. This chapter will highlight how the politics and realities of war formed the foundation of this change.

Part 1 – The 1930s

Strachey's intellectual drive was intrinsically linked with his political activities. His relationship with Oswald Mosley defined his earlier work and set the tone for his later work. From 1924 they formed a partnership and explored the radical politics that eventually became the basis for the New Party. During the election campaign in May 1929 Strachey urged socialists within the Labour Party to push for reforms and maintain a socialist platform. He desired to use the parliamentary system to help bring about reform rather than revolution and believed that the capitalist system had stabilised.

His triumphant victory and positive attitude towards capitalism was soon destroyed by the economic collapse in October. Mosley put forth a proposal that became known as the 'Mosley Memorandum' to address the economic and political problems in 1930. The failure to convince the government led both Mosley and Strachey to resign from the Labour Party in May 1930 and set up the New Party in late February 1931. Strachey denounced Mosley soon after as a fascist and resigned from the New Party in July, ending their partnership.

By this time he had become entirely disillusioned with British politics. Strachey regretted joining the New Party and felt unsure about his future. He turned towards intellectual writing throughout the 1930s and wrote as a Marxist affiliated with the CPGB. He worked as an intellectual, promoting their agenda although his membership was rejected in 1932 due to their distrust of intellectuals and his own political past. At this time his writings became more radical and emphasised a desire for revolution. The growing influence of fascism also dominated his intellectual writings.[371] The years from 1932 demonstrate a shift in his arguments, moving from socialism to Marxism, which was influenced directly by his time in office and his conflict with Mosley.

---

[371] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 23-48.

Strachey desperately desired to create awareness of the growing problems in Europe and the likelihood of deception by the Nazis. He started to examine the issues surrounding warfare in more depth and they increasingly become more central within his work. In 1933 he published a book entitled *The Menace of Fascism* which discussed his views on the ideology and the danger a fascist Germany posed to the rest of Europe.[372] At this point he firmly positioned himself on the far Left with the view that eventually capitalism would fall and socialism would take its place. *Menace* portrayed Strachey's appeal against fascism, highlighting the dangers inherent within the philosophy that could only lead to greater problems within Europe. He argued that a philosophy founded on conquest would inevitably lead to war across the continent and its values threatened to undo all the improvements in living standards seen within the last century. Strachey advocated a forward progression merging the positive aspects of democracy with the benefits of a socialist economy.

The rise of fascism in the 1930s justified all of Strachey's fears and antipathy for capitalism and the dangers of imperialism. In *Menace* he explicitly argued that capitalism inevitably led to fascism and the liberal capitalist states would soon become fascist unless they took action towards socialism. Yet fascism also provided Strachey with a contrast between liberal capitalism which tended to lean towards pacific-ism and the militarism and aggression of fascism. In comparison the liberal states seemed the far better option.

The importance of democracy within his thinking remains the key to understanding his work. While his arguments on the nature of economics within a democratic state changed over time, the fundamental principles which made up his thinking on a democracy remained constant. In *Menace* he characterised democracy through the liberties derived from a state that granted its people universal suffrage. He promoted democratic rights of association and assembly, and freedom of speech.[373]

The rise of fascism and the threat of war helped focus his belief in democracy. It also helped push Strachey away from analysing states through an ideological lens. By 1938 he started to see the values enshrined within a state as of greater importance than its overall ideology and economic system. In a private letter Strachey argued that "it is not a

---

[372] Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*.
[373] Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*, pp. 28-29; 246.

question now of whether this country is to become socialist or remain capitalist [...] It is a question of whether or not we are to remain free to choose what we are to become."[374]

Strachey's work responded to this problem and he used his arguments to make others aware of these dangers. He believed that the rise of unemployment would lead to social unrest and eventually seal the destruction of capitalism. In 1933 when he wrote *Menace* unemployment in Britain reached its highest point and the consequences of the Great Depression drove Strachey to believe that this heralded the end of capitalism.[375] He briefly touched on the situation in America but only as another example of a capitalist state in danger of fascism.[376] After visiting America shortly afterwards he started to explore this nation in more depth. Time spent in America only increased his belief that politicians and officials did not care about the problems of the ordinary people. In 1934 he spoke of his dealings with a Democrat recently elected to the State Legislature by a normally Republican town. Having believed that Democrats represented the liberal sector of American political thought, Strachey was shocked when this official came out against a relief commissary system for the unemployed because he felt it brought the unemployed together, "letting them talk amongst themselves, and that's dangerous."[377] Whether the official meant dangerous to the town or the government is not known but Strachey's clear sense of outrage and betrayal at such an opinion suggests he felt the Democrat had intended the latter. Other examples of similar sentiments came from the attitude of 'Mercy Inc' in the United States, which despite having a mandate to help the unemployed still felt the status of unemployed citizens came as a result of their own failures, and the corporation even came out and suggested letting them all die for the benefit of society as a whole.[378] Strachey's outrage at these attitudes went hand in hand not only with his humanity but his belief that unemployment came from the flaws in the system and not the flaws of its victims. Strachey had examined the issue of unemployment in 1932 and described it as "The most striking and visible form of waste […] the enforced physical deterioration, that is, of millions of human beings".[379]

---

[374] Letter to Robert Boothby, 2 October 1938, p. 1. Strachey Archive, papers 1936-38.

[375] By 1933 unemployment in Britain had been estimated at 17.0% with 3.4 million workers unemployed. In comparison unemployment was estimated at 12.2% in 1921 and only 8.0% in 1929. Source: John Burnett, *Idle Hands: The Experience of Unemployment, 1790-1990* (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 205.

[376] Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*, p. 139.

[377] John Strachey, 'The Unemployed under the New Deal in America', *New Statesman and Nation Review* 7, 17 March 1934, pp. 402-403.

[378] John Strachey, 'Mercy Pays', *New Statesman and Nation* 8, 1 September 1934, pp. 260-261.

[379] Strachey, *The Coming Struggle for Power*, p. 89.

Strachey believed that unemployment would cease through the implementation of state controlled means of production.

Rather than allowing the upper classes to institute a fascist regime in Britain, he argued the workers should use their democratic rights to implement a socialist revolution. He used the example of the Soviet Union to enhance the positive aspects of this idea, arguing, "the Russian government [...] has realized for the Russian workers one hundred times as much democracy and liberty" than any capitalist regime could imagine let alone achieve.[380] He also fully acknowledged that the Soviet Union embraced a political dictatorship but at this point in his life Strachey felt the rights obtained in a socialist dictatorship provided more freedom than any rights afforded to the people within a capitalist democracy. He put more emphasis on the ideology of a state rather than the authoritarian nature of its government and could accept a dictatorship as long as the majority (or what he perceived as the majority) held the power.

The desire to frame his ideas through an ideological structure led to contradictions within his thinking. The fight against fascism highlighted the positive aspects of democratic capitalism that did not exist within fascist states but when faced with a socialist state he ignored these in favour of socialist economic progress. This mirrored other socialist thinking at this time and resembles the blindness shown by intellectuals such as Carr and Cole in their adherence to ideological beliefs over the actual political realities of a socialist state.

One major problem resulted in attempting to put socialist theory into practice. In broad terms theorists such as Strachey believed that once the whole world turned to socialism the problems of warfare would disappear because war resulted from imperial capitalist powers challenging each other. The problem here came from the need to make all countries adopt socialism. To do so either one needed a violent revolution (almost certainly resulting in some form of civil war), or a democratic move towards socialism. Karl Marx and the Bolsheviks in Russia preferred the former option and accepted the resulting warfare as a short-term consequence necessary for eventual peace. This also included the acceptance of the loss of liberty in the short term in order to achieve a better world in the long term. In reality this translated into an authoritarian regime that advocated violence and suppression to increase its power.

---

[380] Strachey, *The Menace of Fascism*, p. 250.

For the British socialists the idea of a violent revolution followed by dictatorship did not appeal as much. Some, such as Harold Laski, never contemplated socialism as anything other than a democratic political movement. Yet many, including Strachey, at times accepted the necessity of a revolution whilst at other times expressed the desire for a democratic march towards socialism. Considering the limited support these ideas had within Britain, the latter option seemed unlikely and they all understood this, even if they continued to hope otherwise. In framing his argument using an ideological structure, Strachey ended up at times advocating domestic violence while promoting international peace.

In 1938 he still hoped to prevent a second world war and talked of creating a powerful peace bloc to counter the fascist aggression.[381] By this point he also remained aware of the decreasing possibility of this occurring. During that year he published the book *Hope in America* which highlighted his fascination with the New Deal and Keynesian economics. While his main arguments lead one to assume he talked of opposition through economic reform, the exact nature of this opposition is left slightly ambiguous and could suggest opposition of a more militant nature. His determination to prevent a fascist conquest of Europe came across with the full force of his words. When he spoke of another war he displayed a strong negative attitude but made it clear that war remained inevitable if fascism stood unimpeded.[382] While he made strong points that the aim of his argument was peace, the language he used to describe fascist states, using phrases such as "intolerable" and "a menace to every nation in the world", suggests that he believed a war remained preferable to a fascist conquest.[383] Yet while he continually argued against fascism, he never explicitly came out in favour of violence to end their reign.

In September 1938 he published an article summing up the position he had taken in *Menace* and applying economic considerations to back up his claims.[384] This article came during the period of negotiations that resulted in the Munich Agreement later that month. While Strachey desired peace, he clearly felt the characteristics of the Nazi state

---

[381] John Strachey, 'The Economic Basis for Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 3 September 1938, pp. 336-339.
[382] Strachey, *Hope in America*, pp. 111-112.
[383] Strachey, *Hope in America*, pp. 6; 11.
[384] Strachey, 'The Economic Basis for Fascism', pp. 336-339.

precluded such a possibility, and the economic argument put forth here demonstrated his extreme scepticism about the Nazi promises. His arguments aligned with the majority of thinking from the British Left. Labour condemned Munich as abject surrender and called for a resistance bloc between states opposed to fascism.[385] His article sparked off a debate within the *New Statesman*, centred on his views that fascist states depended on aggressive expansionism to survive.[386] The majority of those interested in contributing to this debate came from academic and political backgrounds, including three Oxbridge Fellows.[387] These opponents felt that fascism could change, especially if its definition fell within the capitalist imperialist model, in the way that other examples did.[388] Some also called into question the validity of the range of examples he gave of fascist states, arguing that far more nations could be classed as fascist and they did not fall into the same patterns of warfare that Strachey had highlighted.[389]

The war itself helped cement Strachey's move away from Marxism. Not only had he made the intellectual leap towards social democracy, but on a personal level he felt a huge betrayal at the actions of the Soviet Union and the CPGB. In Strachey's opinion neither had lived up to their promises. The Soviet's alliance with the fascists with the support of the CPGB had led both to betray the foundations of their ideology. Strachey made his feelings known through the *New Statesman* which sparked off a fierce debate between Strachey and a number of British Marxists in 1940. Strachey accused the *Daily Worker* of misrepresenting the facts of the war and making apologies for German militancy. Rather than taking the anti-war stance of a socialist they actually supported the Nazis: "They believe that the safety of the Soviet Union is now bound up with the success of the German Government".[390] Through this debate Strachey received a number of harsh rebuttals. William Rust, one of the editors of the *Daily Worker*, suggested that Strachey continually changed his allegiance, and cited his previous relationship with Mosley to discredit him.[391] Marxist Historian Christopher Hill argued that Strachey had

---

[385] William R. Rock, *British Appeasement in the 1930's* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), p. 71.

[386] Christopher Morris, 'Economic Basis of Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 10 September 1938, p. 375; William Brown, 'The Economics of Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 10 September 1938, p. 375; T. Balogh, 'The Economics of Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 17 September 1938, p. 412; C. W. Guillebaud, 'The Economics of Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 24 September 1938, p. 453; Antony Stevenson, 'Economics of Fascism', *New Statesman and Nation* 16, 1 October 1938, p. 487.

[387] Morris, 'Economic Basis of Fascism', p. 375; Balogh, 'The Economics of Fascism', p. 412; Guillebaud, 'The Economics of Fascism', p. 453.

[388] Brown, 'The Economics of Fascism', p. 375.

[389] Morris, 'Economic Basis of Fascism', p. 375.

[390] Strachey, 'The Daily Worker and the War', p. 559.

[391] William Rust, 'Daily Worker', *The New Statesman* 19, 4 May 1940, pp. 588-589.

betrayed his previous ideals. In supporting the government he had become a man that talked of change but refused to take any action.[392] Strachey rejected the words of his detractors and maintained his denunciation of these Parties.

Part 2 – The Conventional Politician vs. the Imaginative Socialist Thinker [393]

The key to understanding Strachey's later intellectual work lies in understanding the direction his life took in the political world from the 1940s. Not only did his ideas on how he envisioned the world and its future change but he put more emphasis on talking in practicalities rather than using theoretical models.

After his move away from Marxism he was elected to the House of Commons in the 1945 Labour landslide, becoming Minister of Food the following year. This job set the tone for many of the troubles Strachey came to face in the following five years. He came up against mistrust by his colleagues in Whitehall who still saw him as a communist. The continued rationing made him extremely unpopular with the middle classes who saw this as unwanted state control and an attempt to force socialism onto Britain.[394]

In 1950 he gained a promotion to Secretary of State for War. His time in office had a major impact in redefining how Strachey understood issues of defence. His role in the Labour government of 1950-51 brought about a variety of new challenges, relating both to his intellectual thinking and to the reality of working as a politician. This new position brought him further into the public eye. The combination of his new role in dealing with international matters alongside his controversial Marxist past made life difficult for Strachey especially once the Cold War gained momentum. The first of these problems occurred once Klaus Fuchs had been arrested for treason, and saw the media linking the two men together as communists. Problems with his public image and disagreements with Attlee marred the time leading up to the Korean War.

As a high-ranking member of the ministerial team at the Ministry of Defence, Strachey took an active part in the developments of the Korean War and the budgetary concerns

---

[392] Hill, 'The Daily Worker', p. 644.
[393] The title for this section is paraphrased from a quotation by Richard Crossman: Richard Crossman, 'The Coming Struggle for Policy', *New Statesman and Nation* 58, 28 November 1959, pp. 755-756.
[394] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 109-110.

that sparked the crisis within the Labour Party in 1951 surrounding rearmament. These events had a large impact on his role in government and influenced his thinking on warfare. Strachey voiced these concerns when addressing the House of Commons. In March 1950 he supported rearmament in conjunction with NATO:

> I think that, together with the Allies who are bound to us under the Atlantic Pact, the country is fully defensible and, by wise and steady preparation, can be made part of a defensive system which is not only defensible, but which is sufficiently strong to avoid the possibility of attack.[395]

When discussing the rearmament programme in 1951 during the Korean War and shortly before the budget crisis, Strachey quoted the *Times*, arguing: "The nation has to be marshalled not for early all-out war but for effective defence for an indefinite time."[396] A few months later he stated in a public address: "It would be literally crazy to try to live in the world as it is today without arms."[397]

Once committed to the war Britain faced major issues over the cost of rearmament and trying to appease American demands for further results whilst maintaining their domestic budget. This led to the crisis within the Labour Party. With the resignation of Bevan and Harold Wilson as a result of Hugh Gaitskell's budget, many predicted Strachey would follow their lead and resign.[398] He failed to meet their expectations and while he agreed with Bevan's complaint his priorities focused on issues of foreign rather than domestic policy. The controversial nature of Strachey's choice has created diverse opinions within the subsequent historiography. In his biography of Bevan, Michael Foot accused Strachey of political cowardice in not joining Bevan.[399] Although he did agree with Bevan, his own motivations differed. Strachey's prognosis led him to fear another world war fought with nuclear weapons and thus he accepted rearmament. Newman argues that Strachey's actions might have resulted either from a wish to display his anti-communist values to the public, or that his anger at further negative association with communism led him to greater antipathy towards the Soviets and their allies.[400]

---

[395] HC Deb, 27 March 1950, vol 473, cc109.

[396] HC Deb, 14 February 1951, vol 484, cc542.

[397] Speech given by Strachey in Keighley, 19 May 1951. The speech was originally archived in the Labour Party Archives. A photocopy of the speech was provided by Dr. Till Geiger as the original is no longer available.

[398] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 119-123.
Bevan's main complaint came from the introduction of prescription charges to the NHS to pay for the increasing costs of the Korean War.

[399] Michael Foot, *Aneurin Bevan: A Biography Vol. 2: 1945-1960* (London: Davis-Poynter, 1973), p. 329.

[400] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 119-123.

Yet his actions seem to come from more than simply a reaction to the events surrounding him personally. His apprehension also stemmed from his disagreement with American actions. Douglas MacArthur and his advocates had exacerbated international tensions and Strachey firmly believed that if America continued on this path another war would result. Now his main focus centred on this problem. He continued to use his role in the government to try to persuade Attlee to take action to separate the two nations in order to safeguard Britain from Soviet aggression. He became convinced that while America may survive an atomic war Britain would not. His apprehension came across clearly in the numerous memos he drafted during his time in office in an attempt to get the Prime Minister to listen to him.[401] The overall assumptions within these notes suggested Strachey felt American actions stemmed primarily from self-interest. He argued:

> the risks involved in an early general war are different for America and Russia on the one hand and Britain on the other. […America] may reasonably feel that she could almost certainly survive it […] But Britain knows that in an early war […] it is almost impossible to see how she can survive".[402]

America's actions with regards to China increased these fears. They ignored Attlee's suggestions towards making peace with China when he visited Washington in December 1950 and publically announced in September 1950 they wished to rearm Germany without allowing time for NATO to build up enough force to counter the Russian response. All this, Strachey felt, could lead to another war with Russian and China, and the most likely result would be the nuclear bombardment of the whole of Southern England, decimating Britain.[403]

Strachey's dealings with America not only convinced him that they acted from self-interest but forced Strachey to do the same. During this time he became increasingly concerned with British independence and the need for the British government to distance themselves from America's warmongering.[404] He showed a much greater degree of nationalism and the need for national self-interest. He also displayed a more pragmatic

---

[401] John Strachey, *Anglo-American Relations*, Top secret memo, 2 January 1951; John Strachey, Untitled top secret memo to Minister of Defence Emanuel Shinwell, 6 April 1951; John Strachey, Untitled memo, 29 April 1951; John Strachey, *Proposed Four Power Meeting*, Top secret memo to Prime Minister Attlee, 31 January 1951; John Strachey, *German Rearmament*, Top secret memo to Prime Minister Attlee, 7 February 1951. Strachey Archive, papers 1951.

[402] Strachey, *German Rearmament*, p. 5.

[403] Strachey, *Anglo-American Relations*, pp. 1-4.

[404] Strachey, *Anglo-American Relations*; Strachey, *German Rearmament*.

understanding of democratic governments and the belief that even a group of democracies could not stop international conflict. The relationship between Britain and America provided a good example of two democracies working together but still analysing international relations through self-interest and basing their decision making on these findings. He believed that as long as states relied on self-interest to guide their actions the possibility of war would always remain.

This shows a shift in focus from economic theory to the role of warfare as a result of his position in the government and his fear of a nuclear war. Strachey's role had moved from a political philosopher challenging the state to a politician working for the state, and his ideas on warfare focused exclusively on policy making and their practical application. Once he refocused his work on his intellectual writings this outlook did not fade.

These events had a striking effect on his later work on nuclear warfare, and understanding of the international situation altered as a result. As his work progressed, we can see the full extent of this change as he came to believe that ideology had no place in the analysis of international relations, and no ideological structure could ensure peace. He accepted the need for a balance of power within the international situation, although evidence suggests that he saw this as a temporary situation, maintained to avoid a nuclear war, and not a permanent reflection of international relations.

During the Cold War, international tensions were often portrayed as a challenge between Soviet communism and Western capitalism but Strachey no longer accepted an analysis of the international system using the simplicity of such labels. Nor did he see ideological change as the means to deal with the problem. Strachey's political involvement in the Korean War demonstrated to him the failure of socialism to fulfil its promises to end war. It highlighted the precarious nature of conflict within a nuclear era and the need for practical solutions. These feelings came throughout Strachey's work in the 1950s and became stronger as time progressed. By the 1960s Strachey's work on warfare looked exclusively at the nuclear situation and how to deal with it.

Strachey himself acknowledged this change, as did others that examined his work. In 1963 at the very beginning of a lecture series entitled *The Challenge of Democracy* he talked about the benefits of the debate on democracy leaving "the abstract" for the first

time in history and engaging with the ordinary people.[405] He also stated that he would deal with the subject matter in this way "now I am a practical, working politician, not a professor of political theory."[406] Simply by stating his desires in this way, he demonstrated that his work in politics had had a significant effect on his arguments and the way he expressed them.

In 1959 Richard Crossman commented on the effect Strachey's political life had had on his work. He argued that in *The End of Empire* when Strachey analysed the future of Britain's defence policies "the conventional Shadow Secretary for War replaces the imaginative Socialist thinker", and in Crossman's view this change did not reflect well on Strachey's writing.[407] This contrasted with Crossman's views on Strachey's work only a few years previously. In 1956 he highlighted the strength of Strachey's writings in the 1930s and his foresight in changing his views to reflect the changes in Western society. He then asked Strachey to write another analysis of the socialist movement.[408] Strachey published such a book later that year (although obviously not as a result of Crossman's plea) and Crossman proceeded to give it a glowing review.[409] The difference in his critique of the two books helps demonstrate the difference in Strachey's economic analysis and his outlook on issues of war in the late 1950s.

Part 3 – Defence in the 1950s

Strachey published his most important and prolific work on war in the 1950s and 1960s after his time in government. This next section will discuss the change in Strachey's arguments and show how this related to his political career. It will track the evolution of Strachey's ideas over this time and examine the increasing level of realism within his analysis. This section will pay particular attention to Strachey's involvement in the nuclear debates of the day, which dominated his thinking on the international situation.

---

[405] John Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy* (Munich: John Strachey Historical Manuscripts Archive, 1963), part I, pp. 1-2. Information and quotations from this work were taken from the manuscript of Strachey's ten-part radio broadcast for *Radio Free Europe*.
[406] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part I, p. 4.
[407] Crossman, 'The Coming Struggle for Policy', pp. 755-756.
[408] Richard Crossman, 'John Strachey and the Left Book Club', *New Statesman and Nation* 51, 7 January 1956, pp. 16-17.
[409] Richard Crossman, 'How Capitalism was Preserved', *New Statesman and Nation* 52, 14 July 1956, pp. 46-47.

The evolution of a nuclear age had a two-fold impact on Strachey's view of warfare. Firstly Strachey's ideas moved into a committed defencist stance. He argued for the maintenance of strong Western military defence using both nuclear and conventional weapons. This would ensure the survival of Western civilization against the Soviet threat in the eventuality of smaller, non-nuclear wars, and provide a deterrent to avoid a nuclear conflict.[410]

The tone of his writings on nuclear warfare show a radical difference from his earlier work. Strachey examined the standard arguments of the day concerning nuclear weapons and aligned himself with mainstream thinking. That is not to say that he simply took the standard government line without questioning its wisdom. He displayed a willingness to challenge such thinking, but did so through the established debates that occurred during this time and his answers lacked the controversial nature of his earlier arguments. He no longer reflected his radical intellectual leanings of the 1930s but argued as a mainstream political analyst.

One such example came across through his ideas on the need for conventional forces as well as nuclear forces. Here he accepted the need for a nuclear arsenal but also advocated for a strong conventional force against government policy. The debate over spending the defence budget on conventional weapons or nuclear weapons became one of the most important defence issues during the 1950s. Within government circles debates ranged throughout the political and military elites on the most significant dangers to Britain and how to achieve the most economically efficient solution. The practicalities of trying to remain in the arms race alongside two superpower nations became clear to Britain. In 1954 the Air Defence Sub-Committee put forth the idea that once both sides had the bomb, mutually assured destruction would prevent either side from using it.[411] This argument soon proved fallacious and the importance of maintaining a technologically superior delivery system became apparent. As the 1950s progressed Britain fell further behind the superpowers in their progress on aircraft development, lacking the economic power to maintain their technical drive.[412]

---

[410] John Strachey, 'Use of Nuclear Weapons', *Manchester Guardian*, 8 March 1958, p. 4; John Strachey, 'The Good Ally', *Times*, 24 January 1963, p. 11.
[411] Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy*, p. 287.
[412] Geiger, *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War*, pp. 145-189.

Ian Clark and Nicholas Wheeler argue that the mid-1950s brought about "what was possibly the first real British debate about nuclear strategy and deterrence in the post-war era."[413] The development of the hydrogen bomb created a breach within strategic thinking and this emerged within the intellectual community as well as Whitehall. Alongside Strachey, intellectuals such as P. M. S. Blackett and Basil Liddell Hart argued against British nuclear strategy.

After the Labour defeat Strachey's political life tapered off for several years until 1956 when he was appointed to the front-bench by Gaitskell as a defence expert.[414] At this time he also produced two major intellectual writings: *Contemporary Capitalism* (1956) and *The End of Empire* (1959). In 1957 he began to take a more active role in the House of Commons in response to the changes in defence policy, commenting on issues such as defence spending, conscription and nuclear warfare.

One deviation occurred in March 1953 when Strachey, after a year of almost total silence in the House of Commons, emerged to participate in the debate on the 1953 Defence White Paper.[415] This paper reduced the defence budget and acknowledged that the rearmament programme started by the Labour Government would have to be downgraded by £200 million for 1953-54.[416] The government's desire to reduce defence spending had been discussed in the previous year's White Paper,[417] and was officially confirmed by Churchill in December 1952.[418] Strachey supported Churchill's reductions stating: "The main submission I make to the House is that the White Paper is scaling down our defence effort from the 1947 programme, as I think rightly".[419] Churchill's actions supported the argument Bevan had made three years previously, which Strachey had also supported (although, as shown earlier, not for exactly the same reasons). Yet Strachey also accepted that Attlee had acted in light of the immediate threat of nuclear warfare. He argued that the defence spending for the Korean War was necessary at the time and was the correct decision:

[413] Ian Clark and Nicholas J. Wheeler, *The British Origins of Nuclear Strategy, 1945-1955* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), p. 211.
[414] Newman, *John Strachey*, p. 154.
[415] HC Deb, 05 March 1953, vol 512, cc567-693.
[416] 1952-53 [Cmd. 8768] Statement on Defence.
[417] 1951-52 [Cmd. 8475] Statement on Defence, p. 9.
[418] 1952-53 [Cmd. 8768] Statement on Defence, p. 4.
[419] HC Deb, 05 March 1953, vol 512, cc631.

> I am not saying that I am in the least ashamed that we of the previous Government set our sights too high when we made our defence effort. I believe that in the international emergency at that time, to which the Prime Minister referred, any Government would have had to make almost the maximum defence effort which could be made.[420]

This particular argument of Strachey's is extremely useful in understanding his attitude towards defence expenditure, and his later arguments against the 1957 Defence White Paper. Strachey acknowledged the problems of the rearmament defence budget but still supported Attlee's actions. Here he stated that the urgency of the international situation forced the government into action for which they had no choice. In other words, defence was paramount. His main criticism of the government in 1957 revolved around the budgetary cuts that promoted nuclear weapons and cut conventional forces. Strachey urged the government to maintain both, making it clear he felt that British defence depended on a nuclear deterrent and the ability to win smaller, limited conflicts without the need to surrender or risk a nuclear escalation. At this time he maintained this belief that defence outweighed other budgetary concerns.

The debate on the defence budget ran throughout the 1950s and has dominated the economic historiography since. The impact of the Korean War and the 1957 Defence White Paper has had the greatest impact on historiographical debate. Historians have examined the Labour dispute in 1951 and the decision in 1957 to focus on nuclear weapons, downgrade conventional forces and end conscription. Till Geiger argues that the Korean War slowed the momentum of economic growth, although also speculates whether it made any real difference to overall economic growth.[421] Martin Navias argues that in 1957 Sandys put greater priority on "economic necessity" than "a policy of nuclear deterrence".[422] In contrast Malcolm Chalmers focuses on the excess defence spending and the desire for an independent nuclear deterrent, which he argues paved the way for the decline of the British economy, even accounting for the defence cuts in the 1950s.[423] This challenges Geiger's argument and other recent literature which has challenged the validity of 'declinism'.[424]

---

[420] HC Deb, 05 March 1953, vol 512, cc631.
[421] Geiger, *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War*, pp. 237-272.
[422] Martin S. Navias, *Nuclear Weapons and British Strategic Planning, 1955-1958* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), p. 188.
[423] Malcolm Chalmers, *Paying for Defence: Military Spending and British Decline* (London: Pluto, 1985).
[424] David Edgerton, 'The Decline of Declinism,' *The Business History Review* 71, no. 2 (1997); Edgerton, *Warfare State*; Jim Tomlinson, *The Politics of Decline: Understanding Post-War Britain* (Harlow: Longman, 2001).

In 1957 Strachey took a more active role in politics and in the nuclear situation. This eventually led to *On the Prevention of War* in 1962. The book criticised the British government and the path they had taken in the previous five years. Despite his earlier antagonistic approach to US foreign policy and Eisenhower's New Look, he embraced their realist approach. Kennedy's shift towards a flexible response in 1961 gave Strachey a more optimistic view of America's defence policy.

The 1957 Defence White Paper showed a move towards nuclear over conventional armaments. The Chiefs of Staff argued against spending the money on civil defence and pushed for a greater deterrent to try to prevent an attack rather than deal with the aftermath. The Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan agreed with the view that Britain could not defend itself from a nuclear attack and refused to increase the civil defence budget in 1958. By the 1960s the economic constraints of a conventional army forced Britain to limit their overseas interactions, pulling their forces out of the Persian Gulf, Singapore and Malaysia by 1968. The nuclear deterrent had become the central feature of British defence policies.[425]

Strachey accepted the argument for the nuclear deterrent but strongly disagreed with the issue of conventional forces, arguing that relying too heavily on nuclear weapons would leave Britain vulnerable. He backed Labour's official stance against British unilateralism without a global consensus to disarm, although he did so with reluctance.[426] Strachey argued that if British unilateralism would help stop nuclear weapons spreading to other countries he would favour such a policy, but at the present time this would not happen and "to do it for no particular advantage whatever would be a mistake."[427] Here his pragmatism and understanding of international politics pushed him away from his desired idealism.

His first response to the 1957 Defence White Paper came in the debate on the White Paper in the House of Commons on 17 April 1957.[428] The White Paper focused Britain's defences on the nuclear deterrent and the development of ballistic missiles. It emphasised the necessity of the deterrent and the need for Britain to have the power of a deterrent without reliance on their American allies. Strachey argued for the need for

---

[425] Peden, *Arms, Economics and British Strategy*, pp. 280-339.
[426] Strachey, 'Use of Nuclear Weapons', p. 4.
[427] HC Deb, 01 March 1960, vol 618, cc1040.
[428] HC Deb, 17 April 1957, vol 568, cc1929-2059.

conventional forces as well as nuclear. Strachey was particularly critical of Duncan Sandys, the Minister of Defence, finding him ignorant and uninformed. He felt the government's policies would promote nuclear conflicts that would escalate and devolve into the "ultimate unlimited war".[429] He claimed Sandys refused to consider conventional forces because they cost too much and he preferred the strategy of "chucking hydrogen bombs at Moscow" in response to a Russian attack on West Germany, thus producing "the end of the world at the first stage".[430]

Within this speech he demonstrated his acceptance of realist defence policies. His argument centred on the need for greater understanding of the nuclear threat and a lack of such in Britain. In particular he stressed the danger of escalation from atomic warfare to nuclear warfare. He criticised ideas such as 'graduated deterrence', a military policy promoted by theorists including Captain Liddell Hart and Admiral Anthony Buzzard. Part of this theory suggested using atomic weapons instead of nuclear. Strachey argued:

> There has been all the thinking which has been done by the earnest advocates of what is called the "graduated" deterrent. I have studied all the things that they have said as carefully as I could, but I have never been able to believe – I wish I could – that they were right in thinking that some kind of Queensberry Rules for atomic warfare could be devised. I do not think that that is so.[431]

As a result of their promotion of nuclear weapons, Strachey felt their policies too closely resembled Dulles' massive retaliation.[432]

As Britain's defence policies continued to maintain the same line of argument in the following years, Strachey continued to raise objections. In 1959 he proclaimed that "a threat to commit suicide is not a rational defence policy."[433]

An article published in 1958 supported these views and drew on the thinking of Crossman and the journalist Peregrine Worsthorne.[434] He published this article as the third part of a series, entitled *Our Bomb and Theirs*, with Crossman and Worsthorne

---

[429] HC Deb, 17 April 1957, vol 568, cc2025.
[430] HC Deb, 27 February 1958, vol 583, cc655-657. Despite Sandys' policies, Strachey's arguments were not new – the government had endorsed this policy since 1952.
[431] HC Deb, 17 April 1957, vol 568, cc2025.
[432] HC Deb, 17 April 1957, vol 568, cc2026.
[433] HC Deb, 26 February 1959, vol 600, cc1305.
[434] John Strachey, 'Nuclear Chess', *Encounter* XI, August 1958, pp. 3-6.

providing the previous two contributions.[435] Strachey discussed the strategic implications of the nuclear and conventional debate alongside the economic problems associated with the maintenance of such large defences. Crossman and Strachey agreed that Britain had started to spend too much on nuclear weapons at the expense of conventional forces but Strachey rejected Crossman's solution of increasing conventional forces by getting rid of the nuclear ones. He claimed that as long as the Soviets maintained their nuclear arsenal the West must match it to maintain the deterrent. He also pointed out that as a solution it would not achieve its aims as conventional forces cost far more than nuclear ones. He went on to argue:

> The effect of thinking out the logic of the situation on these lines has redoubled my sense of the urgency of an attempt on the part of the West to reach a détente with the Russians by means of some form of disengagement in Europe and of nuclear disarmament. I am aware that to write this in present circumstances, when all the signs are pointing to a sharpening of Russian world policy and a return to full cold war, will be very unpopular. […] It is perfectly possible, though the measures needed are elaborate and extensive, for the two sides to disengage in Europe, and to disarm to a very considerable degree in the nuclear field, without trusting each other at all.[436]

His words portrayed the mind-set of a man attempting to use the realities of the nuclear situation to bring about the best solution. He comprehended the problems and limitations the Cold War generated. His attempts to bring about disarmament had no basis in ideology but stem purely from a practical desire to stop a nuclear war.

He concluded by arguing that "The West has never yet in my opinion tried to get disengagement and disarmament."[437] Here Strachey referred to the talks in May 1955 in which the USSR put forth a proposal, originally drafted as an Anglo-French memorandum, to destroy the stock piles of nuclear weapons on both sides and radically cut down their own conventional forces. While initially the West accepted the proposals, the US later insisted on adopting the proposal put forth by Eisenhower at the Geneva Summit in July instead. In doing so they effectively ended the negotiations. Despite their earlier words to the contrary, the US had little interest in disarmament or accepting the terms of the proposal.[438]

---

[435] Richard Crossman, 'The Nuclear Obsession', *Encounter* XI, July 1958, pp. 3-10; Peregrine Worsthorne, 'How the Russians See It', *Encounter* XI, July 1958, pp. 11-15.
[436] Strachey, 'Nuclear Chess', p. 6.
[437] Strachey, 'Nuclear Chess', p. 6.
[438] M. Evangelista, 'Cooperation Theory and Disarmament Negotiations in the 1950s,' *World Politics* 42, no. 4 (1990): pp. 514-515.

Strachey may have disagreed with abandoning the nuclear path but he still objected to what he saw as the Conservative government's willingness to use these weapons. The majority in the House of Commons continually shot down strong objections to using these weapons as anything other than a deterrent, favouring the idea that they should be "willing to use nuclear defence or anything else that is available."[439]

Strachey also brought up this problem in several lengthy articles submitted to *Encounter* magazine. He argued that if the West did not put enough of their defence expenditure into conventional forces any conflict with the Russians would have to lead to a nuclear war or their complete surrender.[440] This summarized the heart of the problem. While Strachey's work made it clear he felt surrender by the West would lead to the end of freedom for its people and destroy the progress made in the 20th century, the alternative – a nuclear conflict – would lead to the end of civilization altogether. Based on these two grim outcomes, Strachey still preferred the former to the latter.

Yet Strachey's work in *Encounter* also showed that he felt the possibility of the West choosing to surrender very slim. When he talked about NATO policy and the attitude of the American military, his words strongly suggested he felt a nuclear war presented the biggest possibility. His critique of the American military's derisive attitude to any other armaments besides nuclear weapons implied he felt they would push for this option in a conflict.[441] This led to his strong desire to do the opposite and maintain conventional forces so neither possibility became reality. Strachey also pushed these ideas in numerous newspaper articles, using a variety of different arguments rather than just sticking to his original observations. He continued to criticize NATO and European military strategy in particular, claiming:

> In the nuclear defence controversy within the Western Alliance, it is the Americans who are now preaching, and practising, a cautious, complicated and highly intelligent military doctrine. It is the Europeans' who are pressing for maximum, immediate, massive nuclear retaliation.[442]

---

[439] This proposition won the vote by 330 votes to 197. HC Deb, 01 March 1960, vol 618, cc1158.
[440] Strachey, 'Nuclear Chess', pp. 3-4.
[441] John Strachey, 'Reversing NATO Strategy', *Encounter* XVIII, April 1962, pp. 8-9.
[442] John Strachey, 'Beware of the Weak', *Observer*, 29 July 1962, p. 8.

He felt this arose from feelings of impotence brought about by a lack of conventional forces. The British government also found itself on the receiving end of his criticism concerning their policies on conventional forces.

While Strachey certainly disagreed with much of Sandys' defence policy in the late 1950s this did not include the issue of an independent deterrent. In 1959 he openly scoffed at the Liberal Party's idea of integrating Britain's nuclear forces into America's. Despite agreeing that nuclear weapons were "beastly things", he rejected the idea of dependence on the US for nuclear protection.[443] He also criticised what he perceived as the Liberal's intent to abstain from the moral responsibility of building these weapons and their expectation that the US would accept the entirety of this responsibility. In this respect he believed Britain had to accept the moral objections in order to adequately maintain a deterrent.

While questions from tactical and moral stances featured within these arguments, the most pressing and decisive issue for all nations remained focussed on the finances available to build, maintain and deploy these systems. This presented a problem for Strachey who looked at the other implications when supporting the drive for a strong conventional army alongside a nuclear arsenal. Many felt that nuclear weapons offered the cheaper option instead of having to outfit and maintain a large conventional army. In 1963 Strachey, along with his colleagues in the Labour Party, fought against the British government's plans to increase their nuclear arsenal while cutting down army recruitment.[444] Part of these strong objections resulted from the failure of the Blue Streak missile. The missile, which was designed to allow Britain to gain an independent nuclear deterrent, was cancelled in 1960 after five years of work.

Part 4 – His Final Work

This last section will attempt to understand Strachey's later ideas on warfare through the examination of two pieces of literature he produced in the early 1960s. *On the Prevention of War* and *The Challenge of Democracy* help highlight his later ideas on the Labour Party, United States and the Soviet Union. Strachey displayed a move towards

[443] HC Deb, 26 February 1959, vol 600, cc1404.
[444] Strachey, 'The Good Ally', p. 11.

US thinking and a desire to engage in US intellectual debate and influence their thinking. According to Newman "he was still a 'centralist' in 1956, by 1963 he was one of the principal opponents of the Labour Left on the revisionist-Right of the party."[445] *Prevention* highlights this attitude and his opposition to unilateralism. His work in the 1950s had been accepted as important contributions to socialist literature. Crossman described him as "the only prominent Socialist politician [besides Crosland] who is attempting to fill this intellectual void and so to help restore our sense of direction."[446] His work on *Prevention*, however, failed to appeal to the British Left. It lacked a strong socialist foundation and fell in line with US realist foreign policy. It achieved great success in the US and increased Strachey's eminence as an expert in international politics.[447]

From 1959 Strachey engaged with the debate on the nuclear conflict. This debate became one of the most important within the Labour Party at this time. While the majority supported Churchill's decision to build the hydrogen bomb in 1955, a minority on the far-Left supported a unilateralist stance. Others altered their arguments in line with international events. Bevan, who represented the anti-nuclear contingent of the Party in 1955, accepted the need for a nuclear arsenal in 1958.[448]

With the exception of the far-Left of the Party, Labour's official position supported the British nuclear programme up until 1960. In the 1950s the Conservative government had emphasised the need for an independent programme. The failure of the Blue Streak missile in 1960 helped demonstrate that Britain could not build a successful independent deterrent and needed American expertise. The British government then turned to Skybolt, an American missile, but the US scrapped the design in 1962 and the British government were not able to complete the work. The failure of the independent deterrent led many in the Labour Party to question the policy.[449]

These issues along with trips to the US altered Strachey's perspective. In particular his visits to the RAND Corporation and discussion with Herman Kahn and William

---

[445] Newman, *John Strachey*, p. 156.
[446] Richard Crossman, 'The Coming Struggle for Policy', *New Statesman and Nation* 58, 28 November 1959, p. 755.
Crossman referred to Crosland just before this quote.
[447] Newman, *John Strachey*, pp. 155-156.
[448] Hugh Thomas, *John Strachey* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), p. 284.
[449] Leon D. Epstein, 'The Nuclear Deterrent and the British Election of 1964,' *The Journal of British Studies* 5, no. 2 (1966): pp. 140-143.

Kaufmann helped him revise his thinking. RAND, a think-tank set up in 1948, deliberated the problems of nuclear warfare and advised the US military. Kahn and Kaufmann were both nuclear strategists employed by RAND.[450] By the 1960s Strachey no longer believed in a British independent nuclear deterrent and saw the alliance with the US as the most sensible course.[451]

In *Prevention* Strachey argued that: "Today the threat of nuclear war is the decisive issue."[452] He attempted to explain the complicated international situation in respect to the nuclear conflict and discuss the best way to prevent a nuclear war. Firstly he put forth the argument that delivery systems for nuclear weapons were the most important aspect of the arms race, contradicting ideas put forth by scholars such as Blackett. He argued Blackett's view – that once both sides had the bomb it created a stable stalemate – did not conform to the present situation:

> For it is not difficult to possess a more than adequate stock of weapons. Their means of delivery, their capacity to penetrate the enemy's defences and, *in particular*, their degree of invulnerability to a previous attack by *his* nuclear striking force, are what are held to matter.[453]

Here Strachey's argument referred to both or either side. With this in mind he went on to examine the capacities of both sides. He concluded that: "Since war is at present being averted by a balance of power, the stability of the balance is of the essence."[454] To do this Strachey put forth a direct reproach to the unilateralist argument. He wanted to maintain Western deterrence and ensure they had the required conventional forces for smaller conflicts. Otherwise: "we shall have only the alternative of surrender or of escalating [to nuclear weapons]".[455]

At this point the move to a strong defencist interpretation of international relations became the clearest. When analysing *Prevention* a question arises on the nature of what Strachey wished to achieve, insofar as whether he wished to prevent war or to gain peace. Typically while both goals have great similarities, they do not constitute identical objectives. Often the motives behind each statement differ slightly, and the former remains less ambitious and more achievable. More importantly they can end with

---

[450] For further information see: Kaplan, *Wizards of Armageddon*.
[451] Thomas, *John Strachey*, pp. 284-287.
[452] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, vii.
[453] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. 30.
[454] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. 82.
[455] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. 104.

different outcomes. Preventing a war between two or more nations does not guarantee peace between them. Continued animosity could remain or they could find themselves in a stalemate, neither friends nor enemies. In fact this sums up the entire concept of a 'cold' war and described the situation between the West and East as it developed in the years following 1945. Clearly Strachey's objective moved far beyond the latter. Yet the question then turns to the title of Strachey's last major treatise: *On the Prevention of War*. That the very title of this book talks about *prevention* rather than peace-making signifies Strachey's mind-set when writing this type of thesis. As a socialist Strachey's ambition had in previous years always aimed at creating a lasting peace. In his later years this became far less clear-cut and his confidence in international affairs far less inspiring. At the very beginning of the book he talked about the aim of the nuclear deterrent: to create such fear in the world's governments that they would never willingly start a nuclear war.[456] This would prevent war but would bring the world no closer to peace. The book talked of maintaining the status quo rather than embracing the betterment of international relations. He even went so far as to discuss maintaining the "balance of power", using, one can assume deliberately, a phrase associated with realist international relations theories.[457]

When focusing on nuclear warfare Strachey wrote with different intentions and appealed to a different audience. He corresponded with a number of prominent British intellectuals outside the Left. These included Alastair Francis Buchan and Liddell Hart. Buchan had worked for the *Economist* and the *Observer*, and was appointed as the first director of the Institute for Strategic Studies in 1958. He was considered an expert on defence and the nuclear deterrent and one of the most important voices on these topics in the 1960s.[458] Buchan's notes to Strachey, commenting on a draft of *Prevention*, suggested to Strachey that he should better distinguish between the concept of a 'world authority' and a 'world government'.[459] The former referred to institutions such as the UN and the existence of international law. In the final draft of the book Strachey attempted to address these problems. Strachey looked at this concept primarily near the end of the book in two sections on the nature and exercise of world power.[460] He

---

[456] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, pp. 4-5.
[457] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, pp. 82; 123-127.
[458] Michael Howard, 'Buchan, Alastair Francis (1918–1976)', rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30868, accessed 19 May 2014].
[459] Letter from Alastair Buchan, 8 January 1962. Strachey Archive, papers 1960-62.
[460] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, pp. 298-301; 312-315.

explained the concept of a world authority through an alliance of future super-powered nations which would have a monopoly of power and could halt any attempts to start a world war.[461] From their correspondence it is unclear whether this satisfied Buchan's critique. Strachey's words still remained vague on how this would come about and through what means they could accomplish it. Yet it is also clear that Strachey did not mean a 'world government' nor did he apply any meaningful discussion of his earlier utopianism to this work.

He also corresponded with a large range of American thinkers, including Bernard Brodie and Albert Wohlstetter, both of whom were experts on the nuclear situation.[462] His correspondence with his New York publisher and his desire to determine American reaction as early as possible show the value Strachey placed on his American audience and his desire to participate in American intellectual debate.[463] This desire to interact with American opinion seems to have achieved success. His American reviewers gave a range of mostly positive reactions. Some excerpts include: "one of the better books [...] on the subject of fighting and preventing nuclear wars"; "a most important book"; and "a vitally important and dramatic volume".[464] A number of these commentators approved of Strachey's realistic analysis of the problem, using logical reasoning rather than promoting an idealistic and therefore unfeasible account and remedy.[465] His pragmatism helped capture his intended audience, and appealed to a wide range of readers, including politicians, journalists, and academics.

Aligning with American realist foreign policy in *Prevention* highlighted the development of his thinking towards Britain's closest ally over the decade following Korea. After Truman removed MacArthur Strachey felt more optimistic about the relationship, seeing this action on Truman's part as a declaration of peaceful intent.[466] This optimism continued to develop with regards to America's participation in the nuclear stand-off with the Soviet Union. By the 1960s Strachey had come to the conclusion that the American government understood the realities of the nuclear situation far better than the

---

[461] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, pp. 298; 313.
[462] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. ix.
[463] Letter and collection of early reviews send to Strachey from John Donovan, of St Martin's Press (his American publisher), 7 March 1963. Strachey Archive, other publications c1956-62.
[464] Russell Barnes, 'A Plan to Avert Nuclear War', *Detroit News*, 17 February 1963; Ruth Manier, 'Critical Problems of Nuclear Age', *Nashville Banner*, 1 March 1963; Transcript of TV broadcast: Lee Kinard, 'On the Prevention of War', *Good Morning Show*, (WFMY-TV, Greensborg, North Carolina).
[465] Manier, 'Critical Problems of Nuclear Age'; Meacham, 'Man's Habit of War'.
[466] Untitled memo sent to Shinwell, 6 April 1951; Untitled memo, unknown recipient, 29 April 1951.

countries in Europe and felt their actions towards the East demonstrated this. At this time Europe had recovered from the post-war economic downturn and seemed to be moving further away from America. De Gaulle in particular pushed for a nationalist stance against the Soviets and questioned US loyalty to Europe in the event of a war.[467] When it came to planning nuclear strategies, Strachey criticized what he saw as the Europeans' desire to rush forward without thinking of the consequences of war and for their "reckless and irrational" attitude.[468] He felt America, in contrast, had suggested intelligent and cautious solutions despite having a far stronger position to bargain from, and thus go on the offensive if they wished. Here Strachey displayed a clear desire to understand the nuances of the international situation. He urged caution and practicality, emphasising the need for responsible actions by political leaders.

Following the publication of *Prevention* his ideas were put to the test when the tensions rose later that year over the situation in Cuba. Strachey's attitude when writing about the outcome seemed positive, not only as a result of the avoidance of increased nuclear conflicts but from feeling that the outcome proved his own calculations outlined in *Prevention*. Kennedy and the American government clearly impressed him in contrast to Macmillan, whom he described as "a fussy old retired nanny".[469] He felt in these situations Britain should stay in the background and quietly support America. The difference between his attitude to America's military tactics in 1951 and 1962 remains quite striking. In 1951 he worried they would drag Britain into a third world war, but by 1962 he felt happy to let the US handle East-West relations in order to stop a nuclear war. Strachey had clearly overseen the development of a more sophisticated understanding of the dangers inherent within nuclear politics that emerged during this time within the US. He argued that "for every minute's sustained attention which has been given in Europe to what would actually happen in a nuclear exchange, the Americans have given an hour, if not a day, of organised study".[470] This crisis also strengthened his belief in the need to maintain a nuclear deterrent. When discussing the Cuban Missile Crisis Strachey asked, "How silly can you get?" in response to the unilateralist's argument that world would have been safer if America had scrapped its nuclear arsenal.[471]

---

[467] David Rees, *The Age of Containment: The Cold War, 1945-1965* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1967), p. 75.
[468] Strachey, 'Beware of the Weak', p. 8.
[469] John Strachey, 'Cuba: Threat or Promise?', *Observer*, 11 November 1962, p. 11.
[470] Strachey, 'Beware of the Weak', p. 8.
[471] Strachey, 'Cuba: Threat or Promise?', p. 11.

The following year he broadcast *The Challenge of Democracy* as a series of lectures for *Radio Free Europe*. Following the Suez Crisis and the 1957 White Paper, Strachey had become more antagonistic towards the British government, questioning their expertise and understanding of the current nuclear situation. The use of publishing outlets such as *Radio Free Europe* and *Encounter* help demonstrate these feelings. Both organisations created a forum for intellectual discussion with a strong pro-Western and pro-American outlook. While not commonly known at this time, both received funding from the CIA to propagate this type of message.[472]

George Urban, the producer of *Third Programme* broadcasts, of which *The Challenge* contributed to, asked Strachey to speak on his programme. Strachey's eminent standing as an intellectual and his transition from Marxism to social democracy attracted Urban to his thinking. He wanted Strachey to speak to the communist intellectuals within the Soviet bloc and force them to re-think their own ideas by appealing to their moral centres and pushing them away from "their slavish yes-manship."[473] This work for *Radio Free Europe* demonstrated a much more focused attempt at propagating Western propaganda. The language and ideas he used when discussing the Cold War differed greatly from *Prevention* and other material published in Britain at this time. Strachey clearly tailored his ideas to their intended audience. *Prevention* spoke about stabilising the international situation and discussing how future changes would affect global survival. *The Challenge* focused on the importance of liberty and how nuclear war threatened it.

By examining the concept of democracy in these lectures, Strachey could have reverted to the more theoretical framework of his earlier writings. This, however, did not occur. Strachey used his political background and his immersion into practical democratic politics to help guide his ideas and presented a more realistic outlook for his listeners. The series challenged his audience to think about the problems associated with authoritarian states and nuclear warfare in order to promote the value of democracy. He tried to depict stereotypes and prejudices within the West and East towards their adversaries, and highlight the importance both types of regime placed on democracy,

---

[472] Frances Stonor Saunders, 'How the C.I.A. Plotted against Us,' *New Statesman*, 1999, http://www.newstatesman.com/199907120022; Andrew Roth, 'Melvin Lasky: Cold Warrior Who Edited the C.I.A. Funded Encounter Magazine,' *Guardian*, 2004, http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2004/may/22/guardianobituaries.
[473] George Urban, *Radio Free Europe and the Pursuit of Democracy: My War within the Cold War* (London: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 47.

while demonstrating the inconsistencies found within the reality of each set. Strachey outlined his arguments on the advantages of democracy for a world in which the threat of nuclear war was "the supreme question of our epoch" and the most dangerous threat to liberty.[474]

Within these lectures Strachey spoke to his audience not as a theorist but using his "40 years' experience as a practical, working politician".[475] He specifically separated himself from his opposition, which he simply refers to as "the Communists" throughout. In doing so he associated himself with a rational and practical approach rather than a theoretical and ideological agenda. His words implied the communists fell into such a category and that they attempted to fit the real world into their theoretical model rather than allowing their model to reflect the reality. In the middle of the third lecture he told his reader that the communists refused to accept the rise in living standards as a positive aspect of capitalism and instead insisted that "some of the super profits of imperialism have filtered down to the wage-earners of the West."[476] His response clearly highlighted his belief that this argument fell far short of the reality: "During the last 20 or 30 years – in those same years […] in which the improvement in the standard of life of the wage-earners in the Western democracies has been most marked – every one of the great empires has been dissolved."[477]

By specifically bringing up communist arguments, Strachey tried to refute the claims made by his communist audience and show them the errors in their thinking, doing exactly what Urban wished for when he chose a man who had given up his own communist ideals and understood how best to argue in this manner. Interestingly he did not attempt to invalidate the views of the Marxists within the Soviet bloc but choose to focus on the views from Austrian communists.[478] He may have attempted this in order not to alienate his audience and to allow them a more objective reading of the facts.

In the last lecture he then discussed the possibility of a world government as a consequence of nuclear warfare. The debate on utopianism in the previous chapter ran throughout intellectual discussion quite frequently during this time. On the whole

---

[474] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part X, p. 2.
[475] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part III, p. 1.
[476] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part III, p. 11.
[477] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part III, p. 11.
[478] Strachey, *The Challenge of Democracy*, part III, p. 7.

Strachey did not participate in this discussion, and with the exception of this lecture, did not appear to agree with this view point. His work, especially with regards to nuclear warfare, portrayed a rational approach, grounded on the traditions of American deterrence policies.

His move away from the absolutist mentality of communism, a philosophy often associated with utopian ideals, led Thompson to believe that "he resisted, as others did not, the temptation to seek the psychological prop of an alternative absolutist faith."[479] The desire for world government would certainly fall into this category. The change in his audience could help explain the reason for the difference between these ideas and his work in *Prevention*. He wrote *Prevention* for a wide ranging audience across the Western world, and clearly attempted to address political and intellectual leaders within both Britain and America. He designed these lectures, however, to appeal to communist intellectuals rather than the political elites. The move back towards Thompson's "absolutist faith" might have resulted in the desire to speak the language of his audience and allow them to envision an alternative philosophy that still maintained the utopian appeal of communism.

Yet these ideas remained only a suggestion because Strachey never articulated any ways to implement such an approach. Clearly within these lectures he could not have given a detailed analysis on how to create a world democracy, nor would such an account have properly integrated with Strachey's motivation for giving the lectures. This suggestion appears more of an intellectual exercise designed to make his audience think rather than the more serious political arguments discussed in Chapter Two on the value of world democracy and bringing forth change.

This section has brought together two diverging pieces of intellectual writing. At this time Strachey had moved the furthest away from Marxist ideology. The issues of the Cold War dominated his political outlook. Both pieces examined the Cold War but in most other respects differed significantly. *Prevention* was a monograph, written for a Western audience and designed to appeal to the political elites. *The Challenge* was a series of lectures written for a group of communist intellectuals within the Soviet Union. The emphasis of the arguments differed and the style of writing reflected not only the medium of transmission but the intended audience. Both, however, demonstrated the

---

[479] Thompson, *John Strachey*, p. 235.

importance of Strachey's political life in the 1950s and his attitudes to the British and American government. These attitudes changed most significantly as a result of defence issues. He believed that the American government had better understood the changes in the international situation and their thinking and policies reflected this. He had become disillusioned with the British Conservative government, especially men such as Sandys, and their unwillingness to provide adequate protection for Britain.

Conclusion

Strachey's writing provides an interesting example of the impact of nuclear politics from 1945. The contrast between absolutist theories and realist balance of power theories helps demonstrate the enormity of nuclear politics on British defence thinking. The more significant changes seen within Strachey's work resulted from his first-hand experience with political policy making. This brought a desire for caution in dealing with enemy nations and an awareness that change on an international level would take far longer than he believed in his younger years.

This chapter gives an alternative account of the work of John Strachey, which contrasts the more recent biographical accounts. Both Newman and Thompson identify his role as an intellectual and a politician, but neither integrates these roles closely, nor fully demonstrates the impact of his political life on his intellectual thinking. Historians generally associate Strachey with his economic theories, or his brief stint as Secretary of State for War and his participation in the controversy of Bevan's resignation. The former highlights the most successful aspect of his career, and the latter depicts the lack of success he achieved as a politician. By examining Strachey through his work on warfare, this chapter demonstrates one aspect of Strachey's work that has typically been overlooked. His work on war brought his political and intellectual life together in a way that was not apparent in his socialist writings. His work as a politician became instrumental to understanding the intellectual work of his later life. It also highlights on a more general note how integrated politics had become to British intellectuals during this time.

This chapter also highlights the more general move away from ideological thinking within mainstream British intellectuals. Strachey's later ideas combine mainstream

liberal ideals with social democracy, contrasting the Marxist philosophy he maintained in the 1930s. His expression of social democracy came across most clearly in his economic writing. By the 1960s Strachey's discussion of warfare postulated a defencist position and the maintenance of a balance of power between the nuclear powers. This fell in line with American contemporary thinking on the topic, and supported a liberal understanding of the circumstances. Working on the practical application of warfare (as opposed to merely discussing it in the abstract) brought out a more defencist line of thinking within Strachey. During the war he accepted the capitalist government's right to fight, which challenged the CPGB's official stance. When working for the Ministry of Defence he participated in the events of Korea and supported British action. In the following years during the threat of nuclear war he encouraged rearmament and tried to find the best way to defend Britain. These actions display the defencist mentality of a political analyst in contrast to the absolutism of a socialist ideologue.

The thesis as a whole deals with the change in intellectual ideas, brought about as a result of warfare. Strachey provides an excellent example of the radical changes that occurred over this period. His relationship with other intellectuals helps demonstrate the collaborative nature of intellectual discourse. In particular his more realist approach led Strachey to collaborate with intellectuals with more specific expertise such as Blackett and Liddell Hart. The next two chapters will develop this discourse and examine how the role of expert intellectuals within the wider intellectual debates of the time.

Chapter Four: Ethics and Liberal Science in the Nuclear Era

Introduction

In 1944 Joseph Rotblat became the only member of the British scientific contingent to walk out mid-way through the Manhattan Project. A Polish born physicist, Rotblat had worked on the project in Britain and was sent to Los Alamos in February 1944 to continue his research. Rotblat had ethical qualms about building a weapon of such destructive power, but the fall of Poland convinced him to set aside such thoughts and work to defeat the Nazis. In the early years of the project he maintained the popular belief that the Allies needed to develop the bomb before their German counterparts succeeded. When General Groves, the military director of the project, informed him that their main target was the Soviet Union, their supposed ally, he was dismayed. These feelings, alongside his growing belief that the bomb was not necessary for victory, caused his early departure.[480]

Rotblat's dissatisfaction with government work and his extreme dislike of the results drew him into public engagement and a lifelong campaign for unilateralism. After the war ended Rotblat, in an attempt to help stabilise the international situation, gave a series of lectures across England advocating a moratorium on nuclear research for three years. This generated fierce opposition from the Left who claimed he wanted to encumber the Soviets' research. As a result he abandoned the idea and helped found the British Atomic Scientists Association (ASA) in 1946.[481] The organisation tried to bring the issues and dangers of nuclear weapons to the public. In 1955 he joined with Bertrand Russell and Cecil Powell to become the British signatories of the Einstein-Russell Manifesto. Together they helped set up the first Pugwash Conference in 1957.

His story provides one example of the emergence of a new type of scientific intellectual discourse fuelled by participation in the development of military technology. From the mid-1930s the government started to recruit Britain's top scientists away from academia to work as advisors on the war effort. Many of these scientists started to discuss the

---

[480] Ferenc Morton Szasz, *British Scientists and the Manhattan Project: The Los Alamos Years* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992), pp. 56-62; Reiner Braun, ed. *Joseph Rotblat: Visionary for Peace* (Weinheim: Wiley-VCH, 2007), p. 7.
[481] Szasz, *British Scientists and the Manhattan Project*, p. 60.

consequences of war as a result of such participation. The development and use of the atomic bomb drew more scientists into this discussion.

Scholars have used Rotblat as an example of the rise of political awareness amongst Western scientists resulting from the detonation of the atomic bombs.[482] Robert Filner and Christoph Laucht both discuss the monumental impact of the atomic bomb on the political and ethical concerns of British scientists. As Laucht argues: "the creation of the atomic bomb moved the question of science and morality to a higher and much more complex level."[483] Yet the atomic bomb does not fully account for the rise in intellectual thought that accompanied the political activism. This chapter will argue that while the atomic bomb played a large part in expanding and focusing scientific political thought it did not solely cause this change in those scientists that undertook an intellectual approach. Instead a discourse emerged as a result of scientific integration with the state and the rise of what Edgerton describes as 'the warfare state'. For Rotblat, his new direction resulted from more than hatred of the bomb. The act of working for the military, interacting in this closed environment and creating weapons of warfare altered his way of thinking, which was reflected through public engagement.

The chapter will study this discourse by examining how the immersion into military research affected the beliefs and thinking of a variety of Britain's scientific intellectuals. Firstly it will chart how these intellectuals shifted their thinking at this time and examine the reasons for such changes. It will then discuss the role of high level scientific administrators. The need for these administrators developed alongside the inclusion of civilian scientists in government. The men that took on these roles often used their knowledge of state science as a platform for their own intellectual discussions. Lastly the chapter will examine the major aspects of this debate: liberal science and ethics. In doing so it will discuss how these concepts developed through participation in the state and their impact on the wider field of intellectual discussion in this thesis.

---

[482] Historiographical discussion in: Robert E Filner, 'The Roots of Political Activism in British Science,' *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 32, no. 1 (1976): pp. 25-29.
[483] Christoph Laucht, *Elemental Germans: Klaus Fuchs, Rudolf Peierls, and the Making of British Nuclear Culture 1939-59* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), p. 125.

Part 1 – Science and the State

The importance of scientists as intellectuals results from two main points: their role in influencing political thinking and their contribution to existing debates on ethics and liberty. Their discussion on the role of liberal science influenced broader thinking on science in relation to warfare. This included the work of thinkers such as Strachey and Liddell Hart.[484] Their role in the government also led them to directly interact with political and military leaders, disseminating their ideas to these officials.

While many groups within society took part in this debate, including political leaders and the Church, the role of scientists in evaluating their own responsibilities makes this aspect of intellectual enquiry extremely important to the overall discussion. The use of science as the basis of their analysis highlights one of the main differences between this type of thinking and the mainstream intellectual arguments seen in earlier chapters. This rationale often ignored other aspects of society and devalued the importance of other social and political factors. Scientists did not, for example, focus on the role of ideology or the role of state institutions. Their aims remained on the ethics of war and the importance of liberal science. The phrase 'liberal science' within the thesis refers to the idea of scientific freedom and the sharing of information, with only a limited regard for the ideology of liberalism.[485]

By the 1930s it became clear that technological innovation would define a future war. Technical specialists such as Barnes Wallis and Robert Watson-Watt worked alongside the military to develop defensive and offensive technology.[486] Yet despite acting as military advisors many within the military elite did not accept the scientists as equals and rejected their attempts to involve themselves in matters outside of their fields. Perhaps the best way to describe this relationship derives from the term 'boffin' which came into popular use in the late 1930s. According to Ronald Clark: "The boffin has since been defined as 'a civilian technician who advises air crew and others on specialized subjects', and also as 'a civilian scientist employed by the Royal Air

---

[484] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*; Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence: A Fresh Look at the West's Military Position* (London: Stevens and Sons, 1960).
[485] This differs slightly from the more conventional use of the term which refers to science undertaken for knowledge rather than profit.
[486] Wallis worked on aircraft design in the inter-war years and is best known for his invention of the bouncing bomb that took out German dams in Operation Chastise. Watson-Watt developed the British radar system working with the Tizard Committee in the mid-1930s.

Force'."[487] The etymology of the term remains unclear. Clark uses an explanation given by Air Vice-Marshal Chamberlain as "a bird of astonishingly queer appearance, bursting with weird and sometimes inopportune ideas but possessed of staggering inventiveness, analytical powers and persistence."[488] Its use commands respect and derision simultaneously. In using such a term military leaders respected these scientists but made it clear that they were separate and not completely trustworthy. The term moved into popular culture, seen within films such as *The Dam Busters*, and became a common stereotype for scientists and engineers during the Cold War.

The debate on the role of science became increasingly important in mainstream politics and intellectual discussion as the Cold War progressed. In 1945 debate on atomic energy and the bomb brought forth questions on the freedom of scientific research. Ideas were put forth promoting international control of atomic weapons. At a UN meeting Captain Harold Stassen, the former US Governor of Minnesota from 1939 to 1943, argued that by supressing atomic scientific knowledge the US would only encourage other nations to explore the destructive powers of atomic energy.[489] The McMahon Act of 1946 ended such hopes. In Britain the ASA spoke out against Britain's Atomic Energy Bill in 1946, arguing that it restricted freedom. The government refused to allow their request that scientific freedom be maintained through law.[490]

The foundation of the ASA highlights an important milestone in British scientists' participation in politics and public engagement. Laucht describes their objectives to educate the public, influence political decision makers and give control of atomic weapons to an international body.[491] This organisation represented a major collaborative effort between many of Britain's atomic scientists to reach out and inform the public of the effects of these weapons, even if their information interfered with the government's response to the situation.[492]

The importance of scientists in the Second World War and the following events brought science into the public eye. Throughout the Western world scientists such as Albert

---

[487] Ronald William Clark, *The Rise of the Boffins* (London: Phoenix House, 1962), p. vii.
[488] Clark, *The Rise of the Boffins*, pp. vii-viii.
[489] 'World Control for Atomic Power', *Times*, 10 November 1945, p. 4.
[490] R. E. Peierls and P. B. Moon, 'Atomic Energy' *Times*, 5 November 1946, p. 5.
[491] Laucht, *Elemental Germans*, p. 134.
[492] See: Christoph Laucht, 'Atoms for the People: The Atomic Scientists' Association, the British State and Nuclear Education in the Atom Train Exhibition, 1947–1948,' *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 04 (2012).

Einstein and Robert Oppenheimer became household names not just because of the eminence of their work but because of their role in public life. In Britain scientists working as advisors to the military including P. M. S. Blackett, Frederick Lindemann (Lord Cherwell), C. P. Snow, and Solly Zuckerman all became public figures. Blackett, Snow and Zuckerman all achieved fame by engaging with the public,[493] while Lindemann's relationship with Churchill and his central role in the Second World War brought him to the public's notice.

The success and controversy surrounding the Manhattan Project also played a large part in promoting individual scientists. In contrast to other defence projects, such as aircraft manufacturing, the Manhattan Project did not rely exclusively on technical experts and engineers. When building the bomb the government came up against two major problems: the limited understanding of the science behind the construction of the atomic bomb, and the uncertainty of success. To help solve these problems the British and US governments brought in theoretical scientists with academic backgrounds. In other areas these academic scientists advised the military and created new methods for improving military technology.

David Edgerton's work provides a detailed analysis of the role of these scientists in the state. He examines the contrast between the top academic scientists and the technocrats that gained power during the rise of the warfare state.[494] The greater emphasis on warfare and on technical developments led to an increase in the importance of specialist orientated departments and a drive towards hiring a greater number of technical experts. This included academics and civilians, but also included senior military personnel involved with R&D, businessmen and civil servants. Edgerton argues that "the crucial senior recruits from the outside were businessmen, not academics, let alone socialist academics, and many of them came straight from the arms industry."[495] These technocrats gained power at the elite levels and directed scientific research for the

---

[493] Examples include: P. M. S. Blackett, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy* (London: Turnstile Press, 1948); C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959); C. P. Snow, *Science and Government* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961); Solly Zuckerman, *From Apes to Warlords: The Autobiography (1904-1946) of Solly Zuckerman* (London: Hamilton, 1978). Snow also achieved fame through writing fictional novels. These scientists also came to the notice of important political officials. Guy Ortolano discusses their influence in helping Harold Wilson position the Labour Party as the party of modernisation: Guy Ortolano, *The Two Cultures Controversy: Science, Literature and Cultural Politics in Postwar Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 167-178.
[494] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, pp. 145-190.
[495] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, p. 146.

government's war efforts. Edgerton argues that their power even exceeded that of Labour ministers in the early post-war years.[496] Yet Edgerton's analysis only examines the 'warfare state' in relation to technical changes and the integration of the state apparatus and military involvement and expenditure. Another aspect of the 'warfare state' arose parallel to the changes in the state. This included a discourse on war and the challenges the state would face as it increased its involvement in the Cold War. For scientists, this discourse included questions on the nature of the state and questions on the morality of their actions.

The scientists that chose to speak out about current affairs fell into two main categories: scientists and scientific administrators. The scientists included some of Britain's most eminent researchers such as A. V. Hill and P. M. S. Blackett. The scientific administrators, including C. P. Snow and Vannevar Bush, operated alongside the research scientists and often worked as mediators for the government when they employed academic scientists during times of war.

When discussing science and the state, these intellectuals represent the most influential voices. The importance of this group helps highlight a larger issue on the nature of political and intellectual thinking on warfare. Their expertise helped them form new methods of analysing the shift in warfare as a result of new technologies. In contrast, political and military ideas remained firmly rooted in traditional modes of thinking even when adapting to new types of warfare.[497] The scientific thinking of this group brings forth a new frame of analysis and helps illuminate the problems with traditional reactions to modern forms of warfare.

Scientists had two major roles in the war: firstly to participate on committees and produce reports for military and political leaders. The most important of such reports went to the Joint Chiefs and the War Cabinet. Secondly these scientists took on the role of advisors to government departments and military officials. The specifics of both roles put the scientist in the position of advisor to those with executive power.

The reports of scientists helped back up the ideas of the military but the scientists themselves had little say in how their ideas would be implemented. This resulted from

---

[496] Edgerton, *Warfare State*, pp. 148-149.
[497] Ronald William Clark, *Tizard* (London: Methuen, 1965), p. 116.

the structure of different scientific committees in relation to the military. The committee that developed radar (The Tizard Committee) worked under the Air Ministry, and under the Air Defence Research Sub-Committee of the Committee of Imperial Defence (CID) which in turn worked under the CID. The MAUD Committee (the precursor to the Manhattan Project) worked under the Committee for the Scientific Survey of Air Warfare which worked under the Tizard Committee and the Committee for the Scientific Survey of Air Offence, both of whom reported to the Air Ministry.[498] Complications and bureaucracy within the state made it difficult for scientists to have a voice in government and even more difficult to find any unified approach for getting their message across.

The beliefs of the military leadership did not always reflect those of the military intellectuals who saw science as the driving force behind military innovation. Some officers including retired Captain Liddell Hart and Lieutenant Commander Charles Goodeve (a trained scientist) petitioned for greater involvement of civilian scientists.[499] The role of science as a means to analyse warfare ran throughout both scientific and military thinking. The discussion of military thinkers in the following chapter will demonstrate the importance of technological progress to their arguments. Both Liddell Hart and Fuller, as military historians, relied on new technology to analyse and discuss changes to warfare. Fuller argued that science in the post-war years had become regimented by war. This turned society into a 'wardom' (a term he created as an analogy for a militaristic state or 'kingdom of war'), destroying culture and morality while at the same time advancing science.[500]

While the discussion on warfare in mainstream intellectual debate resulted from larger discourses on the nature of the state, intellectual discussion by scientists and military thinkers started with questions about war. Both groups help expand the understanding of the changes of this period through a perspective that differed from the political one seen within mainstream intellectual thinking.

Both groups also tended to see war as a systemic part of the international system. They used war to frame their ideas on international politics rather than looking at war as a

---

[498] Clark, *Tizard*, p. 128.

[499] Maurice Kirby, *Operational Research in War and Peace: The British Experience from the 1930s to 1970* (London: Imperial College Press, 2003), pp. 86-87.

[500] J. F. C. Fuller, *The Second World War 1939-45: A Strategical and Tactical History* (London: London Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948), pp. 409-410.

symptom of a larger problem. Both scientists and military intellectuals mostly defined peace as the absence of war. Using Ceadel's model, this puts their arguments firmly within the defencist strand of war and peace thinking. Their work discussed ways to stop war rather than ways to bring about a lasting peace. By using war to define peace, scientists and military thinkers put more emphasis on war as the seminal feature of the international system. This differed from intellectuals discussed in the first three chapters who often defined peace in terms of change to the international system. Their analysis created a discourse that lacked the strong ideological element that defined mainstream thinking. These scientists still held ideological beliefs, but when discussing war their ideas focused on a different narrative. They became more concerned about the use of their technology and the progress of the arms race than the structure of the state itself.

While ideological divisions did not feature as a central point of contention, scientific ideas did overlap with the ideology of the Cold War, which focused on liberty. It argued that through the spread of democracy the West could free other nations from tyranny and protect Western liberty by destroying its greatest threat.[501] Scientists engaged with these ideas by focusing on the freedom of science rather than the freedom of individuals. As many of these scientists felt the future of society was dependent on scientific advances, by promoting the freedom of science they were also indirectly arguing for the freedom of society.[502]

Within this discourse, scientists argued that when the government gave its scientists freedom to pursue their own ideas without outside interference, science generated superior results. This contrasted to the dictatorial control over science within totalitarian nations. Such arguments were framed through ideas on the Cold War and used not only to promote the scientists' interests but also to highlight the superiority of the democratic states in the West. The most famous example of such an argument was put forth by Bush in 1949.[503] Bush argued that the lack of bureaucracy and greater freedom given to scientific exploration allowed Western science to advance faster and more successfully. His argument will be examined in greater depth later in the chapter.

---

[501] Engerman, 'Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War', pp. 20-27.

[502] In wider public discussion these concerns became prominent through the work of Karl Popper, who will be discussed later in the chapter.

[503] Vannevar Bush, *Modern Arms and Free Men: A Discussion of the Role of Science in Preserving Democracy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949).

These debates took place alongside mainstream discussion on the role of science and the need for scientific freedom. The central role of science in the Cold War brought scientists and their work into the forefront of public discussion. The role of science became politicised, particularly in the US and Soviet Union. In the US questions arose on the dangers of science and the trustworthiness of scientists. In his inaugural address Eisenhower stated: "Science seems ready to confer upon us, as its final gift, the power to erase human life from this planet."[504] The debate on the role of scientists became exemplified by the Oppenheimer hearing in 1954. McCarthy accused Oppenheimer and other scientists of delaying work on the H-bomb because of their communist sympathies. This followed a wave of protest against the H-bomb from scientists, politicians and religious leaders.[505] In the Soviet Union debates arose on the superiority of Soviet science, fuelled by Soviet Propaganda. One example is the debate on genetics started by Trofim Lysenko in 1947. While the Soviet Academy of Science condemned his work, Lysenko was considered a patriot and endorsed by Stalin, thus ending the debate in his favour.[506]

There also emerged an increasing desire for greater scientific freedom from intellectuals, both within and beyond the scientific community. Articles in publications such as the *Encounter*, a magazine clandestinely funded by the CIA, put forth these arguments. In the very first issue of *Encounter*, Irving Kristol, a prominent journalist and editor, discussed the importance of scientific freedom and the growing demand that scientists in the Soviet states should have the same rights.[507]

Their debate was limited to a small number of scientists who wrote in relation to one another. They did not write often with the general public in mind, even if they did publish through mainstream media such as newspapers and periodicals. The nature of the discourse remained limited to the problems these scientists perceived. The question of ethics demonstrates an important distinction between this discourse and other mainstream intellectual thinking. The debate on ethics focused on the moral implications of developing weapons of war. This debate did not, however, examine the concept of just warfare which gained prominence in intellectual and academic discussion during the

---

[504] Benjamin P. Greene, *Eisenhower, Science Advice, and the Nuclear Test-Ban Debate, 1945-1963* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007), p. 23.
[505] Philip M. Stern, *The Oppenheimer Case: Security on Trial* (New York: Harper, 1969), pp. 133-159.
[506] Ted Hopf, *Reconstructing the Cold War: The Early Years, 1945-1958* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 36.
[507] Iving Kristol, 'Men of Science – And Conscience', *Encounter* I, October 1953, pp. 57-59.

war and post-war years.[508] These scientists also did not engage in discussing utopian visions of a world without war. Mainstream intellectuals in the post-war period often deliberated on the concept of competent authority, and whether democratic states had the legal or moral right to wage war against autocratic ones. Scientists mostly focused on the role of scientists in preparing for war. In doing so they ignored the ideological dimension to war theory.

This came across in one of two ways. Scientists who took a pacifist approach condemned war without reference to ideological or nationalist agendas. These scientists took part in various political protests. In 1950, 100 scientists from Cambridge petitioned the government to halt the development of nuclear weapons, with little success.[509] In the 1950s a group called *Science for Peace* generated a large following. This group believed that scientists had an obligation to educate the public on the increasing dangers.[510] It held several conferences and disseminated information on the consequences of nuclear weapons. British scientists also played an active role in the CND. In 1961 approximately 800 scientists, including many from the European Organisation for Nuclear Research, launched an appeal for a peaceful solution to the Berlin issue and a stop to all nuclear testing. They believed in the positive benefits to nuclear research but wished to prevent their work being used in a militant capacity.[511]

Others accepted warfare and discussed the issues of warfare with the assumption that war was permanent and unavoidable. In many ways this mirrors the realist analysis of international relations which remains sceptical on applying moral judgements to state behaviour.

The greater damage and atrocities committed by modern weapons drew more scientists into the debate on the moral responsibility of science but few thought to look beyond the consequences of weapons to the underlying problem of warfare. In contrast to other intellectuals, scientists often ignored the political and philosophical dimension of war and focused on the practical applications. Even the strong unilateralist movement amongst scientists, demonstrated by the emergence of organisations such as Pugwash in

---

[508] Holger Nehring, *Politics of Security: British and West German Protest Movements and the Early Cold War, 1945-1970* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 21.
[509] Joan Ruddock, *CND Scrapbook* (London: Optima, 1987), p. 140.
[510] 'Science for Peace', *Times*, 21 January 1952, p. 3.
[511] '800 Scientists Urge Peace Talks', *Guardian*, 3 November 1961, p. 13.

1957, mainly focused on modern weapons rather than warfare as an institution. This perhaps relates to the difference between expert intellectuals and mainstream intellectuals. The focus of experts remained largely on the specifics of their own field, even when discussing these issues in a wider context.

For the most part they also stuck to traditional media to express their ideas. These included published books as the primary means of expression, and smaller pieces in newspapers and periodicals. Their academic backgrounds led them to publish in journals with greater frequency than other intellectuals and they used speeches as another means of communication. These varied between academic lectures and speeches given to political organisations on the nature of science and defence.

Michael Polanyi argued that scientists existed "as members of a closely knit organisation."[512] As a result scientists had the freedom to choose their own direction but their work would always be part of a larger body of research intertwined within this community. The intellectual discourse examined within this chapter also emerged as part of this community, connected through the direction of science and through the experiences of these scientists.

Perhaps more importantly for the development of a scientific community, these men also engaged in social activities together. The London dining club Tots and Quots, founded by Zuckerman, rose to become one of the most prominent of such organisations in the late 1930s. This type of group helped develop intellectual thinking and collaboration. An example of such occurred in 1940 when a group of 25 anonymous authors published the book *Science in War,* arguing against the government's ineffectual deployment of civilian scientists.[513] These authors included Zuckerman, Blackett and J. D. Bernal, and the book resulted from their discussions in the club.[514]

---

[512] Michael Polanyi, 'The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory,' *Minerva* 1, no. 1 (1962): p. 54.
[513] Anonymous, *Science in War* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1940).
[514] Kirby, *Operational Research in War and Peace*, p. 88.

Part 2 – The Impact of the Arms Race

In the 1930s the debate on the merits of socialism and the evils of fascism became the most popular discussion points from British scientists participating in public intellectual writing. From 1939 onwards the immersion of academic scientists into government and military work altered the perspective of scientific intellectuals towards warfare. Many of these scientists who had stayed out of public life previously started to engage with political thinking on liberal science and the ethics of science.

The public discussion in the 1930s, particularly on socialism, linked directly with other public debate. Socialist scientists such as Bernal and Blackett engaged with mainstream debates on the nature of the state and the role of economic planning.[515] Bernal in particular became the face of socialism amongst scientists and his book *The Social Function of Science* brought him further into the public sphere.[516]

From 1939 a new type of public engagement emerged from scientific intellectuals, focused directly on scientific issues. These debates arose alongside the introduction of academic scientists into the military organisation. One of the first examples became known as the Tizard Committee, and involved a group of scientists led by Henry Tizard working towards developing radar. Tizard, at this time, was considered the foremost scientific administrator within Britain and the government's unofficial chief scientific advisor. When discussing the government's reluctance to include scientists within the state Tizard stated: "The first time, I believe, that scientists were ever called in to study the needs of the Services as distinct from their wants, was in 1935, and then only as a last resort."[517] The progression of this new relationship developed slowly as the military elites acknowledged the importance of scientists to the war effort. Many, however, remained resistant, seeking to control the output of science and direct scientific progress. After working on this Committee Blackett rose to prominence with the introduction of Operational Research (OR) and its dissemination into all branches of the military.

The war also saw the promotion of Lindemann who became the government's most important scientific advisor and helped direct the agenda for wartime research.

---

[515] Filner, 'The Roots of Political Activism in British Science'; Andrew August Brown, *J. D. Bernal: The Sage of Science* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 137-164.

[516] J. D. Bernal, *The Social Function of Science* (London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1939).

[517] Henry Tizard, 'Science and the Services,' *The RUSI Journal* 91, no. 563 (1946): p. 338.

Lindemann had been working as Churchill's scientific advisor and remained so when Churchill took office. Lindemann's rise saw the marginalisation of Tizard when top officials including Sir Archibald Sinclair, the Secretary for Air, started to ask Lindemann for advice over Tizard.[518] Both men, however, had input on the atomic research. They followed the work of the MAUD Committee, and Lindemann urged Churchill to allow the research to continue.[519]

The Tizard Committee became extremely important not only for the scientists that worked on the project but as the foundation for the relationship between scientists and the state. The Committee included A. V. Hill, one of Britain's foremost scientists. As a physiologist, Hill's work on analysing the mechanical processes of muscles gained him a Nobel Prize in 1922. Hill held a Royal Society Chair at University College London and used his position to campaign for greater scientific participation in government in the years following the Tizard Committee. In 1940 he was elected to the House of Commons and continued such campaigns.[520] His political activities contrasted sharply with his views in the earlier 1930s, when he urged scientists to stay away from politics.[521]

His work on the Tizard Committee had a major impact on his views on scientists' involvement in politics. With the introduction of Lindemann to the Committee the relationship between the scientists became strained and Lindemann became extremely unpopular with the rest of the Committee. The Committee broke up with the resignation of Blackett and Hill due to their dispute with Lindemann. When the Committee reformed in October 1936 Lindemann was not asked to re-join.[522] These events had such a dramatic impact on Hill that he even went so far as to literally turn them into a Greek epic, depicting them in a poem set in the style of the Earl of Derby's translation of the Iliad.[523] A dramatized account of the disagreement between Lindemann and the rest of the scientists was set out in the poem. The effort and satirical nature of such actions

---

[518] G. J. Piller, 'Tizard, Sir Henry Thomas (1885–1959)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36528, accessed 8 July 2014].

[519] Richard Rhodes, *The Making of the Atomic Bomb* (London: Touchstone, 1986), pp. 371-372.

[520] Bernard Katz, 'Hill, Archibald Vivian (1886–1977)', rev. V. M. Quirke, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31230, accessed 30 April 2014].

[521] Mary Jo Nye, *Blackett: Physics, War, and Politics in the Twentieth Century* (London: Harvard University Press, 2004), p. 30.

[522] Snow, *Science and Government*, p. 35.

[523] The poem was written at the time and later published in: A. V. Hill, *The Ethical Dilemma of Science and Other Writings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 269-271.

displayed his emotional investment in these events. When Snow later discussed these events publically, Hill took an active and pronounced interest in the subsequent debate.[524] He also allowed Snow to republish the poem in his *A Postscript to Science and Government*.[525]

Through participating in various government roles these intellectuals started to interpret the Cold War through a specific discourse. The lack of ideology showed a key aspect that differed from much of mainstream thinking. The Cold War can be divided into two main facets: the dispute between the ideologies of the West and East, and the development of the arms race. When discussing the rhetoric of the Cold War, scholars have assessed the competing discourses between a Cold War fought on strategic terms and a Cold War fought on ideological terms.[526] At the time intellectuals such as C. Wright Mills criticised the discrepancy between the two and the idea that an arms race could help encourage the spread of freedom and democracy.[527] A recent study by Holger Nehring suggests that the concept of the 'Cold War' has been used so often and with such varied meanings that historians have lost sight of the main aspect of the Cold War: "its war-like character."[528] The simplicity of the scientists' understanding of the Cold War as an explosion of arms gives credence to Nehring's analysis in respect to other, more complex interpretations. It is easy to see how one can break the idea of the 'Cold War' down into many difference facets and consequently end up fitting them together to form a totalising, and thus inaccurate, whole. This idea will be further discussed in the next chapter.

After working on the Tizard Committee, Blackett went on to participate in the state throughout the war and became one of Britain's most important scientific intellectuals. As one of Britain's most notable socialist scientists, the move away from ideological trends makes Blackett's work even more significant. During the war he headed different groups of scientists as they explored various approaches to increase the efficiency of military technology. He also worked on the MAUD Committee. Blackett was the only one of these scientists to believe that Britain could not build an atomic bomb by 1943 at

---

[524] See: A. V. Hill archives at Churchill College, Cambridge.

[525] C. P. Snow, *A Postscript to Science and Government* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 19-22.

[526] Martin J. Medhurst, Robert L. Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert L. Scott, *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology* (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1997).

[527] C. Wright Mills, *The Causes of World War Three* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1959).

[528] Holger Nehring, 'What Was the Cold War?,' *English Historical Review* 127, no. 527 (2012): p. 923.

a fraction of the eventual cost at Los Alamos.[529] At this point the role of scientists played a vital part in the decisions taken by those in power. Their understanding of technology helped them understand the realities of warfare and how these decisions would shape the war. Yet both Attlee and the Joint Chiefs dismissed his arguments, calling him a layman.[530] The end of the war saw a rise in Blackett's public discussion but such writings moved away from examining the nature of the state and focused on the West's military policies. His sympathetic leanings towards the Soviet Union come through his work but it lacked the socialist theories seen in his work in the early 1930s.[531]

With the emergence of the Cold War Blackett's socialist politics raised suspicion in the government. He published his most important intellectual work, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*, in 1948.[532] Out of all the scientists discussed in this chapter, Blackett's work most closely resembled mainstream intellectual debate through its methodological approach. While still analysing warfare using his scientific expertise, Blackett also heavily engaged in debate on the political implications of the Cold War. His reliance on understanding the atomic bomb's effects and its similarities to other types of weaponry also had parallels with the discourse of the military intellectuals, who tried to understand warfare through technological change.

Blackett accepted the possibility that the Soviets would soon develop their own atomic weapons and the political landscape would alter as a result. His argument did not differentiate much between conventional weapons and atomic weapons, seeing atomic weapons only as a larger scale bomb. He believed it unlikely that any state would use atomic weapons to invade another in the next few years and thus did not put much stock in the power of the deterrent as a means to stop warfare, especially smaller, non-global wars. Blackett also put forth a highly critical view of America's position on atomic energy, criticising their treatment of the Soviets and condemning the Baruch Plan.[533] His conclusions downplayed the threat of war and communism. Officially the government policy at the time argued "the best deterrent to war is tangible evidence of our intention and ability to withstand attack."[534] In writing this book he spoke out against the

---

[529] Nye, *Blackett*, pp. 65-74.
[530] Nye, *Blackett*, p. 87.
[531] This came through clearly in his work: Blackett, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*.
[532] Blackett, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*.
[533] Blackett, *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*, pp. 46-175.
[534] 1947-48 [Cmd. 7327] Statement Relating to Defence, section 51.

government and argued against deterrence as a viable policy, which caused many to see him as a communist sympathizer.

His problems with the government throughout the 1940s helped encourage Blackett to increase his public engagement and speak out against government policy. When Polanyi argued to Blackett in 1941 that it was his duty to speak out, Blackett stated that he did not wish to risk the consequences of such action.[535] After the war his perception had altered and he openly spoke out about the scientific and political realities of the Cold War. This book directly referenced the problems of Second World War, and perhaps the validation of his previous conclusions helped his decision to speak out with such candour. Mary Nye, Blackett's biographer, suggests that his work for the government helped him understand the problems within the system, causing him to become "deeply suspicious of the marriage of academic OR with Cold War military strategy."[536]

His next piece of intellectual writing occurred in 1956 with the publication of the book *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*.[537] The intervening years between 1948 and 1956 saw major changes in the West's defence strategies and technical development. The hydrogen bomb, whose existence Blackett had looked on with scepticism, now occupied a prominent place in Western military defence. The relationship between the US and the Soviets had altered with the US no longer holding the global monopoly on atomic and nuclear weapons. The 1952 Global Strategy Paper from the new Churchill government and Eisenhower's 1954 New Look both demonstrated these changes. While the two policies showed important distinctions,[538] both emphasised the reliance on nuclear retaliation as a way to cut costs and strengthen the deterrent.

Blackett's work in 1956 responded to these changes and in particular the concept of 'massive retaliation' seen from the Eisenhower doctrine. Blackett emphasised the need to move away from the nuclear supremacy and plan for smaller, conventional wars. He also highlighted the discrepancy between the actions Britain and America would take in reality (using just enough force to get the Soviets to retreat) in contrast to their policy declarations. By publically stating the West would use massive nuclear force, Blackett

---

[535] Nye, *Blackett*, p. 88.

[536] Nye, *Blackett*, pp. 84-85.

[537] P. M. S. Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956).

[538] See: Andrew M Johnston, 'Mr. Slessor Goes to Washington: The Influence of the British Global Strategy Paper on the Eisenhower New Look,' *Diplomatic History* 22, no. 3 (1998).

argued they were causing unnecessary instability. He suggested that this resulted from the belief that if the East gained military supremacy they would automatically attack. Blackett disagreed with this analysis and argued that the Russians would act no differently than the Americans had when they held supremacy.[539]

While Blackett did not oppose nuclear weapons, as the Soviet's conventional army greatly outnumbered the West's, he argued that the current defence policies did not fully reflect the nature of nuclear warfare. Blackett advocated the British (or optimistic) school of thought on nuclear weapons. This school argued that once both sides had nuclear weapons the international situation became more stable as mutually assured destruction prevented both sides from waging war. He believed this made "all-out total war exceedingly unlikely" and as a result "we should act as if atomic and hydrogen bombs have abolished total war".[540] He argued the Soviet bomb created a balance of power that actually improved the international situation rather than worsened it. Blackett's ideas show similarities to the arguments put forth by the military intellectuals who also argued that a limited nuclear war was impossible. Fuller maintained that the existence of nuclear arms on both sides guaranteed the stalemate and the only way to settle international disputes and avoid a nuclear war would be to use diplomacy.[541]

Blackett's stance had become generally more accepted and resulted in far less outrage. Blackett himself noted the change in the violence of his critics in 1948 as opposed to his reception a decade later. He believed that the rest of the country had caught up with his line of thinking, displaying once again the notion that he had been right at the wrong time. He described this phenomenon as "being a premature military realist."[542] Ironically the ideas put forth in this book turned out to be wrong at the right time. Blackett's assessment ignored the need for a technologically advanced delivery system although the prevailing British opinion on the nuclear stalemate supported his arguments in the 1950s. Those that did take an opposing view argued the belief in a permanent stalemate was naive and too simplistic. Strachey put forth the contrasting theory, the pessimistic school of thought, several years later and used Blackett's work to highlight the problems inherent with the British school of thought. Strachey argued that simply having the bomb

---

[539] Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*, pp. 22-32; 85-88.
[540] Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*, p. 100.
[541] J. F. C. Fuller, *The Conduct of War, 1789-1961: A Study of the Impact of the French, Industrial, and Russian Revolutions on War and Its Conduct* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961), pp. 316-317.
[542] P. M. S. Blackett, *Studies of War: Nuclear and Conventional* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962), p. 76.

did not protect a nation and that the most important aspect of defence came from having the capacity to deliver these weapons.[543] By the 1960s this had become the prevailing military view, although in 1962 Blackett still argued for limiting the amount of weapons as the path to disarmament.[544]

Despite looking at the ideas of scientists such as Blackett, Strachey did not spend too much time examining the influence of science as part of his analysis. He acknowledged the importance of technological changes arguing that presently "the race is qualitative not quantitative."[545] Yet the majority of his ideas revolved around analysing the political and diplomatic aspects of the Cold War. His interest in science was limited to using these changes to help explain the reactions of states to the international situation.

While there are distinct differences in the arguments and outlook of these two authors, on the whole their ideas had many similarities. Both used a realist framework of analysis and both responded to the same debates. The similarity of their analyses is most likely why Strachey choose to focus so heavily on Blackett's analysis. Both men present examples of socialists who altered their thinking as a result of the events surrounding the war and the atomic bomb. Both presented their arguments on the nuclear situation using a realist analysis that lacked an ideological framework.

Part 3 – Liberal Science and Freedom from Coercion

After the war the government increased its efforts to integrate science and military thinking.[546] Those scientists working for the government started to discuss the problems of such an endeavour. Military research limited the freedom of science and the ability to disseminate ideas. This raised the issue of the dangers of secrecy to scientific progress and to the freedom of its scientists. The role of the public intellectual intersected with the role of scientific administrators. These administrators worked to deal with these concerns at the government level and helped influence the intellectuals discussing these ideas at the public level. Two of the most influential administrators that helped guide this thinking were Tizard and Bush. While Bush worked as an administrator for the

---

[543] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, pp. 27-32.
[544] Blackett, *Studies of War*, p. 164.
[545] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. 117.
[546] 1945-46 [Cmd. 6923] Central Organisation for Defence, p. 4.

government of the United States and wrote as an intellectual for a US audience, he has been included in this thesis due to the enormous influence he exerted over the British scientific intellectuals and his central role in defining how a scientific administrator could also work as a public intellectual.

While Tizard's public engagement remained limited, he did speak out after the war about his involvement as a scientific administrator. Both Tizard and Bush used their experience to evaluate the failure of German science during the war. Tizard argued that the German "High Command was too confident that it knew what was needed in all branches of the war effort, and turned to the scientists too late."[547]

Bush worked at MIT from 1919 and became the Dean of the MIT School of Engineering in 1932. His work within politics began in 1938 when he became the vice-chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA), the predecessor of NASA. In this role he had to lobby the Senate Appropriations Committee for funding. After taking the chairmanship of NACA he approached President Roosevelt in 1940 about forming a federal agency to help facilitate the cooperation between civilian scientists and the military. This became known as the National Defense Research Committee (NDRC), with Bush as its chairman. Bush left this position in 1941 to chair the newly created Office of Scientific Research and Development. The new organisation had a similar mandate to the NDRC but with greater financial resources. In this role Bush became the most powerful scientific advisor in the US and the most important administrator between the military and civilian scientists.[548]

Bush's more considerable endeavours into public engagement led to a more in-depth evaluation of the contrast between German science and the Allies' liberal science. His book, *Modern Arms and Free Men*, became one of the leading discussions on the importance of liberal science. He argued that the more open science in democratic countries allowed science to prosper and accounted for the success of the Allies' bomb.

As one of the US's leading scientific administrators, Bush wrote primarily for an American audience without engaging with the British debate on this topic. Yet his ideas

---

[547] Tizard, 'Science and the Services', p. 339.
[548] G. Pascal Zachary, *Endless Frontier: Vannevar Bush: Engineer of the American Century* (London: Free Press, 1997), pp. 89-143.

had a large impact on the thinking of British scientific intellectuals and influenced those scientists that worked as political advisors.

Bush's work explored the relationship between political freedom and scientific progress. Writing during the time leading up to the Soviets gaining atomic weapons, Bush attempted to explain how science and democracy had changed the nature of warfare. In doing so he laid out an argument that Western military defence would gain superiority over totalitarian states as a result of the freedom they gave their scientists. His own work in developing weapons for the United States government and overseeing the war effort prompted Bush to express his ideas on the future of science and the fear of atomic warfare. His public work followed from a government report submitted to Truman in 1945: *Science, The Endless Frontier*.[549] In this report he urged the federal government to continue to fund the physical and medical sciences and continue on the path of technological progress to maintain good defences. His ideas eventually reached Congress and resulted in the formation of the National Science Foundation in 1950.

His underlying premise came from the idea that science prospered more when the state allowed scientists to work openly and freely, giving the scientists greater control and autonomy to carry out their research and expand their ideas. Science within totalitarian states brought in a far greater amount of bureaucracy and central control from non-scientists which limited the scope and effectiveness of such research.

Bush's role as an administrator helps demonstrate the precarious nature of scientists in roles of authority. During the war Bush garnered great support from the government. Once Truman took over in 1945 his power base, which relied entirely on political favour, dissipated. Many within the military had resented his control during the war and took advantage of Truman's detachment. Their main concern lay in Bush's demand for equal status for civilians working in the military and greater inter-service co-operation. The National Security Act of 1947, which increased military autonomy, also helps account for his loss in power. After leaving government service he wrote *Modern Arms*, which resulted from the understanding of military science he gained during the war. Its success earned him public esteem and he became the face of science in the US. The book directly influenced his return to politics. The Soviet bomb called into question US superiority and

---

[549] Vannevar Bush, *Science, the Endless Frontier* (Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1945).

Bush's words helped alleviate some of these concerns, and revitalised his popularity in political circles.[550]

Overall British intellectual discussion of this book appears highly favourable. Even those that responded with a critical assessment still encouraged others to read his work and participated in debate on the issues he raised. Author Edwin Colston Shepherd believed Bush effectively showed "the classic rule for success in war might now be re-written as: 'Trust in the scientist'".[551] Author and journalist Sebastian Haffner argued the points within Bush's thesis "go to the very root of the present political world crisis."[552] Perhaps the most interesting positive appraisal of this work came from the *Economist*. The review suggested that Bush's work helped erase the fears from the Great Depression that Marxism might be right.[553] This highlights the importance of scientific research in influencing other aspects of the state and bringing forth new perspectives.

A more critical response from Richard Crossman suggested that Bush ignored the aspects of German science that did not correspond to his thesis. Crossman also brought up the point that this image of democracy worked well during war but not in peacetime. He used the analogy of Hitler expelling Jewish scientists to parallel the loyalty purges of socialist scientists in the US.[554] In essence Crossman argued the Cold War had made Western society more militant, denying its citizens liberal freedoms, as evidenced by the treatment of scientists. Crossman examined Bush's arguments from an American and British perspective, bringing out the similarities between the threats to democracy on both sides of the Atlantic and highlighting the increased dangers for Europe from Soviet rockets. The discussion of warfare through a scientific perspective brought about new ways of examining the situation, and through this discourse the danger of technology and military growth came into public debate. A lack of such ideas in British political and military thinking helps highlight the contrast between the more traditional modes of thinking in politics that accepted British militancy, and the new ideas from scientists.

The success of Bush's thesis within scientific circles demonstrates the importance of the scientific perspective within this group of intellectuals. Bush's influence on Britain's

---

[550] Zachary, *Endless Frontier*, pp. 346-350.
[551] Edwin Shepherd Colston, 'The Scientist's Responsibility', *Times Literary Supplement*, 24 March 1950, p. 179.
[552] Sebastian Haffner, 'Prospect for Freedom', *Observer*, 2 April 1950, p. 8.
[553] 'A Creed for the Free', *Economist*, 31 December 1949, pp. 1467-1468.
[554] Richard Crossman, 'Books in General', *New Statesman and Nation* 39, 22 April 1950, pp. 460-461.

scientific intellectuals contrasts to the ideas of thinkers such as Karl Popper. Popper, who also put forth a strong argument in favour of liberalism, did not receive any notice from this community despite his eminence in mainstream intellectual circles.[555] The importance of some works as opposed to others demonstrates the narrow discursive field these intellectuals operated within. Debate written from a scientific perspective gained attention but mainstream ideas received little notice. While writing on similar themes, Hill never mentioned Popper in his work on scientific ethics; nor did Snow when he examined closed politics within liberal democracies. Snow did, however, mention Bush several times.[556]

Bush's book also made a significant impact on British political and scientific thought. In 1944 the British Chiefs of Staff had set up the Defence Research Policy Committee (DRPC) to assess the 'Future Development in Weapons and Methods of War,' chaired by Tizard.[557] Tizard asked the DRPC, set to review the report in 1950, to use Bush's book as part of their discussions.[558]

In response to Tizard's work members of the Admiralty read and discussed *Modern Arms*. In a letter to Tizard, Michael Denny, the Controller of the Navy writing on behalf of the Admiralty members of the DRPC, expressed concerns on Bush's argument in favour of scientists in executive positions:

> Throughout, also, we believe too much weight and feeling is thrown upon the dogma that Civilian Scientists should control the military users, and not vice versa. Many examples are alleged where military stagnation strangled possible scientific advances. If co-operation was bad in the U.S.A. in the past, it is certainly not the case in the U.K. now![559]

The language here suggests this topic was more controversial and a bigger problem within higher military circles than they wished to acknowledge. Using both "control" and "co-operate" in the same context clearly demonstrates their belief in scientific subordination and suggests that they accepted joint ventures as long as they remained at

---

[555] Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Vol. 1 the Spell of Plato* (London: Routledge, 1945); Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Vol 2: The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath* (London: Routledge, 1952).
[556] Snow, *Science and Government*; Hill, *The Ethical Dilemma of Science and Other Writings*.
[557] The National Archives (TNA): CAB 137/19.
[558] Letter sent by Tizard to the Ministry of Defence for the members of the D.R.P., 30 March 1950. TNA: DEFE 9/19.
[559] Letter to Tizard from the Controller of the Navy on behalf of all Admiralty members of the D.R.P.C., 16 May 1950. TNA: DEFE 9/19.

the top. Denny also focused entirely on Bush's emphasis on political ideology and the need for changes to military strategy. He stated: "The principal lesson from this book is political; it is that Democracy must be made to beat Totalitarianism on its own merits".[560] Denny diminished the central role science played in Bush's argument in order to focus on the military applications. This letter demonstrates the lack of acknowledgement of scientific autonomy from the highest levels of military leadership and the refusal to accept any changes.

By the 1950s the role of the scientist in military and public thinking had started to shift. The increasing role of scientists within the state led to further concerns. The emergence of spies such as Klaus Fuchs and the Rosenbergs brought up questions on the loyalties of these scientists. The situation was particularly difficult for British foreign-born scientists. Rudolf Peierls, one of the founders of the ASA, came under suspicion not only due to his German nationality and friendship with Fuchs, but also due to his belief in the freedom of science and scientific exchange with the Soviets.[561]

At the time he published these ideas Bush headed up a contingent of scientists, including Oppenheimer, to investigate the claims that the Soviet Union had developed their own atomic bomb. Bush expressed his outrage at the loss of Oppenheimer's security clearance in 1954. He wrote a long article putting the events surrounding Oppenheimer into the broader context of scientific freedom.[562] The article started by discussing the security concerns faced at the present time. He argued that "a free people when it is afraid tends to abandon its liberties. There is an enormous difference between taking due care and striking blindly in a wave of hysteria."[563] He spoke in particular of the danger to science from this growing fear and the resulting actions. Bush highlighted the "underlying unrest and discouragement" that now permeated American scientists caught up in the wave of McCarthyism, "because they have inevitably been intimately associated with problems of national defense, and also because in this present day there has been a general distrust of science itself and of scientists as individuals."[564] Bush suggested the growing mistrust led to the refusal to allow scientists to participate in executive decision making. He stated:

---

[560] TNA: DEFE 9/19.
[561] Laucht, *Elemental Germans*, p. 110.
[562] Vannevar Bush, 'If We Alienate Our Scientists', *New York Times*, 13 June 1954, pp. 9; 60-71.
[563] Bush, 'If We Alienate Our Scientists', p. 9.
[564] Bush, 'If We Alienate Our Scientists', p. 60.

> If one is in any doubt as to this matter he can consult recent statements of the Secretary of Defense. There is no need to caution scientists not to step beyond the minor matters of technology. They need to be welcomed where they can contribute, welcomed genuinely and their opinions respected.[565]

The tone and angle of inquiry differs in this article from his work five years before. While both discuss the need for freedom within science, his early work provides a more optimistic and patriotic account. By 1954 during the height of McCarthyism, Bush projected his anger and frustration at government actions and the consequences for the scientific community.

Part 4 – Liberal Science and Ethics

The secrecy and importance of their work left the scientific community especially vulnerable to McCarthyism, particularly those with socialist beliefs. When in the US Blackett was searched and monitored by the FBI. Within Britain this suspicion stopped him from achieving any major government advisory position for 16 years after 1948.[566] This occurred despite his winning the Nobel Prize that year. Even before the Cold War the government felt suspicion over scientists with Left leanings. While working on the Manhattan Project, Nobel Laureate Niels Bohr appealed to both Roosevelt and Churchill for a more open relationship with the Russian nuclear physicists. Both men disagreed and Churchill talked about imprisoning Bohr for his ideas.[567]

These problems persisted throughout the Cold War. Solly Zuckerman's public disagreement with British policy in 1961 at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe Exercises caused a major outcry in Parliament. At this time he worked as the Chief Scientific Advisor to the Ministry of Defence. During the war Zuckerman worked as a scientific advisor to Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Tedder, and helped evaluate the effects of strategic bombing with Bernal. He left government service in 1946 to pursue academic interests, but accepted an appointment in 1960 to become the Chief Scientific

---

[565] Bush, 'If We Alienate Our Scientists', p. 64.
[566] B. Lovell, *P.M.S. Blackett: A Biographical Memoir* (London: Royal Society, 1976), pp. 70-71; Nye, *Blackett*, pp. 92-93.
[567] Margaret Gowing, *Britain and Atomic Energy, 1939-1945* (London: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 353-371.

Advisor to the Ministry of Defence. In 1964 he received a promotion and became the first appointee to the position of Chief Scientific Advisor to the British government.[568]

Zuckerman believed that NATO did not have enough understanding on the nuclear situation. In 1960 the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Larry Norstad, had encouraged Britain to acquire intermediate range ballistic missiles and tactical atomic weapons. Zuckerman believed the use of such weapons would immediately spark a major nuclear conflict and challenged the entire concept of tactical nuclear weapons.

He painted a devastating picture of the results of nuclear war and brought to light the outdated military thinking that backed current policy. He also made it clear that the defenders could never win such a battle. As the West always put themselves in this role, this caused his audience huge consternation. He published this speech in two major academic journals.[569] His use of public forums to express non-governmental views raised questions on whether a government scientist could issue ideas into the public domain that contradicted government policy.

As the Prime Minister argued that Zuckerman had published the article with the agreement of the Minister of Defence Harold Watkinson,[570] questions arose on whether these ideas would become the new official policy of the British government in contradiction to present policy. Despite his assurances, Macmillan backtracked on the issue of policy and made it clear that Zuckerman wrote as a scientist first rather than as a government employee. This caused Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition, to ask:

> While agreeing with the Prime Minister that this is an extremely interesting and valuable article, is he really telling us that the Chief Scientific Adviser to the Ministry of Defence is completely free to put his own views in print and publish them even though they violently disagree with those of the Government? Can we have the situation in which a person in this position expresses in public views which differ from those of the Government? Cannot we assume perhaps rather that the Government, appreciating this,

---

[568] Philip Ziegler, 'Zuckerman, Solly, Baron Zuckerman (1904–1993)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2013 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53466, accessed 30 April 2014].

[569] Solly Zuckerman, 'Judgment and Control in Modern Warfare,' *Foreign Affairs* 40, no. 2 (1962): pp. 196-221; Solly Zuckerman, 'Judgment and Control in Modern Warfare,' *OR* 13, no. 3 (1962): pp. 253-266.

[570] Before publishing Zuckerman received official authority from Watkinson, with the implied consent of Macmillan.

authorised the publication of this article because they have changed their mind and agree with it?[571]

Debate on the article entered the national and international press. News organisations on both sides of the Atlantic argued against Zuckerman's views and his challenge of the accepted doctrine on nuclear policies.[572]

Despite his credentials as an eminent scientist with a far greater understanding of nuclear weapons than either Macmillan or Watkinson, the nature of his work for the government required permission from both men before publishing any material that dealt with defence issues. Yet presumably if either of those men had objected to his voicing sentiments that went against their political policies, the article would not have made it into the public arena. Despite having received permission, this example also demonstrated the lack of freedom for those in the scientific community. It also highlighted the questionable nature of government scientists speaking out and how little tolerance those in power had for such actions. The general feelings in Whitehall displayed suspicion and anger. It also suggests that such actions did not happen often.

Such examples demonstrated the need for greater freedom within science and for scientists themselves. The vulnerabilities of classified military research left scientists open to harassment, suspicion and the loss of their freedom of speech and expression. Debate arose from resentment over this type of treatment and fear on the repercussions to science as a whole. This debate centred on the need for greater freedom in order to maintain an ethical foundation for scientific progress.

Michael Polanyi became one of the first to examine to relationship between ethics and science in detail at this time. Polanyi's scientific career focused on chemistry, but he also used his understanding of the scientific methodology to discuss the social sciences and political philosophy. His work argued against the use of central planning and examined the negative consequences to technological and innovative thinking. These ideas not only influenced debate within the scientific community but also permeated mainstream thinking, including the work of liberal thinker Frederick Hayek. He argued that the relationship between scientists mirrored the free market, making it important for science to develop without state interference. His ideas were heavily influenced by a trip in 1936

---

[571] HC Deb, 25 January 1962, vol 652, cc401-3.
[572] Solly Zuckerman, *Monkeys, Men and Missiles: An Autobiography, 1946-88* (London: Collins, 1988), p. 290.

to the Soviet Union where he learned that the state dictated scientific research through five year planning. Polanyi became concerned that the increasing impact of science on society was not being addressed in enough depth. If society did not understand science then this would open science up to control by selfish or malevolent forces. By 1962 his ideas on science as a free market had evolved into the desire to model the scientific community on a republic where scientists chose the direction over their research. This would stop the state imposing its authority onto science and reducing its effectiveness.[573]

Polanyi argued that scientific truth did not come from an understanding of scientific laws or principles but from its interaction with society:

> Respect for the ideals of science cannot be restored except by recovering the common ground on which all human ideals are jointly founded. Scientists must help to-day to re-vindicate the ideal of truth in all its aspects, which constitute the heritage of Christian civilization; they must feel concerned with the entire cultural, political and economic order of society on which the integrity of that heritage depends.[574]

With such a system in place no central or ruling body would be necessary and the scientific community, rather than outside political influences, would direct science. For Polanyi, the way in which society dealt with science reflected the progress of that society towards civilization. The values of tolerance, fairness and self-respect came through in these societies. By restricting science a state ignored these fundamental tenets and destroyed the freedom of their people.

Part of such thinking resulted from the drive within fascism towards warfare, aided by science. Yet his views also indirectly challenged the British government's stance on warfare, especially in the years following the war. The classified nature of defence research was hostile to liberal science. His words indirectly challenged the British claim to liberal freedom or at least argued that they still had a long way to go to achieve true civilization.

Polanyi's arguments merged the importance of ethical science with the importance of freedom for society. This differed from wider contemporary concerns about the future of liberal freedom and democratic government. In his work the scientist reflected every

---

[573] Polanyi, 'The Republic of Science'.
[574] Michael Polanyi, 'Science: Its Reality and Freedom,' *The Nineteenth Century and After* 135, no. 2 (1944): p. 6.

citizen and science reflected the progress of society. He argued ethics of science required liberty for the scientist, and without liberty science could not have a moral foundation. The two concepts interlink, and by using science to reflect society, he inferred that the freedom within liberal democracies was essential for the ethical foundations of a society. Similar ideas can be found in other scholarship at this time, including Hayek and Popper, but neither intellectual used science as the foundation for their arguments or saw science as the basis of liberal prosperity.

Polanyi's ideas were framed through the importance of science during the war. The deployment of the atomic bomb energised this debate on ethics. Throughout scientific discourse there appeared an underlying feeling of guilt. Part of this also emerged in the form of resentment at the state for putting them in this position.

Kathleen Lonsdale's approach to this discussion put the blame of war jointly on the scientists and the government. Lonsdale, one of Britain's top female scientists, worked in the field of crystallography. She subscribed to the Quaker faith and a strong belief in pacifism. In 1945 she became one of the first two female Fellows of the Royal Society. In the early 1940s she started to work on the thermal movement of atoms in crystals. Her work on atomic particles combined with her ethical objections to war created a strong interest in atomic weapons. After the war she became the vice-president of the ASA and participated in groups designed to promote peace.[575]

She put forth the suggestion that scientists should stop building the weapons, forcing the government to find other ways of dealing with international tensions. Obviously she did not mean this as a serious proposal, but used it to illustrate the guilt of both the scientists and the politicians in promoting war. She also judged the scientists that accepted the need for war and worked to help advance it.[576]

Lonsdale's arguments were heavily influenced by her Quaker religion and much of her public engagement came as a result of this. As a public intellectual she was foremost a Quaker and spoke to this audience rather than other scientists. She saw her science and religion as intrinsically linked and used her religious ethics as the backdrop for scientific

---

[575] Gill Hudson, 'Lonsdale, Dame Kathleen (1903–1971)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2010 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31376, accessed 30 April 2014].
[576] Kathleen Lonsdale, *Removing the Causes of War* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1953), pp. 15-16.

understanding. As a pacifist she denounced all forms of warfare and violence, including the role of scientists as enablers of military technology.[577]

Lonsdale's words also highlighted the scientific debate that ran alongside religious ones. Many religious intellectuals put forth a pacifist approach to war and discussed the role of science in helping to achieve increasingly more destructive weapons. One such discussion occurred during the war in the journal *Nature*. Starting with a booklet published by British biologist and philosopher Conrad Waddington, the journal then asked a number of authorities to comment on the booklet including a number of religious leaders, public intellectuals and scientists.[578] Waddington presented an argument to dispute the idea "that science […] had nothing to do with the formation of ethical systems".[579] The religious contributions to this debate came from the E. W. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham and W. R. Matthews, the Dean of St. Paul's. Barnes discussed the idea that both morality and science developed as society developed. Other input came from a variety of scientific and philosophical experts including Joad and Bernal.

Similar arguments were put forth in the US by Noble Laureate Albert Szent-Györgyi. He argued that the scientists' search for truth carried no responsibility and thus all scientists should follow a moral code. He believed the recent changes forced each scientist to face the influx of politics into science, making morality a priority.[580] Here Szent-Györgyi summed up the relationship between ethics and freedom. The scientist must act morally as the importance of science to warfare created state intervention and dictatorship.

A similar argument developed between British scientists as a result of their participation in warfare. Not only did they argue that science should be free from outside interference but they also argued that scientists should have executive roles in the government in order to ensure their discoveries were being put to the best use. Such arguments displayed a lack of confidence in the government by those that worked for them and a fear that government control would lead to catastrophic consequences.

These intellectuals promoted the greater involvement of scientists at the executive level. This connected heavily to the debate on morality. Scientists believed that their greater

---

[577] Hudson, 'Lonsdale, Dame Kathleen (1903–1971)'.
[578] Conrad Hal Waddington, *Science and Ethics* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1942).
[579] Waddington, *Science and Ethics*, p. 10.
[580] Albert Szent-Györgyi, *Science, Ethics and Politics* (New York: Vantage Press, 1963), pp. 85-91.

expertise gave them superior knowledge on the damage their weapons could achieve and thus would have a greater understanding on how they should be deployed. They suggested that these scientists would do a better job at making executive decisions than the military as they had a stronger ethical framework.

Hill became one of the strongest supporters of scientists using an ethical agenda to advance in government work and take the lead in matters of warfare. His ideas incorporated science within a broader social framework, and used the existence of the atomic bomb to discuss the ethical dilemma of scientific progress on the world. He argued that without ethical restraint science could not be controlled and might "set up a final grand explosion in which human civilization will perish."[581] Hill understood the immense power he and his colleagues had and the need to acknowledge this responsibility underpinned his work.

Hill's work incorporated the debate on the role of scientists with the debate on ethics. He promoted the need for greater responsibility of scientists whilst arguing that in order to get the best outcome in matters of defence scientists needed to participate in military discussions.

In these views he shared his thoughts with Lindemann, both of whom believed scientists could achieve better results and defend Britain more successfully if they had greater power.[582] During the war Hill spoke of the danger of revolutionary scientists becoming marginalized by the government. He petitioned the government to appoint a central technical staff of scientific men to advise and collaborate on a relatively equal footing to the Generals.[583] He argued that side-lining scientists for military purposes led to the feelings of mistrust and fear prevalent within the public towards scientists. Hill argued this would lead to the loss of scientific freedom and cause the destruction of science altogether.[584]

His mistrust of government secrecy with regards to science most likely came in part from the perspective he gained while working as an MP from 1940 to 1945. He complained that science did not receive the same levels of respect in defensive matters as the military

---

[581] A. V. Hill, 'Scientific Ethics,' in *Science and Civilization. The Future of Atomic Energy*, ed. A. V. Hill (London: McGraw-Hill, 1946), p. 7.
[582] Clark, *Tizard*, pp. 128-148.
[583] W. M., 'Scientific War', *Daily Mirror*, 8 July 1942, p. 3.
[584] Hill, 'Scientific Ethics', pp. 13-14.

and that a greater degree of technical understanding was necessary for the future of British defence. In the House he argued:

> Nor can the sort of technical knowledge which is necessary for those who have to guide our strategy now be acquired as a part-time job by an elder statesman whose historical outlook inevitably leads him to think in terms of earlier wars. It requires the full-time attention of a technical section of a combined General Staff, composed for the main part of young and able officers of all arms who have grown up with modern weapons and equipment. No such joint technical section of a combined staff exists at present to guide the councils of the Minister of Defence.[585]

These words, spoken in 1942, continued to feature as a central point of intellectual debate throughout the next two decades. In 1960 he argued: "Nothing in the long run breeds fear, jealousy, mistrust, and insecurity so effectively as so called 'security'."[586] By insisting on such measures the government increased the negative image of the scientist and exacerbated the problems they faced. Such secrecy, Hill believed, allowed scientists to act in immoral ways, without public oversight, or to be used by politicians with unethical purposes. He stated that "the big bosses regard us as pawns […] how little our advice is heeded unless it supports their intuitions".[587]

In spite of Hill's words, some evidence exists to suggest that these ideas had started to feature in political discussion, although any active progress towards unifying scientific staff did not occur until the 1960s. A Statement for Defence in 1946 suggested "that any future development of our central organisation for defence would be incomplete if it did not provide throughout for the closest possible integration of scientific and military men."[588] This shows a move towards Hill's suggestions on joint technical staff. Edgerton's argument also provides evidence that such staff existed, although not as a collaborative body between the academic scientists and the state.

His work within Parliament during the war undoubtedly influenced his thinking. Directly after he left politics he started to write as a public intellectual. These works examined the ethical implications of science in the modern world and argued for the importance of scientists at the executive level of government. The arguments he put forth during his time in the House of Commons came across within his later writings. His style of

---

[585] HC Deb, 24 February 1942, vol 378, cc126.
[586] Hill, *The Ethical Dilemma of Science and Other Writings*, p. 70.
[587] Hill, *The Ethical Dilemma of Science and Other Writings*, p. 69.
[588] 1945-46 [Cmd. 6923] Central Organisation for Defence, p. 4.

discussion altered, however, and he became far more philosophically inclined in his public works. The nature of his audience undoubtedly played a large role in determining his approach to these types of issues. When discussing scientific problems in the political arena, Hill focused on issues of defence and the military implications of the changes to science. When discussing the role of science as an intellectual, Hill's work clearly suggests his intended audience consisted mainly of other scientists and those with scientific understanding. His work in 1946 on *Science and Civilization* formed the first half of a book that also looked at *The Future of Atomic Energy* (although while he edited the book he only wrote the first half).[589] The two parts of the book fitted together; the first discussing the changes to science at the social level and the second moving on to discuss more technical aspects of atomic energy within society. The audience, therefore, needed a reasonable understanding of science.

Hill's thinking not only linked ethics into a scientific liberal framework but also challenged the military's role in a liberal state. By demanding that scientists gain greater control and executive power over decisions of warfare, Hill inferred that the role of the military damaged liberal freedom. Without an ethical underpinning the state would not act within the boundaries of a liberal democracy.

The growing scepticism of Hill's attitude mirrors the changing mode in the general scientific intellectual writing at this time. As suspicions surrounding scientists grew, so did their frustration. By the 1960s the cultural image of the scientist had moved from the more benign image of the 'boffin' towards the more insidious portrayal of the mad or dangerous scientist best depicted by the character Dr. Strangelove. This image portrayed a scientist who lacked any awareness of the consequences of his actions and only cared about his discoveries.

Scientific intellectuals tried to address this from two angles: changing the public perception of scientists and making scientists more aware of the consequences of their actions. This first point relates to the debate surrounding liberal science. Intellectuals discussed how the secrecy within military research created the perfect environment for irresponsible scientists to flourish.

---

[589] A. V. Hill, ed. *Science and Civilization. The Future of Atomic Energy* (London: McGraw-Hill, 1946).

The debate revolved around the argument that scientists would become so enamoured with their ideas that they did not think about the realities of their research. When on trial in 1954 Oppenheimer told the court that, "When you see something that is technically sweet, you go ahead and do it and argue about what to do about it only after you've had your technical success. That is the way it was with the atomic bomb."[590] The need for ethical considerations was implied throughout his argument, bringing forth the idea that science without responsibility resulted in technology that caused nothing but destruction.

This fear directly influenced C. P. Snow's Godkin lectures, *Science and Government*, given at Harvard in late 1960 and published in early 1961. Snow's career placed him in the perfect position to evaluate the role of scientists working for the military. He worked for a sub-Committee of the Royal Society from 1939 and as a member of the Ministry of Labour from 1940, researching the most efficient use of scientists for the war effort. From 1942 he became responsible for co-ordinating these scientists.[591] This work drew him into the inner workings of military science and the closed system in which decisions were made. His ideas resulted from two main influences: the strategic bombing campaign during the war and the atomic bomb. When discussing the scientists at Los Alamos he argued:

> We heard people, intoxicated by the discovery, predicting that it would give the United States unheard-of power for so long as one could foresee. We did not believe it. We had no special prescience, but we were outside the area of euphoria.[592]

Snow took Bush's ideas and expanded on the role of freedom within science and the need for change at the executive level. He believed that mistakes seen during the Second World War continued to cause problems during a period where science had become essential to military success and secrecy surrounding this research had growth even further.

Snow drew on parallels with events in the 1930s and 1940s to illustrate his point. He used the example of work generated by Tizard and Lindemann on the Tizard Committee in the 1930s and during the debate on strategic bombing in 1942. Snow argued that Lindemann's close relationship with Churchill granted him precedence in the war

---

[590] Richard Polenberg, ed. *In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer: The Security Clearance Hearing* (London: Cornell University Press, 2002), p. 41.
[591] D. Shusterman, *C. P. Snow* (Boston: Twayne, 1975), p. 22.
[592] Snow, *Science and Government*, p. 71.

despite his lack of scientific vision and the accuracy of his work. Snow suggested that this adversely affected the ability of Britain to fight the war and the lack of oversight on classified projects stopped anyone else from countering Lindemann's faulty work. When Tizard and Blackett attempted to do so they met with derision and scorn within Whitehall, despite the accuracy of their findings. In discussing this example, Snow hoped to demonstrate that the continued secrecy in Britain's efforts to fight the Soviets could potentially have disastrous consequences and would not benefit scientific research or British defence. He warned of the dangers of a small number of men making decisions that could potentially determine the future of humanity.[593]

Snow's cynical arguments reflected the feelings Bush put forth in 1954. Snow's work takes Bush's further by questioning the contrast between liberal democracy and secrecy, and in doing so his work challenges the validity of democracy. He implied that the secrecy resulting from the Cold War damaged liberal freedom within Britain.

These lectures coincided with the increase in public discussion on the power of the military-industrial complex. While Snow did not use this term specifically, his arguments had similar implications to Eisenhower's farewell speech earlier that year. Eisenhower had argued:

> In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.[594]

While much of *Science and Government* related to the British war efforts, Snow targeted an American audience and his discussion related to the changes in America as well as in Britain. America in particular saw the merger of academic science and military defence. Stuart Leslie argues:

> The "golden triangle" of military agencies, the high technology industry, and research universities created a new kind of postwar science, one that blurred traditional distinctions between theory and practice, science and engineering, civilian and military, and classified and unclassified […] But the long-term costs only gradually became apparent in academic programs and corporate

---

[593] Snow, *Science and Government*, pp. 36-66.
[594] Dwight D. Eisenhower, 'Farewell Address,' *American Rhetoric: Top 100 Speeches*, 1961, http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html.

products so skewed towards the cutting edge performance of military technology that they had nothing to give to the civilian economy.[595]

The dramatic increase in funding for universities resulted from Bush's belief in university research and the need for their expertise in the upcoming conflict. In making these changes academic science in America altered fundamentally and the role of the military dominated their research.

While backing up Eisenhower's fears Snow also asked questions on the role of individual scientists in this complex and their relationship with those in government. Bush's influence on Snow's work came across not only through their similar views on liberal freedom but also in Snow's discussion on the role of scientific administrators and advisers. He discussed the correlation between the power these men achieved and the lack of freedom within the state. While Snow upheld Bush as a paragon of scientific administrators, his book examined the role of others in these types of position and the negative effect their influence could have on the state.

In *Science and Government* Snow used closed politics to draw a relation between democratic states such as Britain and non-democratic totalitarian states in the Soviet bloc. He argued that the degree of closed politics within Britain destroyed her claims to liberty within the scientific world. "By the sheer nature of the operations, all countries have to follow very similar laws. No country's governmental science is any 'freer' than any other's, nor are its secret scientific choices."[596] When it came to comparing US and Soviet science he was "struck, not by the differences, but by the similarities."[597] Here Snow put forth the idea that the nature of science in a military environment directly affected the liberal basis of Western democracy. He emphasised the importance of the state in the development of science and the destructive nature of this relationship.

His portrayal of Tizard and Lindemann created a great deal of controversy from within the scientific community and from subsequent historiography. Many scientists involved in the proceedings, including Blackett, spoke out either in corroboration with Snow's account or to challenge its validity.[598] His example did contain historical inaccuracies

---

[595] Stuart W. Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 2.
[596] Snow, *Science and Government*, p. 55.
[597] Snow, *Science and Government*, p. 55.
[598] Blackett, *Studies of War*, pp. 120-127.

and his description of Lindemann came across as extremely ungenerous. Even A. J. P. Taylor, who when describing Lindemann said he had "never met anyone more dislikeable", still believed Snow's description was overly harsh.[599] Zuckerman suggested Snow's portrayal of Lindemann resembled the character Dr. Strangelove in an effort to highlight the fictitious nature of Snow's account.[600] Ironically this described the exact image Snow wished to portray.[601] The problem arose from Snow choosing to use a real person to demonstrate this, and men such as Zuckerman argued that this characterization did Lindemann a disservice and discredited Snow's work. Perhaps using a character from one of his fictional novels would have better helped Snow exemplify his argument in the same way that the film *Dr. Strangelove* did.[602]

When discussing this issue in his own books Zuckerman tried to alter the public perception of the scientist and try to extract the scientist from the Dr. Strangelove image. He argued: "Scientists have been blamed for the evils of war; and, conversely, there is a belief that war, or the threat of war, automatically stimulates the growth of scientific knowledge".[603]

This latter point forms one aspect of the larger debate on the justification of warfare that emerged after the Second World War. Zuckerman wished to dissuade his readers from the view that scientific advancement could justify the horrors of war.[604] Zuckerman was one of the few scientists that engaged in the debate on just warfare. Even so, his contribution remained extremely limited and he did not go into any depth beyond this implied warning. While many scientists opposed war, particularly in the aftermath of the Second World War, few asked questions on the righteousness of war. During the Cold War they discussed the role of new weapons and the how to prevent another war. One explanation for such a gap suggests that the central role scientists played in ensuring the success of war focused their thinking on how warfare should play out rather than why states go to war. War was an ingrained aspect of their thinking and the reasons for war had less impact than the methods of war.

---

[599] A. J. P. Taylor, 'Lindemann and Tizard: More Luck than Judgement', *Observer*, 9 April 1961, p. 21.

[600] Zuckerman, *From Apes to Warlords*, p. 45.

[601] Despite Snow's portrayal, at no point has anyone suggested that Lindemann was the inspiration for this character.

[602] As well as writing pieces of intellectual commentary, Snow was also a successful fictional author. His novel *Strangers and Brothers* discussed similar themes.

[603] Solly Zuckerman, *Scientists and War: The Impact of Science on Military and Civil Affairs* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966), p. 4.

[604] Zuckerman, *Scientists and War*, pp. 3-5; 48-50; 120-121.

All of these scientists highlighted the importance of science to the future of civilization while at the same time exploring the problems inherent within military research. One of the main approaches that emerged from this discourse looked at the need to increase the liberal foundation of science and expand scientific dissemination. Such freedoms would allow scientists to make more informed decisions and provide better advice in their government roles. Such thinking had a large ethical component, suggesting that greater freedom would stop corruption and the abuse of science.

Conclusion

By examining the intellectual writings of these scientists, this chapter not only demonstrates the emergence of an intellectual scientific discourse but also makes a bold statement on the nature of intellectuals as a category. The question of what makes an intellectual has become extremely prominent since the idea of a 'public intellectual' emerged in the 1990s. The 20th century brought about a new type of intellectual: the expert, who differed from the writers and philosophers who defined intellectuals in the 19th century. Yet scholarship rarely, if ever, puts these two categories of intellectual together in historiographical accounts. This chapter not only brings together a scientific discourse that has not previously been examined but also highlights how this discourse fits into the wider intellectual debates of the time. These scientists engaged with wider ideas and used them to propagate their own theories. These theories were in turn used by other non-scientific intellectuals to help them understand the nature of technological change.

Their discourse drew on the role of science within the state and the impact of war research on British scientists. The arms race became the single most important driving force for the defence of the West and a major component of the Cold War. Many of Britain's top scientists left academia to help develop new technology to aid this endeavour. The introduction of academic scientists into positions of advisors helped generate a new perspective on the relationship between science and the state. These scientists attempted to reconcile the dangers of military research with the promise of a more prosperous future inherent in the development of modern science. This discourse merged ideas on ethics and liberty to create an intellectual approach developed on the

belief that science heralded the future of civilization. Taken as a whole these debates criticised the ethical foundations of the state and argued for a stronger scientific presence to offset the damage to British liberty.

These academics with knowledge of the principles of science worked alongside the technicians and engineers to proliferate the war effort. This new relationship altered the perception of scientists by the government, the public and the scientists themselves. Many of these scientists drew on public engagement to deliberate these changes. Much of this debate stemmed from a discussion on government involvement in science and whether the need for secrecy in war outweighed the need for the freedom of science. A consensus was formed, propagating the idea that science in a nuclear age must have an ethical background, and to achieve this, the scientists must have the freedom to direct and dictate their own research without interference. Such ideas suggested that those in government lacked ethical considerations and the emergence of a warfare state derailed liberal freedoms.

This new discourse emerged without the strong ideological stance of mainstream intellectual discussion. The scientists' arguments were formulated without adherence to discussion on the nature of the state and the need for fundamental changes. Previous chapters have examined the need for new ideologies, new systems of government and the forward march of civilization. Scientific discourse centred so completely around science that state institutions rarely came into their ideas, with the exception of the need to generate a more liberal system. Yet at the same time, this chapter has highlighted how their ideas, while emerging from a different foundation, examined the same problems and drew the same conclusions on the nature of freedom. This scientific discourse fit into wider intellectual discussions and correlated with non-scientific intellectual thinking.

These scientists highlight an important feature of the discussion on war. These ideas resulted from a group of intellectuals that all worked within government circles and all helped develop the means in which fighting in the 20th century commenced. Their expertise gave them a better understanding of the dangers of their research and how using such technology might affect the wider world. The events of this period, in particular those surrounding the development of nuclear technology, are crucial to the understanding of war and this discourse provides a unique discussion from those with close ties to this work.

Chapter Five: The Nature of Warfare: A Military Perspective

Introduction

"War is merely the continuation of policy by other means".[605]

The quotation above, translated from *On War*, helps summarise one of the most important arguments from Carl von Clausewitz, the 19th-century military theorist. In early 20th-century Britain, these ideas became the foundation for military strategy. They were also central to the thinking of Britain's most significant military intellectuals.

The military intellectual had two main roles within British debate: to put forth their own ideas on military strategy and to critique current thinking. For the military intellectual, 20th-century warfare presented a major problem. Total war and nuclear war challenged Clausewitzian ideas, becoming a means to annihilate the enemy instead. This chapter will analyse the ideas of the two most influential military theorists of the 20th century: Basil Liddell Hart and J. F. C. Fuller.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, these intellectuals helped contribute and develop an intellectual discourse based on their areas of expertise. In this case a military discourse was formed, based on military conceptions of total warfare. Neither Liddell Hart nor Fuller desired or attempted to become known as political intellectuals in the way of the mainstream public intellectuals. Instead they used their expert knowledge to discuss the problems of politics in relation to warfare. They are given the description of public intellectual within this thesis because they chose to engage with the public through articles in newspapers and the publication of books designed for non-experts. They attempted to outline the problems with the current system of government and convince their readers that, in relation to warfare, change was needed.

The centrality of warfare to the thinking of these intellectuals resulted in a discourse that lacked major change. As warfare changed they adapted their analysis but the underlining assumptions of their arguments remained the same. They did, however, make important contributions to broader intellectual discussion and examined the changing nature of the

---

[605] Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (London: David Campbell, 1993), p. 99.

state in relation to warfare in great detail. The two subjects both used their expertise on war to discuss current problems and identify the direction Britain should take. They used their analysis of warfare to criticise the British state and the actions of its leaders.

The chapter will try to draw out three important points. Firstly it will discuss Liddell Hart and Fuller's arguments on democracy and total warfare, and their conclusions that liberal democracy was not a suitable political regime for the successful implementation of modern warfare. They argued that desire for peace and for international unity led leaders astray and brought out aggression and fanaticism that obstructed their ability to act as rational agents.

Secondly the chapter will highlight the role of their ideas in shaping the subsequent historiography of war. Many of their ideas contradicted mainstream thought at the time but became important schools of thought in the following decades. Their arguments, which challenged the understanding of British and American governments, led both men to help pioneer many of the major academic and intellectual revisionist debates that took place from the 1960s on the Second World War and its aftermath. These debates have shaped the continuing discussion on warfare into the present day.

Thirdly the chapter will discuss the concept of a 'cold war', highlighting how different interpretations have heavily influenced the historiography of the Cold War. Earlier chapters have identified the idea that different thinkers understood the Cold War in different ways and expressed this by focusing on different points of contention. Some philosophers and political analysts used ideology to analyse the tensions between East and West, while others used realist international relations theories. The scientists in the previous chapter used science and technology as their main framework of analysis. Military planners of the time mostly saw this as a conflict between two sides and deliberated on how to defeat the enemy. As Julian Lider argues, military thinkers "have devoted much more attention to issues connected with preventing or winning war than to answering the question 'why war?'."[606] In studying military intellectuals, this chapter brings out the difference in the debates on the Cold War and examines how this influenced the writings of these theorists. In doing so, it will discuss the implications for wider study of the Cold War and the importance of analysing discussion on the topic as well as the events.

---

[606] Julian Lider, *British Military Thought after World War II* (Aldershot: Gower, 1985), p. 27.

The chapter will emphasise how different interpretations of the Cold War affected intellectuals' arguments. By using a military focus, these intellectuals were able to critique other concepts of the Cold War and discuss the problems of ideology and the actions of the state.

The chapter discusses the intellectual contribution of the two men whom Christopher Bassford describes as "the first true military theorists in British history - since Henry Lloyd (c. 1720-1783)".[607] Robin Higham and Lider have suggested other candidates for this role, but they acknowledge these men remain the most important and prominent British military theorists of the 20th century.[608]

Liddell Hart in particular played an important role in British public intellectual and political life. His work as the military correspondent for the *Telegraph* and the *Times* made him Britain's most renowned military thinker. His books were extremely popular with the public and were read and analysed by Britain's top politicians. This led to his appointment as a political advisor in the late 1930s. He also had a large and varied correspondence with numerous politicians and intellectuals.[609] This included almost all the intellectuals discussed in this thesis.

Fuller played a less direct part in British politics but his ideas had important repercussions. In the inter-war years he successfully attempted to challenge existing military thinking and discuss new methods of warfare. He retired from active service in 1933 and spent the following years producing numerous books and a large selection of articles. These ranged from military history to political commentary.

Their fame derived not only from their ideas but also from the uniqueness of their position. Together they helped propagate a discourse of military thinking that did not exist previously in Britain.[610] Historians have often grouped them together, looking at

---

[607] Christopher Bassford, *Clausewitz in English: The Reception of Clausewitz in Britain and America, 1815-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 128.

[608] Robin Higham, 'The Dangerously Neglected: The British Military Intellectuals, 1918-1939,' *Military Affairs* 29, no. 2 (1965); Lider, *British Military Thought after World War II*.

[609] For a complete list of his correspondents see: Liddell Hart Library (LHL), Kings College London, 1/1-780; LH2.

[610] Brian Holden Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller: Military Thinker* (London: Macmillan, 1987), p. 1.

their position and ideas within the same analysis.[611] Their work which developed in the aftermath of the First World War, as well as their friendship, makes it impossible to separate them completely.[612]

Following this trend, the chapter will examine these two men as the main examples of military intellectuals at this time. It will, however, place more emphasis on Liddell Hart's contribution as he had a greater role on public debate, political policy making, and acquired more influence on public opinion. Out of the six military intellectuals Higham identifies, he argued that Liddell Hart was the most important.[613] As a result Liddell Hart can be considered the foremost British military intellectual of the 20th century.[614]

The debates on their public perceptions and their military ideas have been discussed in detail and as such will not be examined here. There have been multiple biographies written of both men. A. J. Trythall has written a biography of Fuller's life and military career and Brian Reid followed this with an intellectual biography of his work.[615] Alex Danchev has written a biography of Liddell Hart's life and Brian Bond has written an intellectual biography of his work.[616] John Mearsheimer has also written a biography of Liddell Hart,[617] but framed it through a critical assessment of Liddell Hart's autobiography.[618] He describes Liddell Hart as "the most famous and widely admired military historian and theorist in the world."[619] He challenges Liddell Hart's claims that he predicted the fall of France and that his work had major influence on the German generals before the war. There have also been numerous works which use these men as their subjects.[620]

---

[611] See: Azar Gat, *Fascist and Liberal Visions of War: Fuller, Liddell Hart, Douhet, and Other Modernists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Brian Holden Reid, *Studies in British Military Thought: Debates with Fuller and Liddell Hart* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998).

[612] Even Fuller's biographer used a biography of Liddell Hart to fashion his own work on: Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*, p. viii.

[613] Higham, 'The Dangerously Neglected', p. 75.

[614] Liddell Hart's reputation as a scholar did come into serious question in the 1970s, but this chapter is more concerned with his reception during the time period of the thesis.

[615] Anthony John Trythall, *'Boney' Fuller: The Intellectual General, 1878-1966* (London: Cassell, 1977); Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*.

[616] Alex Danchev, *Alchemist of War: The Life of Basil Liddell Hart* (London: Phoenix Giant, 1998).

[617] John J. Mearsheimer, *Liddell Hart and the Weight of History* (London: Brassey's Defence, 1988).

[618] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *The Memoirs of Captain Liddell Hart* (London: Cassell, 1965).

[619] Mearsheimer, *Liddell Hart and the Weight of History*, p. 1.

[620] These include: Gat, *Fascist and Liberal Visions of War: Fuller, Liddell Hart, Douhet, and Other Modernists*; Higham, 'The Dangerously Neglected'; James D. Atkinson, 'Liddell Hart and Warfare of the Future,' *Military Affairs* 29, no. 4 (1965).

The chapter will firstly examine their history and relation to each other in more detail, laying out their ideological views in greater depth and discussing their intellectual careers. It will then look at each scholar in turn and examine how their ideas fit into the wider intellectual and academic discourse that emerged on warfare in the latter half of the 20th century.

Despite being a liberal himself,[621] Liddell Hart was very much aware of the failings of liberal governments, particularly in relation to how they conducted warfare. In *The Revolution in Warfare* he argued that the passion of democratic states when engaged in warfare with illiberal states stopped them from using more objective and pragmatic tactics which resulted in the need to completely destroy their enemy.[622] He continued to promote this argument after the war. In *Deterrence or Defence* he used the atomic bombing of Japan to demonstrate this philosophy in action.[623]

Fuller also advocated a very similar line of thinking. He joined the British Union of Fascists (BUF) in 1934. The militant organisation appealed to Fuller, who disliked British politicians and their defence policies. His fascist approach to statehood led him to become a vehement critic of liberal democracies. He also raised the question of the discrepancy between their peace-loving theories and their constant involvement in warfare. In *The Conduct of War* he argued that nationalism created jingoism towards states that did not conform to the democratic ideal, and such hatred led to the desire to go to war.[624]

Despite different ideological standpoints, both men came up with similar analyses of the British state. This was due in part from their collaboration in the inter-war years. Liddell Hart came to the attention of Fuller early in his career and Fuller took on the role of his mentor. Their friendship briefly stalled in the mid-1930s due to Fuller's association with the BUF. In 1937 Liddell Hart wrote to Fuller and discussed his feelings towards fascism, describing it as a philosophy that had the tendency "to quench men's critical faculty and their spirit of enquiry."[625] In 1942 they reconciled through the belief that Britain should sign a peace treaty with Germany and end the war. They maintained a

---

[621] His views are classed as such due to his commitment to liberal democracy, peace and international co-operation.
[622] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *The Revolution in Warfare* (London: Faber & Faber, 1946), pp. 65-75.
[623] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, pp. 17-26.
[624] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, pp. 248-308.
[625] Liddell Hart to Fuller, 6 May 1937. LHL, 1/302.

correspondence throughout their careers and gained the other's critical perspective on their writings.[626] As a result they both had a large influence on each other's thinking.

Both men critiqued liberal methods of war. Their arguments had similarities to the academic debate that started in the late 1970s. Michael Howard, the most eminent military historian of the 20th century, argued that liberal states perpetrated war.[627] By desiring global peace these states generated more conflict through their idealism. These states undertook military campaigns under the banner of protecting human rights and spreading democracy. Howard argued that both world wars were fought on the desire to build peace and destroy militant regimes. This mentality resulted in the dehumanisation of the enemy and desire to destroy them at all costs.[628]

As intellectuals, Liddell Hart and Fuller chose similar methods for interacting with the public. They used a public forum to try to influence those in the highest levels of the state and the military. Fuller approached his work through a number of large contributions, mostly in the form of published books and broadened his outreach through contributions to newspapers and periodicals. Liddell Hart, however, had a much more active public persona. His work as the military correspondent for the *Telegraph* from 1925 to 1935 and the *Times* from 1935 to 1939, and again in the mid-1950s, gave him the largest audience base for his views.[629] As a result he became highly sought after as an expert on matters of warfare. His public image in the 1950s supported peace and unity for the West and he propagated this image through political activism, including signing the Declaration of Atlantic Unity between 1954 and 1962, a set of proposals designed to support NATO against Soviet aggression.[630] He received invitations to join numerous organisations devoted to peace, and was asked twice to become a sponsor of the CND. He refused this offer both times because he disagreed with the practicality of their aims.[631] He also undertook a wide and varied correspondence with other intellectuals and political leaders in which he was often asked to read and comment on their own intellectual writings. This contrasts to Fuller who did not engage with this type of political activism.

---

[626] LHL, 1/302.
[627] Michael Howard, *War and the Liberal Conscience* (London: Temple Smith, 1978).
[628] Howard, *War and the Liberal Conscience*, p. 128.
[629] Higham, 'The Dangerously Neglected', p. 75.
[630] LHL, 5/10.
[631] LHL, 5/24.

Part 1 – Fuller and Liddell Hart in Context

Fuller started his military career in 1898 in the Oxfordshire Light Infantry. He earned a name as a military theorist through his refusal to conform to conventional thinking, publishing such views from 1914. By 1920 he published *Tanks and the Great War*, starting the development of his most significant theory on the influence and importance of the tank in modern warfare.[632] Retiring in 1933, he furthered his interest in politics by joining the BUF. He continued to publish books throughout the 1930s, and contributed articles within newspapers and periodicals. He died in 1966 after having recovered his standing from his time with the BUF. Howard describes him as "One of the greatest military thinkers of our century".[633]

Born at the end of the 19th century, Liddell Hart started his intellectual career in the mid-1920s writing short books and journal articles on military theory. After fighting in the First World War he undertook a career in journalism and continued writing on military matters. Within a decade he had risen to become one of Britain's most influential military thinkers. Whilst working for the *Times* he became the advisor to Leslie Hore-Belisha, the Secretary of State for War. Both positions afforded him greater influence in public policy and a wider intellectual audience. He encountered problems during the war when he supported the idea of defence over offence, which led to accusations of defeatism and his reputation took a major blow. After the war he set out to restore his reputation and continued to advance his military and political ideas through a number of works, including his renowned *History of the Second World War*. He died in 1970, having succeeded in restoring his reputation and creating a legacy as one of the most distinguished military thinkers and historians of the 20th century.[634]

Despite his fascist beliefs, Fuller could not necessarily be classed as an anti-democrat but as an anti-liberal democrat. He placed his own ideas on democracy alongside those of Giuseppe Mazzini, the Italian nationalist. Mazzini argued that every nation should have their own state. These ideas made up the basis for Fuller's ideas on democracy

---

[632] J. F. C. Fuller, *Tanks in the Great War, 1914-1918* (London: John Murray, 1920).
[633] Michael Howard quoted in: Brian Holden Reid, 'Fuller, John Frederick Charles (1878–1966)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33290, accessed 13 Sept 2014].
[634] Mearsheimer, *Liddell Hart and the Weight of History*; Brian Bond, *Liddell Hart: A Study of His Military Thought* (Aldershot: Gregg Revivals in association with Department of War Studies, Kings College London, 1991).

which argued for duty to the nation over individual liberty. Fuller found fault with both sides of the political spectrum in Britain despite being a patriot, arguing that the British system resembled "pluto-mobocracy" and "mass emotionalism".[635] The latter demonstrated his frustration with political idealism and the refusal of leaders to think rationally and base policy on such decision making. These feelings came out quite readily when he analysed the problems of warfare during the 20th century. The term pluto-mobocracy, coined by Fuller, links the two theories of plutocracy and mobocracy. These look at systems of ruling, the first by an oligarchy of a wealthy class, and the second by the mass of the people (i.e. democracy) but through 'mob rule' or a tyranny of the majority. The use of the two terms together is distinctly unusual and some might think antithetical. Fuller most likely used the term to describe his dislike for the British leadership, which he felt lacked the skills and understanding to correctly rule and maintain Britain as a world power.

Not only did their ideas on the failings of democracies often coincide, but their beliefs on military progress often shared similar themes. Both used their intellectual careers to speak out against the perceived old fashioned and ineffectual fighting undertaken during the First World War, and gave an alternative to counter those within the military that wished to return to the pre-1914 methods of warfare. Both rightly understood that this endeavour would be fatal to British warfare in an era of rapid technological growth.

In 1937 a reviewer of both their latest works argued:

> Both men write about military problems, but from entirely different viewpoints. Captain Hart is democratic and almost, one might say, Liberal, while General Fuller would quite rightly be described as a Fascist [...] Yet one cannot help being struck by the fact that on concrete military problems both writers say almost exactly the same things. Their criticism of the Government's plan or lack of plan for rearmament [...] might have been written in collaboration.[636]

Liddell Hart's book, *Europe in Arms*, and Fuller's book, *Towards Armageddon*, both argued that the generals of the day did not understand and accept the progression of warfare and the need for technological superiority over large armies.[637]

---

[635] J. F. C. Fuller, 'General Fuller and Democracy', *Times*, 27 April 1939 p. 12.
[636] J. M. D. P., 'Military Problems', *Manchester Guardian*, 14 May 1937, p. 7.
[637] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Europe in Arms* (London: Faber & Faber, 1937); J. F. C. Fuller, *Towards Armageddon: The Defence Problem and Its Solution* (London: Lovat Dickson, 1937).

Both men's reputations were called into question during this time. Liddell Hart's problems resulted from the fall of France to Germany in 1940 and the discrediting of his military ideas. He was accused of being a defeatist in the early months of the war and an advocate of appeasement in the months preceding the war. This resulted from his strong advocacy of defence over offence in 1939. He criticised the policies of offence and concluded: "This emphasizes the need for a thorough re-examination of the basis of military ideas, and suggests that it would be wise to give due consideration to the new possibilities of national 'defence' by defence in the true sense."[638] Once war had broken out, the public rejected his argument on the superiority of defence.

They both also suffered from their views of the Nazis. Liddell Hart put forth several arguments that have proved to be erroneous and in many cases wilfully blind. These include Hitler as a rational statesman; the belief that the Nazis wanted peace; and his utter refusal to accept their crimes against the Jews.[639] Fuller's own belief in fascism led him to entirely misconstrue the German state and believe that they embraced the military freedom of expression that the British army lacked. His fascination with authoritarianism led him to help perpetrate the erroneous (but popular) idea that democracies were inefficient when it came to fighting wars.[640] In relation to the Holocaust, Liddell Hart's opinions seemed to stem from a genuine lack of understanding. Fuller, in contrast, demonstrated his anti-Semitism in his writings,[641] which led to questions on the morality of his beliefs.

In spite of this their reputations had been restored by the mid-1960s. This was helped by their active participation in the post-war debates on the nuclear situation. Both set out arguments which helped shape debates that became prominent in the 1960s and laid the groundwork for these ideas.

---

[638] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *The Defence of Britain* (London: Faber & Faber, 1939), p. 107.

[639] Bond, *Liddell Hart*, pp. 149-159.

[640] Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*, pp. 193-194; 213-214. In the early years of the Cold War the idea that democracies were weaker than their totalitarian counterparts was a commonly held belief. See: *A Report to the National Security Council - NSC 68*, 12 April, 1950. President's Secretary's Files, Truman Papers.

[641] Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*, p. 196.

Part 2 – Liddell Hart

This section will examine Liddell Hart's ideas on liberal states and argue that despite his belief in democracy he did not feel Britain under a liberal democratic state could successfully navigate the dangers of modern warfare. His concern lay in the disparity between total warfare and nuclear warfare. The warfare in the first half of the century, described as 'total', would not work with nuclear weapons. A third world war would lead to the annihilation of civilisation. As a result he focused on discussing the need for a return to the limited warfare of previous centuries. He argued that liberal states might not allow for such changes due to their obsessive need for victory and the destruction of their enemies.

His work in the 1930s showed a progressive need to promote peace during a time when the liberal attempts had started to deteriorate. Despite a strong desire to maintain peace, Liddell Hart was in no way a pacifist or an absolutist. He viewed warfare as an intrinsic aspect of international relations and his analysis tried to limit the damage of warfare rather than find a way to prevent it altogether.

He published two major works in the 1930s that helped illuminate his thinking. *Europe in Arms* (1937) promoted the need for unity in British politics in order to "resist the totalitarian tide."[642] He discussed the changes in warfare and argued that military leaders needed to understand and prepare for a war based on new technology and ways of thinking. *The Defence of Britain* (1939) put forth an argument to promote defensive tactics rather than offensive. He argued that meeting force with force would only destroy Europe.

His work influenced the thinking of Chamberlain and Leslie Hore-Belisha, the Secretary of State for War. Larry Fuchser argues that Chamberlain's support for Hore-Belisha resulted directly from Liddell Hart's analysis in *Europe in Arms*. Both men desiring to avoid another war found his books useful and illuminating. Hore-Belisha, shortly after taking office in 1937, met with Liddell Hart and together they formed a partnership. Liddell Hart proceeded to work with Hore-Belisha in formulating a strategic concept for

---

[642] Liddell Hart, *Europe in Arms*, p. 2.

the British Army.[643] In 1938 Liddell Hart was critical of Chamberlain's appeasement policies and the Munich Agreement. During these events he corresponded with Churchill and Eden, discussing alternative approaches.[644] He also took part in public debates surrounding this aspect of foreign policy, including the discussion spearheaded by the historian Arnold Toynbee at Chatham House.[645] By mid-1939 he became more accepting of appeasement, even when the rest of Britain had drawn away from these policies. He left the *Times* in late 1939 due to the change in their policy in favour of Continental commitment and the use of force against Germany.[646]

In *The Defence of Britain* he tried to convince Britain's leaders to only use defence rather than offence. The book argued against aggression towards Germany and for the need to negotiate with Hitler. In this book he examined the history of modern warfare, especially the First World War, and concluded that the drive for complete victory damaged the prospects of a long term peace.[647] He argued that:

> [The Armistice of November 1918] secured for the Allies the military equivalent of complete victory. It is hard to see what more could have been achieved by continuing the struggle until peace could be dictated in Berlin – except to increase the post-war exhaustion of all countries, and to deepen still further that bitterness in Germany which, by nourishing the desire for revenge, has again brought Europe to the brink of war.[648]

He repeated this type of analysis in the aftermath of the Second World War. Together with Victor Gollancz, intellectual Gilbert Murray and MP R. R. Stokes, Liddell Hart argued that "it is indecent for conquerors to try the conquered, whatever they may have done, many years after the termination of hostilities, and after years of imprisonment without trial."[649] He argued that this sort of behaviour would make future wars more dangerous if political leaders knew that a loss would lead to their own trial and execution.[650] This displayed another criticism of the policies of the liberal states and his belief that their actions towards their enemies exacerbated international tensions. This type of thinking reflected contemporary criticisms of the trials. In Britain the *Economist*

---

[643] Larry William Fuchser, *Neville Chamberlain and Appeasement: A Study in the Politics of History* (London: Norton, 1982), pp. 85-86.
[644] Robert Shepherd, *A Class Divided: Appeasement and the Road to Munich, 1938* (London: Macmillan, 1988), p. 187.
[645] LHL: 4/15.
[646] Mearsheimer, *Liddell Hart and the Weight of History*, pp. 131-150; 222.
[647] Liddell Hart, *The Defence of Britain*, pp. 35-37.
[648] Liddell Hart, *The Defence of Britain*, p. 35.
[649] Basil Liddell Hart et. al., 'German War Crimes' *Times*, 16 November 1948, p. 5.
[650] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, 'Judgement at Nuremberg', *Times*, 18 October 1946, p. 5.

condemned the trials as hypocritical, citing the Soviets' equal participation and the failure to acknowledge the crimes of the Allies.[651] Lord Simon, the wartime Lord Chancellor, argued that the fate of the Nazi leaders "is a political, not a judicial, question."[652] Simon worried that the trials would be condemned as 'victor's justice' and an extension of the Allies' prejudice.[653]

After 1939 Liddell Hart's life underwent several transformations. His reputation suffered from his stance in favour of defence and negotiation and this affected his participation in British politics. As a political advisor his role ended with the downfall of the Chamberlain government. This did not adversely affect his reputation, which was damaged instead through his intellectual writings advocating defence and appeasement. He also did not receive any of the subsequent blame for the appeasement policies of Chamberlain's government. By 1940 publications, including the highly successful *Guilty Men*,[654] accused those involved in the defence policies of the 1930s as culpable for appeasing Hitler and allowing his military strength to grow.[655] Hore-Belisha, despite his prominent role in the Ministry of Defence, escaped such criticisms due to his attempts to introduce conscription in 1938 and modernise the Army.[656]

After the war Liddell Hart continued to malign the political and military leaders of the liberal states. He argued the West's leaders clung to older means of fighting which would lead Britain to disaster. The atomic bombs on Japan and the Suez Crisis were two examples he used to promote this argument. The colonial implications of the Suez Crisis amplified his belief that military leaders stuck to the past and ignored the changes in the present. He described them as arrogant, ignorant and unable to comprehend that the world had moved on.[657] He labelled the US leaders as "hasty and thoughtless" for detonating the atomic bombs on Japan and the British leaders "foolish" for becoming

---

[651] 'The Nuremberg Judgment', *Economist*, 5 October 1946, pp. 530-532.

[652] Lord Simon, quoted in: Michael Biddiss, 'Victors' Justice? The Nuremberg Tribunal,' *History Today* 45, no. 5 (1995): p. 1.

[653] Biddiss, 'Victors' Justice?', p. 1.

[654] Cato, *Guilty Men* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1940).

[655] The criticisms against appeasement were bolstered by Churchill's war memoirs: Winston Churchill, *The Second World War*, vol. I (London: Cassell, 1948).

[656] Leslie Hore-Belisha and R. J. Minney, *The Private Papers of Hore-Belisha* (London: Collins, 1960), pp. 183-214.

[657] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*.

involved in the Suez Crisis.[658] In particular he saw the detonation of the atomic bomb as a rash action designed to promote world peace, but ultimately causing more problems.[659]

Even before the Suez Crisis he argued that Britain needed to re-evaluate their defence policies, and focus on maintaining a strong deterrent. He argued that nuclear weapons guaranteed a mutual suicide and thus the West should maintain their deterrent. In 1955 he argued that the present policy, which relied on the use of tactical atomic bombs, could too easily develop into a strategic nuclear conflict. In this case a British conventional army would be useless and that both sides were unlikely to start a conventional war for fear of this escalation. As a result he argued: "The maintenance of the hydrogen bomb deterrent to a "Great War" has to be the primary charge on the defence budget."[660] He set out these ideas two years before the 1957 Defence White Paper. This paper re-structured British defence and corresponded to Liddell Hart's arguments:

> While comprehensive disarmament remains among the foremost objective of British defence policy, it is unhappily true that, pending international agreement, the only existing safeguard against major aggression is the power to threaten retaliation with nuclear weapons.[661]

By 1960 he appeared more optimistic about Britain's leaders and their involvement in nuclear politics. His main concern lay in their willingness to follow the United States and its policy of massive retaliation.[662] This concern led him to look at alternative approaches to the one he suggested in 1954. He proposed a policy of 'graduated deterrence' as an alternative to current defence thinking. This policy, first detailed by retired Admiral Anthony Buzzard, suggested "limiting wars (in weapons, targets, area and time) to the minimum force necessary to deter and repel aggression."[663] Liddell Hart and Buzzard had previously discussed ideas on graduated deterrence in 1957 at a meeting at Chatham House. The debate examined the possibility that limited war would escalate into nuclear war. They were joined in the discussion by a number of prominent public figures including Strachey and Tizard, as well as many high ranking military officials.[664] Here Liddell Hart pointed out the possibility that the Russians might launch

---

[658] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, pp. 17; 31.
[659] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, pp. 17-26.
[660] Basil Liddell Hart, 'Planning for Defence: Implications of the Hydrogen Bomb', *Times*, 3 January 1955, p. 7.
[661] 1956-57 [Cmnd. 124] Defence Outline of Future Policy, p. 3.
[662] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, pp. 39-46.
[663] Anthony Buzzard quoted in: Paul H. Nitze, 'Atoms, Strategy and Policy,' *Foreign Affairs* 34, no. 2 (1956): p. 187.
[664] LHL: 4/15.

a surprise invasion using conventional methods and the West should discuss how to counter such a move without resorting to nuclear weapons.

Liddell Hart felt graduated deterrence would allow Britain to go back to concentrating on limited wars that did not run the risk of devolving into nuclear warfare.[665] Part of this change appears to have developed in response to the 1957 launch of Sputnik and the realisation that technological progress in the East had destroyed the West's superiority.

Technology had always played a major role in his thinking. In the inter-war years he argued for the technological change of weapons.[666] In the post-war years, he discussed the role of nuclear weapons. This debate mirrored the arguments of the scientific intellectuals. The importance of science and the need to understand military matters through a scientific perspective ran throughout both types of expert discussion. In 1938 Bernal wrote to Liddell Hart and gave him a memorandum on the importance of scientists in national defence. Liddell Hart replied in agreement, advocating the inclusion of scientists through operational research, an approach which became prominent during the war:

> for years past I have been becoming more and more convinced in the sphere of defence, even the military side of it, that the only chance of anything approaching adequate efficiency lies in the organisation of the scientific study of the problems and of proper coordination of the results.[667]

After the war he moved onto discussing the power of atomic weapons and the problems of the international situation. He, along with six public figures, argued that politics could not keep up with the current scientific progress and "the scientific revolution has to be matched by a political revolution, to allow that great leap forward in international relations for which we wait."[668]

One of the major similarities between both Liddell Hart and Fuller and the scientists was the lack of ideology within their analysis of the Cold War. They focused on defeating the enemy rather than analysing the differences between the enemy and the West. They chose to focus on the arms race and technological aspects of the Cold War instead of the ideological component. Their ability to separate ideological claims and military

---

[665] Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, pp. 47-67.
[666] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Paris, or, the Future of War* (London: Kegan Paul, 1925).
[667] Letter to Bernal, 28 November 1938. LHL, 1/65/4.
[668] Basil Liddell Hart et. al., 'Science and Politics', *Times*, 9 November 1959, p. 11.

reasoning became the foundation for their critique of modern political leaders and these leaders' insistence on allowing ideology to determine their actions.

A major part of Liddell Hart's argument posited that political leaders could not understand the complexities brought about through the technological and atomic revolution. In *The Revolution in Warfare* (1946) he discussed the shortcomings of total warfare. Liddell Hart defined total warfare in terms of the totality of victory. He argued that nuclear war invalidated total warfare: "Total warfare implies that the aim, the effort, and the degree of violence are unlimited. Victory is pursued without regard to the consequences."[669]

His conception of total warfare is important to his critique of liberal states. He challenged the accepted view of total warfare, which described a war which came into all aspects of life, and instead looked at it through a military perspective.[670] Total warfare, in his analysis, lacked the rules of traditional warfare. The concept of 'absolute surrender' invalidated earlier modes of warfare and resulted in unlimited violence. The 'totality' of war implied the challenge of both sides to defeat the other completely, for only this action could stop the war.

He highlighted the serious concerns over the desire of democracies to push their own ideologies without thought of the long-term repercussions. With nuclear weapons they could no longer afford to engage in total warfare. The ability to annihilate the enemy, which defined democratic thinking in times of total war, could no longer work in the present time as their enemy was too powerful.[671] Another part of the problem, he argued, resulted from an unwillingness to accept these new conditions by the military and political elites. He argued: "a major section of the military profession feels so out of its depth in an atom age that it tends to cling to which it is accustomed – a war like the last one".[672] These men understood the 'old style' of warfare and would not be easily persuaded from this path. His work questioned the stability and security of a nation whose leaders did not understand how to successfully deal with the changes in warfare.

---

[669] Liddell Hart, *The Revolution in Warfare*, p. 85.
[670] That is not to say that he was the only one to argue in this way. See: M. E. Neely, 'Was the Civil War a Total War,' *Civil War History* 37, no. 1 (1991): p. 5.
[671] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *Defence of the West: Some Riddles of War and Peace* (London: Cassell, 1950), pp. 81-89.
[672] Liddell Hart, *Defence of the West*, p. 82.

This mirrors some of the scientific discussion at the time. Many scientists agreed with Liddell Hart and his argument that the political leadership could not keep up with the changes in military technology. Blackett especially helped Liddell Hart formulate his ideas on the relationship between scientific development and politics in a nuclear age. Both men felt America's massive retaliation philosophy showed a deeply flawed understanding of the Russians.[673]

Liddell Hart believed that the Soviets were as unlikely as the West to start a nuclear war and thus nuclear weapons should be kept simply because the enemy also had them. He used these arguments to criticize the government for devoting so much effort to prepare for a war which would never occur. He stated: "Once such weapons are used it is scarcely conceivable that the war could continue, even in a 'broken-backed' form. The conduct of war is 'organised action' and this collapses where chaos reigns."[674] He suggested that the power of the bombs and the inability to successfully target their launch sites made it impossible for any rational state to engage in nuclear warfare.

From his words we can draw the conclusion that Liddell Hart had serious concerns with the ability of the democratic states to protect the West in this new crisis. Their desire to challenge states that did not conform to their ideologies, and to fight for the liberal conception of freedom and peace, resulted in a militant attitude that led to major conflicts and the desire to annihilate their enemies. Liddell Hart believed the inclusion of atomic bombs changed warfare and made the liberal mentality extremely dangerous for the future of civilization.

The idea that the Soviets would never start a nuclear war was quite a common argument at this time, particularly in opposition to the 1957 Defence White Paper. Opposition increased after 1960 and the failure of the government to achieve an independent deterrent. Scholars including Strachey and Blackett argued strenuously for the need to prepare for conventional warfare rather than solely focusing on nuclear.[675] Blackett argued that there was no evidence the Soviets planned to launch a nuclear attack and believed "that those in the West who make prophecies of disaster, are in fact projecting on to the Soviet Union what they thought American policy was or perhaps should have

---

[673] Bond, *Liddell Hart*, pp. 196-198.
[674] Liddell Hart, 'Planning for Defence', p. 7.
[675] Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*; Blackett, *Studies of War*; Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*.

been."[676] Zuckerman took a similar view in 1960, stating that neither side would run the risk of a nuclear war.[677]

In contrast to the scholars in the first three chapters of the thesis who examined warfare from a political and philosophical stance, the military theorists very rarely engaged with the idea that war could be stopped. In a similar way to the scientists their writing showed war to be a systemic part of international politics and their analysis tried to lessen or prevent wars rather than destroy the warfare as an institution. Their work implied that war would continue but through changing tactics, ideas and implementation. As an historian, Liddell Hart saw the evolution of warfare through time and used this to predict future events. He talked about a revolution in warfare but did not suggest that this revolution could be transmitted into the political world. His definition of revolution precluded the political side of warfare and focused on technological improvements and changes to military thinking. At the beginning of *Revolution* he criticised democratic leaders for refusing to change their thinking or look at the long-term implications of their actions.[678] Part of this, he argued, resulted from the desire of the peaceful nations to prevent war. When this failed they ended up in a major conflict because they focused on prevention rather than limiting warfare.[679]

In *Revolution* he briefly engaged with the idea of global disarmament.[680] He discussed this in his final remarks, suggesting he saw this as a hope for the future rather than a serious discussion point. Such a limited discussion highlights how little faith he had in these ideas, perhaps more clearly than if he had ignored the subject completely, and how negligible they were to his military analyses. This mirrors the same type of discussion seen in Strachey's *Prevention*. Both men engaged with these idealistic ideas but neither discussed them in any detail in their most important analyses of the nuclear situation, highlighting a more realist approach in these later years. Unlike intellectuals such as Russell and Beveridge, who believed that world government could bring stability, Strachey and Liddell Hart both used the balance of power to analyse international relations. Strachey clearly drew a great deal of inspiration from Liddell Hart's analysis. In the preface of *Prevention* Strachey discussed Liddell Hart's argument that to maintain

---

[676] Blackett, *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*, pp. 95-96.
[677] Zuckerman, *Monkeys, Men and Missiles*, p. 276.
[678] Liddell Hart, *The Revolution in Warfare*, pp. 7-8.
[679] Liddell Hart, *The Revolution in Warfare*, p. 76.
[680] Liddell Hart, *The Revolution in Warfare*, p. 92.

peace the West needed to understand war rather than prepare for it.[681] This idea underpinned *Prevention*. Liddell Hart was the only author Strachey referenced in this way.

Liddell Hart's international reputation ensured that all these major works received much publicity and reception in Britain and abroad. The public reaction highlights an important aspect of his work, and an insight into intellectual and political reception to military thinking. For Liddell Hart his public perception constituted a vital component of his career, and he desperately needed acceptance. The contrast between the reception of his books in the interwar years, after 1940, and in later years remains quite striking.

In *The Defence of Britain* (1939), he set out his belief in the supremacy of defence over offence and the direction the British government should take in their relationship with Germany. In Britain his work received almost universal praise. His reviewers continually brought up his expertise and his authority on these matters. C. S. Forester, a renowned military novelist, suggested "When, in the twenty-first century, the historian prepares to write the history of the middle nineteen hundreds, this book will form one of the principal sources".[682] A. G. MacDonell, a Scottish writer and journalist, suggested "a time is rapidly approaching when people will not only regard him as a technical expert, but will regard him as a deep and understanding thinker on the major problems of our times."[683] Many reviews suggested that his words be taken and noted by those in political office. Interestingly, one major exception came from *Army Quarterly*, expressing a more traditional interpretation of military theory. The reviewer argued that his theories were "new and dangerous" and designed to appeal to those with little understanding of military matters.[684]

By 1941 his reputation had undergone a dramatic shift with the fall of France and the belief that defence alone could not win the war, and he brought out a work entitled *The Current War*.[685] The book provided a compilation of articles he wrote in the past decades. Public reaction was decidedly mixed. Robert Wright Cooper, a war correspondent for the *Times*, argued: "It is a little curious, this constant harking back, in

---

[681] Strachey, *On the Prevention of War*, p. viii.
[682] C. S. Forester, 'The Strength of Britain', *Sunday Times*, 16 July 1939, p. 7.
[683] A. G. MacDonell, 'Britain and Defence', *Observer*, 16 July 1939, p. 5.
[684] Excerpt of review in LHL, 9/17/9.
[685] Basil Henry Liddell Hart, *The Current of War* (London: Hutchinson, 1941).

a military critic of international repute whose stage for so long was the next great war, as though, now that it has come, there were nothing left for the prophet but uneasy memories."[686] T. R. Fyvel, a journalist and literary editor, argued: "Only yesterday he seemed still the outstanding military mind of his age. […] since the war actually broke out, he seems to have nothing to say."[687] Some reviewers thought him brave to bring up older writing, some of which he had written in his early twenties, and which had since become redundant. Yet this was definitely not his intention; his intention was to prove his critics wrong and show he had anticipated this war for two decades and his arguments had been ignored by those in power and forgotten by those that condemned his ideas.

After the war he continued his campaign by endeavouring to show that his ideas had been successfully used by the German army in their 1940 operations. His success is highlighted in the more positive reception his later works generated.[688] Many of his respondents to *Revolution*, *Deterrent or Defence* and his *History of the Second World War* once again emphasised his authority on military issues and their wish for his work to receive attention in political circles. At the same time that Higham highlighted the need for a greater appreciation for military thinkers, Liddell Hart's work started to be taken seriously within the academic community and reviews of his work expanded from newspapers and periodicals into academic journals.

Part 3 – Fuller

Fuller's analysis of the new situation differed significantly from Liddell Hart's but both argued the earlier understanding of total warfare played a crucial role in explaining the new developments. Fuller displayed a significant dislike for liberalism and socialism, blaming these ideologies for many of the problems at this time. In a similar stance to Liddell Hart, Fuller blamed the liberal governments for their policies of total warfare, analysing the actions of these states as a consequence of their bloodlust. This dislike of the government, liberalism, and total warfare underpinned all his writings during these decades.

---

[686] R. W. Cooper, 'Second Thoughts of a Strategist', *Times Literary Supplement*, 1 March 1941, p. 99.

[687] T. R. Fyvel, 'The Soldier Who Lost Himself', *New Statesman and Nation* 21, 15 March 1941, pp. 283-284.

[688] For a large collection of reviews see: LHL, 9/23/9, 9/29/11, 9/31/44.

His definition of limited warfare went as follows: "A limited war is one fought for a clearly defined limited political object, in which expenditure of force is proportioned to the aim; therefore strategy must be subordinated to policy."[689] He criticised the lack of these objectives within the world wars of the 20th century. Instead he saw them as a battle for ideology and victory rather than peace. Their major failing was their desire for victory at all costs and the annihilation of their enemy. This in turn led democracies to become more authoritarian in order to wage war.[690]

Fuller also raised questions about the role of the traditional military in an atomic war. He clearly saw the conduct of warfare as one of the ways of judging a civilized culture. He gave his reader a picture of Britain as a civilized society when it was ruled by a small group of elite men who approached warfare as one would approach a game of chess. Even back in the 1940s his views would have been considered quite antiquated, conforming more closely to the early 19th-century arguments of Clausewitz without modern changes.[691] His adherence to an aristocratic form of government radically challenged mainstream thinking in the late 1940s which promoted Labour's welfare reforms. In his analysis of the Second World War he argued:

> It may seem a little strange, nevertheless it is a fact, that this reversion to wars of primitive savagery was made by Britain and the United States, the two great democratic factions of cadocracy, and not by Germany and Russia, the two great autocratic factions of that same cult.[692]

Fuller commented on the pretence of the liberal creed, that by rejecting the legitimacy of warfare they end up creating war without limits and rules. He then argued:

> With the disappearance of the gentleman – the man of honour and principle – as the backbone of the ruling class in England, political power rapidly passed into the hands of demagogues who, by playing upon the emotions and ignorance of the masses, created a permanent war psychosis.[693]

Fuller argued that this change in the ruling class resulted in leaders that saw war as a feature that encompassed all of society. His 'permanent war psychosis' was a more dramatic way to describe total warfare. He saw war that infringed on women and

---

[689] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, p. 316.
[690] J. F. C. Fuller, *Watchwords* (London: Skeffington and Son, 1944), pp. 9-12.
[691] Clausewitz, *On War*.
[692] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 404.
On a side note: his use of 'cadocracy', while not an actual term, means a society not ruled by aristocrats.
[693] Fuller, *The Second World War*, pp. 404-405.

children, and which forced a society to ration their food and endure the bombardment of their cities as "a travesty of history."[694] He argued that modern leaders accepted this rather than seeing it as the horror that past leaders would have.

Here Fuller also demonstrated his commitment to military thinking. He approached the topic of war by focusing on the wars themselves not the political thinking that motivated them. In doing so he challenged the peaceful philosophy of the liberal states. He understood that merely stating a dislike of war did not stop a state from engaging in warfare, and the liberal states needed to accept this. This was particularly relevant in 1948 at a time when tensions were beginning to mount against the Soviets and another world war seemed plausible.

He clearly felt that modern leaders such as Churchill had abandoned civilization and embraced barbarism through the desire to win and destroy at all costs. When it came to discussing the role of the West versus the East in the post-war years, he described it as "a conflict of gangsters".[695] The evolution of warfare using atomic bombs had, in Fuller's opinion, destroyed traditional means and methods of warfare. In following these rules warfare had limits and regulations, which had vanished in this society. He questioned the legitimacy of liberal governments as a result, suggesting their participation in this type of conflict would destroy civilization and they had thus forsworn their right to lead.

This came across in his work during the Second World War and throughout the Cold War. His arguments suggested that one of the main reasons for the move towards total warfare was the desire of politicians to use war as a means to help promote their wider political agendas. Military men, in comparison, saw war for what it was. Fuller quoted Clausewitz agreeing with his argument: "war is nothing but a duel on an extensive scale."[696] For political leaders, war became about annihilating the enemy not winning the battle. In relation to the Soviets, this meant that the political weaknesses of their regime would stop their military ambitions. Fuller did not believe they posed a significant threat to the British system and argued that their own instability and use of force to control their population would stop them from challenging the West.

---

[694] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 405.
[695] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 411.
[696] Fuller, *Watchwords*, p. 134.

In agreement with Liddell Hart, he believed this had led to total warfare and policies unconstructive to British interests. He criticised the liberal, democratic arguments that promoted a consensus of pacifism and took us into the League of Nations. He argued that for most of our history from the Tudors, our leaders' "business was the security of the Empire and the prosperous homeland they were building, and not the behaviour of foreign nations or the rights and wrongs of their interminable quarrels."[697] Yet in modern times the need for economic resources became prioritised over political alliances. In 1919 revolution abounded in Europe and the liberal approach to international relations forced Britain to become entrenched in their problems. Fuller's own analysis suggested that "we should have written off our war losses; for the time being have kept clear of Europe, and during that time have concentrated on the economic, political and strategical development of our Empire."[698] Again Fuller promoted the separation of war and ideological politics and appeared to wish to retreat to the warfare of the 18th century and ignore the political realities of the modern world.

During the Second World War he wrote extensively on these issues of total warfare, using the events of the previous war as a backdrop for his own criticism of the current one. His arguments were tied up with his critical analysis of liberal democracy and his rejection of individualism that could be seen through his acceptance of the fascist ideology. This interpretation produced very controversial ideas on the nature of liberalism. Such ideas can be seen in his analysis of Churchill and his role in the war effort. The main ideas that came across were Churchill's inherent culpability for the direction the war had taken. He clearly blamed Churchill for producing a climate of total warfare and the evils inherent within such a system. In December 1943 he argued that:

> Mr Churchill, the leader of our 1935 pacifists, has shown such an unqualified gusto for war that he would seem to have overlooked that in war the constant aim of the head of a State is the establishment of a profitable peace.[699]

Fuller made a plea for negotiations and the end of the war through a settlement rather than a complete annihilation of the enemy. The latter part of this statement supported the idea that liberal leaders become so involved in defeating the enemy they refused to concede for anything less than a complete victory. The first part equates the 1935 liberals with pacifists, not only making a strong claim on the nature of their goals but

---

[697] Fuller, *Watchwords*, p. 134.
[698] Fuller, *Watchwords*, p. 136.
[699] Fuller, *Watchwords*, p. 136.

also condemning Churchill for hypocrisy, ignorance on true military objectives, and the type of barbarism that leads one to enjoy hurting others.

The former part of the statement shows a gross, and most likely very deliberate, misunderstanding of the liberal sentiment that followed Churchill during this period. Churchill's speeches in the first half of the 1930s show a determination to increase British defence and counter the Germany threat.[700] His work in helping to form the anti-fascist lobbying group The Focus in 1935 supports this conclusion. According to R. J. Q. Adams this group "came to exist largely to provide a platform for Churchill's campaign for a bolder foreign policy."[701] By accusing him of pacifism, Fuller ignored Churchill's militarism and focused on his desire to maintain peace.

Such words become even more perplexing in contrast to his earlier opinion of Churchill. Brian Reid, Fuller's biographer, points out the irony that "he supported Churchill during his years in the wilderness, when he was mocked and despised, and yet denigrated him when he was applauded as the saviour of his country."[702] Reid also makes the point that, "throughout the 1930s Churchill, the champion of rearmament, had held a high place in Fuller's esteem."[703] To go from applauding Churchill for his stance on rearmament to calling him a pacifist highlights how low his opinion had reached and how he allowed himself to be blinded by these feelings.

After the war he expounded an even more critical analysis of Churchill and how his actions led to the troubling international situation of the Cold War. In his military history of the war he heavily criticised the decision to use the atomic bomb on Japan.[704] He attacked America's insistence on absolute surrender and their treatment of the Japanese Emperor. He called the decision to drop the bomb both a "psychological" and "political blunder".[705] He also criticized the actions of the democratic states and argued that the savagery of the war came from their end. Fuller argued that their actions showed that the aim of the Allies was not to end the war but to make their enemies pay.[706] "By the Western Allied Powers the war in the Far East, as in Europe, allegedly was fought in the

---

[700] Churchill, *Winston S. Churchill*, VII, pp. 4705-5572.

[701] R. J. Q. Adams, *British Politics and Foreign Policy in the Age of Appeasement, 1935-39* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993), p. 53.

[702] Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*, p. 200.

[703] Reid, *J. F. C. Fuller*, p. 199.

[704] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 400.

[705] Fuller, *The Second World War*, pp. 396-397.

[706] Fuller, *The Second World War*, pp. 391-397.

means of Justice, Humanity and Christianity; yet it was won by means which mongolized war and thereby mongolized peace."[707] By using the term 'mongolized' Fuller equated Churchill, Roosevelt and Truman to Genghis Khan. He argued they fought the entire war on a wave of emotionalism because traditional modes of warfare would not work due to a lack of defence preparations in the 1930s. "Unable to base their war policy on the balance of power, on 3rd September 1939 – two days after Hitler invaded Poland – Britain and France proclaimed an ideological crusade against Hitlerism."[708] By doing so Churchill based the war on the fight against evil and thus needed to win at all costs. He failed to realise that "In war, victory, is never more than a means toward the end, and to the true statesman, the end of war is peace."[709]

For Fuller the Cold War constituted a continuation of the problems generated during the Second World War by Churchill and Roosevelt. He argued they appeased Russia, came to mistakenly see them as Allies and aided them for no price. Roosevelt's dealing with Stalin lead him to trust the Soviets to deal with Japan and resulted in giving them power over all of Europe.[710] For Fuller using atomic devices showed the same reasoning that led the Allies to bomb German cities and insist on a Japanese unconditional surrender. Although the US let the Japanese keep their Emperor, Fuller saw this as irrelevant. He argued that use of atomic bombs had forced Japan to agree to the condition of absolute surrender, and only after they had capitulated did America reduce their demands and allow the Emperor to keep his position. Fuller asked why the Allies did not make this clear before they had dropped the bombs.[711] He argued it constituted a desire to annihilate the enemy rather than dealing with the political problems behind the conflict.

Fuller's arguments on Japan show one side of the debate on one of the most heavily contentious issues of the 20th century. Since 1945 intellectual and academic scholarship has assessed Truman's decision to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 1948 when Fuller wrote his history of the war, his stance in opposition to Truman put him firmly in the minority of public and scholastic opinion. Public opinion in Britain weighed heavily in

---

[707] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 395.
[708] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, p. 250.
[709] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, p. 255.
[710] J. F. C. Fuller, *The Decisive Battles of the Western World and Their Influence Upon History: From the American Civil War to the End of the Second World War* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1956), pp. 449-459.
[711] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 395.

favour of the bombing.[712] Michael Kort has argued that public opinion in the US heavily favoured Truman's actions and the majority of dissenting voices objected on religious or pacific grounds.[713]

Within academic debate, the two main camps have tried to assess whether dropping these bombs was necessary for victory. The prevailing theory at this time posited that dropping the bomb stopped America from having to invade Japan and saved the lives of numerous soldiers. This theory maintained that the Japanese refused to surrender and would not have capitulated until they had no choice.[714] In the mid-1960s a revisionist approach challenged this by arguing that Japan would have surrendered if their Emperor had been allowed to stay on the throne. Truman with full knowledge of Japan's prospects and their conditions chose to drop the bomb rather than accept their terms.[715] A leading revisionist historian, Gar Alperovitz, argued that the United States chose to drop the bomb to intimidate the Soviet Union.[716] Revisionist scholars have emphasised that these actions were the start of the Cold War rather than the end of the Second World War. Fuller's argument (two decades earlier), had similarities to the revisionist camp, although he differed in his interpretation of the relationship between America and Russia and his work lacked a pro-Soviet stance. The revisionist historiography of the 1960s developed largely in opposition to the Vietnam War and this created sympathies towards the Soviet Union. This school of thought started in 1959 with William Appleman William's analysis of the US as imperialist, challenging the prevailing view of containment.[717] These historians emphasised the role the US played in starting the Cold War and challenged their peace-loving philosophy. Fuller also put forth a similar argument, and while it lacked any sympathy for the Soviets, it also questioned the role of democracies in world affairs and the belief that they promoted peace.

---

[712] Gallup polls in August 1945 show 52% of British people felt the bomb would make war less likely and only 12% felt it would make it more likely. In 1952 60% believed Britain should make their own bomb in comparison to 22% who voted against: George Gallup, *The Gallup International Public Opinion Polls: Great Britain, 1937-1975* (New York: Random House, 1976), pp. 115; 263.

[713] Michael Kort, *The Columbia Guide to Hiroshima and the Bomb* (Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2007), p. 5.

[714] For an historiographical review see: J. S. Walker, 'Historiographical Essay - Recent Literature on Truman's Atomic Bomb Decision: A Search for Middle Ground,' *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 2 (2005).

[715] Walker, 'Recent Literature on Truman's Atomic Bomb Decision', p. 2.

[716] Gar Alperovitz, *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation with Soviet Power* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965).

[717] William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (New York: World Publishing, 1959).

Another aspect of the argument has centred on the role of the Soviet Union in this decision. Military thinking at the time and debate in the subsequent historiography has discussed whether Britain and America appeased the Soviets and whether they should have pushed further into Eastern Europe. The work undertaken by diplomatic historian Herbert Feis promoted the interpretation of American naiveté towards Stalin and the tragic destruction of the wartime alliance.[718] At the time accusations claimed Churchill, Eden and US Secretary of State James F. Byrnes appeased the Soviets and allowed them to take Eastern Europe. During the negotiations John Foster Dulles, a leading Republican member of the delegation and future Secretary of State, threatened to publically attack Byrnes with the accusation of appeasement.[719] Later historiography suggests that the division of Europe was not a result of the failure of Potsdam but the result intended by Truman and Byrnes.[720]

Fuller blamed the liberal system rather than a specific person and argued that by forcing a policy of total warfare, Britain and America allowed the Soviets to gain territories in Eastern Europe. He discussed how the Allies policies obstructed their military ability. He argued that by June 1945:

> the military might of America had cleared the way to certain and rapid victory. But militarily the obstacle was irremovable, it was the Allied policy of unconditional surrender. By shackling both Britain and the United States, it unbarred the political road for Russia. […] Unconditional surrender spelt political victory for the U.S.S.R.[721]

Fuller demonstrated his belief that the democratic states had instigated the Cold War through their policies of unconditional surrender. In a similar way to Liddell Hart, Fuller also expressed his belief that the liberal states posed a threat to the West with their actions and inability to act rationally in times of war. Fuller also once again demonstrated his faith in military thinking as a prerequisite for success in war. This thinking also underpinned his arguments on the Cold War.

For Fuller the Cold War rested mainly with the two superpowers and their inability to accept the other's ideology. Russia in particular, Fuller argued, insisted on destroying

---

[718] Herbert Feis, *Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960).

[719] Daniel Yergin, *Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State* (London: Deutsch, 1978), p. 129.

[720] Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963* (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1999), p. 14.

[721] Fuller, *The Second World War*, p. 391.

capitalism.[722] The Cold War, therefore, had nothing to do with policy but with the clash of ideological ideals and the desire to eradicate the opposing side. In relation to previous 20th-century warfare nothing significant had changed. Their aims towards the Soviets in the 1950s were the same as their aims towards the Nazis in the 1940s. This analysis failed to correctly understand the Soviet belief system. He argued that because:

> Khrushchev and his colleagues held that Capitalism was doomed through its inherent inefficiency, it was more profitable to besiege its garrison and starve it into surrender by economic competition than to assault it by military force."[723]

When it came to the addition of nuclear weapons, Fuller also argued that a nuclear war was unlikely given the destructive capability of these weapons and the knowledge that a war that would almost certainly destroy both sides. In contrast to Liddell Hart, he felt that limited wars could also be discounted as they would almost certainly lead to a major war and the use of nuclear devices. Neither side would then be willing to risk such a step. As a result the fight would be more likely to take place on a different battleground, perhaps through economics.[724]

Conclusion

The work within this chapter has demonstrated the importance of the ideas of these two men on warfare and their arguments that the nature of Britain's liberal democracy had become a major obstacle towards peace and a danger to the future well-being of its people. It has revealed important contributions made to public and political debate, as well as a historiographical discussion.

The military intellectuals helped contribute to public debate on war through their analysis of military strategy. In using their expertise on military theory, they tried to highlight the problems inherent within modern warfare. The two men had different opinions on the ideology and thinking behind warfare, but both came to a similar conclusion: liberal democracies encouraged unlimited warfare in their attempts to maintain peace and protect humanity from illiberal and totalitarian regimes.

---

[722] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, p. 315.
[723] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, p. 321.
[724] Fuller, *The Conduct of War*, pp. 316-317.

Their ideas showed significant differences from some of other British intellectuals. In previous chapters intellectuals with political and philosophical backgrounds tried to understand how war developed and how to stop it. The military mind-set focused on victory and the nature of war itself. Despite this alternative approach, their ideas gained a great deal of notice within Britain and became popular with the public and other intellectuals. Liddell Hart in particular participated in joint projects and organisations alongside other distinguished public figures.

This analysis has identified one of the problems of scholars' approach to examining warfare by exploring the concept of total war and the Cold War. These concepts encompass multiple strands of thinking that cannot be discussed within one analysis. Historians tend to focus on one perspective, such as economic or military history, but in doing so distort the history and ideas generated at the time. When analysing intellectual discourse, one must acknowledge the importance of the backgrounds of the intellectuals themselves and how this affected their interpretation of current events.

Overall the chapter has identified a military discourse that developed as a result of total and nuclear warfare and discussed how it fit in with the wider discursive issues of the time. It stands alongside the previous chapter through an analysis of expert intellectual debate and has demonstrated the links between these two discourses.

Conclusion

The historiography of the British state has become split between two contrasting analyses: the welfare state and the warfare state. The belief in Britain as a welfare and declining state dominated scholarship in the latter half of the 20th century. In recent years this narrative has changed, and scholars such as David Edgerton, Till Geiger and George Peden have reformulated the history of the British state in the 20th century through the conception of a warfare state.

This thesis has added to this historical narrative and demonstrated the importance of intellectuals in the debates on warfare and on the actions of the British state. Previous scholarship has examined individual intellectuals as a minor component of the discussion on warfare, but there has been no analysis of intellectuals as a group or the role of intellectual discourse as a factor in these historical events. The thesis provides this analysis and demonstrates the role intellectuals played in formulating the warfare state and influencing the political and military leaders who were pivotal in developing British warfare at this time. This analysis also highlights the problem of classifying the British state as a 'warfare state' and rejecting other aspects of the state that ran in parallel to the warfare infrastructure.

Whilst adding to existing historiography on warfare, this analysis also brings out a gap within the historiography on British intellectuals. Major studies of these intellectuals, including work by Stefan Collini and Julia Stapleton, have largely ignored intellectual discussion on international relations and warfare.[725] The thesis demonstrates the wide-ranging discourse that existed in the mid-20th century on these topics, and the number of prominent intellectuals that engaged with these debates. Warfare and international relations brought out arguments from well-known political theorists and philosophers, those traditionally seen as the most important public intellectuals of their time, but also helped develop a discourse from expert intellectuals. The rise of a nuclear age and the importance of new technology encouraged experts to voice their opinions in public and speak within the British intellectual community.

---

[725] Collini, *Absent Minds*; Stapleton, *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain since 1850*.

A number of different discourses emerged that all centred on warfare. These include a mainstream discourse centred on ideological understandings of liberty. This discourse analysed the state and discussed how state interactions caused warfare. The intellectuals that engaged with these ideas put forth ideological arguments that suggested ways to bring about peace and discussed their concerns on the growing power of the military. A utopian discourse also emerged that focused on building a world government and argued that the current international system would not protect the world from a nuclear war. Alongside this scientific intellectuals created a discourse that examined the role of scientists and science in a changing world. These scientists debated the morality of war and the scientists' place within government and their role in creating increasingly dangerous military technology. A military discourse also developed that focused on the evolution of warfare and its impact on the state. This discourse examined the dangers of liberal democracy and questioned their approach to warfare, especially in regards to protecting the British people during the Cold War.

Throughout these different narratives there remained a central focus on liberty and a larger discussion on how to maintain the British liberal freedoms in a time of military advancement and technological revolution. The thesis highlights growing concern over the dangers of warfare to British liberty, and demonstrates different ways intellectuals responded to these changes. The realities of a nuclear age made the topic of warfare a greater problem with more dangerous outcomes. This inspired calls for international change and a more forceful push to take action to prevent a nuclear war. Yet there remained many similarities between the ideas of the inter-war years and the post-war years. The concerns over the ideological tensions between liberalism, fascism and communism, and the growing power of military technology in the 1930s all influenced intellectual discussion in the post-war years and are necessary for the understanding of the trajectory of intellectual thinking in these later years.

The thesis has shown the importance of intellectuals within the historiographical discussion of the British state, not just as individual thinkers but as a group working towards common goals and influencing those in power. The narratives they put forth often differed from the generally accepted ideas of the public and the state. Their contributions often helped shift the debate on warfare and added new ideas and perspectives to the accepted wisdom.

The 20th century, and in particular the latter half, became known at the time as a period of intellectual inertia, when the promises of previous years had faded and been replaced by a more pragmatic understanding of the world. Several suggestions could account for this change including the trend towards scientific approaches or disillusionment brought about from 20th-century warfare, economic problems and genocide. The research undertaken in this thesis supports this conclusion in some respects. Many intellectuals including Bertrand Russell and John Strachey chose a more pragmatic and realist approach to warfare after 1945. This reaction coincides with the scholarship that highlights the death of political theory and ideology at this time.[726] Scholars have also suggested that utopian thinking ended in the 19th century. As Krishan Kumar has stated: "Can there be anything more commonplace than the pronouncement that, in the twentieth century, utopia is dead – and dead beyond any hope of resurrection?"[727] In examining the concept of war – one of the most challenging and heartfelt topics for 20th-century intellectuals – the thesis gives an alternative interpretation of the period and agrees with contemporary accounts that challenge this assumptions and the argument that the British state was in a period of decline.

The thesis also brings together two different categories of public intellectual which have been identified by previous scholarship.[728] These groups examined the international situation in different ways but showed great similarities in their approach to speaking out as intellectuals. Their aims and purposes were similar and they hoped to create political awareness, influence those in power and highlight the moral shortcomings of warfare. Previous historiography has developed the traditional model of an intellectual but rarely examines the role of expert thinking or combines the two groups together and examines their work simultaneously. The thesis demonstrates the importance of both groups of intellectuals and how their work resulted from joint endeavours and inspired one another. There were great similarities in their ideas and conclusions, and their discourse both conform to the traditional role of an intellectual as Collini's 'public moralist'. As a result future intellectual historians should attempt to engage with both groups and broaden their concept of an intellectual during this period and beyond.

The words of intellectuals as individuals and their discourse as a group had an important role to play in framing the debates on mid-20th-century warfare, creating public

---

[726] Berlin, 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?'; Bell, *The End of Ideology*.
[727] Kumar, *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*, p. 380.
[728] See: Fleck, Hess, and Lyon, *Intellectuals and Their Publics*, p. 4; Collini, *Public Moralists*.

awareness and bringing about change at the executive level of government. These intellectuals were also a driving force for social activism and had a major role in political and military decision making. They came from a variety of different backgrounds and wrote with different purposes to a varying audience. Some intellectuals started their careers through public dissemination while others used these methods later on as a result of their involvement in the state. Their ideas and role within the state should be examined and incorporated into the histories of Britain and developed by future historiographical studies. The theme of warfare should also be included in intellectual history studies. The thesis highlights the importance of this narrative to many of Britain's most prominent intellectuals and examines how they tackled some of the most important and challenging social and political questions of this period. The many aspects of warfare played a large role in intellectual discussion and should be incorporated into the understanding of British intellectual history.

The title of the thesis automatically classifies warfare into two categories: total and nuclear. These labels, which are used commonly throughout historiographical scholarship, imply the existence of different periods of warfare with different defining features. In some ways it is easy to classify the two world wars as 'total warfare', especially the Second World War. The years after 1945 also easily fall into a 'nuclear age' simply because of the existence and importance of nuclear weapons. Yet these definitions highlight the military aspects of the wars but ignore a broader approach which allows for the understanding and public reaction to war. The age of nuclear warfare clearly encompassed the whole nation, bringing out ideas from many different aspects of society and becoming embedded within Western culture and media. It also conforms to the notion of total warfare, inasmuch as it can be classed as a period of warfare that never broke out into all-out war. The two periods should not be separated and the analysis of intellectual discourse helps bring out this discrepancy.

In examining these ideas, however, the thesis does have some limitations. The scope of intellectual analysis of warfare is enormous and in some respects never ending. This is partly due to the difficulty of defining a public intellectual and assessing who to analyse within this category. In order to make the research viable, the thesis limited its subjects to a select few intellectuals that wrote extensively on the subject and made a major impact on public and political life. Subjects whose fame derived from politics such as Churchill or Mosley were also excluded from the definition of 'public intellectual'. A

study which used varied contributions from across public discussion, as in the case of Jackson's work, provides an entirely different outlook but in the study of war would have lacked depth and focus due to the constraints in the length of the thesis.

The same is true on the topics discussed. The thesis is limited to concerns related to the conflicts with fascism and communism, and in the post-war years focuses more on the nuclear threat than other aspects of warfare. The nuclear threat was the primary concern of intellectuals and the discussion on the changes to warfare revolved around this issue. As a result smaller issues such as British imperialism and the problems of Germany in the post-war years were not addressed.

As well as looking at how intellectuals have engaged with other concepts, there is still a great deal more that can be discussed on the topic of warfare. The work in this thesis has implications for further historical study. While the later years of the Cold War may prove to be an interesting topic to analyse, attention should be paid to more recent history. The new forms of communication available in the 21st century have changed the dynamic of the relationship between the public, intellectuals and political elites. The internet has created a faster paced media and greater freedom of information.[729] Opinion makers are no longer confined to the print media and specific television and radio stations, but use forums and blogs to put across their message, with the potential of reaching a far greater audience from across the globe. This has altered public reaction to the wars in the 21st century, and fundamentally altered public perception of warfare. The ideological strand of intellectual thought discussed in this thesis has all but vanished from British discussion in the 21st century, and intellectuals more often come from academic or journalist backgrounds. There is a large scope for historiographical research on the intellectual perception of 21st-century warfare, as well as scope for social scientific research into the relationship between intellectuals, politicians and the public in this new era. Already a great number of studies have discussed US public opinion on Iraq and Afghanistan, although there is far less in Britain and nothing specifically on intellectual opinion.[730]

---

[729] Barney Warf, *Global Geographies of the Internet* (London: Springer, 2013).
[730] Some examples include: Kenneth Alan Osgood and Andrew Frank, eds., *Selling War in a Media Age: The Presidency and Public Opinion in the American Century* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010); Paul Rutherford, *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War against Iraq* (London: University of Toronto Press, 2004); Ole R. Holsti, *American Public Opinion on the Iraq War* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011).

The thesis attempts to demonstrate the importance of warfare to intellectual contributions and bring out the role of intellectuals in discussions of British statehood during the mid-20th century. By examining the words of a select number of influential intellectuals, it has highlighted different discourses that emerged around the role of war and military technology. This analysis suggests that these intellectuals played an important role in defining public and political opinion and their ideas should be included in accounts of the British state and British intellectual history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

<u>Official</u>

The National Archives:

CAB 127
CAB 137/19
CAB 168/1
CAB 168/2
DEFE 9/2
DEFE 9/19
DEFE 9/23
DEFE 9/26
DEFE 9/35

<u>Official Published</u>

1945-46 [Cmd. 6743] Statement Relating to Defence.
1947-48 [Cmd. 7327] Statement Relating to Defence.
1951-52 [Cmd. 8475] Statement on Defence.
1952-53 [Cmd. 8768] Statement on Defence.
1945-46 [Cmd. 6923] Central Organisation for Defence.
1947-48 [Cmd. 7327] Statement Relating to Defence.
1956-57 [Cmnd. 124] Defence Outline of Future Policy.

Hansard Collections (ranging from):
HC Deb, 27 March 1950, vol 473 – HC Deb, 25 January 1962, vol 652
HL Deb 28 November 1945 vol 138 cc68-137 – HL Deb 14 May 1958 vol 209 cc305

A Report to the National Security Council - NSC 68, 12 April, 1950. President's Secretary's Files, Truman Papers.

<u>Personal Papers</u>

William Beveridge Archives, London School of Economics.
G. D. H. Cole Archive, Nuffield College Oxford.
Victor Gollancz Archives at the Modern Records Centre, University of Warwick.
A. V. Hill Archives, Churchill College Cambridge.
Labour History Archive: LP/LAS/38/3/2.
Liddell Hart Library, King's College London.
John Strachey Historical Manuscripts Archive.

Published

Economist, October 1946 – December 1949.
Encounter, October 1953 – May 1960.
Guardian, January 1959 – November 1961.
Manchester Guardian, May 1937 – March 1958.
New Statesman and Nation, March 1934 – January 1960.
Observer, July 1939 – November 1962.
Times, April 1939 – July 1963.

Anonymous. *Science in War*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1940.
Barnes, Russell. 'A Plan to Avert Nuclear War'. *Detroit News*, 17 February 1963.
Bernal, J. D. *The Social Function of Science*. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1939.
Beveridge, William Henry. *Power and Influence*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1953.
Beveridge, William Henry. *The Price of Peace*. London: Pilot Press, 1945.
Beveridge, William Henry. *Social Insurance and Allied Services: The Beveridge Report*. London: HMSO, 1942.
Blackett, P. M. S. *Atomic Weapons and East-West Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
Blackett, P. M. S. *Military and Political Consequences of Atomic Energy*. London: Turnstile Press, 1948.
Blackett, P. M. S. *Studies of War: Nuclear and Conventional*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1962.
Bush, Vannevar. 'If We Alienate Our Scientists'. *New York Times*, 13 June 1954, pp. 9; 60-71.
Bush, Vannevar. *Modern Arms and Free Men: A Discussion of the Role of Science in Preserving Democracy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949.
Bush, Vannevar. *Science, the Endless Frontier*. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1945.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *Conditions of Peace*. London: Macmillan, 1942.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *Democracy in International Affairs*. Nottingham: University College, 1945.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *Democracy in International Affairs*. Nottingham: University College, 1945.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *A History of Soviet Russia*. 14 vols London: Macmillan, 1950.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *Nationalism and After*. London: Macmillan, 1945.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *Public Opinion as a Safeguard of Peace*. Bungay: R. Clay, 1936.
Carr, Edward Hallett. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Macmillan, 1939.
Cato. *Guilty Men*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1940.
Churchill, Winston. *Europe Unite: Speeches 1947 and 1948*. Cassell, 1950.
Churchill, Winston. *The Second World War*. Vol. I, London: Cassell, 1948.
Churchill, Winston. *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches, 1897-1963*. edited by Robert Rhodes James. Vol. VII, London: Chelsea House, 1974.
Clark, Grenville, and Sohn, Louis Bruno. *World Peace through World Law*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. London: David Campbell, 1993.
Cole, G. D. H. 'The Decline of Capitalism', in *Where Stands Democracy: A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society*, 107-126. London: Macmillan, 1940.
Cole, G. D. H. *Europe, Russia and the Future*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1941.

Cole, G. D. H. *A History of Socialist Thought*. London: Macmillan, 1953.

Cole, G. D. H. *A History of the Labour Party from 1914*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1948.

Cole, G. D. H. 'Freedom and Tolerance'. *Dundee Free Press*, 6 January 1933.

Cole, G. D. H. *The People's Front*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1937.

Cole, G. D. H. *The Post-War Condition of Britain*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956.

Cole, G. D. H. 'World Socialism and the Hungarian Crisis'. *World Socialist* 2, no. 2 (1957): 1; 6; 12.

Cole, G. D. H., and Cole, Margaret. *The Condition of Britain*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1937.

Cole, G. D. H., and Postgate, Raymond. *The Common People, 1746-1938*. London: Methuen, 1938.

Colston, Edwin Shepherd. 'The Scientist's Responsibility'. *The Times Literary Supplement*, 24 March 1950, p. 179.

Cooper, R. W. 'Second Thoughts of a Strategist'. *The Times Literary Supplement*, 1 March 1941, p. 99.

Crossman, R. H. S. *Planning for Freedom*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1965.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Dwight D. Eisenhower: 1954: Containing the Public Messages, Speeches, and Statements of the President, January 1 to December 31, 1954*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 2005.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. 'Farewell Address'. *American Rhetoric: Top 100 Speeches*, 1961, http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html.

Forester, C. S. 'The Strength of Britain'. *The Sunday Times*, 16 July 1939, p. 7.

Fuller, J. F. C. *The Conduct of War, 1789-1961: A Study of the Impact of the French, Industrial, and Russian Revolutions on War and Its Conduct*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1961.

Fuller, J. F. C. *The Decisive Battles of the Western World and Their Influence Upon History: From the American Civil War to the End of the Second World War*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1956.

Fuller, J. F. C. *The Second World War 1939-45: A Strategical and Tactical History*. London: London Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948.

Fuller, J. F. C. *Tanks in the Great War, 1914-1918*. London: John Murray, 1920.

Fuller, J. F. C. *Towards Armageddon: The Defence Problem and Its Solution*. London: Lovat Dickson, 1937.

Fuller, J. F. C. *Watchwords*. London: Skeffington and Son, 1944.

Gallup, George. *The Gallup International Public Opinion Polls: Great Britain, 1937-1975*. New York: Random House, 1976.

Gollancz, Victor. *The Devil's Repertoire, or Nuclear Bombing and the Life of Man*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1958.

Gollancz, Victor. *Is Mr. Chamberlain Saving Peace?* London: Victor Gollancz, 1939.

Gollancz, Victor. *Our Threatened Values*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1946.

Gollancz, Victor. *Where Are You Going? An Open Letter to Communists*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1940.

Gollancz, Victor, Orwell, George, and Strachey, John. *The Betrayal of the Left: An Examination & Refutation of Communist Policy from October 1939 to January 1941*. edited by Victor Gollancz London: Victor Gollancz, 1941.

Haddow, Alexander, Russell, Bertrand, Beveridge, William Henry, and Usborne, Henry. *The Bomb: Challenge and Answer*. London: Batsford, 1955.

Hayek, Friedrich. *The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents: The Definitive Edition*. The Collected Works of F. A. Hayek. edited by Bruce Caldwell. Vol. II, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Hayek, Friedrich A. von. 'The Intellectuals and Socialism'. *The University Chicago Law Review* (1949): 417-433.

Hayek, Friedrich A. von. *The Reader's Digest Condensed Version of The Road to Serfdom*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1999.

Hayek, Friedrich A. von, Kresge, Stephen, and Wenar, Leif. *Hayek on Hayek: An Autobiographical Dialogue*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Hayek, Friedrich A. von. *The Road to Serfdom*. London: G. Routledge & Sons, 1944.

Hill, A. V. *The Ethical Dilemma of Science and Other Writings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Hill, A. V., ed. *Science and Civilization. The Future of Atomic Energy*. London: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Hill, A. V. 'Scientific Ethics', in *Science and Civilization. The Future of Atomic Energy*, edited by A. V. Hill, 5-22. London: McGraw-Hill, 1946.

Hobhouse, L. T. *Liberalism*. London: Oxford University Press, 1911.

Hobson, J. A. *The Crisis of Liberalism: New Issues of Democracy*. London: P. S. King & Son, 1909.

Hogg, Quintin McGarel. *Science and Politics*. London: Faber and Faber, 1963.

Hore-Belisha, Leslie, and Minney, R. J. *The Private Papers of Hore-Belisha*. London: Collins, 1960.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1932.

Joad, C. E. M. *Guide to Modern Thought*. London: Faber & Faber, 1933.

Joad, C. E. M. *Guide to Philosophy*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1936.

Joad, C. E. M. 'I was a Life-Long Pacifist but Hitler Changed My Mind'. *Standard*, 13 August 1940.

Joad, C. E. M. *Liberty to-Day*. London: Watts & Co, 1938 [1934].

Joad, C. E. M. 'Professor Joad on War and Peace'. *Sunday Dispatch*, 17 January 1943.

Joad, C. E. M. *Why War?* Harmonsworth: Penguin, 1939.

Kinard, Lee. 'On the Prevention of War'. *The Good Moring Show*, (WFMY-TV, Greensborg, North Carolina).

Laski, Harold Joseph. *The American Democracy: A Commentary and an Interpretation*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1948.

Laski, Harold Joseph. *The American Presidency: An Interpretation*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1940.

Laski, Harold Joseph. *Democracy in Crisis*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1933.

Laski, Harold Joseph. *The Dilemma of Our Times*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1952.

Laski, Harold Joseph. 'Government in Wartime', in *Where Stands Democracy: A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society*, 1-42. London: Macmillan, 1940.

Laski, Harold Joseph. *Is This an Imperialist War?* London: Labour Party, 1940.

Laski, Harold Joseph. *Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1943.

Laski, Harold Joseph, Fyfe, Hamilton, Barnes, Leonard, Crossman, R. H. S., Cole, G. D. H., and Zilliacus, Konni. *Where Stands Democracy? A Collection of Essays by Members of the Fabian Society*. London: Macmillan, 1940.

Lasswell, Harold D. 'Does the Garrison State Threaten Civil Rights?'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 275 (1951): 111-116.

Lasswell, Harold D. 'The Garrison State'. *American Journal of Sociology* 46, no. 4 (1941): 455-468.

Lenin, Vladimir. 'Socialism and War', in *Lenin Collected Works*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1964.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *The Current of War*. London: Hutchinson, 1941.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *The Defence of Britain*. London: Faber & Faber, 1939.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *Defence of the West: Some Riddles of War and Peace*. London: Cassell, 1950.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *Deterrent or Defence: A Fresh Look at the West's Military Position*. London: Stevens and Sons, 1960.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *Europe in Arms*. London: Faber & Faber, 1937.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *The Memoirs of Captain Liddell Hart*. London: Cassell, 1965.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *Paris, or, the Future of War*. London: Kegan Paul, 1925.

Liddell Hart, Basil Henry. *The Revolution in Warfare*. London: Faber & Faber, 1946.

Lonsdale, Kathleen. *Removing the Causes of War*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1953.

M., W. 'Scientific War'. *The Daily Mirror*, 8 July 1942, p. 3.

Manier, Ruth. 'Critical Problems of Nuclear Age'. *Nashville Banner*, 1 March 1963.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Causes of World War Three*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1959.

More, Thomas. *Utopia*. Translated by George M. Logan and Robert M. Adams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Oliphant, Mark, Blackett, P. M. S., Harrod, R. F., Russell, Bertrand, Curtis, Lionel, and Brogan, D. W. *The Atomic Age: Sir Halley Stewart Lectures, 1948*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949.

Orwell, George. *1984*. Stockholm: Atlantis, 1949.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. Anstey: Charnwood, 1945.

Polanyi, Michael. 'The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory'. *Minerva* 1, no. 1 (1962): 54-73.

Polanyi, Michael. 'Science: Its Reality and Freedom'. *The Nineteenth Century and After* 135, no. 2 (1944): 78-83.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Vol 2: The High Tide of Prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the Aftermath*. London: Routledge, 1952.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies: Vol. 1 the Spell of Plato*. London: Routledge, 1945.

Russell, Bertrand. *Authority and the Individual: The Reith Lectures for 1948-9*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949.

Russell, Bertrand. *Autobiography*. London: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1998.

Russell, Bertrand. *Common Sense and Nuclear Warfare*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1959.

Russell, Bertrand. *Detente or Destruction, 1955-57*. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. edited by Andrew G. Bone. Vol. 29, London: Routledge, 2005.

Russell, Bertrand. *Has Man a Future?* London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1961.

Russell, Bertrand. *How to Keep the Peace: The Pacifist Dilemma, 1935-38*. The Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell. edited by Andrew G. Bone and Michael D. Stevenson. Vol. 21, London: Routledge, 2008.

Russell, Bertrand. *Human Society in Ethics and Politics*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1954.

Russell, Bertrand. 'Only World Government Can Prevent the War That Nobody Can Win'. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 14, no. 7 (1958): 259-261.

Russell, Bertrand. *The Scientific Outlook*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1931.

Russell, Bertrand. *Unarmed Victory*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1963.

Russell, Bertrand. 'Values in the Atomic Age', in *The Atomic Age: Sir Halley Stewart Lectures, 1948*, 81-105. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1949.

Russell, Bertrand. *War Crimes in Vietnam*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1967.

Russell, Bertrand. *Which Way to Peace?* London: Michael Joseph, 1936.

Russell, Bertrand, and Einstein, Albert. 'The Russell-Einstein Manifesto'. *Pugwash*, 1955, http://www.pugwash.org/about/manifesto.htm.

Russell, Bertrand, and Griffin, Nicholas. *The Selected Letters of Bertrand Russell: The Public Years, 1914-1970*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Russell, Bertrand, Kasrils, Ronald, and Feinberg, Barry. *Bertrand Russell's America*. Vol. II, London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1973.

Snow, C. P. *A Postscript to Science and Government*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Snow, C. P. *Science and Government*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Snow, C. P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Strachey, John. *The Challenge of Democracy*. Munich: John Strachey Historical Manuscripts Archive, 1963.

Strachey, John. *The Coming Struggle for Power*. London: Gollancz, 1932.

Strachey, John. *Contemporary Capitalism*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1956.

Strachey, John. *The End of Empire*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1959.

Strachey, John. *Hope in America*. New York: Modern Age Books, 1938.

Strachey, John. *The Menace of Fascism*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1933.

Strachey, John. *On the Prevention of War*. London: Macmillan, 1962.

Strachey, John. *Revolution by Reason: An Account of the Financial Proposals Submitted to the Labour Movement by Mr. Oswald Mosley*. London: Leonard Parsons, 1925.

Strachey, John. *The Theory and Practice of Socialism*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1936.

Strachey, John. *Why You Should Be a Socialist*. Revised ed. London: Victor Gollancz, 1944 [1938].

Szent-Györgyi, Albert. *Science, Ethics and Politics*. New York: Vantage Press, 1963.

Tizard, Henry. 'Science and the Services'. *The RUSI Journal* 91, no. 563 (1946): 333-346.

Waddington, Conrad Hal. *Science and Ethics*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1942.

Wells, H. G. *Men Like Gods*. London: Cassell, 1923.

Wells, H. G. *A Modern Utopia*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1905.

Wells, H. G. *The Shape of Things to Come: The Ultimate Revolution*. London: Hutchinson, 1933.

Woolf, Leonard. *International Government: Two Reports*. Westminster: Fabian Society, 1916.

Zuckerman, Solly. *From Apes to Warlords: The Autobiography (1904-1946) of Solly Zuckerman*. London: Hamilton, 1978.

Zuckerman, Solly. 'Judgment and Control in Modern Warfare'. *OR* 13, no. 3 (1962): 253-266.

Zuckerman, Solly. 'Judgment and Control in Modern Warfare'. *Foreign Affairs* 40, no. 2 (1962): 196-212.

Zuckerman, Solly. *Monkeys, Men and Missiles: An Autobiography, 1946-88*. London: Collins, 1988.

Zuckerman, Solly. *Scientists and War: The Impact of Science on Military and Civil Affairs*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1966.

Secondary Sources

Adams, R. J. Q. *British Politics and Foreign Policy in the Age of Appeasement, 1935-39*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.

Alperovitz, Gar. *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam: The Use of the Atomic Bomb and the American Confrontation with Soviet Power*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.

Atkinson, James D. 'Liddell Hart and Warfare of the Future'. *Military Affairs* 29, no. 4 (1965): 161-163.

Baratta, Joseph Preston. *The Politics of World Federation: United Nations, UN Reform, Atomic Control*. Vol. One, Westport: Praeger, 2004.

Barber, Noel. *Seven Days of Freedom: The Hungarian Uprising 1956*. London: Macmillan, 1973.

Barker, Rodney S. *Political Ideas in Modern Britain: In and after the Twentieth Century*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1997.

Barnett, Correlli. *The Audit of War: The Illusion and Reality of Britain as a Great Nation*. London: Macmillan, 1986.

Barnett, Correlli. *The Lost Victory: British Dreams, British Realities, 1945-1950*. London: Macmillan, 1995.

Bassford, Christopher. *Clausewitz in English: The Reception of Clausewitz in Britain and America, 1815-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Baylis, John. *Ambiguity and Deterrence: British Nuclear Strategy, 1945-1964*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Becker, Peter. 'The Neurosciences and Criminology: How New Experts Have Moved into Public Policy and Debate', in *Engineering Society: The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies, 1880-1980*, edited by Kerstin Brückweh, Benjamin Ziemann, Dirk Schumann and Richard F. Wetzel, 119-138. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Bell, Daniel. *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

Berlin, Isaiah. 'Does Political Theory Still Exist?', in *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, edited by Peter Laslett and W. G. Runciman, 143-172. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.

Biddiss, Michael. 'Victors' Justice? The Nuremberg Tribunal'. *History Today* 45, no. 5 (1995): 40-46.

Birn, Donald S. *The League of Nations Union 1918-1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

Blundell, J. 'Looking Back at the Condensed Version of the Road to Serfdom after 60 Years'. *Economic Affairs* 24, no. 1 (2004): 34-38.

Bond, Brian. *Liddell Hart: A Study of His Military Thought*. Aldershot: Gregg Revivals in association with Department of War Studies, Kings College London, 1991.

Braun, Reiner, ed. *Joseph Rotblat: Visionary for Peace*. Weinheim: Wiley-VCH, 2007.

Brown, Andrew August. *J. D. Bernal: The Sage of Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Brückweh, Kerstin, Ziemann, Benjamin, Schumann, Dirk, and Wetzel, Richard F., eds. *Engineering Society: The Role of the Human and Social Sciences in Modern Societies, 1880-1980*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Burnett, John. *Idle Hands: The Experience of Unemployment, 1790-1990*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Caplan, Bryan Douglas. *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Ceadel, Martin. 'King and Country Debate, 1933: Student Politics, Pacifism and the Dictators'. *Historical Journal* 22, no. 2 (1979): 397-422.

Ceadel, Martin. *Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Ceadel, Martin. *Semi-Detached Idealists: The British Peace Movement and International Relations, 1854-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Ceadel, Martin. *Thinking About Peace and War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Chalmers, Malcolm. *Paying for Defence: Military Spending and British Decline*. London: Pluto, 1985.

Clapson, Mark. *The Routledge Companion to Britain in the Twentieth Century*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Clark, Grenville, and Sohn, Louis Bruno. *World Peace through World Law*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Clark, Ian, and Wheeler, Nicholas J. *The British Origins of Nuclear Strategy, 1945-1955*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Clark, Ronald William. *Life of Bertrand Russell*. London: Cape, 1975.

Clark, Ronald William. *The Rise of the Boffins*. London: Phoenix House, 1962.

Clark, Ronald William. *Tizard*. London: Methuen, 1965.

Clarke, P. F. *Liberals and Social Democrats*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Clavin, Patricia. *Securing the World Economy: The Reinvention of the League of Nations, 1920-1946*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Collini, Stefan. *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Collini, Stefan. *Liberalism and Sociology: L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England, 1880-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Collini, Stefan. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain, 1850-1930*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Danchev, Alex. *Alchemist of War: The Life of Basil Liddell Hart*. London: Phoenix Giant, 1998.

Doyle, Michael W. 'Liberalism and World Politics'. *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4 (1986): 1151-1169.

Edgerton, David. *Britain's War Machine: Weapons, Resources and Experts in the Second World War*. London: Penguin Books, 2012.

Edgerton, David. 'The Decline of Declinism'. *The Business History Review* 71, no. 2 (1997): 201-206.

Edgerton, David. 'Liberal Militarism and the British State'. *New Left Review* 185 (1991): 138-169.

Edgerton, David. *Warfare State: Britain, 1920-1970*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Edwards, Ruth Dudley. *Victor Gollancz: A Biography*. London: Gollancz, 1987.

Engerman, David. 'Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917-1962', in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, 20-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Epstein, Leon D. 'The Nuclear Deterrent and the British Election of 1964'. *The Journal of British Studies* 5, no. 2 (1966): 139-163.

Evangelista, M. 'Cooperation Theory and Disarmament Negotiations in the 1950s'. *World Politics* 42, no. 4 (Jul 1990): 502-528.

Feis, Herbert. *Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Feser, Edward. *The Cambridge Companion to Hayek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Filner, Robert E. 'The Roots of Political Activism in British Science'. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 32, no. 1 (1976): 25-29.

Fleck, Christian, Hess, Andreas, and Lyon, E. Stina, eds. *Intellectuals and Their Publics: Perspectives from the Social Sciences*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.

Foot, Michael. *Aneurin Bevan: A Biography Vol. 2: 1945-1960*. London: Davis-Poynter, 1973.

Freeden, Michael. *Liberalism Divided: A Study in British Political Thought 1914-1939*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986.

Freeden, Michael. *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.

Friedberg, Aaron L. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Fuchser, Larry William. *Neville Chamberlain and Appeasement: A Study in the Politics of History*. London: Norton, 1982.

Gat, Azar. *Fascist and Liberal Visions of War: Fuller, Liddell Hart, Douhet, and Other Modernists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Geier, Joel. 'Socialism and War'. *International Socialist Review*, no. 8 (1999).

Geiger, Till. *Britain and the Economic Problem of the Cold War: The Political Economy and the Economic Impact of the British Defence Effort, 1945-1955*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Geiger, Till. 'The British Warfare State and the Challenge of Americanisation of Western Defence'. *European Review of History: Revue europeenne d histoire* 15, no. 4 (2008): 345-374.

Getty, J. Arch. *Origins of the Great Purges: The Soviet Communist Party Reconsidered, 1933-1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Gordin, Michael D., Tilley, Helen, and Prakash, Gyan, eds. *Utopia/Dystopia: Conditions of Historical Possibility*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Gowing, Margaret. *Britain and Atomic Energy, 1939-1945*. London: Macmillan, 1964.

Greene, Benjamin P. *Eisenhower, Science Advice, and the Nuclear Test-Ban Debate, 1945-1963*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Greenleaf, W. H. *The British Political Tradition*. 4 vols London: Methuen, 1983.

Greenleaf, W. H. *The British Political Tradition: The Ideological Heritage*. Vol. II, London: Methuen, 1983.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. 2 vols London: Heinemann, 1984.

Harries, Meirion, and Harries, Susie. *Soldiers of the Sun: The Rise and Fall of the Imperial Japanese Army 1868-1945*. London: Heinemann, 1991.

Harris, Jose. *William Beveridge: A Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Henig, Ruth B., ed. *The League of Nations*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1973.

Hennessy, Peter. *The Secret State: Preparing for the Worst, 1945-2010*. London: Penguin Books, 2010.

Heyck, Thomas William. 'Myths and Meanings of Intellectuals in Twentieth-Century British National Identity'. *Journal of British Studies* 37, no. 2 (1998): 192-221.

Higham, Robin. 'The Dangerously Neglected: The British Military Intellectuals, 1918-1939'. *Military Affairs* 29, no. 2 (1965): 73-87.

Hodgkin, R. A. 'Polanyi, Michael (1891–1976)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31558, accessed 29 May 2014].

Hogan, Michael J. *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hogan, Michael J. *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Holsti, Ole R. *American Public Opinion on the Iraq War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011.

Hopf, Ted. *Reconstructing the Cold War: The Early Years, 1945-1958*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Howard, Michael. 'Buchan, Alastair Francis (1918–1976)'. rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30868, accessed 19 May 2014].

Howard, Michael. *War and the Liberal Conscience*. London: Temple Smith, 1978.

Hudson, Gill. 'Lonsdale , Dame Kathleen (1903–1971)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Sept 2010 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31376, accessed 30 April 2014].

Jackson, Ben. *Equality and the British Left: A Study in Progressive Political Thought, 1900-64*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Jacobsen, Michael Hviid, and Tester, Keith, eds. *Utopia: Social Theory and the Future*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Johnston, Andrew M. 'Mr. Slessor Goes to Washington: The Influence of the British Global Strategy Paper on the Eisenhower New Look'. *Diplomatic History* 22, no. 3 (1998): 361-398.

Judt, Tony. *Past Imperfect: French Intellectuals, 1944-1956*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Kaplan, Fred M. *Wizards of Armageddon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Katz, Bernard. 'Hill, Archibald Vivian (1886–1977)', rev. V. M. Quirke. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31230, accessed 30 April 2014].

Kirby, Maurice. *Operational Research in War and Peace: The British Experience from the 1930s to 1970*. London: Imperial College Press, 2003.

Kort, Michael. *The Columbia Guide to Hiroshima and the Bomb*. Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.

Lane, Melissa. 'The Genesis and Reception of *The Road to Serfdom*', in *Hayek: A Collaborative Biography*, edited by Robert Leeson, 43-60. Hampshire: Macmillan, 2013.

Larres, Klaus. *Churchill's Cold War: The Politics of Personal Diplomacy*. London: Yale University Press, 2002.

Laslett, Peter, ed. *Philosophy, Politics and Society*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956.

Laucht, Christoph. 'Atoms for the People: The Atomic Scientists' Association, the British State and Nuclear Education in the Atom Train Exhibition, 1947–1948'. *The British Journal for the History of Science* 45, no. 04 (2012): 591-608.

Laucht, Christoph. *Elemental Germans: Klaus Fuchs, Rudolf Peierls, and the Making of British Nuclear Culture 1939-59*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Leffler, Melvyn P., and Westad, Odd Arne. *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Crises and Détente*. Vol. II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Leffler, Melvyn P., and Westad, Odd Arne, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Cold War: Origins*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Leslie, Stuart W. *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford*. Oxford: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Lider, Julian. *British Military Thought after World War II*. Aldershot: Gower, 1985.

Linehan, Thomas P. *Modernism and British Socialism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Lovell, B. *P.M.S. Blackett: A Biographical Memoir*. London: Royal Society, 1976.

Manson, Janet M. 'Leonard Woolf as an Architect of the League of Nations'. *The South Carolina Review* (2007).

Manuel, Frank Edward, and Manuel, Fritzie P. *Utopian Thought in the Western World*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1979.

Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea*. London: Allen Lane, 2012.

Mearsheimer, John J. *Liddell Hart and the Weight of History*. London: Brassey's Defence, 1988.

Medhurst, Martin J., Ivie, Robert L., Wander, Philip, and Scott, Robert L. *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1997.

Mehta, Uday. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. London: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Mingst, Karen A. *Essentials of International Relations*. 2nd ed. London: Norton, 2001.

Mitchell, Timothy. *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. London: University of California Press, 2002.

Morgan, Kevin. *Harry Pollitt*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Navias, Martin S. *Nuclear Weapons and British Strategic Planning, 1955-1958*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Neely, M. E. 'Was the Civil War a Total War'. *Civil War History* 37, no. 1 (Mar 1991): 5-28.

Nehring, Holger. *Politics of Security: British and West German Protest Movements and the Early Cold War, 1945-1970*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Nehring, Holger. 'What Was the Cold War?'. *English Historical Review* 127, no. 527 (2012): 920-949.

Newman, Michael. *John Strachey*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.

Newman, Michael. 'Laski, Harold Joseph (1893–1950)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34412, accessed 28 May 2014].

Newman, Michael. 'Strachey, (Evelyn) John St Loe (1901–1963)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2011 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36337, accessed 2 May 2014].

Nitze, Paul H. 'Atoms, Strategy and Policy'. *Foreign Affairs* 34, no. 2 (1956): 187-198.

Northedge, F. S. *The League of Nations: Its Life and Times 1920-1946*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1986.

Nye, Mary Jo. *Blackett: Physics, War, and Politics in the Twentieth Century*. London: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Orend, Brian. 'War'. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (*Fall 2008), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/war/>.

Ortolano, Guy. *The Two Cultures Controversy: Science, Literature and Cultural Politics in Postwar Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Osgood, Kenneth Alan, and Frank, Andrew, eds. *Selling War in a Media Age: The Presidency and Public Opinion in the American Century*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010.

Parkin, Frank. *Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.

Peden, George. *Arms, Economics and British Strategy: From Dreadnoughts to Hydrogen Bombs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Pedersen, Susan. 'Back to the League of Nations'. *The American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1091-1117.

Pigou, A. C. 'The Road to Serfdom by F. A. Hayek'. *The Economic Journal* 54, no. 214 (1944): 217-219.

Piller, G. J. 'Tizard, Sir Henry Thomas (1885–1959)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36528, accessed 8 July 2014].

Pocock, J. G. A. *Virtue, Commerce, and History: Essays on Political Thought and History, Chiefly in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Polenberg, Richard, ed. *In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer: The Security Clearance Hearing*. London: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Pugh, Michael C. *Liberal Internationalism: The Interwar Movement for Peace in Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Rees, David. *The Age of Containment: The Cold War, 1945-1965*. London: St. Martin's Press, 1967.

Reid, Brian Holden. 'Fuller, John Frederick Charles (1878–1966)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2009 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33290, accessed 13 Sept 2014].

Reid, Brian Holden. *J. F. C. Fuller: Military Thinker*. London: Macmillan, 1987.

Reid, Brian Holden. *Studies in British Military Thought: Debates with Fuller and Liddell Hart*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Rendle, Matthew. 'Post-Revisionism: The Continuing Debate on Stalinism'. *Intelligence and National Security* 25, no. 3 (2010): 370-388.

Rhodes, Richard. *The Making of the Atomic Bomb*. London: Touchstone, 1986.

Roberts, Geoffrey. *Stalin's Wars: From World War to Cold War, 1939-1953*. London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Rock, William R. *British Appeasement in the 1930's*. London: Edward Arnold, 1977.

Roth, Andrew. 'Melvin Lasky: Cold Warrior Who Edited the C.I.A. Funded Encounter Magazine'. *Guardian*, 2004, http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2004/may/22/guardianobituaries.

Ruddock, Joan. *CND Scrapbook*. London: Optima, 1987.

Rutherford, Paul. *Weapons of Mass Persuasion: Marketing the War against Iraq*. London: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Ryan, Alan. *Bertrand Russell: A Political Life*. London: Allen Lane, 1988.

Saunders, Frances Stonor. 'How the C.I.A. Plotted against Us'. *New Statesman*, 1999, http://www.newstatesman.com/199907120022.

Seckel, A. 'Russell and the Cuban Missile-Crisis'. *Russell: The Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies* 4, no. 2 (1984): 253-261.

Shearmur, Jeremy. 'Hayek, The Road to Serfdom, and the British Conservatives'. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 28, no. 3 (2006): 309-314.

Shepherd, Robert. *A Class Divided: Appeasement and the Road to Munich, 1938*. London: Macmillan, 1988.

Shusterman, D. *C. P. Snow*. Boston: Twayne, 1975.

Simhony, Avital, and Weinstein, D., eds. *The New Liberalism: Reconciling Liberty and Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Skinner, Quentin. 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, edited by James Tully, 29-67. Cambridge: Polity, 1988.

Spinardi, G. 'Aldermaston and British Nuclear Weapons Development: Testing the 'Zuckerman Thesis''. *Social Studies of Science* 27, no. 4 (1997): 547-582.

Stapleton, Julia. 'Cultural Conservatism and the Public Intellectual in Britain, 1930-70'. *The European Legacy* 5, no. 6 (2000): 795-813.

Stapleton, Julia. *Political Intellectuals and Public Identities in Britain since 1850*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Stapleton, Julia. 'Political Thought and National Identity in Britain, 1850-1950', in *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750-1950*, edited by Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore and Brian Young, 245-269. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Stern, Philip M. *The Oppenheimer Case: Security on Trial*. New York: Harper, 1969.

Szasz, Ferenc Morton. *British Scientists and the Manhattan Project: The Los Alamos Years*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.

Taylor, A. J. P. *The Origins of the Second World War*. London: Hamilton, 1961.

Taylor, Richard, and Prichard, Colin. *Protest Makers: The British Nuclear Disarmament Movement of 1958-1965, Twenty Years On*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1980.

Thomas, Hugh. *John Strachey*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.

Thompson, Noel. *John Strachey: An Intellectual Biography*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.

Thurston, Robert W. *Life and Terror in Stalin's Russia, 1934-1941*. London: Yale University Press, 1996.

Tomlinson, Jim. *The Politics of Decline: Understanding Post-War Britain*. Harlow: Longman, 2001.

Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Trythall, Anthony John. *'Boney' Fuller: The Intellectual General, 1878-1966*. London: Cassell, 1977.

Urban, George. *Radio Free Europe and the Pursuit of Democracy: My War within the Cold War*. London: Yale University Press, 1997.

Walker, J. S. 'Historiographical Essay - Recent Literature on Truman's Atomic Bomb Decision: A Search for Middle Ground'. *Diplomatic History* 29, no. 2 (Apr 2005): 311-334.

Warf, Barney. *Global Geographies of the Internet*. London: Springer, 2013.

Webster, Charles, and Frankland, Noble. *The Strategic Air Offensive against Germany, 1939-1945*. Vol. 1-4, London: H. M. S. O., 1961.

Williams, Andrew J. *Liberalism and War: The Victors and the Vanquished*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: World Publishing, 1959.

Wood, Neal. *Communism and British Intellectuals*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1959.

Yergin, Daniel. *Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State*. London: Deutsch, 1978.

Zachary, G. Pascal. *Endless Frontier: Vannevar Bush: Engineer of the American Century*. London: Free Press, 1997.

Ziegler, Philip. 'Zuckerman, Solly, Baron Zuckerman (1904–1993)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2013 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53466, accessed 30 April 2014].