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ABSTRACT

*Encounter*'s historical significance lies in its being an Anglo-American cultural and political phenomenon and in its anti-communist ideological project. The histories of the British literary intellectuals and the "New York Intellectuals" are traced, with particular reference to their relationship to the development of intellectual and literary periodicals. The relationship of *Encounter* to its sponsoring organisations and to the American governing class is fully explored. These relationships were crucial for both the intellectual impetus and the financial security which *Encounter* needed. The New York Intellectuals provided the intellectual drive and political consciousness which shaped *Encounter* into the journal which it was. The breaking of the connections between this group of intellectuals and the American governing class sowed the seeds of *Encounter*'s eventual demise, and explains its change from a broadly social democratic to a neoconservative political position.
Encounter was first published in October 1953. Until 1983, when it became bi-monthly, it was a monthly journal which dealt with political and cultural affairs. It was funded by the Congress for Cultural Freedom (the CCF), who ceased sponsoring it in 1965, shortly before revelations in the American press that the Central Intelligence Agency (the CIA) had funded the Congress. It ceased publication formally in January 1991. It had two editors, one American and one British. The American editors were Irving Kristol (1953 - 58) and Melvin Lasky (1958 - 90). Stephen Spender was the British editor from 1953 to 1965; he was followed by the playwright Nigel Dennis, the poets D J Enright and Anthony Thwaite, and the historian Richard Mayne.

The question which has to be asked before a survey of the history and significance of Encounter is embarked on is: what is especially important about this journal? What makes it different from other journals and especially noteworthy as a subject of study? Scholarly journals can be studied either in relation to other journals of their type or in relation to their intellectual background: both can form an equally valid basis for comparison. However,
when the first comparison is attempted in the case of
Encounter, one immediately meets a difficulty: that there
are very few journals of this sort with which one can make
an illuminating comparison.

The journal's description of its contents, "Politics -
Literature - The Arts", belies its uniqueness. On this
basis, it could be concluded that Encounter was in the
same league as other intelligent and respected American or
English journals, such as the New Republic, the New
Statesman, or the Spectator. But it differed from these
journals in two significant respects: its political
articles were almost always of a less journalistic and
more theoretical nature (and always considerably longer)
than those in even the most intelligent political
magazine. Similarly, its coverage of literature and the
arts was almost always on the level of the academic essay,
of the sort (but not always of the length) which could be
found in such publications as Scrutiny or Partisan Review.
At the same time, Encounter was committed throughout its
existence of almost 40 years to the publication of short
fiction and poetry. (Travel writing also was important in
the journal's profile, although this was throughout its
career mainly of a political or polemical rather than
literary nature.)
These three components of the periodical's coverage were remarkably constant throughout its existence. The character and concerns of the articles remained in the same mould; and the equal importance of the three components - political polemic, commentary on arts and literature, and short fiction and poetry - was scrupulously observed throughout the journal's history. 

Encounter - despite the pronounced bias of its political articles - always published fiction writing of quality, irrespective of the political affiliations of the writers (or whether they had any at all). Left-wing writers such as Heinrich Böll and Günter Grass were published by Encounter, along with writers who offended the literary predilections of Stephen Spender - co-editor of the magazine from 1953 to 1965 - such as Kingsley Amis and Philip Larkin (though only in moderate amounts in the last two cases). Indeed, Encounter prided itself on its patronage of both young and established writers. There is no doubt that it was Spender's intention that this should be so (as will be demonstrated later), or that Encounter drew attention to this patronage in order to create a distinctive appeal to its readership. This is indicated by the anthology, Encounters (1), which includes contributions from Evelyn Waugh and W H Auden as well as from Philip Larkin and other younger writers, such as Nadine Gordimer and Sylvia Plath. Unlike its predecessors
in England, *Horizon* and *Penguin New Writing*, it did not confine itself to patronage of British writers, and it conceived of itself as contributing to the creation of a European culture, in the process making British culture less insular. (However, this very insularity had helped "protect" British writers from the influence of European Marxists such as Brecht, Gramsci and Lukacs, whose influence *Encounter* was meant to counter.) (2)

The process of making British culture less insular was, however, only a beneficial by-product of a journal whose avowed purpose was not only to enlighten its readers but also to serve as a beacon for "Western culture". The fact that, as Ferdinand Mount observed in his obituary of the magazine (3), it was one of the few channels through which intellectual currents on the Continent could pass into British culture, or that, as Fredric Warburg emphasises in his memoirs (4), it was more cultural than overtly propagandistic, does not alter the political purpose of the magazine.

Despite its base in London and despite two of its co-editors (Spender and D J Enright) being distinguished British poets, the persistent connection with the United States (the last American co-editor, Melvin Lasky, having held the post for over thirty years) would seemingly force
the student of Encounter's history to examine the intellectual background of its distinguished American academic contributors, who had formed part of a cohesive intellectual group for almost twenty years before the foundation of Encounter, and who continued to have strong connections with each other, with the journal, and with its sponsoring organisation. This group of intellectuals, which formed the circle around the New York literary and political periodical, Partisan Review, in the 1930s and 1940s, dominated the CCF and the American Committee for Cultural Freedom (ACCF) in the 1950s. From this group both of the American editors of, and the American contributors to, Encounter were drawn. Both the CCF and the ACCF were formed by such individuals as the ex-Marxist philosophers Sidney Hook and James Burnham, the historian Arthur Schlesinger, the writer Arthur Koestler (author of "Darkness at Noon"), as well as Melvin Lasky, in response to the revival of Communist front organisations after the 1939 - 45 war. (These organisations will not be dealt with here, but are treated fully in David Caute's "The Fellow Travellers: a postscript to the Enlightenment", London: 1973.) I have said "would seemingly" on purpose, because it has occurred to no scholar of any aspect of Encounter's history to study the British intellectual context (from which it partly sprang and which it sought to shape) alongside the American intellectual context,
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without which the institutional support and ideological thrust behind *Encounter* would have been absent. There have been studies (5) which have dealt with the connections of *Encounter*’s parent organisation with leading British politicians, but it is the area of culture which needs to be studied, because those intellectuals and polemicists who were the driving force behind *Encounter* and the CCF were concerned not just with politics but also with culture, and more particularly, cultural politics.

These American intellectuals were very influential both in the selection of contributors to *Encounter* and in the ideological timbre of the journal, together with its emphasis on the relations between politics and culture, and between intellectuals and politics. Although Spender emphasises in his memoirs that responsibility for political and for cultural articles was divided respectively between the American editor and the English editor, and that he never experienced interference in his area of responsibility (6), and despite the fact that the journal's choice of a cultural emphasis occasioned disagreements, *Encounter* made a political impact mainly because of its ideological origins in the concerns of these American intellectuals (7).
Equally, it would not have had the wide influence which it enjoyed if it had been a purely political journal. If both the British and American contributions to the content and purposes of *Encounter*, and both the cultural and the political aspects of the magazine's coverage are studied, not in isolation, but together, it may be possible to gain a better perspective on the historical and ideological significance of *Encounter* than has hitherto been possible.

A not insignificant historiography of important aspects of *Encounter* has developed over the last twenty years, particularly since Christopher Lasch's *The Agony of the American Left* (8) was published, which was the first attempt to place the history of the CCF in the context of both the history of radical politics and of cultural history in the United States, and which appeared after *Encounter* had burst upon the public consciousness after the revelations of CIA funding of the journal. However, since Lasch's seminal work appeared, the historiography of *Encounter* has fragmented. Various studies have touched on the history of the journal, and various aspects of the publication's history and significance have been explored, but no attempt has been made to connect the various strands of study, in order to illuminate the whole. Lasch's work is the most cited of all the studies which deal with *Encounter* and the CCF; although there have been
important studies since Lasch which are concerned with the CCF and the American intellectuals associated with the ACCF, they have not fundamentally challenged Lasch's assessment of the CCF or sought to develop it.

What will be attempted here is a provisional survey and analysis of what has been published on *Encounter*, and on the circles which edited it, contributed to it, and funded it, and of the historical origins of this periodical, its relationship to the development of an intellectual class in Britain, and to the history of periodical publishing. This survey can also illuminate the status enjoyed by journals such as *Encounter* - its polemical yet academic slant ensured that its readership never rose above that of 30,000, but its prestige extended far beyond its readership. This prestige remained until the journal's demise, even though it was diminished by revelations of CIA funding of the CCF. Once the reasons for that prestige are sought, the relative importance of the cultural and political components of the journal can be determined.

The funding of the CCF and *Encounter* by the CIA has routinely been regarded as the most important fact about the journal, which above all others determines its role in Anglo-American politics and culture. The desire of the
CIA to sustain *Encounter* has been seen by most commentators as self-explanatory, because it was evident from the outset that its political orientation would hardly be detrimental to the CIA, or to those who managed American foreign policy in general. Therefore, the CIA's support for the journal is not seen as surprising. The debate has focused on the precise extent of the CIA's responsibility for the CCF and *Encounter*, on Spender's self-exculpation, on Kristol's self-justification, and on Diana Trilling's surprise that anybody with anything to do with the CCF and the ACCF was at all surprised about the CIA's involvement (9).

However, *Encounter*'s political affiliations throughout its 37-year history are not as self-evident as to enable commentators to discuss this issue without distorting the truth. Thus, Robert Hewison describes *Encounter* as, from the outset, the organ of "Conservative intellectual orthodoxy", and then moves on to other matters without attempting to justify this ascription of political affiliation. On the other hand, the *Spectator* referred approvingly to *Encounter*'s "fighting liberalism" in its tenth year of publication (10). Martin Green and Alan Sinfield seize on the cultural politics of Spender and his crusade to defend modernism in literature against the resurgence of social realism in fiction and in drama in
England after the mid 1950s as his reason for venturing into politics with his co-editorship, even after his fraught experiences during the 1930s (11).

However, none of these address the question of why the CIA - even without close Congressional scrutiny, as was the case in the 1950s and early 1960s - should want to subsidise a journal, which, in Malcolm Muggeridge's pithy description, consisted of "political theorising and academic literary criticism" (12). Because *Encounter* was founded before the expansion in higher education, it could not have been intended to be an organ of mass propaganda. The very idea that it could perform this function is dubious. (Muggeridge himself, one of the founders of the British section of the CCF, lost interest in *Encounter* because of its unremittingly intellectually demanding content, and described many of its articles as "excruciatingly boring and very tendentious" (13).) Even if its political affiliations were as transparently Conservative as Hewison claims, that would still be no apparent reason why the CIA should have funded it, especially in view of its pronounced emphasis on culture, as opposed to other magazines which the CCF sponsored, such as *Preuves*, whose coverage was exclusively political (14). In short, the literature on the CCF and *Encounter* is long on reasons why the intellectuals of the CCF and
the ACCF sought sponsorship by the CIA, and were not ashamed of such allies (whole monographs have been written on the history of the circle which eventually dominated the ACCF), but short on why the CIA supported them.

A question of equal interest concerns the date of the foundation of the magazine. Justifications for the journal's principal purpose - such as an obituary of the journal in 1991 - imply that the general thrust of Soviet foreign policy in the late 1940s and 1950s was sufficient reason for Encounter's anti-communist crusade (15). However, such an explanation is inadequate if the role of the Soviet Union between Stalin's death in early 1953 and the suppression of the Hungarian uprising in 1956 is examined. Soon after Stalin's death, "Moscow helped end the deadlock over Korea, opened diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia and Greece, abandoned its territorial claims against Turkey, toned down its anti-American rhetoric, and launched a 'peace offensive'' (16), and also Khrushchev continued the thawing of relations by withdrawing Soviet troops from Austria, handing back a naval base to Finland, and Port Arthur to China, and by opening diplomatic relations with Bonn (17).

These events occurred before Khrushchev's revelations about Stalin's rule and the suppression of the Hungarian
uprising, both of which weakened the CCF's enemy. These changes in Soviet foreign policy might have caused even some of the backers of *Encounter* to consider that the Soviet Union had opted for a policy of co-existence, or controlled competition. Domestic events in the Soviet Union (such as disturbances in the labour camps and the freeing of some prisoners) might even have caused some among *Encounter*’s circle to doubt that the Soviet Union was the model of a thoroughly totalitarian state (18). Apparently no such doubts were raised.

It has been regarded as completely natural, and a fact which required no explanation, that a journal of ideas, which was founded in 1953, and whose self-proclaimed allegiance was to liberalism, should have dedicated itself to the anti-Communist crusade. This question, however, did occur to some contemporaries. A J P Taylor, in a review of the first issue, remarked that he had some doubts about the purpose of the journal, since Communism was now a very insignificant force in the United States, and was not growing in popularity in Europe (19). Even allowing for the considerable influence of the Stalinist French and Italian Communist parties in the 1950s, an English-language journal which, against the advice of the CCF's secretariat, was not published and printed in Paris, could have enjoyed influence only in the Anglo-American
world. Despite the palpable diminution in the appeal of Communism - particularly Stalinist Communism - after 1956, *Encounter*, particularly among its "target group", the intellectuals, continued its campaign against fellow-travelling and Communist influence until almost the end of its life. Its obsession may perhaps be explained by Taylor's assertion that *Encounter* was written for "literary men with an itch to dabble in politics". This statement is helpful in guiding us toward the ideological motivation which drove the CCF and *Encounter*, but does not explain why it became the "most influential journal of liberal opinion in the West" (20). Assuredly, the CIA did not start funding *Encounter* because it was bound to become so important for liberal intellectuals. Nor did intellectuals write for the journal merely because of the high fees which it paid; this does not explain why intellectuals considered it worth their while to lend credence to *Encounter*'s pretensions.

A set of interrelated questions concerning the motivations of those who participated, at any stage, in the funding, management, and editing of *Encounter* has to be answered if its importance and the reasons for its eventual demise are to be understood. But the history of the intellectual class in Britain has to be examined as well as the
ideological inspiration in America, if a comprehensive overview of the journal is intended.
CHAPTER 1

Section A

If we are to begin to understand the contribution which Encounter made to intellectual life in the United States and in Britain in the period 1953 - 1990, the formation of the relevant intellectual groups in both countries has to be examined and compared. This has not been done before, but such a comparison is essential. Because of the unevenness of the work that has previously been published on the subject, this comparison will essay an analysis of British and American intellectuals as groups. Stefan Collini's, T W Heyck's and John Gross's works on the intellectual class and the "men of letters" in Britain during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are invaluable (21). There are no comparable works on American intellectuals during the nineteenth century, although there is a growing number of monographs which deal with the twentieth century American intellectual class, especially with the Partisan Review circle, which provided most of the intellectual impetus for Encounter.

The relationship of literary/political intellectuals or "men of letters", not scientific or religious
intellectuals, to politics is our concern here, because literary intellectuals were predominant among the circles which supported the CCF and Partisan Review, and among those who edited and contributed to Encounter. Advocates and critics of the journal have remarked that the literary content was unaffected by the political stance of the magazine (22), but have not enquired why this was so. The historian Sir Denis Brogan, in his introduction to Encounters, thinks that the absence in the journal of any extended treatment of religion and science is noteworthy, but does not ponder its implications, other than to note that it demonstrates the truth of C P Snow's argument about the "two cultures" (23). However, Brogan did not proceed to enquire why this fragmentation of the intellectual class was more advanced in Britain than elsewhere, so that it had become the norm for the cultural and literary section of a journal to be entirely divorced from the political section, so much so that the two had to be judged by entirely different standards. On the same page of the Times Literary Supplement on which the panegyric of Encounter appeared, another article appeared congratulating the old New Statesman for effectively separating its cultural from its political section.

A self-conscious intelligentsia which had overtly political intentions and saw its function as the
transformation of society, whatever the disagreements among its members as to what needed to be changed - such as existed in eighteenth century France or, to some extent, in nineteenth century Russia or eighteenth century Scotland - never existed in England. This did not preclude the development of a vibrant intellectual life: as E P Thompson asserts, "Other countries may have produced a 'true intelligentsia', an 'internally unified intellectual community'; but it is rubbish to suggest that there is some crippling disablement in the failure of British intellectuals to form 'an independent intellectual enclave' within the body politic. Rather, there were formed in the eighteenth century scores of intellectual enclaves ... since few intellectuals were thrown into prominence in a conflict with authority, few felt the need to develop a systematic critique. They thought of themselves, rather, as exchanging specialised products in a market which was tolerably free, and the sum of whose intellectual commodities made up the sum of 'knowledge'" (24).

The argument, however, is not over whether British intellectuals were creative, but over their cohesion as a group. To extend Thompson's analogy, the viability of such a market in intellectual products depends on producers and consumers being willing to buy and sell.
However, the connections between intellectual producers in different disciplines had become so attenuated by the nineteenth century that, although poets and novelists were aware of what was occurring in politics and economics, such an exchange of ideas, as distinct from observation of events and processes, was becoming less common. The absence of such a class consciousness, which prevented British intellectuals from ever producing such a compendium of knowledge as the French Encyclopaedia, was caused by the Civil War and the "Glorious Revolution" of the seventeenth century, which made such a consciousness difficult to achieve in England.

Once the unchallenged authority of both Church and State in intellectual and cultural matters had been overthrown in England in the seventeenth century (but not in the rest of Europe, with the exception of the Netherlands), there was not much against which an intelligentsia could define itself. It could not oppose an overweening authority, when this authority no longer existed; neither was there a single focal point of patronage for intellectual and cultural activity (as existed elsewhere in eighteenth century Europe). Because the state no longer dominated society in Britain after the seventeenth century (if it ever had), pluralism in cultural matters arrived much earlier in Britain than in the rest of Europe. This
pluralism (which was strengthened by the influence of the French Revolution and of Chartism in spreading political knowledge and self-education) flourished without centres of aristocratic and ecclesiastical patronage.

Scotland was, for the middle and latter part of the eighteenth century, the most intellectually active part of Britain, but there the universities were far more important than Oxford or Cambridge in encouraging such activity. Mainland Britain avoided both the Europe-wide revolutionary upheavals of the late eighteenth century and the growth of ethno-linguistic consciousness (or nationalism) in the nineteenth. In both of these political movements, intellectuals were irreplaceable in formulating ideas and in inventing languages (25). Such activities naturally led them to an increased self-consciousness of their role in political life and to a consciousness of their being part of an intellectual class.

Because nothing of the kind happened in mainland Britain, intellectuals never formed a cohesive class. The State was never something which intellectuals had to define themselves against, nor a source of patronage; neither was the nation something which they had to build. The State interfered little; what was vital was the dependence of
writers on a developing market as the principal source of patronage. If Raymond Williams' social history of British writers is to be believed (26), a significant change in the career histories of writers occurred during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when patronage and means of livelihood, whether ecclesiastical, courtly, aristocratic or governmental, became less important and writers had to rely more on contact with the market. Williams dates the rise to importance of the literary magazines in London, both in publishing writers and in providing contacts for them, from this era.

However, as Oxford and Cambridge recovered from the intellectual lassitude of the eighteenth century, their new importance as the residence of historians and philosophers from the third quarter of the nineteenth century tended to abort the possible development of a unified intellectual class, which could have communicated to the interested public because their audience was different from that of writers. This split in the intellectual class was important, because much of the political theory (T H Green, Bernard Bosanquet) which influenced public policy and the politicians of the twentieth century originated in the universities. The study of history, political economy and political philosophy became anchored to the academy. But the most
important fact is that this was merely an aspect of the process of the non-development of an intellectual class.

In one of the few comparisons American intellectuals have essayed between themselves and British intellectuals, Norman Podhoretz (the editor of *Commentary* and a younger member of the *Partisan Review/New York Intellectual circle*) has remarked on the phenomenon of intellectual politicians in Britain (Crosland, Gaitskell) who injected new ideas into politics. He emphasises that politicians who bridged the gap between the worlds of the intellect and of politics did not exist in the United States (27).

However, he does not go on to say that the intellectuals in the *Partisan Review* group had by the late 1940s usurped the function of being the conveyors of political ideas, in the process making the intellectual class less divided between the functions of literary reviewing, on the one hand, and political theorising, on the other, than in Britain.

For British literary intellectuals, who already had status, the problem lay in failing to conceive of a social and political purpose for themselves, as the American intellectuals of the CCF and the ACCF, through their deft adoption of Cold War liberalism, did. Both the
intellectual politicians and the literary intellectuals in Britain were patronised by Encounter, but before they were brought between the covers of the same journal they had had little to do with each other, whereas their American counterparts in the ACCF united political and literary intellectuals in the same person or group. This may help to solve the riddle of the chameleon-like character of the journal. Thus Warburg emphasises the battle between Spender and the Russian emigré composer Nicolas Nabokov (of the Paris headquarters of the CCF) to make Encounter a primarily cultural magazine; other commentators stress the friction between the ACCF and the CCF over the fact that some prominent members of the ACCF thought that the CCF was wasting its funds on a cultural magazine (28). The editor of a magazine which was founded to rival Encounter dwells on its political aims (29); Conor Cruise O'Brien implies that the worth of the cultural articles balanced to some extent the distortions of its political content; and Alexander Cockburn states that its acceptance among British intellectuals implies that they had compromised themselves, not only because the journal was funded by the CIA, but also because it was "so basically right-wing" and that this bias coloured its coverage of all political and cultural affairs (30). However, the foregoing comparison of British and American intellectuals has the explicit aim of demonstrating that these accounts of Encounter's
origins and influence miss the point, because they ignore the question of Encounter's place in intellectual history and in the history of periodical publishing, and because they ignore the fact that the journal was part of an attempt to create a cohesive intellectual class in Britain.

The Partisan Review and ACCF group in the United States had the clear objective of capturing the commanding heights of the intellectual community, and of forcing their fellow intellectuals to debate an agenda which they had largely determined. No group of British intellectuals during the 1940s and 1950s had either the intention or the ability to undertake the same feat, but Encounter's sponsors, the CCF, were determined to give them the opportunity to do so. Why?

If the British intellectual "class" were to be in any condition to fight the cultural Cold War, it had to have a semblance of unity, and at the very least not be indifferent to politics and prone to "neutralist" infiltration. As has been noted, by 1953 international events might have caused the anti-communist crusade to falter, but Encounter was a product of the first conference of the CCF in Berlin in 1950, the year of the Anglo-American involvement in the Korean War and the year
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after the Communist seizure of power in China. The CCF was not to be placated by moves toward detente: it existed in order to reclaim the Soviet sphere for "Western" culture, not to arrive at an accommodation with it. The death of Stalin and any consequent change in Soviet foreign policy could not in any way affect the CCF's argument that the tendency of totalitarian regimes was inherently expansionist. There could be no attempt at reconciliation with a polity whose nature was deemed by the CCF to make an eternal East-West confrontation inevitable. Therefore Taylor's bemusement at Encounter's declared aims was, in a sense, irrelevant. However small the Communist parties in North America and in Britain were, and however much Communism's intellectual attraction was on the wane, the existence of the totalitarian monolith dominated all these facts.

Encounter's mission has always been seen as an ideological one, but it may be more helpful to see it in geopolitical terms. If it had been concerned purely with combating the ideology of Communism, it would not have been so worried about "neutralism" or anti-colonial nationalism as a factor which would create difficulties for the United States as it was. The CCF viewed neutralism (just as much as Communism) as a danger which had to be fought by taking the battle to the enemy's territory. In 1955 luminaries
of the CCF travelled to India to warn of the danger of friendship with the Soviet Union (a trip on which Spender was one of the guests). *Encounter*’s editorial policy was actively hostile to Third World nationalism, until the journal’s demise.

For the CCF, neutralism was not only naive, but also wicked: the similarity which the Soviet Union had with Nazi Germany (that they were both totalitarian) outweighed any ideological differences between them. While the more sophisticated theorists of totalitarianism (such as Hannah Arendt, who exercised an enormous influence over the *Partisan Review/ACCF* group in the United States (31)) did not attempt to blur the differences between Nazism and Communism in the service of overt political aims, Melvin Lasky (the Berlin correspondent for *Partisan Review* and the *New Leader*, before he became co-editor of *Encounter*) attempted to show that the East German state was a thinly disguised form of Nazism (32).

The Manichean view of world affairs which was propagated by John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower’s Secretary of State, and which was apparently shared by the CCF (and *Encounter*), was in fact contrary to the views of several prominent members of the organisation. Norman Thomas, the leader of the American Socialist Party, who had
accompanied Spender with the CCF to India, and Hugh Gaitskell, who attended a conference of the CCF in Milan in the same year, definitely did not share these views. The CCF and Encounter went out of their way to activate those politicians who were sceptical of the Dullesian viewpoint, and it was these politicians, not those of the Right, who contributed to the journal. However, Gaitskell was, as the historian and Kennedy "apparatchik" Arthur Schlesinger (another key member of the ACCF) has pointed out, unashamedly pro-American, and his advent as leader of the Labour Party marked, in Schlesinger's view, a new convergence of progressive thought on both sides of the Atlantic in which Gaitskell was instrumental. (He attributes the fact that Gaitskell "was a good deal more than a national figure" to his "pragmatic conception of socialism [which] enlisted sympathetic interest", and that he believed "that the Atlantic Alliance was indispensable and the Atlantic Community indestructible". These factors were indispensable if any politician or intellectual were to be taken seriously by the CCF and the ACCF. (Lasky evidently thought Gaitskell worth cultivating; he was a frequent visitor at the Gaitskells' house. Schlesinger - who was to become one of the trustees of Encounter after the CCF relinquished control in 1965 - first met Gaitskell at the Milan Conference in 1955 (33).) Schlesinger points out that Gaitskell thought that there was something more
positive in the United States than McCarthyism, and applauds this, without noticing that the ACCF defined its political positions according to the prevailing wind of McCarthyism, and that Schlesinger left the ACCF in the late 1950s (along with other important intellectuals, such as the sociologist David Riesman) precisely because it was too tolerant of this political trend.

These facts might have persuaded both Gaitskell and Schlesinger of the view that McCarthyism was more influential than any positive current in the United States in the 1950s, at precisely the time when the ACCF and the CCF were propagating the idea that Communism was a far greater threat to civil liberties than McCarthyism. The same assertion - that McCarthyism was made too much of abroad, or that it was an aberration in American politics, of greater or lesser importance - was made by other intellectuals of the Partisan Review/ACCF group.

McCarthyism presented quite a problem for the Partisan Review intellectuals, for whereas it helped to unify the intellectual class in the United States, it tended to estrange those whose approval the CCF most needed (even prominent members of the CCF, such as Bertrand Russell), who tended to see McCarthyism as an extreme example of an obsession which had gripped all parts of political and 28
intellectual life in the United States. However, McCarthyism was useful for intellectuals in the United States because, although few intellectuals supported McCarthy, it was convenient for many to view McCarthyism as a natural reaction to Communism and to what was perceived as Communist infiltration in the government agencies and trade unions of the United States since the 1930s, or to compare the apparently dubious and overexaggerated threat of McCarthyism with the overwhelming one of Communist influence. McCarthyism helped American intellectuals both to differentiate themselves from the McCarthyite position, and to represent themselves as the upholders of civil liberties in the United States, while at the same time acting as the housecleaners of the intellectual community, helping to sweep out any elements deemed to be unduly pro-Communist.

Although the ACCF dissolved in 1958, as a result of various resignations over the position on denying civil liberties to Communists, this should not obscure the fact that it was highly successful in presenting a united front in the early part of the decade, when McCarthy was a senator. (After 1954 he was not.) It was in these years that the CCF and ACCF were laying the foundations for the acceptance by intellectuals of *Encounter*, and also the *Partisan Review* intellectuals were making the transition
from political radicalism to academic respectability. During this period, the *Partisan Review* group were to establish themselves as the leading intellectuals in the United States, and also to persuade intellectuals and politicians abroad that they already occupied this position. Because McCarthyism threatened to become a movement which attacked all intellectuals, a movement before which the Truman and Eisenhower administrations were helpless, intellectuals felt that they had to define the limits of "acceptable" ostracism of Communists or former Communists, for fear of being swept along by the tide of anti-Communist hysteria, unprotected by the State. However, Eisenhower's decision in 1956 that Robert Oppenheimer, the nuclear scientist and former "fellow-traveller", was a security risk was ostensibly a shock to the CCF and the ACCF, because he was a member of both organisations. (34)

As the Truman administration had initiated the practice of testing the political beliefs of Federal employees (35), even the ACCF could not have deceived itself into thinking that the erosion of the civil liberties of Communists was solely the preserve of McCarthy. One is driven to the conclusion that the ACCF defined itself by the existence of McCarthyism, and that when its illiberal position left its own members unprotected, it lost its usefulness.
CCF, however, continued, because of its role in lending international recognition to the leading anti-Communist American intellectuals and in cementing ties between them and the British intellectual politicians.

If the impetus behind the foundation of the CCF and the ACCF was related to the intellectual's position within American society, then the question behind the decision to publish *Encounter* in 1953 can be seen in its proper light. Its obituarists were somewhat wrong in explaining the journal by relating it solely to the East-West confrontation, to the threatening international posture of the Soviet bloc and its internal political structures. It could not have existed without the support of the CCF. However much the eventual character of the journal may have owed to the insistence of the British section of the CCF that the cultural input be as important as the political, the ideological drive behind the journal did not come from them (most of whom were fairly bewildered as to why they belonged (36)) but from the American founders, such as Sidney Hook, James Burnham, Melvin Lasky and Irving Kristol. Several of the *Partisan Review*/ACCF group had already written for the CIA-financed *New Leader* and *Der Monat*: so *Encounter* was merely an extension of this principle into the cultural sphere.
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It is fairly clear that the reasons for Encounter's existence did not lie in the ostensible reason cited by its obituarists, but in the internal politics of the ACCF and the CCF, in the intention of the CCF to dissociate American intellectuals from the obvious and disturbing trends in American politics, and in the desire of the CCF to create a dialogue between intellectuals and politicians in Britain which could compensate for the lack of any contact between these groups in the United States. One has to look further than merely to cite contributions by Crosland, Crossman and Roy Jenkins as proof of the journal's progressive tendencies; and to examine how this obvious but not declared left-of-centre bias (even if the bias was only that of the "Croslannite Left", as Ferdinand Mount puts it) was related to the journal's declared aim of countering the intellectual influence of Communism. There are already two elements of an answer: the eagerness of the Partisan Review/ACCF group to dissociate themselves from McCarthyism in the international arena, even if they were hopelessly entangled with it on the domestic front; and the semi-articulated desire to create a unified intellectual class in Britain. This desire could not be fulfilled unless British intellectuals and intellectual politicians were convinced that the Partisan Review group could overcome McCarthyism and yet still remain in the mainstream of American politics, while reassuring the
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British participants in the CCF that the American intellectuals shared their anxieties, particularly those concerned with the policing of culture and the role of intellectuals in politics.

It is curious that *Encounter* was founded with this purpose when the relationship between intellectuals and politicians in the United States was not at all good, and when that between their counterparts in Britain was one of studied indifference (especially if the intellectuals' work was of no practical use for practical administration or for the military-industrial complex). Only through gaining the respect of European politicians and intellectuals could the ACCF intellectuals overcome the ignorance or suspicion with which most American politicians regarded them; only through the patronage of the CCF and *Encounter* could British writers overcome the indifference of the political world. Why was this a problem which needed to be overcome? Why could British literary intellectuals not sustain a literary magazine which ignored political concerns? Why had the relationship of British literary intellectuals to political concerns become so attenuated that they needed the CCF and *Encounter* to rescue them from political irrelevance?
To attempt to answer this question - about the relationship of the political to the literary - is also to explore the relationship between the "popular" and the "academic" journals and to analyse the brief period when, in the words of Stefan Collini, the "non-specialist periodicals of general culture" were dominant (37). (The term "man of letters" will be used frequently here, so it is probably advisable to define it. The term will mean someone engaged in writing on a variety of subjects - literary, historical, economic, political - who was neither a journalist, nor a tenured academic, nor primarily a novelist or poet, and whose writing was often supported by another occupation.) The main argument in this section is that the professionalisation of all middle class occupations hastened the demise of this social type (the distinguishing characteristic of which was its broad and non-specialised intellectual interests) and that this social change fundamentally altered the character of the "journals of general culture", in the process causing these journals and their successors to deal with purely literary matters.

The genres of the literary journal and the political magazine increasingly fused during this period, to produce
a "journal of general culture", a genre peculiar to this era, which, from the 1850s onwards, became, as Macmillan's described itself, "a review of political affairs from the philosophical rather than from the partisan point of sight". Thus, the new journals of "advanced" opinion hoped to avoid any overtly party political allegiances, as the Edinburgh Review and the Quarterly Review had failed to do (37). Journals such as the Spectator, the Saturday Review and the Fortnightly Review offered opportunities for the Oxbridge graduates who viewed literary journalism as a suitable occupation for a gentleman at precisely the moment (the late 1850s and 1860s) when these journals diversified their "coverage" (as was the case of weeklies like the Spectator) or were founded (the weekly Saturday Review (1855) and the monthly Fortnightly Review (1865)). The expansion of the railway system and the abolition of the Stamp Act were fairly obvious reasons for the growth of these periodicals, as was true even more of newspapers. If the journals had changed because they started to include a literary emphasis, this coincided with the change in the social status of journalism. The foundation at the same time of periodicals such as Macmillan's (1859) and Cornhill's (1860), which specialised in serialising works both of fiction and of social criticism, such as Matthew Arnold's Culture and Anarchy (and which achieved an initial sale of 120,000, not to be surpassed until
almost a century later by *Penguin New Writing*) did not foreshadow a split in the intended market for journals, although they tended to be more "popular" in content than the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*. In fact, several of the most important intellectual works of the nineteenth century - among them J S Mill's *Utilitarianism* and Walter Bagehot's *The English Constitution*, first published in *Fraser's Magazine* and the *Fortnightly Review* respectively - were published in the new journals of opinion (39).

The cultural change in the newspaper industry (which led to a sensationalisation of journalism), which has been studied by Richard Altick and Raymond Williams (40), was caused by the same economic change and political decisions which led to the flowering of the serious periodical.

As John Gross reveals (41), there was a sustained improvement in the quality of political-cum-literary journals during the middle and later decades of the nineteenth century, which makes Collini's judgement, that the period "*from the mid 1850s to the late 1880s can be seen as a distinctive phase in the development of periodical writing*", fully justified. Although this was the heyday of such magazines as *Temple Bar* and *St Paul's*, which had no pretensions whatever to intellectual enquiry,
their circulation never rose above (and was at times below) that of journals such as Cornhill's or the Fortnightly Review (42). Periodicals hitherto had mostly been exclusively literary (like Blackwood's) or concerned more with political and social ephemera, as was the case with the Gentleman's Magazine, for which Dr Johnson had written, though only as a hack, reporting Parliamentary debates. Such literary magazines as had existed in the eighteenth century - such as the Critical and the Monthly - had been little more than publishers' catalogues, and it was only in the nineteenth century that journals thought of exploiting the talents of writers as literary critics. (Those periodicals which were at all significant in intellectual life were written by a single author and had a single programme, such as Addison and Steele's Spectator and Johnson's Rambler.) The improvement of the weekly periodicals and the invention of the monthly periodical in the 1850s and 1860s provided excellent fora for commentary on topical political issues (for which the Spectator was originally designed), while the increasing importance of the novel and essay (as opposed to the theatre) for the reading public demanded a class of journalists who would act as arbiters of literary taste and philosophical debate.
The division between the literary and political sections of journals was not as apparent as it would become in the next century, because this reflected a world in which the vocations of literature and politics were not hermetically separated. J S Mill, Fawcett, Bryce, Morley and Lecky all found that writing and politics could co-exist easily and that they could move between the two worlds without experiencing dislocation. (Morley was editor of the *Fortnightly Review.* ) Bagehot, Fitzjames Stephen and Frederic Harrison — all of whom edited influential periodicals — contested at least one election (43). Leading politicians — Peel, Gladstone, Lord Derby — were also distinguished classicists, when they were not themselves novelists (like Disraeli). The vocations of literature (in the broadest sense) and politics could cross-fertilise. In the eighteenth century (with a few striking exceptions, such as Burke) this had not happened, and the world of politics had largely been indifferent to that of letters, however much the world of letters (Swift, Dr Johnson) had been interested in politics.

While it has been emphasised before that Britain never produced a self-conscious intellectual class, it came closer to doing so in the middle decades of the nineteenth century than it has ever done before or since. (An example of this almost-unified intellectual class finding
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an institutional expression was the Metaphysical Society (1869 - 1880). This organisation did not exist to promote any specialised studies, but instead to act as a forum for philosophical discussion. It brought together Ruskin, Seeley, Sidgwick, Huxley, Gladstone, and Balfour with the editors of Fraser's Magazine, the Spectator, the Economist, the Fortnightly Review, Cornhill's and Macmillan's)

That it came close to producing such an intellectual class was partly because the locus of intellectual activity shifted from Scotland to Oxford and Cambridge, where most of the scholar-politicians had been educated. These universities were recovering from the intellectual torpor of the eighteenth century because of the decline of clerical influence among the Fellows, the development of a wider range of subjects, and the acceptance of an academic ethic by the Fellows (44).

In time, the professionalisation of the "don" would help to cause the demise of the generalist intellectual journal, but in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, the new academic ethic was transmitted to their students (the future governing class), who were imbued with a sense of intellectual purpose and responsibility, which had been unknown in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. (Although there were scholar-
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politicians, such as J S Mill, who were not educated at university at all, the generalisation holds.) The emergence of the journal as a means of literary and political communication had also given a stability of income to writers resident in London which could not be had anywhere else. (It is noteworthy that among those most active in literary life in London during these decades were those of Scottish descent - Carlyle, Macaulay, James Mill - who could have continued intellectual activity in Scotland.)

This "horizontal" cross-fertilisation (between letters and politics) was paralleled by a vertical two-way flow between "academic" and "popular" journals. Periodicals such as the Athenaeum, the Academy, the Nineteenth Century and the Fortnightly Review were inspired by a purpose to spread knowledge of scholarship, not only in literary matters, but also in law, science and anthropology, to a wider audience. The intellectual periodicals provided a means for disseminating the scholarly essay which did not find an equivalent forum until the founding of Encounter.

Periodicals which catered for narrowly defined fields in the arts and humanities tended not to exist until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and scholarly articles were published in the more generalist journals which have
been analysed. Only in the last decades of the nineteenth century were specialist periodicals such as Mind (1876), the Law Quarterly Review (1884), the Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (1887), the Classical Review (1887), the English Historical Review (1886), the Economic Journal (1891), and the International Journal of Ethics (1891) founded. In Collini's words, the distinguishing mark of these new journals "was the acknowledgement of impersonal and often international scholarly or scientific standards within one particular field of enquiry which imposed their own imperatives and relegated the practical utility of their enquiries to a subordinate status" (45). Although these new journals signified a tendency which was yet to run its course (the English Historical Review in its first edition made clear its intention to be "accessible to the educated man not especially conversant with history"), this was still a new tendency. The impetus for these journals came less from the market and more from the financial backing of scholarly societies, or from certain groups in scholarly societies. The foundation of the English Historical Review, for example, was the attempt of professional historians (J R Green, Freeman, Acton, Seeley) to establish a more systematic study of history than that propagated by the Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, which society was, until 1880, dominated by antiquarians and other eccentrics (46).
However, prior to these publications, the phenomenon of scholars interested primarily in communicating to each other and not to the general public was not so pronounced (at least not in the arts and humanities). Macaulay's essays for the Edinburgh Review, Mill's for the Westminster Review, and Arnold's for Cornhill's were written for the intelligent public, and were not meant to be intelligible only to fellow scholars. Although Collini states that "these changes [the appearance of more specialised journals] need to be seen as the modulation of the forms of public debate rather than as some fatal fragmentation of a once healthily organic culture" (46), one need not be sentimental about the middle-class readership for whom these journals catered and yet still regret that these changes were indeed fragmentations, and that the development of more specialised vocabularies was part of this fragmentation. The more specialised journals did, in his words, mark "a significant alteration in the conditions of public debate", and if these conditions caused the fragmentation of the audience, there was a cultural decline (47).

While it was still possible for literary scholars and reviewers to make a living from writing for magazines until the 1950s, the vital connection to the worlds of history and politics was broken by the 1890s. The
connection to the world of politics was fractured by the changes in the class composition of both the two main political parties in the later nineteenth and early twentieth century (which was accelerated by the defection in 1886 of the Unionists from the Liberals and their eventual union with the Conservatives), and by the rise of Labour. Whatever else may have divided them, Joseph Chamberlain, David Lloyd George and Keir Hardie were united in coming from a completely different educational background from that of Peel, Gladstone, Disraeli, J S Mill, and Macaulay. (Arthur Balfour was perhaps the last politician to pursue scholarly interests which were distinct from his political work.)

If politicians were actively connected to the literary and intellectual life during the middle decades of the nineteenth century, this was also the time when scholarship could be communicated to the intelligent public because of the absence of specialisation and the fact that the academic ethic, which set such a premium on disengagement from politics, did not start to affect scholars until the late 1880s. This can be seen in the disengagement of intellectuals from politics between the protests against the Bulgarian Atrocities (1876), in which an impressive array of scholars of history, philosophy and literature protested against Disraeli's policy, and the
outbreak of the Great War, when many of the prominent intellectuals remained silent. Those who did protest against the war, such as Gilbert Murray and Graham Wallas, did so in their capacity as members of the Liberal Party or the Fabian Society respectively, and not as intellectuals per se. John Morley, who resigned from the Cabinet over the outbreak of the war, was, as a former editor of the Fortnightly Review, an example of the "man of letters" rather than the new academic class (48).

However, the definite break between these two worlds occurred only towards the end of the nineteenth century, when this was indicated by the appearance of more narrowly specialised journals. (The split within the world of the literary journals would not occur until well into the twentieth century, long after literary criticism had become generally accepted in universities as a serious subject.) It was overlooked that during the heyday of the generalist learned journal, university dons had founded, edited, and contributed to the Academy and the Athenaeum. Before and after the middle decades of the nineteenth century, neither dons nor politicians were as concerned as they had been with the world of letters. This change has been documented in the cases of J S Mill and Bernard Bosanquet. Whereas J S Mill was accustomed to change his style according to his audience, but wrote for the
Westminster Review, Fraser's Magazine and other periodicals of the same sort, Bosanquet tended to write for specialist journals such as Mind and the International Journal of Ethics. For someone as concerned with social issues as Bosanquet was, this phenomenon should not be seen as a withdrawal from public life, but as a sign that these journals had become the most important medium of intellectual communication. The audience had become more specialised irrespective of the writer's wishes (49). The article in a learned journal became the means of communication for an intellectual's more profound work, while the books that were published by intellectuals (T H Green, Seeley, Sidgwick, Dicey and Maitland) tended to be compilations of lectures, which did not necessarily include their most searching work (50). The departure of both dons and politicians from the world of the London journals was a coincidence, but it did materially alter the appeal of periodicals and the extent of the influence which they could expect to exert.

It is unfortunate that Gross does not explore this question in his entertaining work, but merely notes that those journals which had been the focus of intellectual activity throughout the 1850s and 1860s had, by the start of the twentieth century, become stale and were intellectual by-lanes. He does not make explicit the
reasons for this. Because Gross's study concentrates on personalities rather than on historical and cultural changes and their causes, he overlooks the reasons for the marginalising of the literary journals in British intellectual life. The argument is not that those journals did not continue to publish the same quality of work but that the departure of politicians (whether practising or aspirant) and of academics left a vacuum which literary figures could fill only with their often eccentric political opinions. These journals did contain works of literary value, but, with the exception of A R Orage's New Age (which propagated Guild Socialism), did not contribute to political debate. Periodicals like the Spectator and the New Statesman (founded in 1913) did. The New Statesman (which was eventually to absorb the Nation, which had in turn merged with the Athenaeum (51), was a political journal with a separate cultural, literary and book reviewing section, rather than a periodical, like the Fortnightly or the Edinburgh, in which political and literary essays enjoyed equal importance and were sometimes written by the same people (Macaulay and Mill could move with ease from literary to historical and political topics.) After the nineteenth century, such polymaths were almost unheard of, at least in the world of the literary magazines.
The founders of the New Statesman, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, had almost twenty years earlier founded the London School of Economics. This institution was devoted to fostering precisely those disciplines (sociology, economics, public administration) which were of direct practical use to politicians and civil servants who needed guidance in fostering the growth of State intervention in social affairs. This growing symbiosis between academe and administration made the phenomenon of the "man of letters" who was also a person who contributed to political debate increasingly an anachronism. The New Statesman continued this political and cultural change: although it attracted important writers to its pages beyond the Fabian Society (Herbert Read, Evelyn Waugh, Virginia Woolf), the literary section of the journal was subordinate to its political purpose, in a way that had not been thinkable during the nineteenth century. But Gross entirely misses this point when he writes of the dominance of Sir John Squire in literary reviewing (including the literary pages of the New Statesman) during the 1920s: it was only in the literary world that he was at all important, not in that of the New Statesman and the Fabian Society.

During the 1920s and 1930s there was a proliferation of purely literary journals, several with a strong emphasis
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on poetry and adherence to Modernism and the artistic movements which had grown out of it. Much innovative work was published in these magazines, so that in creative energy, if in nothing else, journals had recovered somewhat from the doldrums of the first decade of the century. However, to talk, as Michael Shelden does, of the significance of the literary magazines in publishing important works of Modernism is to ignore their place on the periphery of intellectual life (52). Of the journals solely devoted to literature, T S Eliot's Criterion was the longest lived and most influential, and that had a circulation of around 400 (53). (It was kept alive only through the generosity of Lord Rothermere, more out of sympathy with the extreme right wing political views of many of its contributors than with the aim of disseminating literature.) Literary reviews could be read in the Spectator or the New Statesman, but because those magazines were extended commentaries on news and political affairs, and therefore tended to supplement newspapers, they could not perform the role of communicating scholarly research to a wider public. The article, rather than the extended essay, predominated in this type of publication precisely because of this change of function.

The foregoing survey of the history of intellectual journals in Britain has been necessary in order to
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appreciate the magnitude of the task which **Encounter** set itself, because it was endeavouring to provide intellectual material of a sort which had not existed in journal form for the general reader since the mid-nineteenth century and for which it was uncertain that a market still existed. Sir Denis Brogan, in his introduction to **Encounters**, when he compared the journal to the **Edinburgh Review** and the **Revue des Deux Mondes** (which inspired the **Fortnightly Review**) skated over this issue without confronting it (54). Because of the controversial issue of its links with the CCF and, indirectly, with the CIA, **Encounter**'s place in the history of intellectual and cultural periodicals has been overlooked, and it has been studied almost solely in the context of the politics of the late 1940s and 1950s, to the detriment of its study within its longer historical context.

On the other hand, the history of literary journals has tended to be written solely by scholars of literature, and they have ignored the political and social reasons for the changes in the content of, and the market for, these publications. They have not considered that the history of literary journals has to be studied in the light of history as a whole, not just of literary history. This neglect has meant that journals have not been studied as
a part of the history of the intellectual class, and have tended to concentrate excessively on the colourful personalities who edited and contributed to these periodicals. Stefan Collini's recent work represents a breakthrough in the study of periodicals in the context of intellectual history, and of the social history of the intellectual class (even though his analysis does not extend beyond the end of the nineteenth century). Yet even his analysis demonstrates that such work is still in its infancy when he refers to "complex and still puzzling aspects of the economics of periodical publishing" which may have contributed to the emergence of specialised journals (55). Gross's and Michael Shelden's works are examples of this steadfast avoidance of any theoretical perspectives, and of the marginalising of social or cultural history. There is much serious analytical work on the history of the literary journal yet to be done.

The significance of Horizon has to be examined, because of Spender's co-editorship of that magazine as well as of Encounter, and because Encounter was conceived as the natural successor to Horizon. One of the problems which the monographs about this period in cultural and intellectual history pose is (even when they are written by historians, such as Angus Calder (56)) that they relate the literary periodicals of the 1940s only to the 1930s,
and consistently fail to take a longer view. This failure matters because these works consistently make judgements on the state of the intellectual class, or the literary intelligentsia, which, in part, depend on their judgement of the significance of literary periodicals (the most important of which were *Horizon* and *Penguin New Writing*). Literary journals had assumed an importance far greater than that which they had in the mid-nineteenth century, because the almost complete divorce of academic intellectuals in the humanities and social sciences from those whose profession was the making and criticising of literature had caused any common ground between them to disappear. This meant that there was no longer any place for institutions of discussion and debate such as the Metaphysical Society and its associated journals of opinion.

Related to this phenomenon was the divorce of literary intellectuals from the political class, which, as has been seen, had occurred long before the 1920s. This did not mean that writers did not concern themselves directly with politics, whether that of the far Right (Eliot, Pound, Wyndham Lewis) or the Communist Party (Auden and Spender, albeit for a short time, and a host of more obscure writers for longer). However, this did not mean that these writers hoped to exercise any meaningful influence
through publication in periodicals or through any political activity (which was why Auden's and Spender's sojourn in the Communist Party was so brief). In short, most of the writers of the 1920s and 1930s did not seek to engage in any activity which would bring them into close contact with the political class or to make any deep impression on the thinking of the wider public (even when they were not apolitical).

There were exceptions to this rule; Koestler, Orwell, Spender and J B Priestley did engage in journalism and activity which was far from the fringes of British politics; and Koestler and Spender knew Richard Crossman, who was to become a contributor to *Encounter* (57). However, this intimacy with a member of the political class was, on Spender's part, a fortuitous circumstance (he and Crossman had known each other from student days); and Koestler, whose interests included the history of science as well as political causes, was exceptional in the breadth of his interests. The fact that both Spender and Koestler stood out in this respect from other writers may not be irrelevant to their being instrumental in respectively founding *Encounter* and the CCF.

However, these exceptions indicate that, in the absence of institutional fora, personal friendships were the only
connection between certain members of the political class and literary intellectuals. However, a major factor in the marginalising of literary intellectuals in political debate was, as Collini has contended, the "professionalisation" of that part of the intellectual class whose task was to make political and social science useful and available to politicians and the future governing class. It is part of Collini's argument that this "professionalisation" caused a retreat by academics into specialist vocabularies, journals and institutions, a growing disengagement from political activity, and a desire to be involved with politics only when they were required to perform research for a specific purpose (58). With a few exceptions, this continued to be so during the 1930s and 1940s.

However, as with the literary intellectuals, it is the exceptions which matter. The Left Book Club had provided opportunities for some academics such as G D H Cole to communicate to a wider public, but the arrival of the paperback just before the war of 1939-45 led to opportunities which one publisher was ready to exploit, in the form of Penguin Specials (59). The availability of the paperback (especially Penguins from 1936 onwards) coincided with both a hunger for reading material and a spreading interest in politics, all of which combined to
produce a sale of well over 100,000 copies for each of the 87 titles sold in 1941, and a first sale of over 80,000 for a Penguin Special by Harold Laski (60). If the interest in Beveridge's report is considered, together with the importance of Keynes both in inspiring post-war domestic economic policies and in constructing the post-war institutions of the international economy, it may be said that Britain possessed a political intelligentsia. It possessed one in the sense that there were many political and social scientists and economists who not only were self-confident in their position in society, in their ideas and in their future role and purposes, but also succeeded in communicating (for a short period) to a wider public than had ever been reached by the "journals of general culture" during the mid-nineteenth century (61).

It is another question altogether as to whether a literary intelligentsia existed during the period 1939 - 45. It is Calder's contention that such a class existed. In surveying the range of employment opportunities available to writers during the war at the BBC, the Ministry of Information, and in the official and semi-official film companies, he asserts that "a closely knit literary society emerged" at this time, and that "for the first time, perhaps, English literary intellectuals began to see
themselves as a class, an intelligentsia on the Continental model" (62). Shelden agrees that "the war created a tighter sense of community of writers", and claims further that "there was an intensity and focus in literary life, in many ways reminiscent of earlier times" (63). There was the fact of mere geographical proximity to each other (reflected in the subtitle of Hewison's work about this period (64)). Horizon and Penguin New Writing were undoubtedly dominant in the publication of new work (although not as dominant as Shelden and Martin Green imply: there were many outlets for new writing which were not as widely distributed as these two, and were not so catholic in the range of writers which they published (65)). It is no doubt true that "with so little competition from other magazines, [Cyril] Connolly was able to exercise an extraordinary degree of influence over the literary scene" (66), and that he used his position to act as the mouthpiece for writers in stating their grievances and articulating their demands. This does not mean, however, that writers as a whole possessed that degree of cohesion which an "intelligentsia" or even a "tightly knit ... society" could be said to have. The word "intelligentsia" is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as comprising "the educated portion of society ... regarded as capable of forming public opinion." The second part of the definition is what concerns us here.
The other considerations which have been assumed by Calder and Shelden to be important in indicating that such a "class" did exist are insignificant or irrelevant. If a class is "capable of forming public opinion", it must have a degree of consciousness about doing it, because if that consciousness does not exist, it cannot define the purposes to which their ability to form public opinion should be put. As the sociologist Karl Mannheim points out (67), members of the intellectual class, because they are no longer a closed priesthood, and because they are people from diverse backgrounds, should be able to go beyond their class origins. Other classes may have world views which are not articulated, are self-contradictory and are not intended to serve anything other than their class interest, but intellectuals can, at the very least, go beyond their class interest and try to understand how society as a whole works. If these conditions are fulfilled, a group of intellectuals can be called an "intelligentsia".

The two writers who spring to mind as fulfilling these conditions during the war years were Orwell and Koestler. It is no coincidence that it is these two writers who come closest to the description "men of letters" in the sense used by Gross and Collini. It is also no coincidence that Orwell and Koestler were the London correspondents of
Partisan Review, a journal which was dedicated to the cross-fertilisation of literature and politics, and which was later to germinate into the CCF and ACCF. Both Orwell and Koestler were anti-Communist socialists, and were therefore the sort of intellectual whom the CCF and Encounter were most interested in recruiting. (Koestler, indeed, was to edit the special issue of Encounter in 1963, entitled "Suicide of a Nation") They were, however, exceptions in the world of the literary intellectuals of the early 1940s.

During the war, writers who were employed by official or semi-official agencies (such as Orwell) were often hostile to them; Spender and Koestler perceived an absolute contradiction between their role as creative writers and working for the State during wartime, even though Connolly, the most determinedly apolitical of writers, declared that the war was necessary for the survival of culture (68). The 1941 manifesto, Why Not War Writers?, which was signed by Orwell, Koestler, Spender and Connolly, is remarked on by Calder, Hewison and Shelden as a moment of great importance, because it is supposed to signify an emergent class consciousness among writers (69). However, this amounted only to an plea for the sort of official protection which war artists enjoyed, which meant that they could continue to be artists, and not have
either to be conscripted or to perform civil defence work (T S Eliot and Graham Greene were air-raid wardens, and Spender was in the fire service). The duties of official war artists were not onerous; they were often subject to the minimum of supervision; and they were often published in _Horizon_, through which art and art criticism reached a much wider public than previously or since (70). It is hardly surprising that writers were envious of their situation. However, this does not amount to a desire or an ability to "form public opinion", only a personal interest in the survival of literary intellectuals.

Much has been written about Connolly's aestheticism, his aversion to political engagement, and the absence of any criterion for writers' inclusion in _Horizon_ other than Connolly's artistic taste (71), but what is curious is that these observations are made by the same writers who advocate that he was the representative of a literary "intelligentsia"! (This is quite another question from assessing whether Connolly's intention to publish only material which was good from a literary point of view, regardless of its significance to the war, was laudable.) Connolly abjured consciously any role as an "opinion former", even in matters of culture, and was resolutely against the "culture-diffusionists" (that is, publishers, the B B C, and the State, who sought to spread
appreciation of culture), because he thought that their work was irrelevant to that of ensuring that writers had the conditions in which to produce work of quality (72). He did not want the state to do anything more in the cultural field beyond the provision of tax incentives for writers and those who patronised them (73). Beyond that, he could not recommend any cultural policy, beyond railing against the increasing philistinism of rich patrons, publishers, critics, and cultural bureaucrats (74). The "Begging Bowl", a regular feature in Horizon which appealed for donations from subscribers to contributors, was, as Connolly proclaimed, an effort to create a new "patron class" (75). Though the results were fairly risible, the intention was serious. Connolly recognised, as Collini has stated, that the mid-nineteenth century saw "the last stages of aristocratic or other private patronage for writers and savants of various kinds" (76), and that discerning patrons were now very rare. Horizon was the beneficiary of one such patron, the son of a rich margarine manufacturer, who ensured that Horizon continued for as long as it did, and that it ceased publication when he decided to invest in the foundation of the new Institute of Contemporary Arts (77). It also benefited from a regular supply of paper, which was ensured through a connection in Whitehall. However, Connolly had no
practical suggestions to deal with this problem; nor could he offer an historical analysis of why it had come about.

He could view politics only from the point of view of a literary intellectual, not from that of someone who was naturally engaged in politics, as a mid-nineteenth century "man of letters" would be. His aversion to the Conservative Party was based on the belief that Labour Party politicians valued culture more than the "millionaire hoodlums" (78). His disillusionment with the Labour Government of 1945 – 51 arose because of the worsening shortages of paper and fuel, which caused the closure of many literary magazines and the cancelling of the Third Programme for two weeks (79). Connolly chose to interpret this as a general attack upon culture by the Attlee government, and chose to ignore the economic causes, such as the indebtedness of the British economy, the pressure on sterling, and the shift of economic power to the United States, which it was exerting on Britain.

It may be asked: why should a literary intellectual like Connolly be expected to know anything about economics or international politics? That such a question can be asked, however, illustrates the cultural change since the mid-nineteenth century which has been examined in this chapter. The editors of, and contributors to, the
cultural and political reviews of the mid-nineteenth century, such as Bagehot (a banker), Fitzjames Stephen (a barrister), Macaulay and Mill (civil servants), and Arnold (a school inspector), had occupations which not only allowed them enough income but also plenty of time for literary and political activities (80). The "professionalisation" of these occupations, especially that of the Civil Service, implied two things. First, it would no longer be possible for an aspirant "man of letters" to have the time to have an occupation which would allow space for significant income-generating activities. (The term "man of letters" is used in the sense implied by Gross, and refers to the intellectual whose interests were not only literary but also extended into the political, economic and historical fields. Their salaried occupations were not just a means of supporting their intellectual activity, but contributed to and extended their activities and knowledge - as was so in the case of Macaulay, Bagehot and Arnold.) The professionalisation of occupations other than the "don" is reflected in the changes which literary periodicals underwent in the hundred years from 1850. They became more purely literary, as opposed to covering other fields of scholarship as well.
Second, the increasingly accepted professional ethic, from the 1870s onwards, frowned on any political engagement: this was true not only of the universities, but also of the Civil Service. The consequence was that any literary editor by the mid-twentieth century was bound to gain his income mostly, or solely, from his writing and editing. That several editors, such as Ford Madox Ford or Connolly himself, did not approach the task of editing in a very professional or methodical manner, is irrelevant: the point is that it was the professionalisation of other occupations which had placed the writer/literary critic in the position of being the only social type who would edit literary journals. This resulted in Connolly's world view being accepted as entirely natural for a literary intellectual.

It has been argued, in particular by Martin Green, that Connolly represented only one strand (the "dandyism" or aesthetic) in literary life in the 1940s, and that the poet John Lehmann, the editor of *Penguin New Writing*, represented the other, more socially conscious or responsible, strand in literary journalism (81). This claim is reinforced by Spender, who states that he found Lehmann's focus on the social purpose of literature and his conviction that literature in wartime should reflect the fact that a war was happening, more congenial than
Connolly's aestheticism. Spender (until his departure from *Horizon* in 1942) had endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to persuade Connolly to publish more political articles (82). It is true that Lehmann had been instrumental in the publication of "proletarian" writers associated with the Communist Party in the 1930s (and also of the Auden/Isherwood group) (83), that he had been a "fellow-traveller", and that he had publicly expressed his admiration for the Soviet Union in the 1930s (84). *Penguin New Writing*, to his surprise, had a much greater success (in terms of circulation) than *Horizon*, despite its disavowal of escapism (85). However, Green's assertion that he dominated literary publishing in the 1940s has to be taken with a quantity of salt. He was a very important and able literary editor, but the success of *Penguin New Writing* during the war years was partly due to Allen Lane's having access to large stocks of paper, and to his being willing to finance publications written or edited by people with completely different literary or political leanings from his own (as is shown by the left-wing *Penguin Specials* which he published) (86). He was, in other words, a rich and disinterested benefactor, like *Horizon*’s backer, Peter Watson.

Green cites Lehmann's autobiography as evidence for his assertion of his unassailable position in literary
publishing, but it reveals quite the opposite: he was surprised by the phenomenal circulation success of *Penguin New Writing*, and equally taken aback by the fall in its sales after 1947 until 1950, when Allen Lane pulled the plug on the publication (87). He was not only completely dependent, as was Connolly, on a rich patron, but also completely unable to adapt himself to the market (88). In 1953, Lehmann founded the *London Magazine*, which was dependent on the backing of the newspaper publisher, Cecil King, who, in 1965, became the publisher of *Encounter*, when the CCF relinquished its sponsorship of the journal. From the point of view of journal publishing, rather than from that of literary politics or politics, Lehmann was in the same position as Connolly, which was far from that of "dominance".

Lehmann's and Connolly's editing careers have been studied, not only because of their alternately close association and rivalry with Spender, and the necessity of considering them if an assessment of the historical significance of *Encounter* is to be made, but also because they are assumed to be, along with Spender and Koestler, representative literary figures of Britain in the 1940s. Lehmann and Spender are assumed (by Green and Hewison) to represent the left-leaning tendency in literature; yet Lehmann, despite believing in the social purpose of
literature and literary journals, no longer believed in the political purpose of literature; and Spender, despite noting with foreboding the coming of the collectivist, "mechanical" age in his autobiography, which would have no place for the creative artist, forecasts at a social occasion during the war that the British people will have had enough of state intervention after the war and will desire a return to "laissez-faire". He made this confident assertion despite admitting his distance from, and distaste for, the firemen with whom he worked. (It is interesting that he made these assertions in the company of Harold Nicolson and T S Eliot, neither of whom shared Spender's previous political views (89).) Lehmann's and Spender's views on the need to maintain the personal integrity of the creative writer against the pressures of wartime are seen by Hewison as "the strategic withdrawal of the left", but in view of both Lehmann's and Spender's subsequent views (as recorded in their autobiographical writings) they appear to have abandoned permanently their political engagement, and agreed with Connolly that it was impossible for the artist to take up any political position or to seek to form public opinion in wartime (90).

Contrary to Calder's view, even some of the most political of literary intellectuals had abandoned any aspiration to
the role of an "intelligentsia". This means that they had abjured any possibility of forming political opinion, and that Connolly had not, as Shelden claims, re-created the literary community of earlier times, but had instead re-affirmed its impotence. This "community" of literary intellectuals could not, by itself, create the sort of periodical which, as Sir Denis Brogan claimed (in the introduction to Encounters (91)), would emulate the Edinburgh Review and the Fortnightly Review. It would, instead, need a supply of energy from elsewhere, which could make up for the lack of cohesion and purpose which was so obvious.
In assessing the historical significance of *Encounter*, it should be borne in mind that the reasons for this intellectual review becoming well known in Britain did not have much to do with the circle of intellectuals in the United States who were ultimately responsible for the inception of *Encounter* and for providing the motive force behind the organisation (the CCF) which sponsored it, and the CCF's "loose" affiliate, the ACCF. Spender, Brogan and the obituaries note that *Encounter* became known to the British public through Nancy Mitford's article on social class (more particularly, on "U" and "non-U" linguistic usage). Although this article was included in the anthology, *Encounters*, it was atypical of the journal's concerns. It is significant that it was published in the journal on Spender's initiative, not on Kristol's. Such articles had to be included so that the journal could be relevant for British readers; but they did not have much to do with the motivation behind the formation of the periodical. In order to discover the ideological and political origins of *Encounter*, it has to be appreciated that the journal's two American editors, Irving Kristol and Melvin Lasky, as well as most of the journal's
American contributors (Sidney Hook, Daniel Bell, Seymour Martin Lipset, Edward Shils, Nathan Glazer, Lionel Trilling, Leslie Fiedler, Arthur Schlesinger) came from a tightly-knit group of intellectuals. They were all associated with certain intellectual journals in the United States (namely Partisan Review, Commentary, and the New Leader). In addition, many of them had enjoyed common membership of Trotskyist organisations in the late 1940s and early 1950s. They were the motive force in the foundation, organisation, and strategic objectives of both the CCF and the ACCF, the significant personnel of which organisations overlapped. However, between their political radicalism of the 1930s and their activities in the ACCF and the CCF, the guiding thread was the intellectual community around Partisan Review and, to a lesser extent, Commentary (although this journal became increasingly important after the late 1940s to this circle).

The importance of this group in sponsoring Encounter and setting its ideological tone demands an extended treatment not only of this group as such but also of its connections with other institutions in which the American political and economic establishment was predominant - the CIA, the Ford Foundation, and the Voice of America - which provided the funding for the CCF and Encounter. During the first
chapter, the extent to which the history of the CCF and, more especially, of the ACCF was dominated by the threat of McCarthyism to almost all American intellectuals was made clear. The ACCF will be examined in greater detail in this chapter, not only because the American intellectuals who wrote for Encounter were also very active in that organisation, but also because the ACCF was crucial in propelling the intellectual circle around Partisan Review and Commentary to the centre both of American intellectual and of American public life, to an increasing extent, from the 1960s. The extent to which this intellectual circle aimed to bridge, and succeeded in bridging, the gap between academic activities and those of a "man of letters" (which, as the previous chapter demonstrated, had become impossible in Britain) may provide some insights into the sort of periodical which Encounter was. It is Russell Jacoby's contention that the circle around Partisan Review formed perhaps the last generation of the "public intellectuals" in the United States - that is to say, that they pursued their academic specialisms, wrote for, and in some cases founded, specialist journals, but that they also continued to propagate their views through more public media (92).

An examination of this circle may illuminate the changing character of Encounter after the CIA ceased funding it in
1965. David Caute has argued that the CIA funding was not the significant factor in Encounter's political orientation, because it did not become any more left-oriented after 1965 (when the CIA connection ceased) (93). An obituary for Encounter went further and claimed that the journal had become significantly more right wing after the break of the CIA connection (94). A comparison of Encounter's contents in the late 1970s and 1980s with those of the 1950s and early 1960s does indeed indicate a change in general political orientation from the social democratic Left to the Right. This is partly because those American intellectuals who had contributed to the journal from its inception (Irving Kristol, Melvin Lasky, Daniel Bell, Nathan Glazer) had themselves become prominent "neoconservatives", but also because there was a change in the British and European political (as distinct from cultural) contributors to the review. During the 1950s, prominent social democratic politicians and intellectuals such as Crosland, Crossman, Jenkins, John Strachey, Andrew Shonfield, and David Marquand contributed; increasingly from the early to mid-1970s, Conservatives such as Hugh Thomas, John Vaizey, Peter Bauer, Elie Kedourie, and Jean François Revel became contributors.
At a mundane level, this change could be ascribed to the political careers or the deaths of several contributors (Crosland, Crossman, Strachey, Jenkins), but had the editor and his circle wished to continue this social democratic orientation other intellectuals of the same stamp could have been selected to contribute. It seems sensible to conclude that, as both the American editors of, and all the American contributors to, the journal came from the same intellectual circle throughout its existence (and as there was no such continuity in the British contributors), it is worth examining the American group of intellectuals if the changes of policy of the journal are to be understood.

The argument in this chapter will be that the CIA connection did have some bearing on the journal's orientation, not because of any sequence of cause and effect, but because the political interests and aspirations of the ACCF/CCF group of intellectuals and the group of CIA and Ford Foundation officials who funded the CCF and Encounter happened to flow in the same direction during the 1950s and early 1960s. This is because both groups had two things in common: opposition to McCarthyism, and identification with Kennedy's appeal both as intellectual and as "man of action". Each group had different reasons for both of these political positions.
However, until the late 1960s, there was a tight web of institutional and personal connections which bound Encounter and the ACCF/CCF group to the "Eastern establishment", from which the key group of officials at the CIA and the Ford Foundation who funded the CCF and Encounter were derived. These connections were not coincidental, but, as long as they lasted, were based on ideological agreement between the two groups (although this agreement was based more on what both of them were against). It is no coincidence that, after the break with the CIA, the ideological interests of both groups diverged, Encounter's political viewpoint changed, and the group of intellectuals who edited and contributed to the journal embarked on a new phase of their careers, both as intellectuals and in their relationship to the public. The journal's orientation was always that of pronounced anti-communism: that is not the issue. The problem is the journal's shift within that political position: it contained everything from social democracy or liberal socialism to "neoconservatism", so there was much room for manoeuvre.

To summarise: the purpose of this chapter is, firstly, to deal with the development of the ACCF/CCF intellectuals as a group, and, secondly, to deal with their relationship to the organisations which funded Encounter. It is useful to
begin the argument by defining the group of intellectuals which will be described. They are usually known as the "New York Intellectuals"; although this is a conveniently brief description, it is misleading, as it seems more inclusive than it actually is. The phrase does not include all the intellectuals who lived in New York from, say, 1930 to 1960. Many important intellectuals who lived in New York (such as the sociologists C Wright Mills and Jane Jacobs) were not considered part of the group of "New York Intellectuals". They were not part of the circle which contributed to, and read, Partisan Review, and who were later active in the ACCF. As Russell Jacoby says, the term is "a cultural rather than an empirical category" (95). Indeed, some intellectuals who were later active in the ACCF and who contributed to Encounter (such as the literary critic Leslie Fiedler and the historians Arthur Schlesinger and Richard Hofstadter) were neither born nor educated in New York, but attached themselves to Partisan Review and its circle during the 1940s.

The "New York Intellectuals" have been the subject of much scholarly attention over the past twenty years: monographs have been published which place them in their context of American intellectual history (Christopher Lasch, Richard Pells, Russell Jacoby, Charles Kadushin (96)), and, more recently, which deal solely with the group as such
(Alexander Bloom, Terry Cooney, Alan Wald (97)). This is because they exercised an enormous cultural influence not only in academia but also in society at large from the 1940s onwards, not only as individuals but also as a cohesive group. Although there were other intellectuals who were not part of this group who enjoyed great public attention and influence (the economist John Kenneth Galbraith, the sociologist Michael Harrington, the linguistics theorist and political polemicist Noam Chomsky, and the social theorist Lewis Mumford, not to mention C Wright Mills and Jane Jacobs), they were not part of any other group which was so cohesive. What makes the "New York Intellectuals" distinct from other writers and critics is that they came to exert such influence through their prolific output in literary journals and their proximity to important publishing and academic institutions in and near New York (into which many of the intellectuals moved after the 1940s).

Although Alexander Bloom asserts that "its (the group's) existence is now the province of history" (98), the fact that so many of its members have been, or are, influential figures in the fields of sociology and literary criticism (Bell, Lipset, Kristol, Hook, Fiedler, Irving Howe, Alfred Kazin, Mary McCarthy) points to the importance of *Partisan Review* and its circle as an intellectual testing ground.
Bloom ascribes the break-up of this group to political and cultural schisms, geographical dispersion and death, but this is to overlook the fact that, in Alan Wald's words, these intellectuals "remained a coherent, distinguishable group" for over thirty years (99), despite wide variations in political orientation, and that this remained a magnet for younger intellectuals in the 1950s, who had not been among the original contributors to Partisan Review. This was because, in Wald's words, their "tradition had become such a clearly demarcated ideological force that Norman Podhoretz and others of a younger generation could assimilate it at second hand and perpetuate some of its features" in the 1950s and 1960s (100).

The "New York Intellectuals" have not been influential necessarily because of the outstanding quality of their work. It is possible to divide them into two groups: Bell, Lipset, Howe, Kazin and Glazer fall into the "academics" camp, while Kristol, Lasky and Podhoretz are important as editors, disseminators of ideas, and polemicists (despite Kristol having held academic positions) rather than as scholars. However, the uneven quality of their work has not lessened their influence; and Kristol's and Podhoretz's cultural and political influence steadily increased after the 1950s, even more than Bell's and Lipset's did. The ex-Marxist philosopher
Sidney Hook (who, as shall be seen, was a crucial figure not only in the formation of the CCF and the ACCF, but also in the direction of *Encounter*) has enjoyed a comparable increase in his influence, although it has been argued that he has published nothing of originality since the 1930s (101). The argument here is that their influence and their steady success in gaining access to public media beyond *Partisan Review* and *Commentary* is a function not of the quality of their work but of their success in setting the parameters of ideologically acceptable debate and of their becoming "public intellectuals", in which the role of the ACCF was crucial. In 1974, Charles Kadushin noted that "... the social circles of elite American intellectuals ... tend to represent the resolution of past issues rather than current ones, [and that] the circles ... represent alignments of the late fifties ..." (102). It is no coincidence that the *Partisan Review* group was heavily represented among the elite intellectuals whom Kadushin analysed, as the ACCF (the board of which was dominated by that group) was primarily responsible for determining those political alignments.

It is not the purpose of this chapter to recount the history of the *Partisan Review* group, but only to point to those aspects of their intellectual concerns and of their
development which resulted in their being a conscious group of public intellectuals, a phenomenon which had not been known in Britain since the mid-nineteenth century, as was shown in the previous chapter. The experience of literary intellectuals in Britain during the war of 1939-45 showed that (contrary to what most historians claim) such a conscious intellectual class was not created; in the United States the experience of the war did foster such a class, which comprised the circle around Partisan Review. This class was concerned both with culture and politics, and particularly with their interactions, to an extent that the British literary intellectuals of the 1940s (with the exceptions of Orwell and Koestler, both of whom contributed to Partisan Review) were not. Encounter was concerned with the relationship of culture and intellectuals to politics (and with making sure that the intellectuals did not support the wrong side), and it was Encounter which was edited and sponsored, and contributed to, by intellectuals from the Partisan Review group. This is the reason why an analysis of the significance of Encounter has to encompass the Partisan Review group.

Partisan Review was originally founded in 1934 as the organ of the New York John Reed Club (the John Reed Clubs forming the literary and cultural wing of the American Communist Party). However, their dissolution when the
Communist Party decided on its Popular Front strategy in 1935 deprived *Partisan Review* of its financial support. (It started publishing again, on an independent basis, in 1937.) The editors, William Phillips and Philip Rahv, had, in any case, been increasingly disturbed by the Communist Party's cultural policy, which used political (instead of literary) criteria in evaluating works of literature, and on that account had elevated "proletarian" literature above the classics of modernism (T S Eliot and Henry James were especially reviled). The Popular Front marked a decisive change in the political as well as the cultural strategy of the Communist Party: the New Deal was to be given support (not critical, but total, support), the international struggle against Nazism and Fascism would be prioritised, and the domestic class struggle would become invisible. In the cultural sphere, organisations such as the League of American Writers would replace the John Reed Clubs and attract a wider range of writers (such as Ernest Hemingway and Archibald MacLeish) who could not have supported the Communist Party before 1935. At the same time, the Party decided to abandon its support for solely "proletarian" literature, and to embrace all forms of popular culture (such as Hollywood films) insofar as they contributed to the struggle of American democracy against Fascism and Nazism.
However, there was one constant during both the pre- and post-Popular Front periods in Communist Party policy: unwavering support for Stalin and an endeavour to replicate his methods inside the American party. This is hardly surprising, but this fact is often lost in the other issues which cloud accounts of the cultural politics of this time. Alexander Bloom states that Partisan Review was constantly against the Popular Front, and that this is more important than Phillips' and Rahv's protests against the abandonment of the class struggle or their attitude to modernism. However, as Bloom himself points out, the Partisan group were unable to form a coherent position on the Popular Front: William Phillips, Sidney Hook and Diana Trilling reviled the Popular Front both for betraying the class struggle and, alternately, for being a dishonest cover for Communist infiltration (103). Partly because Partisan Review was eclectic in its contributors, it is difficult to determine its political positions. However, some attempt can be made to delineate a basic pattern.

Besides Phillips and Rahv, the Partisan circle in the 1930s comprised the literary critics Edmund Wilson, Mary McCarthy, Lionel and Diana Trilling, the philosophers Sidney Hook and (to some extent) John Dewey, the essayist and film critic Dwight Macdonald (later to become the American editor of Encounter for one year in 1958) and the
art critics Clement Greenberg and Harold Rosenberg. All of these (with the exception of Wilson) were active in the ACCF in the 1950s (Hook and Macdonald were the founder members of the ACCF); and Rosenberg, the Trillings, and Hook would contribute to Encounter. The political position which they all shared was anti-Stalinism and an increasingly problematic place on the left. Like the Trotskyites in the Socialist Workers' Party, they opposed Stalin and the Popular Front, but increasingly not for the same reason. Unlike Trotsky, they tended to oppose the Popular Front not for the reason that it had abandoned the class struggle, but because it continued to advocate (as had the Communist Party before 1935) the subordination of the intellectuals to the party. Their view of the Soviet Union (both of its society and of its cultural policy) became wholly negative after 1937 (unlike Trotsky's), and it was for this reason that Partisan Review opposed the United States' entry into the war of 1939 - 45. After 1937, any thought of the class struggle became increasingly irrelevant to the Partisan Review circle, as they viewed their principal task as the creation of an intellectual class which would not be subordinate to a political party but which would be responsible for what Bloom has termed "spiritual guidance". (Indeed, William Phillips referred to the ecclesiastical intellectuals of
the Middle Ages as an example of the intellectual class free from social pressures which he wanted to emulate.)

Closely related to Phillips' and Rahv's desire to create an independent intellectual class was their desire to rescue both left-wing politics and left-wing literary criticism from Stalinism. The Partisan Review circle never advocated a positive programme of political change: and, between 1937 and 1943 (when, after prolonged internal argument, the Review decided to support the war), its emphasis became more cultural and less political. However, it retained a commitment to striving after a synthesis of Marxism and the modernist classics of literature. This synthesis did not attempt to subordinate literature to political pressures (as the Communist Party did), or to ignore politics altogether (as academic literary critics did). It wanted to demonstrate instead that writers such as Dostoyevsky, Henry James, and Kafka (dismissed by the Communist Party's writer on cultural affairs, Michael Gold, as "reactionary") had social and political insights which could be useful to Marxists and whose works could be interpreted using Marxist methods without damaging the literary integrity of their works. Alan Wald has asserted that no such synthesis was ever achieved, and that Partisan Review only succeeded in housing both Marxism and modernism in the same journal,
without ever demonstrating that one was relevant to the other (104). However, the relevance of noting the purposes of Partisan Review is not to explore the success or otherwise of these aims, but to point out that no other political or literary journal in the United States had these aims, and to compare the social status of the Partisan Review circle with their counterparts in Britain during the same period (such as Connolly, Lehmann, and Spender).

The arguments within the board of Partisan Review in 1942 and 1943, which concerned the journal abandoning its anti-war position, and whether the journal should deal primarily with politics or with culture, led to Partisan Review's first tentative reconciliation with existing American institutions and politics. These arguments within Partisan Review are seen by Bloom and Wald as marking a decisive break with the political radicalism of the journal's first nine years. Dwight Macdonald advocated the retention of the anti-war and radical position, and left the board of Partisan Review to found his own journal, Politics, thus causing the first schism in the Partisan Review circle (105). However, historians of the Partisan group have tended to examine too closely the twists and turns in the internal politics and the personal rivalries of members of the group without
noticing the significant continuity in the journal's policy. It continued to be an important medium for the publication of political debate, such as the symposia, "The Future of Socialism" (1946), and "Our Country and Our Culture" (1952), where Sidney Hook, Daniel Bell, Arthur Schlesinger and Dwight Macdonald argued over the intellectuals' relationship to political radicalism and to existing American society and culture. It is true that these debates marked an important rejection of the revolutionary socialism of most of the intellectuals in the pre-war years, but they also were about the same issues which they had debated during the pre- and post-war years.

Contrary to Dwight Macdonald and William Phillips, the Partisan intellectuals did not demote political concerns after 1943, but remained significantly more interested in these issues than their counterpart literary intellectuals in Britain. However, Macdonald and Phillips are right in seeing Partisan's change in policy in 1943 as a decisive break with radicalism. Contrary to Bloom and Wald, the group's rejection of radicalism was not, as a matter of cause and effect, simply connected to most of its members gaining secure academic posts in the late 1940s and early 1950s, but had happened before then. This is shown not only by the symposium on socialism in 1946, but also by an
editorial in *Partisan* by William Phillips in which he argued, in an uncanny anticipation of McCarthyism, that liberals should not defend Communists, for fear of being placed in the same category as Stalinists by the Right (106). Bloom, Cooney and Wald assume that changes in the economic circumstances of the *Partisan Review* intellectuals can explain the changes in their political attitudes between the 1930s and 1950s. But it is clear that there were constants in their political viewpoint, such as their anti-Stalinism, which have been overlooked, but were more important than their rejection of political radicalism in the 1940s. The political outlook of *Partisan Review* in the 1930s and the ACCF in the 1950s had one thing in common - anti-Communism. The same group of intellectuals monopolised the boards of both organisations.

If the political element was so strong in the ideology and aims of the literary intellectuals of *Partisan Review*, the next question which has to be posed is: why was this element so much stronger in the case of this group of American intellectuals than in that of the British literary intellectuals who were analysed in the previous chapter? The existence of a political purpose and of an intellectual class-consciousness are, as was argued in the previous chapter, indispensable elements if a collection
of individuals is to be considered a cohesive intelligentsia. Despite the arguments of some historians, neither of these two elements existed in the case of the British literary intellectuals during this period (who adhered to aestheticism); but both of them were present in the case of the Partisan Review group. No historian has claimed that this group constituted an intelligentsia. However, in contrast to those American intellectuals who subordinated their intellects either to the Communist Party or to American nationalism during this period, their qualifications for such an appellation would seem to be unquestionable. The reasons for this omission on the historians' part are closely connected to the different cultural and political paths which the British and American literary intellectuals travelled during the 1940s.

There are two aspects of the Partisan Review circle which, when pointed out, seem obvious, but have received insufficient examination: their working-class and lower middle-class origins (with the exception of some declassed, such as Dwight Macdonald and F W Dupee), and their exclusively urban provenance. Much attention has been devoted to the Jewish origins of the Partisan Review circle, and this is important in explaining the social position of many of the literary intellectuals. Anti-
semitism was widespread in the United States during the 1930s, not just in the radio broadcasts of Charles Coughlin, but also in the universities. Lionel Trilling was told to leave his post as a lecturer at Columbia University in 1936, not only because of his Marxism, but also because of his Jewish ancestry (107). Other extremely talented people, such as Elliot Cohen, the editor of Commentary (and, in the 1950s, an activist on the board of the ACCF, like Trilling), felt unable to pursue an academic career, despite his education at Yale. However, members of the "second generation" of "New York Intellectuals", whose introduction to intellectual life came through reading Partisan Review, such as Bell, Kristol and Howe, experienced their class origins as being perhaps a still more formidable obstacle than their ethnic background against their considering an education at a prestigious university, still less an academic career.

For the Partisan Review group, the Communist Party could have opened a way out of their intellectual isolation. As Wald emphasises, it offered opportunities for contact with other intellectuals in an international political movement, and for publication, both by political journals (such as the New Masses and even the New Republic) and by publishing houses in the Soviet Union. Popular Front organisations (such as the League of American Writers)
increased the possibilities of contacts that these literary critics could have had, not only with each other, but also with creative artists. However, these opportunities were deliberately eschewed, and, as a result, the Partisan Review group was more middle-class and more Gentile than the "second generation" (and some of them, such as Dwight Macdonald, had been educated at prestigious universities), and a very few, such as Sidney Hook and James Burnham, had academic posts. However, the "second generation" was almost exclusively of Jewish ethnic origin, and had lower middle-class or working-class origins. The "second generation" were all educated at City College, New York, and all considered themselves as part of the anti-Stalinist left. They met regularly to read and discuss Partisan Review, which provided a connection to an intellectual life after which they were all striving, but never thought they could reach. This group included both Kristol and Lasky (the American editors of Encounter), Daniel Bell (who was in the 1950s in charge of the seminar programme of the CCF, where he met and influenced Anthony Crosland), Nathan Glazer, Seymour Martin Lipset, and Irving Howe. All (except for Howe) were to become contributors to Encounter. There was another difference between the two generations which should be noticed: the first consisted principally of literary and art critics (Wilson, Trilling, Rahv,
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Greenberg, Rosenberg, McCarthy), and the second, while also numbering literary critics among its ranks (Howe, Kazin), primarily comprised academic sociologists (Bell, Glazer, Kristol, Lipset, Philip Selznick, Seymour Melman, and several others).

However, the description "academic sociologist" does not fully describe their role: "public intellectuals" or "men of letters" (in the mid-nineteenth century use of the term) might be more suitable. Not only do they publish in academic journals (including The Public Interest, which Bell and Kristol founded), but they also write articles of more polemical and topical interest in Commentary and the Wall Street Journal. Both Bell's and Kristol's interests extend far beyond sociology to religion (especially Judaism), Freud, and American foreign policy. Whether Kristol's or Podhoretz's reflections on these subjects are original and scholarly contributions is another matter. Despite their positions in academe (except for Podhoretz, they all had academic posts), they bear a resemblance to the British public intellectuals or "men of letters" of the nineteenth century who were discussed in the previous chapter (Morley, Mill, Arnold). It could be said that Kristol and Polhoretz derive their importance in American public life from their editorship of journals (The Public Interest and Commentary, respectively) and that their role
is to act as the "gatekeepers" of ideas and culture. However, even in this role, their range of interests and their influence is so much wider than those of Connolly, Spender and Lehmann that the "New York Intellectuals" are a fundamentally different type from their British counterparts. Jacoby has claimed that Bell, Glazer, Kristol, and Podhoretz are among the last generation of public intellectuals; and that younger generations of academics are not interested in communicating directly to the public. Whether that is true or not, they have managed to combine the roles of academic and man of letters to an extent that, as Collini and T W Heyck emphasise, was apparently impossible in late nineteenth century Britain.

The degree to which they have enjoyed public influence is related to their self-consciousness as an intellectual class and their view of their mission in society as an intellectual class (this preoccupation is apparent in the writing of the New York Intellectuals, from Phillips and Rahv in the 1930s to those of Kristol and Podhoretz in the 1980s). This preoccupation, in turn, derives from their class origins and their political position, both of which (until the late 1940s) deprived them of economic security and institutional support. They had nothing in common with the existing academic class in the United States, and
they were forced to carve out a niche for themselves, almost as a separate class. The ethnic origins of most of the New York Intellectuals are relevant in discussing their isolation, but so much has been made of them by historians that the factor of social class has almost been neglected. But it is this factor which is most relevant in comparing the New York Intellectuals with their British counterparts.

As Heyck emphasises, both the British public intellectuals of the mid-nineteenth century and the academic intellectuals were derived overwhelmingly from the middle and upper middle classes and had been predominantly educated at the same universities (though with a few important exceptions, such as J S Mill). The academic intellectuals and the men of letters diverged after the mid nineteenth century, but they began to develop two common characteristics: indifference to communication with the wider public, and a retreat from any political activity (the rise of the academic ethic and of aestheticism were manifestations of the same phenomenon (108)). Both the academic intellectuals and the men of letters continued to be drawn from the same social classes. In the category of men of letters, those whose function was primarily as creative writers are not included (they came from an increasing variety of
backgrounds, as Raymond Williams has shown (109). Rather, those whose function was principally (though not necessarily solely) as editors, and therefore as "gatekeepers" of ideas, come under this rubric. Connolly, Lehmann and Spender came from the same social class as their nineteenth century predecessors, Morley, Bagehot and Frederic Harrison. Their range of interests was much more narrow than that of their predecessors, and their aestheticism would have seemed peculiar to them, but they still had an accepted, although increasingly marginal, place in public life. They comprised a group who were endeavouring to retain their positions of influence, not to make their way in order to reach them. They had no obvious successors. In these two respects, they differed fundamentally from the New York Intellectuals. They had no ability to form public opinion, because they did not aspire to any political influence, as a group or as individuals. They did not aspire to any political influence, because they had no sense of purpose as a group. It was not their interest at all to reflect on the relationship of culture to politics or of intellectuals to politics (except insofar as Connolly's grudges about the philistinism of politicians or their meagre handouts to creative artists can be dignified with the title of "reflections").
In all these respects, the British men of letters differed from their counterparts in the Partisan Review group, and all these reasons made it culturally and intellectually impossible for them to sponsor and direct a journal like Encouter, which went far beyond the purely literary. It is, therefore, not surprising that the New York Intellectuals had such an important role in editing, controlling and contributing to Encounter as they did.

But the issue of class is also related to that of the urban/rural value conflict in the formation of the intellectual class in Britain and the United States. To put it simply, the origins of the New York Intellectuals were entirely urban; and those of the British literary intellectuals were not so exclusively urban. As Terry Cooney has claimed, the Partisan Review group's association of everything which was cosmopolitan, tolerant, sophisticated and cultural with the urban experience, and their assumption that the rural experience was all about narrow-mindedness, parochialism, intolerance and "middle-brow" culture originated from self-conscious admiration for European literature and European "high culture" and to their ambivalence about American popular culture. (This accounts for their dislike of the Popular Front's strategy of embracing American popular culture.) Bloom and the historian Richard Hofstadter (a peripheral
member of the Partisan Review circle), however, assert that the New York Intellectuals, by the early 1950s, had embraced American society and culture. Hofstadter, in particular, asserts that American intellectuals no longer identified themselves with European culture (as they had done in the 1920s and 1930s) and were no longer embarrassed about their American provenance. Not only European totalitarianism but also precisely the attacks on American institutions and values by McCarthy had led the intellectuals to cherish a society which had ensured them relative freedom of expression (110).

However, as Cooney reminds us, the New York Intellectuals were far from cherishing much of American society and culture: they associated the rural world and its political history (which included nineteenth century agrarian Populism) with McCarthyism. A volume on McCarthyism, edited by Daniel Bell, with contributions by other "second generation" New York Intellectuals such as Glazer and Lipset, and by the two other active members of the ACCF, the sociologist David Riesman and the historian Peter Viereck, endeavoured to prove just such a connection between Populism and McCarthyism (111). Leslie Fiedler argued the same point in an article in Encounter in 1954 (112). Bell's article on McCarthyism in Encounter was reprinted in his "The End of Ideology" (1959). Much work
has been done to show that such a connection did not exist (113). But the purpose here is to show how the changing attitudes of the New York Intellectuals to McCarthyism illuminate their ambivalent attitudes to, and relationship with, the American political and economic establishment (on which they were to depend for the funding of the CCF and Encounter, and part of which was also vulnerable to McCarthyism). As Cooney claims, the New York Intellectuals "associated McCarthyism with populism in the expectation that each would discredit the other", and that in this way they could distinguish "between their own sophisticated anti-communism and the crude rural variety of McCarthy and his kind", and thus could overlook the extent to which their anti-communism was similar to McCarthy's (114). But this self-delusion owes much to the fact that they were vulnerable to McCarthyism. This is hardly surprising, as McCarthy attacked many who did not have a radical past: and he could not be expected to distinguish between ex-Communists and anti-Stalinist ex-radicals.

Before both the ACCF and the New York Intellectuals' response to McCarthyism are dismissed, the discussion about British and American literary intellectuals should be summarised. Their precarious economic situation, their class and ethnic origins (of the second even more than the
first generation of the New York Intellectuals), and their extreme political and intellectual isolation all helped to create an intense group consciousness and sense of purpose, which was partly caused by the immensity of the forces of indifference, prejudice and suspicion which they had to oppose. The British literary intellectuals who were discussed in the previous chapter had nothing to oppose. The marginalisation of their British counterparts was caused by their own aestheticism. The role of the war of 1939-45 was important not in forming the self-conscious group which was the Partisan Review circle but in re-orienting their political viewpoint. Attention has focused on the arguments in 1943 in the Partisan Review board over its anti-war position, but the change in political viewpoint of the "second generation" of New York Intellectuals during the period 1942-45 is more important for understanding the origins of Encounter. Fiedler, Kristol and Lasky all experienced service in the U.S. armed forces during this period. It is noteworthy that all three were active in the Workers' Party (a splinter group from the Trotskyite Socialist Workers' Party) before their service, but that none of them engaged in radical political activity afterwards. (Those who did continue with radicalism after their Army service, such as Irving Howe, were not members of the ACCF, nor contributors to Encounter.)
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Their war service could be seen as the cause of a change in their political attitudes, as they had been members of an anti-war political party which regarded all belligerent powers (including the Soviet Union) as imperialist. After their military service, they retained their negative view of the Soviet Union but had developed a more positive one of the United States. In that sense, the war helped to forge an intelligentsia in the United States which could influence society and politics in a way which did not happen in Britain (despite Calder's and Shelden's assertions that this did happen).

In the next section, both the ACCF and the web of personal and institutional connections (which funded *Encounter*) will be examined. Both of these made the New York Intellectuals the decisive group in determining the course of American intellectual life during the 1950s and afterwards, and both of them have to be understood in examining the significance of *Encounter*.
The New York Intellectuals had always shunned large organisations. The Workers' Party (to which most of the important figures of the second generation, except for Bell, belonged) had a membership of approximately 500; the ACCF comprised, at its height, 600 members. However, the ACCF was vastly more important as a machine for propagating their ideas. The New York Intellectuals differ about the group's significance and the extent to which it dominated debate among intellectuals during the 1950s. For Kristol, "this current of opinion - pro-communist or anti-communist, was powerful, influential, obdurate" (115). Bell, however, claimed that Bolshevism had ceased to be "an intellectual problem" in the United States before the war of 1939 - 45, since all noteworthy Marxist intellectuals adhered to the anti-Stalinist left. (However, as Wald notes, this was compensated for by the success of the Popular Front in attracting numbers of intellectuals. (116)) Irving Howe has recollected that "for the intellectuals, it [the formation of the ACCF] was the break-up of our camp" (117). He meant by this assertion that the ACCF marked an irrevocable schism in the broad anti-Stalinist left, of which the Partisan Review group had been a part. Prominent pre-war socialists such as Sidney Hook and the leader of the
American Socialist Party, Norman Thomas, indeed held official posts in the ACCF. However, Howe's point is that the controversies about McCarthyism (in which the ACCF participated so much) were mere surface phenomena, and that the formation of the ACCF was one of the first steps in the American intellectuals' turning toward Conservatism, "less as ideology than as impulse" (118).

The ACCF group were undergoing this ideological change at the same time as they were becoming, in Jacoby's phrase, "public intellectuals". This is important to bear in mind because their attitudes (as intellectuals) to the role of intellectuals in society changed as they became more influential in academe and the media and increasingly categorised as "neoconservatives". Because these changes occurred as a result of an "impulse", they were dependent on the intellectuals' reaction to external events. Kristol, Bell, Hook, Glazer and Schlesinger chose to argue about certain issues (McCarthyism, the student revolt during the late 1960s) and not to argue about others (wars in Korea and Vietnam). It is no coincidence that these individuals not only were active in the ACCF, but also were important in controlling, and contributing to, *Encounter*. It was through no oversight that the first article in *Encounter* about the war in Vietnam appeared as late as 1965, and that none of the articles in *Encounter*
about this issue were written by any of the New York Intellectuals (they were written by Richard Lowenthal and Alistair Buchan, who both had connections with the CCF).

These facts are not coincidental for the following reasons. The same individuals and their associates (Allen Dulles, John McCloy, McGeorge Bundy) who, through the CIA and the Ford Foundation, ensured the financing of the CCF and Encounter, also participated in major decisions about American foreign policy during the period 1945 - 69, and played major roles in putting those decisions into effect. They had been educated at the same Ivy League universities, had had careers in corporate law and academe, and constituted a common pool from which both Republican and Democrat administrations drew their policy-making personnel. They were not part of the political class, as elected politicians are; but they did constitute part of the governing class. Their political status as ideologists of the strategy of "containment" and as strategists of the "limited" wars in Korea and Vietnam was fatally compromised by the failure of their policy in Vietnam. After 1969, policy-making personnel tended to be drawn from elites of different geographical and social provenance (119).
It was during this period that Encounter's connections with both the CIA and the Ford Foundation ceased (in 1965 and 1972 respectively). Four years previously, Allen Dulles, who had initiated the sponsorship of the CCF, had resigned as director of the CIA. McGeorge Bundy was the National Security Adviser to Kennedy and Johnson from 1961 to 1969. He became President of the Ford Foundation thereafter, when he authorised a substantial donation to Encounter in 1972. This was the last such assured financing which Encounter ever received. The journal itself started to move to the Right during the mid-1970s (after the break with the Ford Foundation). At the same time, a new phase in the careers of Kristol, Bell, Hook, Lipset and Podhoretz began. During Nixon's first term, Kristol became one of his advisers on social policy; both he and Hook dined with Nixon in 1972 (120). Bell and Kristol were invited to lecture at the American Enterprise Institute, hitherto regarded as occupying the outer reaches of the American Right (121); both Hook and Lipset were appointed to posts at the Hoover Institution. Podhoretz, Kristol's associate on the board of the ACCF, began to turn Commentary to the Right in the early 1970s, published articles by Reagan's future Ambassador to the United Nations, and supported Reagan himself in the 1980 and 1984 Presidential elections (122).
What do the careers of these people have to do with *Encounter*? During the 1950s, Kristol was editing *Encounter*, was executive secretary of the ACCF, and was managing editor of *Commentary*; Hook was the first chairman of the ACCF, and was instrumental in replacing Dwight Macdonald as probationary editor of *Encounter* in 1958 with Melvin Lasky; Bell was organising seminars for the CCF and writing articles about McCarthyism for *Encounter*. This increased influence in public life and their being trusted advisers at the highest levels of the State did not come about simply through their steady rise through academe, or through their editing respected social science journals such as *The Public Interest*, or through the startling originality of their scholarship (which is open to doubt). Both the role of the ACCF in defining the parameters of acceptable intellectual debate and the discrediting after 1969 of the elite which had financed *Encounter* facilitated the extraordinary rise of this section of the New York Intellectuals, which was active in the ACCF.

Although Kristol exaggerated when he claims that the Partisan Review/Commentary circle were completely isolated from the centres of power in the 1950s (123), their position in the 1950s is in stark contrast to their influence in the 1940s. They not only sought to advise policy makers, but, as Bell makes clear, also regretted
the passing of the old elite after 1969, and sought to foster a new one (124).

The ACCF comprised a largely passive membership. The tiny number of active members were mostly New York Intellectuals, who monopolised the board of the ACCF, and who ensured that they monopolised the ACCF's output of publications and lectures. The ACCF agreed to publish Partisan Review, ostensibly so that Partisan could retain its tax exempt status. But it really signified the extent to which the Partisan Review circle overlapped so much with the active membership of the ACCF that the two had become indistinguishable. The extent to which Partisan Review had by 1952 become, in Hofstadter's words, "the house organ of the American intellectual community" (125), depended very much on its connection with the ACCF, because it was only through the ACCF that the New York Intellectuals could claim to constitute the centre of that community. Bloom remarks that, through their domination, "their liberal anti-communism gained wide circulation and a kind of 'official sanction'" (126).

The roles of Hook and Kristol in the ACCF have already been mentioned. Diana Trilling, David Bell, and Norman Thomas were officers. William Phillips, Sol Levitas, and Elliot Cohen (editors of Partisan Review, The New Leader
and *Commentary* were board members. Hook and Kristol organised the lecture series of the ACCF in 1951 and 1952, which were dominated by prominent members of the *Partisan Review* group (Schlesinger, the Trillings, Mary McCarthy, Max Eastman). The ACCF re-published an influential *Commentary* article by Kristol, and a notorious pamphlet by Hook, both on McCarthyism. The sole monograph published by the ACCF was also about McCarthyism - James Rorty's and Moshe Decter's "McCarthy and the Communists". The ACCF set up a committee on academic freedom - which was chaired, inevitably, by Sidney Hook.

The central preoccupation of the ACCF was an attempt to use McCarthyism to establish an anti-communist orthodoxy among the intellectual class. If McCarthyism could be associated with the unsophisticated, provincial and "rural" aspects of American politics and society, that was all to the good. The argument of Bell and others in "The Radical Right" that McCarthyism was supported by a rural constituency, by "nouveaux riches" uncertain of their social status, and by Irish and German ethnic groups who had opposed American participation in the war of 1939 - 45, was (however wrong) a reflection of their own history. The New York Intellectuals had not enjoyed their present position for long, and they had also opposed participation in the war. The fact that Bell and his co-writers did not
focus on the anxieties surrounding the Korean war as an explanation for McCarthy mobilising support (127) was also no coincidence. There were differences of opinion about the conduct of the Korean war in the ACCF, just as there were disagreements among the "neoconservative" group of New York Intellectuals about the Vietnam war, but which were not exposed to public gaze (certainly not in Encounter or The Public Interest). The factors which enabled the ACCF and the New York Intellectuals to increase their influence were an emphasis on an issue which united them (McCarthyism) while avoiding foreign policy matters (which tended to divide them).

Bell and his colleagues focused on McCarthy's antagonism to the Democrats, and in particular to precisely that "Eastern Establishment" which subsidised Encounter. They felt a profound ambiguity towards the governing class. Members of that class had been responsible for institutionalising that anti-semitic prejudice which had cost Lionel Trilling his academic career in the late 1930s. There were considerable differences in the class backgrounds of these groups. However, they found themselves on the same side as each other for two reasons. The first was that McCarthy hated both intellectuals and that portion of the governing class which had supported the Democrats since 1932. Very few intellectuals (such as
James Burnham) supported him. The second was that both groups shared political and cultural allegiance to Europe. The American governing class had brought the Marshall Plan to fruition and were enthusiastic about NATO (towards both of which McCarthy felt deeply suspicious). They felt an affection towards Europe as the source of democratic and liberal ideas.

The Partisan Review group felt an affinity toward European culture, which has already been explored. The hostility felt by the Partisan Review group in the 1930s toward many aspects of popular American culture remained in the 1950s. What had happened was not (as Hofstadter claims) a transfer of cultural loyalty from Europe to the United States, but a change in attitudes toward Europe. In the 1930s, European culture would save them from the benighted and intolerant United States; in the 1950s, their mission was to save Europe from neutralism. Europe was still the focus of political and intellectual attention. David Bell thought that the principal division between those New York Intellectuals who were members of neither the ACCF nor the CCF (such as Irving Howe) and himself, Hook, Kristol and Lasky, was that "'I don't think Irving had a deep involvement in European intellectual life'" (128). Howe was just as anti-communist as Bell; but Bell and his comrades thought that the significant intellectual
struggles were taking place in Europe. The attitudes toward European culture of the New York Intellectuals have to be understood, because the CCF and *Encounter* were not primarily American institutions. At a fundamental level, if the New York Intellectuals had chosen to ignore European culture, Bell, Hook, Kristol, Glazer and Lasky would not have chosen to participate in the CCF or to contribute to, and edit, *Encounter*.

The New York Intellectuals found themselves in the same position as the American governing class because of their cultural allegiance to Europe and their vulnerability to McCarthyism. However, their attitudes toward the governing class were very ambivalent. During the Alger Hiss controversy, Fiedler, William Phillips and Diana Trilling pointedly noted Hiss and his defenders' class origins, and their realisation that the attack on Hiss was an attack on their class (129). Although both of these groups were threatened by McCarthy, they denied their common vulnerability by endeavouring to appease McCarthyism. The Eisenhower administration did not dare to challenge McCarthy; John Foster Dulles let McCarthy veto State Department appointments. However, Foster's brother, Allen Dulles, as director of the CIA, had invited Cord Meyer to join the organisation in 1951 to help Dulles co-ordinate the agency's sponsorship of "psychological
warfare". Meyer, who, like Dulles and Hiss, had had an Ivy League education, was responsible for channelling funds to the CCF, Encounter, and various anti-communist labour organisations and institutes (one of which was headed by Norman Thomas of the ACCF board) and to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (130). Meyer was investigated for several years by the House Un-American Activities Committee (because of his activities in suspiciously liberal organisations such as the Union of World Federalists and the American Veterans Committee) and was eventually cleared. He was unusual because, against Dulles' advice, he chose to fight and not to resign. However, the experience made him determined to prove his anti-communist credentials in future beyond any doubt (131).

An analogous pattern with the ACCF intellectuals (such as Kristol and Hook) can be seen, as they "proved" their anti-communism by accepting McCarthy's arguments while protesting against his methods. Indeed, the concept of "psychological warfare" - that the struggle against communism had to be an unremitting one on the cultural and intellectual fronts, and not only a matter of military containment - was enthusiastically advocated by James Burnham. Burnham, a professor of philosophy at Georgetown University, had worked as a consultant for the Office of
Policy Co-ordination (a liaison organisation between the CIA and the State Department) where his ideas had enjoyed wide currency (132).

Burnham is important for the study of the significance of *Encounter* for several reasons. He was a founder member of the CCF, and - with Hook, Koestler, Lasky and Schlesinger - organised the first conference of the CCF in Berlin in 1950 (133). He was a member of both the board of *Partisan Review* and the ACCF, until he resigned from both organisations over their attitudes to McCarthyism. (He was a McCarthy supporter.) Kristol recommended him to Spender as a contributor to *Encounter* on both aesthetic philosophy and foreign policy, but he never contributed (134). However, his importance lies in his influence on two participants in the CCF's seminars and contributors to *Encounter*, Bell and Crosland.

In 1941, Burnham had published an immensely influential work, "The Managerial Revolution", part of which was published in *Partisan Review*. The ideas which he advocated which were to prove to be most influential concerned the convergence of capitalism and socialism, the coming of dominance of managers and technicians (as opposed to owners) and that these phenomena implied that both the individualist, entrepreneurial ethic and Marxist
ideas of class struggle were now obsolescent (135). Excerpts from, and synopses of, his book were widely disseminated, in the Wall Street Journal and Time. Koestler, during his speech at the CCF conference in Berlin, cited Burnham's work as the source for his assertion that the distinction between capitalism and socialism was no longer valid, and had to be replaced by a distinction between liberal democracy and totalitarianism. He reproved sharply American liberals and European social democrats for their tolerance of communism during the same speech (136). At a CCF conference in Milan in 1955 (the same one where Schlesinger met Gaitskell, and where Gaitskell met Brandt), Crosland met Bell, and was greatly impressed by his ideas on economic and social theory (137). It is no coincidence that Crosland's "The Future of Socialism" (1956) and Bell's "The End of Ideology" (1960) (a collection of papers presented to the CCF seminars and articles in Encounter and Partisan Review) share the same analysis of capitalism. It may be said that such ideas were common at that time among other intellectuals, such as John Strachey and John Kenneth Galbraith. (These two were also contributors to Encounter.)

However, it could be argued that the CCF provided a forum in which the "public intellectuals" (Burnham, Schlesinger,
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Bell) could meet the "politician intellectuals" (Crosland, Gaitskell), and thus could break out of the confines of the academy and intellectual journals, and directly influence the future policy-makers. Burnham's influence thus extended not only to the ideology which was propagated in the seminars of the CCF, but also to its original purpose: in Lasky's words, the CCF's purpose was "to broaden out into a full-fledged European and worldwide offensive ... a direct ideological assault" (138). Burnham, like Schlesinger, and unlike the New York Intellectuals, was a commentator on foreign policy, and was, again like Schlesinger, much closer than most of the New York Intellectuals to the governing class. However, his importance was as a link between these two worlds.

It is significant that the members of the governing class who ensured the financing of Encounter and the CCF (Cord Meyer, John McCloy, McGeorge Bundy) also were important members of the Kennedy administration; and that the ACCF intellectuals, from Burnham on the Republican far right to Schlesinger, on the liberal wing of the Democrats, saw Kennedy as a combination of the "man of action" and as an intellectual, and admired him for that reason. It is important to note the Kennedy connection because Kennedy was interested in building firmer links than the Eisenhower administration had with the type of anti-
communist social democratic politicians (Brandt, Crosland, Gaitskell, Strachey) who wrote for *Encounter* (139).

John McCloy, as U S High Commissioner for Germany, had been very enthusiastic about the Berlin conference of the CCF, and had offered the use of military aeroplanes for transportation for delegates. (He was not alone in this effort: the State Department expedited visa clearances and even suggested delegates. (140))

During the American occupation of Germany, Melvin Lasky edited *Der Monat*, which was published with the help of the State Department. While he was High Commissioner, he was very helpful in ensuring that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (which Cord Meyer and the CIA were financing) obtained transmission sites in Germany (141). Radios Free Europe and Liberty had arrangements with the journal *The New Leader* (to which Allen Dulles and James Burnham had contributed), and the Voice of America, to furnish items for use by them. During the CCF conference in Berlin, the director of the Voice of America, Foy Kohler, had publicised the conference in its transmissions (142). Not only was the editor of *The New Leader*, Sol Levitas, on the board of the ACCF, but several employees of the Voice of America held high positions in both the CCF and the ACCF. The Russian emigré composer, Nicolas Nabokov, who had
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worked for both the Voice of America and the U.S. military government as Deputy Chief of Film, Theatre, and Music Control for Germany, and as co-ordinator of the Interallied Negotiations for Information Media in the late 1940s, became secretary general at the CCF's headquarters in Paris in the 1950s (143). Sol Stein and Bertram Wolfe, who had both been directors of the Voice of America, were appointed to the board of the ACCF.

From 1953 to 1965 John McCloy was president of the Ford Foundation. In 1957 the Foundation started subsidising the CCF, and during the early 1960s McCloy was also an adviser on disarmament to the Kennedy administration. One of his colleagues was Arthur Schlesinger (of Partisan Review and ACCF fame). Schlesinger himself became one of the trustees of Encounter in 1965, when the CIA relinquished sponsorship (144). Another of McCloy's colleagues in the Kennedy administration was the former Harvard academic, McGeorge Bundy, one of whose tasks as National Adviser was to oversee the CIA. (His brother, William Bundy, was Deputy Secretary of State for Far Eastern affairs in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and had worked in the CIA in the 1950s.) McCloy relinquished his presidency in 1965; McGeorge Bundy resigned from the Johnson administration the following year. McCloy recommended his colleague to succeed him;
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Bundy was duly appointed (145). In 1972, Bundy made the controversial donation to Encounter. (By this time, the Congress for Cultural Freedom had dissolved itself, and had become the International Association for Cultural Freedom. Its new director was Shepard Stone, who had previously worked for McCloy both at the High Commission and at the Ford Foundation (146).

The point is not just to demonstrate the concrete personal connections involved in the sponsorship of Encounter, but to point out the highly curious role of the Ford Foundation in the enterprise. The donation to the CCF occurred when the Foundation was, as Kathleen McCarthy has pointed out, moving away from subsidising cultural ventures to economic development projects. However, precisely at this time the CCF was abandoning its ostensibly political purpose and turning to more general cultural matters: support for PEN, and the monitoring of censorship and "cultural oppression" (147). The Foundation's donation of $150,000 to Encounter in 1972, for the purpose of increasing its sales in America, was even stranger. When almost the entire pantheon of American writers and literary editors made a protest both at the "political implications" and at "the competitive damage to other literary magazines" (148), McGeorge Bundy defended his decision, saying that the sum was justified,
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"in the context of our programs" (149). This was clearly not the case, as the Ford Foundation was continuing its policy of funding principally economic development projects, and had decided not to fund journals as they tended to be a continuing drain on its resources (which it had discovered, to its cost, from subsidising a Latin American journal which was sponsored by the CCF (150)).

Such decisions, which so clearly contradicted the expressed policy of the Foundation, can be explained only by reference to personal, not to institutional, factors. Melvin Lasky had worked for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the precursor of the CIA, during the war of 1939 - 45, and had afterwards edited a German language journal, Der Monat, in the American occupied zone of Germany after the war. Arthur Schlesinger, who was still a trustee of Encounter at this time, had worked for the OSS at the same time as Lasky (151). The connections of McGeorge Bundy and his brother with the CIA have already been explored. The Bundy brothers were colleagues of Schlesinger and McCloy in the Kennedy administration. McCloy subsidised Lasky's activities when he was U S High Commissioner.

While only inferences can be drawn from this web of professional and personal relationships, these inferences
can constitute the only explanation for the continued subsidisation of *Encounter* after the connection with the CIA was broken in 1965. The reasons for the initial financing of *Encounter* by the CIA lie in the interests which the New York Intellectuals and the governing class wanted to defend against McCarthyism. But the element of personal connection between those who financed and those who controlled *Encounter* cannot be discounted, and as the New York Intellectuals attained influential positions and more secure status, there was no need for the institutional and financial support which the CIA and the Ford Foundation provided. *Encounter* had given valuable support to struggling intellectuals such as Daniel Bell who were making their way in the world (and whose articles in *Encounter* and *Partisan Review*, re-published in "The End of Ideology", earned him his doctorate (152)). The New York Intellectuals' other outlets, such as *Commentary* or the *Wall Street Journal*, enjoyed far healthier circulations than *Encounter*. Journals such as *The Public Interest* or later *The National Interest* had a far sharper focus on their subject areas (social policy and foreign policy, respectively). Contributions by the New York Intellectuals to these journals were far more likely to reach their intended academic audience than those to *Encounter*.
The problem was precisely that of Encounter's problematic position between academic journals (such as The Public Interest) and those of more general interest (such as Commentary). Encounter's assumption was that a journal of heavily academic nature did have public appeal. The New York Intellectuals had, in Jacoby's words, "a commitment not simply to a professional or private domain but to a public world - and to a public language, the vernacular" (153). They are, in other words, "public intellectuals". Jacoby contends that they were among the last generation of such intellectuals. If that is true, it may explain the failure of Encounter to find a secure financial niche when the worlds of academe and the intelligent public tended to polarise. Partisan Review succeeded in becoming an academic journal and being published by Boston University; Commentary was financed by the American Jewish Committee. Encounter - despite adopting a larger format and a more attractive cover in 1983, and becoming a bi-monthly, instead of monthly, publication - never found such financial security after 1972. The obituaries of Encounter suggested that the journal had lost its anticommunist purpose because of the demise of the Soviet bloc. However, for almost twenty years Encounter had survived through the ability of Melvin Lasky to gain short-term finance (154).
Although the journal had been an Anglo-American enterprise from the start, the intellectual impetus behind it had come from the New York Intellectuals (as this chapter has demonstrated). Despite its being published in London, it was dependent on the sales in the United States - for which purpose the subvention from the Ford Foundation was expressly given. It was dependent on such sales because it was designed to have an international appeal to anti-communist intellectuals. It was for this purpose that it was subsidised by the CCF, an organisation which was, in Lasky's words, supposed to be a "democratic international" (155) of intellectuals. *Encounter* was supposed to be a journal of international orientation - it is no accident that the New York Intellectuals prided themselves on their cosmopolitan outlook, and that the American governing class was, during this period, "internationalist", rather than "isolationist", in outlook. When Koestler expressed the belief at the Berlin conference of the CCF that capitalism had become more internationalist than communism, and favourably compared the United States' foreign policy in this respect to that of the Soviet Union (156), he was expressing the world-view of both of these groups.

The CCF was supposed to sustain not only *Encounter*'s international orientation, but also its commitment both to
culture and politics and, more precisely, to the politicisation of culture. Closely related to this was the policing of the intellectual class, to ensure that they did not stray to the wrong side. Just as the ACCF performed the function of house cleaning to the American intellectual community, so Encounter performed the same function on an international scale. Peter Steinfels has summarised its position well: "Encounter flew the banner of intellectual freedom, but it had very little faith in intellectuals, an untrustworthy lot always ready to sell out society to Jean-Paul Sartre. They had to be spooned regular doses of The God That Failed, kept on a short leash, and housetrained in a deferential and mature realism" (157). Encounter itself put it in its second issue: "... there is is a class of people whom [the intellectuals] can and must judge - themselves." Encounter stood implicitly for the subordination of culture and intellectuals to politics: if one pretended to be above the political fray, one might just as well be on the other side. Koestler regarded the apolitical Thomas Mann as just as much an enemy of the CCF as the avowed communist Bertolt Brecht, for stating an opinion that he preferred Stalin to Hitler (158).

This tendency to subject intellectuals to ideological surveillance has slipped to the assumption in the writings
of the New York Intellectuals that all non-conservative intellectuals are suspect; it is assumed that intellectuals' alienation from society stands as a polar opposite to the full acceptance of capitalist society by most non-intellectuals, and the intellectuals' attitude is wrong. Kristol claims that "it is the self-imposed assignment of neoconservatism to explain to the American people why they are right, and to the intellectuals why they are wrong" (159). Both Koestler (at the 1950 conference) and Podhoretz have argued that what Koestler called "a professional disease: the intellectual's estrangement from reality" (160) disables intellectuals from participating in politics because of their inability to see that they have to choose between two polar opposites. Steinfels has detailed what he terms the "counter-intellectual critique" of the intellectual class: that they are, on the one hand, naive, sentimental, utopian, and have an inherent capacity for inadvertent mischief, and, on the other, elitist, authoritarian, and have an insatiable power-lust. In both cases, these "professional diseases" are caused by those intellectuals' distance from power, and their "rootless, volatile and untrustworthy" nature alienates them from both society and the state (161). This critique tends to be made by those (such as Kristol and Polhoretz) who combine the roles of "man of letters" and advisers to influential policy
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institutes and to government. As Steinfels remarks, Bell and Kristol consciously adopt the style of the man of letters of the nineteenth century, replete with learned literary and philosophical references (162). American conservatives have accordingly made a point of attacking academic bureaucratisation and careerism, at the same time as praising the independent man of letters, as long as he does not meddle in affairs outside his specialism (163).

However, this is exactly what the men of letters during the nineteenth century did: they took it upon themselves, in Collini's phrase, to be "public moralists". Like Kristol, Podhoretz and Lasky, they did not confine themselves to their specialism. Unlike the editors of *Encounter* and *Commentary*, however, they were often very critical of their society while retaining their influence and proximity to the powerful in politics and society. This was true, for example, of Mill and Arnold (164).

The difference between the attitude of Rahv and Phillips in the 1930s and that of Kristol and Podhoretz in the 1970s towards the intellectual class is obvious. Rahv and Phillips desired the creation of an intellectual class which was consciously estranged from society and did not seek influence in either the state or civil society. Bell, Kristol and Podhoretz sought to continue the
generalist tradition of men of letters but to combine it with academic specialisms which were designed to be useful to government (Kristol's editorship of The Public Interest) or were supposed to gain access to elite opinion or to create new currents of elite opinion (Kristol's articles in the Wall Street Journal and Podhoretz's editorship of Commentary). The nineteenth century ideal of independent men of letters, who were part of elite opinion, were not alienated from society, but who made trenchant criticisms of it, was never aspired to by the New York Intellectuals at any stage from the 1930s to the 1980s. The polar opposition of McCarthy and Kennedy can provide some reasons for the New York Intellectuals' desire to form an intellectual class while discarding allegiance to intellectual values.

Almost all the New York Intellectuals were eager to support Kennedy, if not to claim him as an intellectual, one of their own. Although only one - Schlesinger - actually worked in Kennedy's administration, Burnham was impressed at first by Kennedy's anti-communism and his commitment to counterinsurgency; Riesman wrote in glowing terms of Kennedy's ability to prevent a resurgence of the McCarthyite Right; and Lipset (not to mention Hofstadter) saw Kennedy as proof that American politicians were not irrevocably anti-intellectual (155). This uncritical
admiration is accounted for partly by Kennedy's respect for intellectuals and the self-conscious intellectualism of his circle. (In this he was unique among American presidents since John Quincy Adams, with the possible exception of Franklin Roosevelt.)

But the more important reason lay in the combination - which he personified - of the man of action and the intellectual. As Christopher Lasch remarks, the New York Intellectuals had largely accepted McCarthy's stereotype of American intellectuals as members of the "Eastern Establishment", with their strange foreign cultural allegiances, outlandish political views, and profoundly "un-American" ways. The New York Intellectuals had accepted the positive side of this stereotype, however, which implied that the intellectuals had attained the same social status as, say, corporate lawyers or advertising executives. The possession of the "style" of an intellectual (rather than the substance), and a sophisticated taste in artefacts were accepted as the distinguishing marks of the intellectual. Intellectuals (such as Schlesinger) were quick to notice that Kennedy possessed these traits in abundance. Kennedy was a symbol that the intellectual class had arrived; that it mattered to men of power (166). Nixon and Reagan, despite their conscious anti-intellectualism, depended on the
"neoconservatives" (among whom Hook, Kristol, Glazer and Podhoretz figured prominently) for the propagation and validation of their ideas. It is not a coincidence that the New York Intellectuals supported Kennedy, when several members of his administration were instrumental in sponsoring *Encounter*. By the 1970s, however, the New York Intellectuals no longer feared the anti-intellectualism of American politics and society; they had embraced it. They applauded Kennedy not because he respected intellectuals, but because he demonstrated that, by adopting an intellectual "style", and by using intellectuals with readily applicable skills in his Defense Department, for example, intellectuals could be used for political and military ends without a diminution in their status.

The New York Intellectuals had prepared the intellectual class for this transformation through their activities in the ACCF. Both Sidney Hook, in a pamphlet published by the ACCF, and Lionel Trilling, who co-authored a Columbia University statement on academic freedom in 1953, denied that Communists had any right to hold academic posts. This was because, in their opinion, Communism itself was a conspiracy, which denied its adherents the possibility of free thought, and for whom the Fifth Amendment should not afford any protection (167). Bell, Glazer, Kristol, Schlesinger, Diana Trilling and William Phillips argued...
that all Communists were agents of a foreign power, that Communists suffered from a form of psychological maladjustment, and that their word could not be trusted. Consequently, they should be denied passports and actively discriminated against in employment, because Communist beliefs in themselves signified untrustworthy and conspiratorial characteristics on the part of those who held these beliefs (168). In 1952, the ACCF - supported by a majority of its active membership, including Bell, Kristol, Glazer, Peter Viereck, Elliot Cohen and Sol Levitas - refused to pass a general motion condemning McCarthy, but passed one which denounced him only for specific actions, such as his condemnation of Edmund Wilson's "Memoirs of Hecate County" as "pornographic" (Edmund Wilson was an intellectual "father figure" to most of the ACCF intellectuals) (169). The ACCF denounced McCarthy's attacks on the Voice of America, an organisation with which some members of the board of the ACCF had connections (170). At other times, spokesmen for the ACCF (such as Hook and Lipset) denied that McCarthyism had had any impact on universities in the United States, said that his principal wrongdoing had been in damaging the image of the United States in Europe, and reproved the playwright Arthur Miller for condemning restrictions on freedom of expression in the United States in the same statement as condemning restrictions in the Soviet Union
(171). A book on McCarthyism sponsored by the ACCF - Rorty's and Decter's "McCarthy and the Communists" - denounced McCarthy's persecution of the China expert, Owen Lattimore, but only because he was being persecuted on the wrong grounds (172). The ACCF denounced the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (of which Albert Einstein and the journalist I F Stone were members), because it contained "fellow travellers", and because it assumed that McCarthy posed a greater danger to American civil liberties than Communism did (173).

These views on McCarthyism were argued by those who considered themselves to be against McCarthy (only a minority of ACCF activists, such as Burnham and Max Eastman, were enthusiasts for McCarthy). Several, such as Bell, Glazer, and Viereck, had contributed to the monograph edited by Bell on McCarthyism. Although it is fair to say that several of the New York Intellectuals who were activists in the ACCF (Dwight Macdonald, Mary McCarthy, Arthur Schlesinger) consistently pressed for a more forthright condemnation of McCarthyism, it remains true that their principal objection to McCarthy was that his indiscriminate anti-communism threatened to damage the interests of the intellectual class, and that the intellectuals could perform the task of ideological surveillance more efficiently.
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It is significant that, after their anti-communist credentials were firmly established, a new phase in their intellectual careers began - that of combining the role of men of letters with that of academic specialists, consultants to government, and media pundits. From this period, their connections with *Encounter* grew weaker, as that type of periodical was no longer always an appropriate vehicle for their ideas. Contrary to so much else which has been discussed here, it was indeed a coincidence that this new phase in the careers of the New York Intellectuals occurred (in the mid 1960s) at about the same time as the cessation of the CIA funding of *Encounter*. In fact, The Public Interest was founded in the same year as the CIA turned the tap to *Encounter* off. Both events signified the start of *Encounter*'s insecurity and its eventual demise.
CONCLUSION

This study of the origins and historical significance of Encounter has also indicated some of the reasons for its eventual demise. Encounter possessed two principal characteristics. It occupied a position between academic journals and the more popular political weekly and monthly magazines (the Spectator, the New Statesman and Commentary). It also put equal emphasis on both the cultural and political aspects of its coverage. The argument in the preceding chapters has intended to demonstrate that only the New York Intellectuals, and not the British literary intellectuals, could have provided the intellectual impetus for such a journal, and to show that they were indeed the driving force behind Encounter. They also succeeded in securing financial security for Encounter and the CCF through their connections with officials in the CIA, the State Department and, later, the Ford Foundation.

The origins of Encounter lie in the New York Intellectuals' interest in both culture and politics and the interactions between them. In that sense, they were the equivalents of the nineteenth century "men of letters" in Britain. As Heyck remarks, from the end of the nineteenth century, the term began to mean "a quaint
second-rate writer of belles lettres" (174). Jacoby states that the term "in the 1980s is almost derogatory, hinting of village poets or family historians" (175). The term, however, is used here in its mid-nineteenth century meaning, when in its most broad sense it included a variety of writers (journalists, novelists, historians, political economists), and also in its narrower sense (those writers who, whether or not they depended on writing for their livelihood, depended on outlets such as periodicals to the reading public for their success as writers. There was much overlap, however, between these two groups, and they shared a common objective: to communicate their ideas to a wider public than the purely academic one. This (whatever other important differences there were) they had in common with the New York Intellectuals.

This group of intellectuals retained sufficient cohesion and achieved sufficient dominance of the political and cultural debate in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s that it can be said to represent the American intellectual class. As representatives of the intellectual class, their connections with a section of the governing class provided the impetus for Encounter. The breaking of these connections - through the New York Intellectuals moving further into academic specialisms,
and through the replacement of this governing elite by another after 1969 - not only caused an important change in the journal's political positions, but also signified the beginning of the end for Encounter.

Why did the "only memorable journal of ideas in England since the great quarterlies of the nineteenth century" (in Mount's words) come about? It certainly did not come about through the efforts of the English literary intellectuals. The Partisan Review circle, on the contrary, retained its most important ideological characteristic - its anti-Stalinism - from the 1930s to the 1960s. It, therefore, was sufficiently cohesive as a group to be able to determine what was acceptable intellectual debate in the United States in the 1950s; and this laid the foundations for the domination of American thought in the 1970s by a significant proportion of the Partisan Review/Commentary group. Although the journal was "not devoted exclusively to a crusade" (Brogan), this was partly to make it palatable to British readers. (The article about "U" and "Non-U" was responsible for a large increase in circulation.) Even its emphasis on cultural and intellectual matters was heavily political. It attacked fellow-travelling and Communist intellectuals consistently from its declaration of intent in its second issue to a series of long articles by Melvin Lasky in the
1980s. Within this anti-Communist objective, it was not only, as Spender says, "open to political debate of the Left as well as of the Right", but almost exclusively of the non-Communist left before 1965. This political orientation can partly be explained by its connection to the CCF and the CIA. However, its general anti-Communist purpose cannot: it sprang from the shared beliefs of the New York Intellectuals. It sustained the journal, and was eventually responsible for its demise.
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