'Going into Europe': *Encounter* Magazine, European Union, and the British Establishment

Jason Harding

Journal of European Periodical Studies, 8.1 (Summer 2023)

ISSN 2506-6587

The *Journal of European Periodical Studies* is hosted by Ghent University

Website: ojs.ugent.be/jeps

To cite this article: Jason Harding, '"Going into Europe": *Encounter* Magazine, European Union, and the British Establishment', *Journal of European Periodical Studies*, 8.1 (Summer 2023), 9–24

‘Going into Europe’: *Encounter* Magazine, European Union, and the British Establishment

Jason Harding
Durham University
jason.harding@durham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

This article focuses on the contents of *Encounter* magazine in 1962–63, the final years that it received secret indirect funding from the CIA. It demonstrates that the editorial policy of the magazine was staunchly pro-European and was often highly critical of British isolationism. In particular, this chapter examines in detail two symposia stage-managed by editor Melvin Lasky: ‘Going into Europe’ and ‘Suicide of a Nation?’ The first symposium, spread over four issues, canvassed the opinions of prominent intellectuals regarding Britain’s application to join the Common Market (they were in favour by a ratio 5:1) and contained an editorial from Lasky reacting to devastating news of Charles de Gaulle’s veto. The second symposium took the form of a special issue guest-edited by the Hungarian refugee, Arthur Koestler, and was provocatively titled ‘Suicide of a Nation?’ In this special issue, Koestler criticized Britain’s apparent failure to adapt to the post-war world. Other contributors, notably Michael Shanks and Andrew Shonfield, elaborated on modern Britain’s economic and social ills, advising the UK to join forces with a resurgent western Europe. This article argues that supporters of US foreign policy were an important force on British public debate regarding Europe and pays close attention to the dynamics of the Cold War as a shaping context for these symposia. It shows that contributions by controversial public intellectual Koestler shed light on aspects of the anti-Communist editorial policy of *Encounter*. This article closes by gauging the impact of these symposia on attempts to reform the British Establishment.

KEYWORDS

Encounter, Common Market, European union, CIA, Cold War, British Establishment

Introduction

T. S. Eliot was a staunch advocate of the cultural unity of Europe. In December 1962, he weighed the pros and cons of the UK's application to join the six nations — France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands — who formed the European Economic Community or 'Common Market'. Wary of handing over this decision to a public referendum and reserving his judgement on the intricacy of the political, economic, and legal issues raised by entry, Eliot declared:

> I have always been strongly in favour of close cultural relations with the countries of Western Europe. For this reason my personal bias is in favour of Britain's entering into the Common Market. And I have not been impressed by the emotional appeals of some of those who maintain that to take this course would be a betrayal of our obligations to the Commonwealth.[1]

This statement was consistent with Eliot's longstanding faith in 'the idea of a common culture of western Europe', a belief that outweighed his support for empire and the economic complications of the UK redirecting its balance of trade, which in 1962 saw 43% of exports heading for Commonwealth countries and 16.7% to those within the Common Market.[2] Eliot was not concerned by any erosion of UK sovereignty. A few weeks later in January 1963, Charles de Gaulle used his veto to keep the UK out of the EEC, dealing a huge blow to those who wished to see Britain part of a European union.

Eliot's statement was a contribution to the symposium 'Going into Europe' published in the London monthly magazine *Encounter*. When it was founded in 1953, Eliot declined an invitation from British co-editor Stephen Spender to contribute to *Encounter* on the grounds of its American backing.[3] He did not know that the money for the magazine came, via a front foundation, from the CIA, using funds covertly siphoned off from the 'European Recovery Program' or Marshall Plan. Spender, who later pleaded ignorance of *Encounter*'s true source of funding, protested to the man who authorized the cheques, Michael Josselson (a CIA agent in Paris), about the 'reputation we have to try and live down of being a magazine disguising American propaganda under a veneer of British culture'.[4] *Encounter* was a sophisticated intellectual magazine promoting an American ideal of liberal democracy based upon what one scholar identifies as 'the common heritage of the European Enlightenment, the rule of law, Wilsonian internationalism, pragmatism, and urban cosmopolitanism'.[5] Eliot disliked liberal politics and he had been scathing about President Wilson's interventions at the time of the Versailles peace treaty in 1919 which led to the fragmentation of Europe, unleashing ethnic and national tensions. Nevertheless, the issue of Britain's application to the Common Market was sufficiently weighty for Eliot to offer a public statement to this liberal magazine in the service of European unification.

1 T. S. Eliot, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 65.
2 T. S. Eliot, *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: Volume 2: The Perfect Critic, 1919–1926*, ed. by Anthony Cuda and Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), p. 778.
3 T. S. Eliot to Stephen Spender, 20 October 1953. Spender Papers, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
4 Quoted in Jason Harding, '"Our Greatest Asset": *Encounter* Magazine and the Congress for Cultural Freedom', in *Campaigning Culture and the Global Cold War*, ed. by Giles Scott-Smith and Charlotte Lerg (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 107–25 (p. 109).
5 Michael Hochgeschwender, 'A Battle of Ideas: The Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) in Britain, Italy, France and West Germany', in *The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–58*, ed. by Dominik Geppert (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 319–38 (p. 326).

The editors of *Encounter* had launched their magazine with the example of Eliot's interwar periodical, the *Criterion*, firmly in mind. In West Berlin in March 1946, Melvin Lasky had listened to Eliot's BBC radio broadcasts to occupied Germany on the subject of 'The Unity of European Culture' in which Eliot spoke of the *Criterion*'s ambition to foster 'an international fraternity of men of letters, within Europe':

> [T]he existence of such a network of independent reviews, at least one in every capital of Europe, is necessary for the transmission of ideas — and to make possible the circulation of ideas while they are still fresh. The editors of such reviews, and if possible the more regular contributors, should be able to get to know each other personally, to visit each other, to entertain each other, and to exchange ideas in conversation. […] [T]heir co-operation should continually stimulate that circulation of influence of thought and sensibility, between nation and nation in Europe, which fertilizes and renovates from abroad the literature of each one of them.[6]

In 1953, Lasky sent excerpts from Eliot's BBC broadcast to *Encounter*'s American co-editor Irving Kristol. 'I read with pleasure' Kristol responded, 'T. S. Eliot's discussion of the *Criterion* which you sent me', adding that 'his remarks were directly to the point as far as the editorial purpose of our magazine is concerned, and perhaps I shall quote them in our first editorial'.[7] However, less than a year later, Kristol was complaining to Denis de Rougemont (a Swiss writer who had obtained Eliot's support for his 1948 Hague Congress on European union): 'Unhappily, our audience is overwhelmingly *not* Europeans. The British, when they speak of Europe, do not say "we" but "they"'.[8]

Eliot's vision of a common European culture was disseminated throughout the 1940s and 1950s by broadcasts for the BBC and lectures for the British Council.[9] Then, in 1961, he was one of 116 signatories to a statement published in *Encounter* supporting democratic freedoms in West Berlin after the construction of the Berlin Wall.[10] A year later, *Encounter*'s American sponsors were doubtless delighted to secure a statement in 'Going into Europe' from this Nobel laureate and celebrated public figure for a position firmly in accord with US foreign policy towards Europe under President Kennedy.[11] In April 1963, shortly after the conclusion of this symposium, Lasky, who had succeeded Kristol as the American co-editor, gushed in his preface to an anthology chosen from the first ten years of *Encounter* that 'Mr. T. S. Eliot who, although he has no knowledge of it and certainly no responsibility, was the begetter of it all. We had, in the early post-war years, listened to his words recalling his own efforts […] (as editor of *Criterion*).'[12]

After the public revelation in 1967 of secret CIA funding of *Encounter*, a hailstorm of condemnation from the New Left rained down upon the magazine. The most influential of these condemnations, delivered by the investigative journalist

6 T. S. Eliot, *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: Volume 6: The War Years, 1940–1946*, ed. by David E. Chinitz and Ronald Schuchard (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), pp. 713–14.

7 Irving Kristol to Melvin Lasky, 3 June 1953. *Encounter* Papers, Howard Gotlieb Archive Center, Boston University.

8 Irving Kristol to Denis de Rougemont, 13 January 1954. Denis de Rougemont Foundation for Europe. Neuchâtel Public and University Library.

9 For further details, see Jason Harding, 'T. S. Eliot, Brexit and the Idea of Europe', in *Eliot Now*, ed. by David E. Chinitz and Megan Quigley (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming 2024).

10 'Freedom in Berlin', *Encounter*, 17.5 (November 1961), 52–53. T. S. Eliot to Melvin Lasky, 15 September 1961. Faber and Faber Archive, London.

11 T. S. Eliot to the Editors of *Encounter*, 1 November 1962. Faber Archive.

12 M. J. L[asky], 'Preface', *Encounters: An Anthology from the First Ten Years of* Encounter *Magazine*, ed. by Stephen Spender, Irving Kristol, and Melvin J. Lasky (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), p. xii.

Frances Stonor Saunders in *Who Paid the Piper?* (1999), characterized *Encounter* as an operational tool of the CIA exhibiting the corruption of free-thinking intellectuals by state power. By contrast, Peter Coleman's sympathetic history of the Congress for Cultural Freedom argued that the editors of *Encounter* were granted autonomy and contributors wrote out of personal conviction. The most persuasive critical accounts of *Encounter* present measured and nuanced analysis of the contents of the magazine. In *The CIA, the British Left and the Cold War* (2003) Hugh Wilford draws on archival research to clearly demonstrate how the editors and key contributors used *Encounter* as a platform to advance their own agendas, resisting outside interference. In *Cold War Modernists* (2015), Greg Barnhisel interprets the magazine's treatment of the legacies of modernism as a defence of liberal values of freedom and individualism. Despite connections, then, through the Congress for Cultural Freedom to the CIA, this article argues that detailed examination of the contents of *Encounter* reveals that debates regarding Britain's entry into Europe were fiercely principled and open to different points of view.[13]

'Going into Europe'

Melvin Lasky was an independent-minded writer blessed with editorial flair. Since replacing Irving Kristol in 1958 as the American co-editor, in effect the political editor of the magazine (Spender was nominally in charge of literature and the arts, although by 1963 John Gross was responsible for these pages), the circulation of *Encounter* more than doubled under Lasky's editing to 35,000 in 1963. By then it was widely regarded as the pre-eminent liberal magazine in London, attracting writers of the calibre of Isaiah Berlin, Frank Kermode, Mary McCarthy, and Lionel Trilling, as well as modernizing 'revisionist' articles from the 'Gaitskellite' group of Labour MPs, including Anthony Crosland, Denis Healey, and Roy Jenkins, who were in embattled disagreement with radical left-wing 'Bevanites' contributing to the *New Statesman*, a periodical criticized for being too soft on repressions within the Soviet Union. In October 1963, the circulation of *Encounter* was characterized in a questionnaire as 'probably the largest readership of any comparable review in the world' (albeit less than half the circulation of the *New Statesman*).[14] Lasky was an assiduous networker. After the 1964 general election Josselson boasted to Daniel Bell: 'We are all pleased to have so many of our friends in the new [Labour] government.'[15] Several of these 'friends'— contributors to *Encounter*, members of Harold Wilson's cabinet — were invited to the magazine's exclusive post-election party.[16]

In 1964, Josselson told Edward Shils that *Encounter* was the Congress's 'greatest asset'.[17] This does not mean that the CIA needed to exert direct pressure on Lasky. By July 1964, Josselson and Lasky had succeeded in freeing *Encounter* from CIA

13 See Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper?: The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999); Peter Coleman, *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe* (London: The Free Press, 1989); Hugh Wilford, *The CIA, the British Left and the Cold War* (London: Frank Cass, 2003); Greg Barnhisel, *Cold War Modernists: Art, Literature, and American Cultural Diplomacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).

14 Loose-leaf insert in *Encounter*, October 1963 issue. Archives in the Lasky Center for Transatlantic Studies, University of Munich record the circulation for this month as 35,235. I am grateful to Dr Maren Roth for this information. In the mid-1960s, the circulation of the *New Statesman*, a weekly magazine, exceeded 90,000.

15 Michael Josselson to Daniel Bell, 28 October 1964. Josselson Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin.

16 'Post-Election Party' (16 October 1964) containing a list of 122 invitees including Anthony Crosland, Richard Crossman and Roy Jenkins. *Encounter* Papers.

17 Michael Josselson to Edward Shils, 17 February 1964. Josselson Papers.

purse-strings.[18] The magazine appeared under the imprint of Cecil King's IPC *Daily Mirror* Group supported by additional grants from the Ford Foundation. Defending his editorial record after the fall-out from the public revelations of CIA patronage, Lasky was unapologetic:

> [A]nyone who has looked through any one single issue and thinks anybody pulled any strings and that anyone could tell the writers that we were publishing what to say and how to say it and when to say it has three more guesses coming. We pulled no punches and that's why we had readers. We tried to take every issue, walk around it and face it critically.[19]

Even Frank Kermode, who resigned as British co-editor of *Encounter* after Josselson lied to him about CIA conduits, and who lobbied the trustees in 1967 to have Lasky fired as editor, recalled in a memoir that Lasky 'was never anybody's simple mouthpiece, and if his politics closely resembled the politics of the State Department, that was because he believed the State Department had on the whole, and conveniently, got things right'.[20]

In the period of Britain's negotiations to enter the EEC, the US State Department's strategic aim to cement the UK into a political and economic union of European democracies, as a bulwark against the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact, was entirely consistent with Lasky's committed social-democratic politics. In a lecture to the British Association for American Studies published in the January 1962 100th number of *Encounter*, Lasky wondered aloud: 'Is it too melodramatic to think that what we have called Western civilisation is now moving into a period of unprecedented partnership between Europeans and Americans, a period of some kind of "transatlantic community"?' He concluded by celebrating 'the most significant fact of our time'; namely, 'that the Americans and all the Europeans, sharing as they do a libertarian ideal of a free and open society, were able in an epoch of historic challenge to communicate in a common tongue'.[21] In this 100th number, contributors to the 'Spectrum' symposium on 'the state of the nation' pondered British decline but were generally hopeful, a note struck by the novelist Angus Wilson who balanced castigation of 'our smugness, our dishonesty, our snobbery' with recognition of a 'gentleness, some goodwill, no flagrant social indecency'.[22] Later that year, 'Going into Europe' was a timely symposium, illustrating Lasky's editorial mission to 'take every issue, walk around it and face it critically'.

Lasky wrote to over a hundred prominent British intellectuals requesting 'brief statements of attitude or analysis' on the UK's application to join the EEC. Although Lasky confessed to 'the unpredictability of almost everyone's attitude' a clear consensus emerged from those who replied and had their viewpoints published from December 1962 to March 1963 in four issues of *Encounter*'s 'Going into Europe' symposium.[23] An overwhelming ratio of 5:1 of the replies printed in *Encounter* were in favour of entry into the EEC compared with a January 1963 Gallup Poll indicating 41% support among British public opinion.[24] Given the doubts about the Common Market voiced by the

18 See Coleman, p. 186.
19 Melvin Lasky to William F. Buckley Jr., *Firing Line*, US TV broadcast, 27 February 1968.
20 Frank Kermode, *Not Entitled: A Memoir* (London: Penguin, 1995), p. 231.
21 Melvin J. Lasky, 'America and Europe: Transatlantic Images', *Encounter*, 18.1 (January 1962), 66, 78.
22 Angus Wilson, 'Fourteen Points', *Encounter*, 18.1 (January 1962), 12.
23 [Melvin Lasky] 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 56.
24 Lasky calculated: 'The results of our tabulation give a rough result of 5 in favour of entry into the Common Market for every 1 against […] [FOR:] 77. AGAINST: 17. INDIFFERENT, UNDECIDED: 16'. 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 20.3 (March 1963), 68. See 'British Attitudes Towards the Common Market, 1957–1972' (London: Gallup Poll, 1972), p. 3.

Labour Party leader Hugh Gaitskell in his thundering 1962 party conference speech warning of 'the end of a thousand years of history' if Britain was absorbed into a federal Europe, it is hardly surprising that many of the smaller group of *Encounter* sceptics regarding the EEC were socialists; for instance, economist Joan Robinson, historian A. J. P. Taylor, literary critic Raymond Williams, and Labour MP Tony Benn.[25] Taylor complained that 'Cartels and monopolies have always been [the EEC's] way' while Benn believed the EEC had 'Laissez-faire as its philosophy and chooses Bureaucracy as its administrative method'.[26] The writers Kingsley Amis, John Braine and John Osborne were concerned about a loss of UK national sovereignty. Amis, who had discarded his early political radicalism, declared forthrightly: 'France, Italy, and West Germany are potentially very wicked'.[27]

Among the luminaries in favour of the Common Market, Eliot's endorsement joined statements by W. H. Auden, Graham Greene, C. S. Lewis, Nancy Mitford, Arnold Toynbee, and Leonard Woolf. With prescience, Hans Eysenck, Professor of Psychology at London University, pointed out a well-evidenced psychological principle that 'Once a choice has been made the object chosen becomes more and more desirable, and the object rejected less and less so'.[28] As positions on 'Going into Europe' hardened, on 14 January 1963 Charles de Gaulle announced at a Paris press conference that France would veto Britain's application to join the EEC since the UK was not sufficiently European and was too closely tied to the US. In an editorial note preceding the last batch of responses, wrapping up a now purely academic 'Going into Europe' symposium, Lasky expressed 'the sinking feeling that the European train has gone off the track of history' laying the blame squarely on 'two old men' — the French President Charles de Gaulle and West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer — whose actions were interpreted as a betrayal of the 'authentic tones of a modern European generation which would never allow a relapse into the old shabby habits of nationalist power-politics and chauvinistic prejudice'.[29]

In February 1963, Lasky published the diary of the Labour MP Roy Jenkins, a passionate pro-European, who detailed his engagements in Brussels and other European capitals tracing the steps of the UK's ultimately fruitless negotiations. When Jenkins worried that the European Commission did not want Britain's entry 'at the cost of any real risk to the coherence of the existing community' his sense of anxiety was palpable.[30] The February and March 1963 issues of *Encounter* contained critical portraits of Adenauer by F. R. Allemann and of de Gaulle by Raymond Aron. Allemann, the Swiss-born political editor of *Der Monat*, bemoaned the 'mean and petty spectacle' of Adenauer's decline.[31] Aron, a liberal sceptic of de Gaulle's authoritarian presidency, condemned his 'calculatedly aggressive manner to all comers'.[32] A few years earlier, Aron had scolded readers of *Encounter* who believed that the Common Market had divided Europe: 'We are all involved in the same adventure. Atlantic solidarity seems no less vital to us than European unity.'[33] On the fundamental issue of the 'transatlantic community' there was little evidence in *Encounter* of editorial impartiality.

25 For details of Gaitskell's 1962 Labour Party conference speech, see Geoffrey McDermott, *Leader Lost: A Biography of Hugh Gaitskell* (London: Leslie Frewin, 1972), pp. 248–53.
26 A. J. P. Taylor, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 62; Anthony Wedgwood Benn, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 20.1 (January 1963), 64.
27 Kingsley Amis, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 56.
28 Hans Eysenck, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 63.
29 M[elvin] J. L[asky], 'Editorial Note', *Encounter*, 20.3 (March 1963), 3.
30 Roy Jenkins, 'Notes from the Brink: A Common Market Diary', *Encounter*, 20.2 (February 1963), 42.
31 F. R. Allemann, 'The End of the Adenauer Era: Letter from Germany', *Encounter*, 20.2 (February 1963), 60.
32 Raymond Aron, 'The Gaullist Republic: Letters from Paris', *Encounter*, 20.3 (March 1963), 11.
33 Raymond Aron, 'Letter to an English Friend', *Encounter*, 14.6 (June 1960), 4.

'Suicide of a Nation?'

'The greatest enthusiasm for Britain's involvement with "Europe"' in the 1960s, contend two Eurosceptic historians Christopher Booker and Richard North, 'was expressed by a group of younger writers and politicians representing what came to be dubbed the "What's Wrong With Britain School of Journalism".' They continue:

> These publicists, such as Michael Shanks, author of a best-selling paperback *The Stagnant Society*, or the Labour MP Anthony Crosland, a regular contributor to the intellectual monthly *Encounter*, enjoyed contrasting what they saw as a stuffy, tradition-bound, class-ridden, obsolete, inefficient Britain, lost in nostalgia for the days of empire, with what they saw as the newly energetic, innovative, efficient 'Europeans'.[34]

Around the time of the Suez Crisis debacle in 1956, which had demonstrated that Britain was no longer a global superpower, *Encounter* was at the forefront of a national soul-searching exemplified by the 'This New England' symposium and tirades by the 'angry young men' John Osborne and Kenneth Tynan.[35] This cultural criticism was buttressed by the economic criticism of Andrew Shonfield's *British Economic Policy Since the War* (1958) and Michael Shanks's *The Stagnant Society* (1961), best-selling paperbacks in Penguin's 'What's Wrong with Britain?' series.

In 1957, Andrew Shonfield, economics editor at the *Observer*, published in *Encounter* 'The Pursuit of Prestige: A Guide to Post-war British Policy' which argued that Britain's low rates of post-war economic productivity and growth compared to other European competitors was a matter of serious concern.[36] Although Shonfield identified complex reasons for relative economic stagnation, foremost amongst them was the political decision to maintain Britain's global commitments as a world power, re-establishing sterling as a major reserve currency, but a policy the country could not afford. When Shonfield expanded his thesis into a Penguin Special, Anthony Crosland praised it in *Encounter* as 'one of crucial importance, which all political and economic students, whatever their views, must either accept or be able to rebut'.[37] In the 'Going into Britain' symposium, Shonfield, a frequent *Encounter* contributor who in 1964 became a trustee, made it clear that he wanted Britain to recalibrate its reliance on a declining share of the Commonwealth market and also to share in the benefits of the EEC's planned economy: 'What has emerged in Europe may be a new and efficient piece of machinery for ordering international economic affairs.'[38] Michael Shanks's Penguin Special *The Stagnant Society* burrowed deeply into the social barriers that he felt underlay this British malaise; in particular, the dysfunctional relations between the government, employers, and trade unions. Shanks concluded: 'One way of increasing both the competitive pressures and the potential rewards for British industry would be to join the European Common Market.'[39] Now that Britain was to remain outside

34 Christopher Booker and Richard North, *The Great Deception: Can the European Union Survive?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), p. 142.

35 See 'This Month's *Encounter*', *Encounter*, 6.6 (June 1956), 2 and Kenneth Tynan and John Osborne, 'This Scepter'd Isle', *Encounter*, 9.4 (October 1957), 19–30. These essays were later collected in Tom Maschler's dissident *Declaration* (1957). Randolph S. Churchill responded to 'the prodigiously burgeoning chips on the shoulders of these two young gentlemen'. 'Discussion', *Encounter*, 10.1 (January 1958), 66–68.

36 Andrew Shonfield, 'The Pursuit of Prestige: A Guide to Post-war British Policy', *Encounter*, 8.1 (January 1957), 38–44.

37 C. A. R. Crosland, 'The Price of Prestige', *Encounter*, 11.1 (July 1958), 87.

38 Andrew Shonfield, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 20.1 (January 1963), 63.

39 Michael Shanks, *The Stagnant Society: A Warning* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Special, 1961), p. 219.

of the EEC while de Gaulle wielded France's veto, *Encounter* turned directly to a trenchant polemical enquiry into the state of the nation. It was edited by an implacable Cold Warrior.

In *Postwar*, Tony Judt says that 'British intellectuals did not play an influential part in the great debates of continental Europe' but that the Hungarian émigré Arthur Koestler did: he lived through the European catastrophe of revolution, inflation, dictatorship, and invasion that British intellectuals residing across the Channel had been spared.[40] In 1950, Koestler was the star anti-Communist at the launch of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in West Berlin. In 1951, however, after resigning from the executive committee of the Congress, Koestler complained 'Cassandra has gone hoarse, and is due for a vocational change'.[41] He resurfaced in *Encounter*'s 'Going into Europe' as a sarcastic observer of British isolationism.[42] Shortly afterwards, Koestler approached Lasky about producing a special issue of *Encounter* focused on a diagnosis of the root causes of British post-war decline. It appeared in July 1963 under the provocative title 'Suicide of a Nation?' headed by Koestler's editorial rewriting of George Orwell's patriotic wartime socialism in *The Lion and the Unicorn* as a less glamorous pairing of 'The Lion and the Ostrich'.

Koestler called this 'characteristically British' hybrid an 'Old Struthonian' (from the Latin *struthio* for ostrich).[43] A cartoon on the cover of the July 1963 issue depicted the UK's royal coat of arms, replacing the unicorn with an ostrich burying its head. Koestler thought Orwell's pamphlet *The Lion and the Unicorn* was the most important political exhortation written during the Second World War describing its opening section 'England Your England' as 'one of the most moving and yet incisive portraits of the English character'.[44] Orwell's appeal for national solidarity — intended to heal class divisions within Britain at a time of existential threat — is stirring and yet at times sentimental. Koestler's unsentimental 'The Lion and the Ostrich' contended that the British displayed leonine bravery in times of crisis but that they also had a reactionary tendency to refuse to see the reality of progressive political and economic trends. Koestler was bitterly disappointed by Britain's refusal to take an active lead in the reconstruction of post-war Europe. 'When the [Second World] war was won', he argued, 'Britain's political and moral prestige in Europe was at an unprecedented height; in less than twenty years, her leaders managed to bring it down to an equally unprecedented low.'[45] 'The inescapable conclusion', according to Koestler's biographer Michael Scammell, 'was that Europeans should accept American hegemony and the Americans should accept their responsibility, in order to bolster the European spirit.'[46]

Articles in 'Suicide of a Nation?' explicitly addressed tension between the island of Britain, nostalgic for empire, and opportunities offered by closer political co-operation and economic integration with continental Europe. Hugh Seton-Watson, a Professor of Russian History at the University of London, in an essay titled 'Commonwealth, Common Market, Common Sense' recounted occasions when Britain 'not always politely — rebuffed the appeal from Europeans'.[47] For example, when declining to join the 1950 Schuman Plan on coal and steel, and the 1954 European Defence Community, and crucially, a self-imposed exclusion from the foundational 1957 Treaty of Rome. In

40 Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (London: Vintage Books, 2010), p. 206.
41 Arthur Koestler, *The Trail of the Dinosaur and Other Essays* (London: Collins, 1955), p. viii.
42 See Arthur Koestler, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 20.1 (January 1963), 62.
43 A[rthur] K[oestler], 'The Lion and the Ostrich', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 7.
44 Koestler, *The Trail of the Dinosaur*, p. 104.
45 K[oestler], 'The Lion and the Ostrich', p. 6.
46 Michael Scammell, *Koestler: The Indispensable Intellectual* (London: Faber and Faber, 2009), p. 374.
47 Hugh Seton-Watson, 'Commonwealth, Common Market, Common sense', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 72.

his contribution to the 'Going into Europe' symposium, British diplomat Sir William Hayter had regretted his own part in these missed opportunities.[48] Seton-Watson brooded upon Britain's post-war dilemma prevaricating between North America and western Europe. He concluded that Britain's future was in Europe and the UK 'cannot live without Europe nor Europe without it'.[49]

Koestler's caustic admonishment in 'The Lion and the Ostrich' highlighted Britain's intractable industrial woes and its relatively stagnant economic growth compared with the rest of western Europe, which had made the failure to reap the economic rewards of the EEC more pressing. Koestler, like Orwell in *The Lion and the Unicorn*, blamed the English public schools and rigid class barriers for producing an incompetent political, social, and economic establishment, or what Orwell had bluntly called 'the decay of ability in the ruling class'.[50] Koestler claimed that weak management by mediocre gentlemen amateurs was exacerbated by the 'cold class war' and the creeping influence of the Communist Party among the British Trade Union movement, leading to an endemic inefficiency and 'often grotesque, frivolous, and fratricidal' strikes.[51] Michael Shanks's contribution to 'Suicide of a Nation?', titled 'The Comforts of Stagnation', reinforced the claim that a principal cause of economic stagnation in Britain was due to the 'poor state of our industrial relations'.[52] Likewise, Andrew Shonfield's essay called 'The Plaintive Treble' lamented: 'The resistance of British workers when anyone tries to introduce clear-cut standards of any kind is an old story'.[53]

The articles collected in 'Suicide of a Nation?' did offer some constructive proposals, summarized by Koestler as: reform of Parliament, reform of the Trade Unions and, above all, reform of the educational system, viewed as a policy to reduce inequality and wasted talent, a conclusion supported by the Robbins Report of October 1963. Koestler looked admiringly to western Europe where he claimed that nationalism was dead, Communist ideology was on the wane, and prosperity on the rise. He added that post-war Europe 'is in a process of cultural cross-fertilisation, the winds blowing from all directions of the compass' and that this had led to 'an explosion of creativity all over the Continent, of which only muted echoes reach our islands'.[54] Koestler echoes Eliot's words in his 1946 BBC broadcast to occupied Germany ('a network of independent reviews, at least one in every capital of Europe […] should continually stimulate that circulation of influence of thought and sensibility, between nation and nation in Europe, which fertilises and renovates from abroad the literature of each one of them') which were quoted by Lasky in his preface to the 1963 *Encounter* anthology composed at the same time Koestler guest-edited 'Suicide of a Nation?'

Not surprisingly, many British readers of *Encounter* reacted with anger and outrage to the strictures of 'Suicide of a Nation?'. In the *Spectator*, Simon Raven roundly rejected its 'nagging and wailing', asserting that 'their remedies for our shortcomings are so unamiable, so aggressive, so philistine'.[55] In the *Times Educational Supplement*, the attack on the British educational system was dismissed as uninformed. This anonymous reviewer protested that: 'If you disagree with its diagnosis you are an ostrich.'[56] Lasky

48 Sir William Hayter, 'Going into Europe', *Encounter*, 19.6 (December 1962), 63.
49 Seton-Watson, p. 72.
50 George Orwell, *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1962), p. 29.
51 A[rthur] K[oestler], 'Postscript: The Manager and the Muses', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 116.
52 Michael Shanks, 'The Comforts of Stagnation', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 37.
53 Andrew Shonfield, 'The Plaintive Treble', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 41.
54 K[oestler], 'Postscript', p. 114.
55 Simon Raven's comments in the *Spectator* were reprinted in *Encounter*, 21.3 (September 1963), 95.
56 This review from the *Times Educational Supplement* was reproduced under the header 'The Flagellants', *Encounter*, 21.3 (September 1963), 92.

published a dozen responses in *Encounter* over the following months from irritated correspondents. John Beaven objected: 'Throughout the whole number achievements are rather lightly dismissed and shortcomings are heavily emphasised.'[57] There were accusations of exaggeration. Sir Hugh Casson singled out Malcolm Muggeridge's masochist jeremiad aimed at 'England, Whose England?' as 'the silliest and the most easy to resist'.[58] One correspondent from Islington expostulated: 'Having read *Encounter* for ten years, I am sad to witness this suicide of a magazine.'[59]

Koestler harboured deep insecurities about his position inside British society. He had felt an outsider since arriving in 1940 as a political refugee. In 1947, V. S. Pritchett wrote in *Horizon* that Koestler was separated from the British 'by the education and politics of the continent, by the vast difference between the large, stable middle-class in England and the small, precarious middle-class of Central Europe'.[60] A few years later, Stephen Spender recorded in his diary André Malraux telling Koestler after an argument in Paris that 'he was a person perpetually in search of a country'.[61] Koestler himself told Cyril Connolly: 'I think of myself as a European of Hungarian background, Austro-French formation, and a naturalized British subject, but a European first of all.'[62] George Steiner put matters in characteristically striking terms when he announced: 'Koestler was one of the great Central European Jews in a time which saw the annihilation of the breed.'[63]

Koestler's belligerent confrontational style in 'Suicide of a Nation?' alienated British readers of *Encounter* in 1963. Tony Judt believed that 'Koestler's accent, his intensity, his experience, and his sense of the tragic all put him at odds with the distinctive English preference for understatement and irony'. As a consequence, 'in London, where he tried very hard to become English and strove for acceptance and membership, Koestler was sometimes an object of amusement and even ridicule'. Yet Judt concludes: 'His English contemporaries admired [Koestler], certainly. They respected him and they acknowledged his influence. But on the whole they did not understand him.'[64] In a 1983 *Encounter* obituary piece on Koestler, Lasky recalled that his friend used to tell people that in spite of all its faults 'England is the best country to sleep in' owing to its venerable tradition of parliamentary democracy and its robust defence of civil liberties.[65] That is, Koestler admired the English for the same qualities that Orwell praised in 'England Your England': a 'respect for constitutionalism and legality' resisting totalitarian controls that had decimated and tyrannized Europe and the Soviet Union. As Orwell put it in 'England Your England': 'It is the liberty to have a home of your own, to do what you like in your spare time, to choose your own amusements instead of having them chosen for you. […] No Gestapo either, in all probability.'[66] Koestler had narrowly avoided execution as a political prisoner during the Spanish Civil War.

Lasky turned to Koestler's journalistic instincts to dramatize the perceived blind spots of British intellectuals. Although he did not agree with all aspects of 'Suicide of a Nation?' — insisting on a question mark at the end of the title — he gave Koestler a free hand to edit this special issue. For Lasky greatly admired Koestler's political insight

57 John Beaven, 'Letters', *Encounter*, 21.3 (September 1963), 95.
58 Hugh Casson, 'Letters', *Encounter*, 21.3 (September 1963), 93.
59 Jeremy Tunstall, 'Letters', *Encounter*, 21.3 (September 1963), 95.
60 V. S. Pritchett in *Horizon,* 15.88 (May 1947), quoted in Koestler, p. 304.
61 Stephen Spender, *New Selected Journals, 1939–1995*, ed. by Lara Feigel and John Sutherland with Natasha Spender (London: Faber and Faber, 2012), p. 80.
62 Cyril Connolly interview with Koestler for the *Sunday Times*, quoted in *Koestler*, p. 505.
63 George Steiner, 'On the Short List', *Encounter*, 61.2 (September–October 1983), 51.
64 Tony Judt, *Reappraisals: Reflections on the Forgotten Twentieth Century* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2008), p. 29.
65 Melvin J. Lasky, 'Remembering', *Encounter*, 61.2 (September–October 1983), 61.
66 Orwell, pp. 19, 13–14.

regarding the dangers of Communism and the complacency of British intellectuals to external threats. Lasky praised Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* in *Encounter* as 'the greatest political novel of our century' and reprinted his essay 'The Trail of the Dinosaur' in his 1963 anthology of the best essays from the opening decade of *Encounter*.[67] It was understandable that Lasky solicited a contribution from Koestler when in 1971 he reran the 'Going into Europe' symposium during Edward Heath's negotiations to enter the EEC. The statements published in 'Going into Europe — Again?', including over forty from those who had contributed to the original symposium (contradicting claims of a wholesale exodus of authors after the CIA imbroglio of 1966–67), revealed less enthusiasm for the question of Europe. Although few had changed their mind — economist and educationalist John Vaizey and Cold War historian Robert Conquest were now against membership — the ratio in favour of joining dropped to 3:1 in this unscientific poll of the 'state of British intellectual opinion'.[68]

In October 1973, after the UK had entered the EEC, Koestler revisited 'The Lion and the Ostrich' for the twentieth anniversary number of *Encounter*. He repeated his earlier complaints about the failure of the English to reform an outdated class system, about toxic Trade Union disputes, and a nationalist myopia regarding Britain's place in Europe. In spite of the cultural revival brought by the so-called 'swinging sixties', Koestler still labelled Britain 'the sick man of Europe'.[69] In his obituary memories, Lasky recalled how Koestler had approached him to edit 'Suicide of a Nation?' but that he was hurt 'that I withheld total agreement and full intellectual approbation'. Lasky pointed out: 'It was, as always with Koestler, a dramatic conception of a doom-laden issue; and if one rereads his contributions, and most of the others which he solicited, it remains all-too-pertinent to British affairs today.'[70] When Lasky wrote these words in 1983, Margaret Thatcher was busy renegotiating Britain's contributions to the EEC. Koestler voted for Thatcher in 1979, disgusted with the intransigence of Labour MPs, notably Michael Foot and Tony Benn, who campaigned to leave the EEC; thirty years earlier, Koestler told Stephen Spender that the Labour Party 'is the main obstacle to European Union' in British politics.[71]

Koestler declared resonantly: 'I would like to hear a European anthem as stirring as the Marseillaise, to see a European flag fluttering in the breeze, to have a European currency and a European government.'[72] In 'The Trail of the Dinosaur' he had worried that owing to the destructive power of the hydrogen bomb, 'the next half century at the utmost, will decide whether homo sapiens will go the way of the dinosaur'.[73] As a student of parapsychology, he would have been reassured if clairvoyance foretold him that Europe had avoided Cold War Armageddon and that a European Union had emerged to strengthen the shared interests of twenty-seven national member states now embracing western, northern, central, and eastern Europe. In the penultimate issue of *Encounter*, Lasky summoned Koestler's ghost to his celebratory 'An Inquest on "the Death of Communism"' in a roll call of intellectuals whom he felt had helped win the Cold War.[74] Koestler would have been overjoyed to witness the collapse of the

67 Lasky, 'Remembering', p. 62.

68 Lasky gave figures of FOR: 46; AGAINST: 17; INDIFFERENT, UNDECIDED: 4. 'Going into Europe — Again?', *Encounter*, 37.2 (August 1971), 28.

69 Arthur Koestler, 'The Lion and Unicorn: Ten Years On', *Encounter*, 41.4 (October 1973), 40.

70 Lasky, 'Remembering', pp. 64, 61.

71 Spender, *New Selected Journals*, p. 78.

72 Arthur Koestler interview with Olivier Todd. Quoted in Scammell, p. 556.

73 Arthur Koestler, 'The Trail of the Dinosaur', *Encounter*, 4.5 (May 1955), 14.

74 Lasky praised 'those who have been called "the martyrs" or "the prophets" in the movement of anti-Communist intelligentsia which has now issued in famous victories […] names like Hook, Silone, Koestler, Souvarine, among many others'. 'An Inquest on "the Death of Communism"', *Encounter*, 75.1 (July–August 1990), 3.

Soviet Union. It is not hard to predict what the guest editor of *Encounter*'s 'Suicide of a Nation?' issue would have thought of the outcome of the 2016 UK referendum on continued membership of the European Union.

Conclusion

In the 'Going into Europe' symposium Anthony Hartley observed 'the debate on Britain's entry into the [European] community has been invigorating'. He also confessed to 'a feeling of revolt against the conditions of life in this country since the war' symptomatic of a 'deep malaise' and 'self-satisfied decay' in Britain.[75] Hartley, a Tory journalist and firm Atlanticist who later joined *Encounter*'s editorial board, also published a book-length critique in *A State of England* (1963) which deplored the UK's isolation from the EEC and issued a rallying-cry for an Orwellian intellectual dissent.[76] In 'Suicide of a Nation?' frustration about the state of England found expression by pointing to the confrontation between old, entrenched snobbish patricians — embodied by Harold Macmillan's Conservative government — and a new cadre of professional managerial elites. Labour MP Austen Albu's 'Taboo on Expertise' championed expertise in science and technology to reinvigorate British industry and the Civil Service.[77] More generally, 'Suicide of a Nation?' directed a searching light on a major preoccupation of journalism of the day — the British Establishment.

Henry Fairlie, a moderate contributor to 'Suicide of a Nation?', gave the concept of 'the Establishment' renewed currency when he defined it as the 'matrix of official and social relations within which power is exercised' arguing power is 'exercised socially' in England.[78] His 1959 *Encounter* article 'The BBC: Voice of the Establishment' admitted the phrase 'the Establishment' was useful 'only if it helps to describe something specific about the manner in which power in England is exercised, something that has been previously overlooked or insufficiently examined'.[79] Treatment of 'the Establishment' was often coupled to the rise of a post-war educational 'meritocracy', a term first coined and gently satirized by Michael Young in *Encounter* in 1958.[80] As Anthony Sampson, a contributor to *Encounter*, declared in his best-selling *Anatomy of Britain* (1962): 'The old fabric of the British governing class, while keeping its social and political hold, has failed to accommodate or analyse the vast forces of science, education or social change which (whether they like it or not) are changing the face of the country.'[81] *Encounter*'s debates on Europe and British decline emerged from earlier controversies about scientific education.

In 1959, Lasky serialised C. P. Snow's 'The Two Cultures' Rede lecture in *Encounter* which sketched a deleterious split between a traditional elite culture supposedly dominated by 'literary intellectuals' and the 'new men' educated in science and technology.[82] Although it initially received favourable responses in an *Encounter* roundtable organised by Lasky, over time the simplifications of Snow's thesis were

75 Anthony Hartley, 'Going into Britain', *Encounter*, 20.2 (February 1963), 74.
76 The instabilities of Hartley's position in *A State of England* are dissected by Stefan Collini in *Absent Minds: Intellectuals in Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 165–69.
77 Austen Albu, 'Taboo on Expertise', *Encounter*, 21.1 (July 1963), 45–50.
78 Henry Fairlie, 'Political Commentary', *The Spectator* (23 September 1955), 5.
79 Henry Fairlie, 'The BBC: Voice of the Establishment', *Encounter*, 13.2 (August 1959), 13.
80 Michael Young, 'The Rise of the Meritocracy', *Encounter*, 11.4 (October 1958), 3–8.
81 Anthony Sampson, *Anatomy of Britain* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1962), p. 638.
82 C. P. Snow, 'The Two Cultures', *Encounter*, 12.6 (June 1959), 17–24; 13.1 (July 1959), 22–27.

challenged.[83] In 1960, Snow contributed his 'Afterthoughts' on 'The Two Cultures' controversy to *Encounter* asserting that his 'call to action' had been designed to educate more scientists.[84] Debate about 'two cultures' prepared the ground in *Encounter* for calls in 'Going into Europe' and 'Suicide of a Nation?' for an urgent reform of the establishment and for meritocratic intellectuals to guide British policy makers. However, Fairlie pointed out in his regular political commentary in *Encounter* that Macmillan — 'one of the most intellectual politicians of his generation' — was indifferent to advice from intellectuals.[85] *Encounter* could not forge close relations with the socially aloof inner circle of Macmillan's Conservative Party representing a traditional British ruling class. By contrast, the magazine's social links with the progressive intellectuals who formulated the social-democratic policies championed by Gaitskell's Labour Party were remarkably good.

In 1955, the Spenders entertained Hugh Gaitskell at their home in St John's Wood.[86] Later that year, a Labour Party delegation led by Gaitskell, Crosland, and Jenkins attended the Congress for Cultural Freedom's 'Future of Freedom' conference in Milan. Gaitskell had recommended Crosland and Jenkins — 'easily our two brightest young people in the House [of Commons] on the economic side' — as valuable contacts for the Congress.[87] Denis Healey, Gaitskell's chief advisor on foreign affairs, joined the transatlantic community in Milan and in *Encounter*.[88] Gaitskell's 'Hampstead set' of social-democratic intellectuals were invited to *Encounter* parties organized by the magazine's office manager Margot Walmsley. In 1959, Spender had nominated Lasky for membership of the Garrick Club of which Gaitskell was a member. From 1960, Lasky was in regular contact with Gaitskell.[89] In his 'political memoir' in *Encounter*, following Gaitskell's unexpected death in January 1963, Jenkins remembered

> the immensely high priority which [Gaitskell] always gave to matters of personal relationship. He cared desperately about his friends, and the small change of social intercourse assumed an unusual importance in his life. […] He believed deeply in the Western Alliance and in friendship with the United States.[90]

After the 1964 election, nine contributors to *Encounter* were members of Harold Wilson's Labour government; six were members of the cabinet. Lasky also cultivated personal links with West German politicians and in 1965 he met Georges Berthoin, an EEC representative in London. If 'the Establishment' exercises power socially then *Encounter* was focused on influencing establishment figures rather than a broad cross-section of the British public.

83 Praise for Snow's thesis was offered by scientists Sir John Cockcroft and Sir Bernard Lovell, philosopher Bertrand Russel, and the artist Michael Ayrton. See *Encounter*, 13.2 (August 1959), 67–73. Next month, physical chemist Michael Polanyi, an important member of the CCF, claimed that 'scientific rationalism' was insufficient by itself and 'corrupted the public life'. *Encounter*, 13.3 (September 1959), 61–65.

84 C. P. Snow, 'The "Two Cultures" Controversy — Afterthoughts', *Encounter*, 14.2 (February 1960), 64.

85 Henry Fairlie, 'From Walpole to Macmillan', *Encounter*, 16.2 (February 1961), 59. It was reported in the *Daily Telegraph* (5 April 1961) that John F. Kennedy had asked a White House official for a copy of this article before his summit meeting with Macmillan.

86 Spender's diary (24 July 1955) noted: 'I find [Gaitskell] gay and amusing and friendly, and much easier to get on with than most politicians.' *New Selected Journals*, p. 189.

87 Hugh Gaitskell to Nicolas Nabokov, 5 July 1954. Gaitskell Papers, University College London.

88 See Denis Healey, 'The Bomb that Didn't Go off', *Encounter*, 5.1 (July 1955), 5–9.

89 In the early 1960s, Gaitskell attended *Encounter* editorial lunches. Lasky wasn't formally elected to the Garrick Club until 1964 (a not unusual waiting time). I am grateful to Dr Maren Roth for this information.

90 Roy Jenkins, 'Hugh Gaitskell', *Encounter*, 22.2 (February 1964), 3, 6.

One of the troubling aspects of *Encounter* is that a magazine secretly backed by the CIA sought to influence British policy. *Encounter* was not a commercial magazine and unlike the mass media it reached only a specialized audience. *Encounter* did not subvert debate in the open marketplace for ideas of a liberal democracy, although it did alter the political and cultural ecology of Britain. It was a prestige publication strategically aimed at intellectuals. The platform that it offered to Gaitskellites in their bitter struggles with the militant left-wing of the Labour Party, following a third consecutive election defeat in 1959, is significant. In 1960, Crosland inaugurated a series of *Encounter* articles on 'The Future of the Left' which were overwhelmingly in favour of Gaitskell's policies.[91] Lasky informed the Congress's Paris office that *Encounter* articles were raised in debates at the 1960 Labour Party conference at Scarborough and that 'Gaitskell has been very glad of our support and has written to me personally to express that gratitude'.[92] In 1961, Lasky published five articles by Crosland advancing his modernizing agenda. *Encounter* was an important forum in the post-election fightback by the Gaitskellites for control of Labour Party policy. In December 1964, a new *Encounter* 'Spectrum' symposium was more optimistic about Labour's 'New Britain' than contributors to 'Suicide of a Nation?' had been about moribund Britain after twelve years of Conservative government.[93]

Historians should make measured claims about a magazine that never spoke with one voice nor sought to evade the polemical cut and thrust of public intellectual debate. Gaitskell, after all, was a vehement opponent of 'Going into Europe' as propounded by *Encounter*. The private tensions affecting editorial disagreements between Spender and Lasky could scarcely be more illustrative of the 'love-hate relations' colouring both sides of this Atlantic alliance.[94] Hugh Wilford has argued that although Lasky's courting of the Gaitskellites was 'deliberate, persistent and highly effective' these politicians shared a 'basic ideological sympathy many British leftists felt for anti-communist US foreign policy goals, as well as a vaguer sense of Anglo-American intellectual community springing not only from a shared language but also a common philosophical heritage'. After public CIA revelations, contributors such as Healey and Jenkins 'felt very little sense of having been duped or betrayed'.[95] Rather than exposing the corruption of free-thinking intellectuals by the CIA, the complexities of the symposia 'Going into Europe' and 'Suicide of a Nation?' are a record of vigorous public debate in early 1960s Britain. According to Karl Miller, the literary editor of the *New Statesman* who had commissioned a very hostile review of the 1963 *Encounter* anthology: 'There can in a sense be no such thing as a secret magazine: *Encounter* said what it had to say, and you could find out what that was by reading it.'[96]

This article has argued that the contents of *Encounter* had a significant impact shaping British debates regarding closer political and economic co-operation with western Europe in the 1960s, through the contributions of the powerful 'Gaitskellites' within the Labour Party and prominent intellectuals with social links to the British Establishment. As editor, Melvin Lasky stage-managed *Encounter*'s support for a position

91 Crosland's 'The Future of the Left', *Encounter*, 14.3 (March 1960), 3–12 preceded *Encounter* essays appearing between April and October 1960 by Richard Crossman , Mark Abrams, Daniel Bell, Patrick Gordon Walker, Michael Foot, Mark Bonham Carter, and a closing rejoinder by Crosland between April and October 1960.

92 Melvin Lasky to John Hunt, 11 October 1960. CCF Papers, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago. Lasky sent Gaitskell proofs of Crosland's and Crossman's contributions to 'The Future of the Left' symposium.

93 See 'Spectrum', *Encounter*, 23.6 (December 1964), 3–19.

94 Spender attacked the 'The Spectre of Americanisation' in *Love-Hate Relations: A Study of Anglo-American Sensibilities* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1974), pp. 25–49.

95 Hugh Wilford, *The CIA, The British Left and the Cold War* (London: Frank Cass, 2003), pp. 283, 289.

96 Karl Miller, *Dark Horses: An Experience of Literary Journalism* (London: Faber and Faber, 2008), p. 146.

in accord with US State Department foreign policy during the Kennedy Administration. However, the disclosures in 1966–67 of *Encounter*'s undeclared connections to the American and British power elites badly damaged and limited its authority in the tribunal of British public opinion. It is not accurate to say that Lasky had orchestrated a conspiracy with the CIA to dupe the British public. *Encounter* aired dissenting viewpoints and entered fully into open public debate in a liberal democracy.

Jason Harding is Professor of English Studies at Durham University and author or editor of seven books including *The Criterion* (OUP, 2002) and *The New Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot* (CUP, 2017). He is completing a book on *Encounter* for Princeton University Press.

Bibliography

Barnhisel, Greg, *Cold War Modernists: Art, Literature, and American Cultural Diplomacy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015)

Booker, Christopher, and Richard North, *The Great Deception: Can the European Union Survive?* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016)

Coleman, Peter, *The Liberal Conspiracy: The Congress for Cultural Freedom and the Struggle for the Mind of Postwar Europe* (London: The Free Press, 1989)

Eliot, T. S., *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot: The Critical Edition*, edited by Ronald Schuchard, 8 vols (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014–19)

Encounter, 427 monthly issues (October 1953–September 1990)

Fairlie, Henry, 'Political Commentary', *The Spectator* (23 September 1955), 5

Harding, Jason, '"Our Greatest Asset": Encounter Magazine and the Congress for Cultural Freedom', in *Campaigning Culture and the Global Cold War*, ed. by Giles Scott-Smith and Charlotte Lerg (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 107–25

Hochgeschwender, Michael, 'A Battle of Ideas: The Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF) in Britain, Italy, France and West Germany', in *The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–58*, ed. by Dominik Geppert (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 319–38

Judt, Tony, *Reappraisals: Reflections on the Forgotten Twentieth Century* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2008)

—, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (London: Vintage Books, 2010)

Kermode, Frank, *Not Entitled: A Memoir* (London: Penguin, 1995)

Koestler, Arthur, *The Trail of the Dinosaur and Other Essays* (London: Collins, 1955)

Lasky, Melvin, to William F. Buckley Jr., *Firing Line*, US TV broadcast, 27 February 1968

Miller, Karl, *Dark Horses: An Experience of Literary Journalism* (London: Faber and Faber, 2008)

Orwell, George, *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1962)

Sampson, Anthony, *Anatomy of Britain* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1962)

Saunders, Frances Stonor, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London, Granta, 1999)

Scammell, Michael, *Koestler: The Indispensable Intellectual* (London: Faber and Faber, 2009)

Shanks, Michael, *The Stagnant Society: A Warning* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Special, 1961)
Spender, Stephen, *Love-Hate Relations: A Study of Anglo-American Sensibilities* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1974)
—, *New Selected Journals, 1939–1995*, ed. by Lara Feigel and John Sutherland with Natasha Spender (London: Faber and Faber, 2012)
Spender, Stephen, Irving Kristol, and Melvin J. Lasky, *Encounters: An Anthology from the First Ten Years of* Encounter *Magazine* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963)
Wilford, Hugh, *The CIA, The British Left and the Cold War* (London: Frank Cass, 2003)

Archives

CCF Papers, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, United States
Denis de Rougemont Foundation for Europe, Neuchâtel Public and University Library, Switzerland
Encounter Papers, Howard Gotlieb Archive Center, Boston University, United States
Faber and Faber Archive, London, United Kingdom
Gaitskell Papers, University College London, United Kingdom
Josselson Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin, United States
Lasky Center for Transatlantic Studies, University of Munich, Germany
Spender Papers, Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, United Kingdom