A Commitment To Campaign: a sociological study of C.N.D.

John Mattausch

Ph.D.
University of Edinburgh
1986
Declaration

This thesis has been composed by myself and the research on which it is based was my own work.
Acknowledgements

This study would have been impossible without the kind cooperation I received from the members of New Town and Scots City CNDs. My supervisors, Dr. Donald Mackenzie and Mr. Frank Bechhofer, have both given me generous and valuable advice and encouragement for which I am most grateful: in particular, I would like to thank them for their prompt and constructive help in the final stages of writing this thesis. I am indebted to all my friends and colleagues at Edinburgh University and to my sister, Edith Mattausch for her unstinting help in proof-reading the thesis. The love and support of my parents has been invaluable, as has the love and patience shown by Dipti Pandya.

Dedication

For the memory of C.
In this sociological study of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, I seek to explain how social factors influence the form which disarmament protesting takes and how they also determine the Campaign's socially unrepresentative basis of support. Following the philosophical recommendations of the 'later' Wittgenstein, I approach the Campaign as a composite of only partially compatible practices and ideologies which share a 'family resemblance' rather than an essential, uniform similarity. The original research component of the study is comprised of a series of tape-recorded, semi-structured interviews with both activists and lay members randomly selected from two CND groups in two contrasting towns: one in Scotland and one in the South of England. In the analyses of these interviews, I show that the respondents' commitment to campaign has been engendered within, and is only fully intelligible by examining, specific social contexts. I argue that one particular component of the Campaign, the contribution of welfare state employees, is especially important and pronounced and I show that the education, training and occupational location of such Campaigners is the heuristical key for understanding and analysing their distinctive style of protesting and for explaining their preponderance in the Campaign's social basis of support. I argue that rather than their social class, it is these respondents' relation to the state which accounts for their attraction to CND.
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Chapter 1

Middle Class Radicals?

Introduction
In late 1979 to early 1980, the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was reborn as a mass social movement.(1) Although CND is one of the largest mass movements in recent British history, the support which it enjoys is still only drawn from a minority of the population. Moreover, the social base of support for the present Campaign is not drawn equally from all walks of life and the available evidence strongly suggests that this was also true for the original Movement.

In this thesis, I discuss and analyse interviews which I conducted with randomly selected samples of Campaigners, both activists and lay members, drawn from two CND groups located in markedly different towns. My intention is to show how social factors play a part in the interviewees' decisions to join the Campaign and in the expression of their protest against nuclear weapons. I try to shed some light upon the following questions: first, why is it that CND appears to be peculiarly attractive to a particular minority of the British population?; second, why is opposition to nuclear weapons expressed in a particular way?; third, what relationship does CND have to other facets of British society?

In addition, I try to convey to the reader a sense of how the CND members whom I interviewed 'saw the social world and their place within it' (Parkin). CND, like any other social movement, is
largely the product of the members' actions and orientations; if CNDers were to stop campaigning the Movement would, once again, become history. Therefore, a sociological study of the Campaign must be grounded in the social world of its constituency.

In this first chapter, prior to beginning my analysis, I critically discuss the work of two of the major writers on CND: Frank Parkin and Richard Taylor. I have concentrated upon these particular works because they are important contributions to our understanding of peace movements and because, unlike most other academic studies of CND, these writers drew upon original research data; data which I wish to use for comparative purposes in this thesis. (Other writings on the Campaign are considered in the final chapter of this study.) This critical discussion is a necessary prelude to my own analysis for it permits me to identify the strengths and insights of these authors whilst at the same time uncovering potential theoretical pitfalls which can thus be avoided.

Frank Parkin's 'Middle Class Radicals'

Any social analyst interested in CND must begin with an appreciation of Frank Parkin's classic study of the original Movement. Published in 1968, Parkin's Middle Class Radicalism\(^2\) has become widely known and has the distinction of being the only major study wherein the research was contemporaneous with the first Campaign: the title has entered into the sociologists' lexicon. The research data and the many useful insights contained within the study constitute a valuable resource for analysts of
the revived nuclear disarmament movement; however, as with any study, Parkin's book is the product of a particular intellectual milieu and subsequent advances within sociology and social science in general call into question the theoretical and methodological approach which underpins Parkin's study. In this discussion of Parkin's work, I show that his theoretical assumptions and perspectives give rise to an analysis which neglects the creative character of the Movement in favour of a misconstrued conception of CND and CNDers.

Parkin's study drew upon an analysis of 445 mail questionnaires completed by youth supporters contacted at the 1965 annual Easter CND March, 358 mail questionnaires completed by adult supporters from CND branches throughout the country, and interviews with branch secretaries and local supporters drawn mainly from London, Yorkshire and North-West regions. In the Introductory Preface, the book is presented as 'a study of the social bases of support for a political mass movement.' Parkin is not concerned with the Campaign's 'general aims and strategies', nor does he intend to give 'an historical narrative'; instead, 'the political movement which resulted is examined here for the light it throws on certain problems of current interest in the sociology of politics'.(p1) Moreover, '... it is not CND itself which is of primary interest so much as the theoretical issues it helps to illuminate. For certain of these issues, but not all, some other movement might have served my purposes equally well.'(p1)

The main theoretical issues in the sociology of politics which
parkin hoped to illuminate in his study are as follows. First, noting the studies already done on working class conservatives, Parkin wished to redress the imbalance of research by considering the 'analogous case of that small minority of the middle class which endorses left wing political and social views'.(p2) Second, he intended to give 'a consideration of CND supporters' perception of the social structure and their place within it'.(p3) Third, Parkin believed that 'CND also provides a useful test case for current propositions in political sociology concerning the sources of recruitment to mass movements', and allied with this, the 'relationship between alienation and recruitment to mass politics will be considered in some detail ...'.(p4) Fourth, 'CND also provides a useful laboratory for investigating one other set of problems of interest to the political sociologist - namely the involvement of youth in radical politics'.(p5)

The foregoing are, then, the main issues and themes with which the author is engaged and, in summary, Parkin presents us with the following portrayal of CND and CND members. In his study, CND is characterised as an exemplar of an 'expressive' mass political movement from which the Campaigners accrue emotional and psychological rewards. The social basis of support for the Movement derives from the highly educated stratum of the middle class and parkin argues that the members' class location and experiences of higher education have caused them to reject 'certain dominant' societal values; in this sense, they are held to be alienated and likely to engage in a 'deviance syndrome''
wherein they have a 'propensity to endorse minority or deviant standpoints.' Their choice of employment reflects their already formed political stance in that they opt for those areas of work, the 'welfare and creative' fields, in which they are least likely to have to compromise their radical ideals. Religious and political members of the Campaign are said to be motivated more by a wish to further their religious/political goals than by any 'rational' assessment of nuclear disarmament. The youth supporters of CND are portrayed as incipient middle class radicals, influenced by their parents' opinions and attracted to the Campaign by its anti-authoritarian appeal.

Parkin's portrayal of CND and its social basis of support is obtained from several interrelated analytical arguments. A distinction is drawn between two 'polar opposite' types of politics, 'instrumental' and 'expressive', each having a distinctive character and social basis of support. In addition, he distinguishes between two concomitant sorts of rewards accruing to the political activists:

'Instrumental activity may be thought of as that which is directly geared to the attainment of concrete and specific goals, generally of a material kind.'

'Expressive activity, by contrast, is that which is less concerned with specific achievements than on the benefits and satisfactions which the activity itself affords.' (p34)

Furthermore:

'Instrumental activity is that primarily concerned with the attainment of power to bring about desired ends, even if this means some compromise of principles. Expressive politics is that which is mainly concerned with the defence of principles, even if this means relinquishing power.' (p34)

Parkin claims that social movements with a working class base of
support 'have been primarily instrumental in character' and cites 'the Chartists, the IWW, the Communists, Labour and Trade Union movements' as 'examples which obviously spring to mind.' (p40) In contrast:

'... radical movements with a middle class base tend to be far less oriented to the achievement of economic or material rewards for their supporters. They are instead more typically concerned with issues of a moral or humanitarian nature - as for example, Anti-Apartheid, the campaign against capital punishment, white support for Negroes' civil rights in the United States, CND and so on. These goals are intrinsically different from those pursued by working class movements in that they offer no particular benefits to those who support them - such benefits are felt to accrue to others (e.g. Negroes, political prisoners) or to society as a whole, rather than to themselves specifically. The main pay-off for such activity is in expressing personal values in action.' (p41)

Members of CND are held to be engaging in expressive politics and CND is presented as an exemplar of an expressive mass political movement. This characterisation of the Campaign is supported by the respondents' answers to questions relating to 'economic' and 'moral' aims. Parkin shows that those of his adult sample drawn from the upper and middle classes are enthusiastic about 'moral' goals whilst those falling into the 'lower' social classes favour 'material' ends. In addition, the adult sample's objections to the Bomb showed a similar class bias in that the middle class respondents seemed more inclined to oppose the Bomb on moral grounds than did their working class counterparts.

The question of recruitment to CND is considered in terms of theories of alienation. Parkin delineates three definitions of alienation: alienation as social isolation, as powerlessness, and as alienation from dominant social values. With regard to the
first definition, and drawing upon his empirical research, Parkin argues that the CNDers in his sample were well integrated into the community and that, as they were overwhelmingly middle class, they were 'axiomatically' 'more closely integrated into society and its major values and institutions than are lower status groups ... .'(p17) Similarly, the second definition of alienation as powerlessness is also found to be inappropriate as an analytical tool in the explanation of recruitment to CND because the respondents' answers to questions regarding the possibility of altering government policies, and the character of human nature, exhibited optimism with respect to the potential for affecting change and influencing the 'course of events'.(p21)

Whereas the first two definitions of alienation fail to distinguish CND supporters from the population at large, the third definition, alienation from dominant social values, is claimed to be fruitful. Parkin argues that whereas alienation in the first two senses may be understood as 'measures of social and psychological integration, this final one may be thought of as a measure of normative integration.'(p26) The adult respondents' degree of normative integration was 'measured by their attitudes to three key social-value indices, attitude to the monarchy, to nationalisation and religious affiliation', and Parkin presents the findings as indeed exhibiting alienation from 'certain central values of British society'.(p27) This degree of alienation, it is argued, is especially significant when it is remembered that the respondents are drawn mainly from the
'axiomatically' better integrated middle class stratum.

Not only are the Movement's supporters alienated from certain dominant social values, in addition, they have a predilection for supporting 'minority or deviant standpoints ....'(p29) These characteristics are presented as 'an important factor in helping to account for involvement in CND'(p29):

'Attraction to CND appears to have depended not simply on individuals accepting the case against the Bomb and for the Campaign, but rather on their having the kind of prior value orientation which made this case psychologically appealing.' (p30, emphases added)

Furthermore:

'*... men's (3) relationship to the normative order provides a far surer guide to their support for, or opposition to, CND than any 'rational' considerations of defence or deterrence.' (p32, emphasis added)

In his discussion of the membership and recruitment of religious and political CNDers, Parkin prioritises ulterior motives as the major spurs for their participation in the Campaign. Instead of drawing upon his questionnaire data, Parkin turns to contemporary newspaper material, trade union records, works of political theory, the writings of Christian spokesmen etc. to support his argument that:

'*... the involvement of Christians in CND could in large part be understood as stemming from their radical interpretation of the scope of religious witness ... Support for the Campaign was not seen simply in terms of achieving unilateralist goals but also as having the more important function of revitalising the Christian community' (pp 108-109, emphasis added)

and that:

'*... the struggle on the part of the Labour left, as with that of the other groups involved in the campaign, represented a form of symbolic politics in that it was concerned less with achieving its declared aims than with playing out a quite unrelated
political drama for which the unilateralist movement provided a convenient national stage.' (p139, emphasis added)(4)

In the last chapter of his study, Parkin notes that CND supporters are drawn not simply from the middle class, but from the educated ranks of this social stratum. Parkin argues that this section of the middle class derive their 'social position and life chances' from 'intellectual attainments and professional qualifications, and not from the ownership of property or inherited wealth.' (p179) He also suggests that, freed from the ideological constraints of property ownership, and enjoying a relative measure of social and financial security, this portion of the middle class are 'freer in their choice of political allegiance' (p179); that is, they are not bound to support the Conservative party which is traditionally associated with the safeguarding of property rights. Furthermore, Parkin argues that 'exposure to certain forms of advanced education has the effect of undermining' the middle class CNDers' acceptance of 'certain values which occupied a dominant position in the normative order.

The study concludes with a discussion of the 'occupational location of middle class radicals.' Drawing upon his questionnaire data (see Appendix C), Parkin notes the clustering of CND members in 'welfare and creative' occupations rather than in commercial or manual fields of employment. For Parkin:

'... the connection between these particular occupations and political radicalism is to be explained not in terms of the strains created by status inconsistency, nor as a result of individuals adopting the humanistic values generated within these professions, but rather as a result of the tendency for individuals who are already radical to enter these employment
fields than others' (p185)

and:

'... it could be said that the welfare and creative professions provide acceptable sanctuaries to those who wish to avoid direct involvement in capitalist enterprises by affording outlets for the exercise of their talents which entail no compromise of political ideals.' (p192)

Problems in Parkin's analysis

The primary strength of Parkin's study is his recognition of the need to examine the social bases of support for the Campaign - the recognition that social factors shape the character of CND and can be seen to play a part in the recruitment of individuals to the Movement. Furthermore, Parkin draws attention to the socially specific constituency from which the Campaign draws its support and hints at an important distinction between different class forms of politics. However, Middle Class Radicalism is the product of a particular intellectual milieu: in the eighteen years since the book was published the discipline of sociology, and social sciences in general, have witnessed important and profound theoretical developments which call into question the viability of Parkin's theoretical paradigm. Parkin's characterisation of CND and CND members stems directly from the thrust of this theoretical paradigm.

Since the publication of Parkin's study, the contributions of ethnomethodologists, conversation analysts, and the insights of philosophers of language (particularly the writings of the 'later' Wittgenstein), have encouraged sociologists to treat social phenomena as the products of social praxes. The
recognition of the generative importance of context, has pervaded sociological analysis with the result that many modern theorists, especially ethnomethodologists and conversation analysts, (5) stress the interplay between context and agency. Crudely expressed, social phenomena such as CND are nowadays seen by many sociologists as expressions of continuous accomplishment. This paradigmatic shift means that today's social theorist can operate with a set of conceptions and assumptions which are in marked contrast to the relatively simple approach favoured in the earlier stages of the discipline's history.

Parkin's approach to CND is reflected in his choice of methodology and language (for example, CND would be 'a useful test case', 'a useful laboratory'). His analysis attempted to employ CND as a test case for certain, then current, propositions and arguments in political sociology and the parameters of these theories and the 'social scientist' stance he adopted inform his whole analysis; they are the limits of his work. In the following discussion, I identify the main consequences of this theoretical paradigm and argue that there are major weaknesses in Parkin's analysis and characterisation of CND and CNDers. The identification of these weaknesses is the necessary prelude to building constructively upon the strengths and insights of Parkin's work.

At the outset, Parkin a priori classified CND as a mass political movement, and chose not to discuss the Campaign's 'general aims and strategies' (p1); an exclusion which is of course related to
his intellectual concerns - CND served Parkin as an example with which to explore theoretical issues in political sociology. But, there are two severe drawbacks to this strategy: first, de-emphasising CND's aims and strategies, treating it as one of several 'similar' movements, may lead to an analytical undervaluing of features of the Campaign which are unique; second, it virtually forces upon Parkin a methodological decision (albeit one he might in any case have wished to take), in that he cannot permit the members' own motives to be accorded the status of causes for their actions and must abandon the conscious expectations and desires which would have to be bound up in their aims and which would have to be included in such causal explanations.\(^6\) Abandoning 'aims' in this fashion also involves jettisoning 'beliefs', a serious step in the distancing of the CNDers' experiences from Parkin's analytic construct.

This a priori classification of CND, and the ignoring of the members' aims, leads Parkin, in the words of Day and Robbins, to show a 'consistent unwillingness to take CNDers' motivations on their own terms.'\(^7\) Instead, he assumed that his analysis would reveal the respondents' more profound motives. For example, when considering the question of recruitment to the Campaign, Parkin couched his explanation solely in terms of theories of alienation and completely ignored the members' own reasons in respect to a 'rational' consideration of the merits of nuclear disarmament. Having plumped for explanation in terms of alienation, Parkin then proceeded to adduce evidence to show that his respondents were indeed suffering from this
psychological state. However, the answers which the author obtained from his adult sample actually only reveal whether they agreed with certain statements relating to the monarchy, to nationalisation and to their religious beliefs. There is nothing in these answers which, as they stand, tell us why they agreed/disagreed, or why they considered themselves religious. Rather, these responses are interpreted within the framework of the explanatory paradigm of alienation as evidence for a cause of recruitment to the Movement; that is, the meaning of the responses is derived not from anything intrinsic to the answers themselves but from the implications of Parkin's chosen theoretical paradigm.

It was initially assumed that the concept of alienation would allow us to explain recruitment to CND and evidence of such alienation was then sought; is it reasonable to interpret the respondents' answers in this manner? The responses are taken as evidence of a state of mind which the respondents make no claim to possess and which is presented as affecting all the members in a similar fashion. Could not 'alienation' be experienced in different ways by different people? And what is the formal relation between disagreeing with a statement and being alienated from a value? It was asked of the respondents whether 'the monarchy is an institution we should be justly proud of?': cannot one, for example, still value the institution of the monarchy and yet not feel justly proud of it? How many ways are there to feel 'justly proud'? And why, even allowing that the respondents were
alienated, do they opt to join a mass movement and CND in particular?

In Parkin's analysis, CNDers are consistently portrayed as sharing common, uniform characteristics; such an analytical understanding results from the essentialist theory of categorisation which underpins Parkin's paradigm. Thus, in the foregoing example, it will be seen that Parkin is trying to discover a common attribute which all CNDers share. This adherence to an essentialist perspective(8) squares well with Parkin's 'scientific' stance; all the hallmarks of the classic explanation are in evidence - the search for causal factors, the refusal to be content with appearances and the identification of formative essences which the members are supposed to share. The possibility that the members may have had differing, only partially complementary motives and perspectives cannot surface in this theoretical paradigm. Similarly, Parkin does not consider the possibility that CND may have been a composite of partially complementary ideologies and praxes existing in a state of harmony and tension, overlapping rather than separate and distinct.

Parkin's social scientist approach, coupled with his essentialist position and unwillingness to take the respondents' accounts of their behaviour seriously has, I feel, the effect of depriving the reader of a sense of the rich creative nature of social enterprise. In particular, we are not given any theoretical space in which to locate an understanding of ethical social praxes. According to Parkin, such praxes are to be accounted for by
'alienation' and the 'deviance syndrome' (which also override any 'rational' consideration of nuclear defence policy): the members' consciousness is subsumed to the requirements of Parkin's causal explanation.

It will be remembered that middle class radicalism was characterised as an example of 'expressive' politics from which the Campaigners derived emotional/psychological rewards. This political classification is used to account for the moral nature of middle class radicalism. The fact that many CNDers saw their actions as a moral response to a moral problem is accepted by Parkin and used in the distinction between instrumental/expressive politics. However, his a priori classification of CND as a political movement, and his unwillingness to take the CNDers' accounts of their reasons seriously, means that moral aims and desires cannot be accorded the status of sufficient motives for campaigning.

Parkin's use of the term 'moral' is somewhat analytically misleading. It is not at all clear that those political aims which Parkin locates within his instrumental category are primarily non-moral; for example, surely it is reasonable to think that the Chartists (cited by Parkin as an instance of a working class instrumental movement, p40) were, at times, primarily orientated to ethical aims such as justice: material goals may be a means for securing moral ends such as a fair wage. Although Parkin admits that the instrumental non-moral/expressive moral dichotomy is rarely found in a pure form in the real world,
he nevertheless employs this pure distinction in his own analysis, inferential conclusions and characterisation of the Campaign.

For Parkin, the term 'moral', a distinguishing feature of expressive politics, is seemingly unproblematic and applicable to a large number of activities; the only attempt at definitional refinement is by negative comparison (that is, it is not applicable to those forms of political activity which are addressed to bread-and-butter issues). But Parkin, locked in his theoretical paradigm, forgets that issues are not automatically moral or otherwise. If the first wave of CND activity took on a moral character it was because the CND supporters made it moral; CND was created, and the moral nature of the Campaign was not axiomatic, there is nothing about disarmament or the Bomb which forces them to be moral issues; issues are made by people. Nor were the sort of morals that came to concern CND supporters exactly the same as those which pertain in other social movements. It may seem that instances of moral campaigns all possess a common essence which legitimises the use of the word 'moral' when speaking of them; this view is, however, fundamentally mistaken and is spawned by a misunderstanding of the ways in which linguistic categorisation is accomplished (this point is taken up and developed in later chapters throughout this study).

When Parkin employs the word 'moral' in his analysis he makes it appear as though all moral ventures can be happily grouped together and simply contrasted with non-moral enterprises
 One important consequence of this procedure is that it robs us of any understanding of the unique nature of CND ethics. Parkin could not, therefore, relate this definitional aspect of the Campaign to any other facet of British society and is, thus, unable to develop an adequate sociology of CND. I believe this to be a most serious weakness of Parkin's study, a deficiency which I hope to repair in this thesis.

Significantly, Parkin chose to discuss the importance of the class and occupational locations of his (male) adult sample in the final chapter of his study. Parkin argues that CNDers initially enter into the job market equipped with a political orientation which is out of accord with the ethos of commercial capitalist employment. Consequently, they opt for work in the 'welfare and creative' fields wherein they experience the minimum of conflict between their radicalism and their work: 'the welfare professions provide the kind of milieux most amenable to their political orientations.' Thus, they are held to be already radicalised before entering into their chosen professions and their political outlook is 'to be explained not as a result of individuals adopting the humanistic values generated within the professions ....'(p185, and see above text).

There are three main imbricated flaws in this argument. First, it presupposes a sharp distinction between higher academic education and the respondents' world of work: for many of these welfare professions a further qualification (for example, a State Registered Nursing Certificate) is often necessary and in-work
training is usual. Parkin does not consider the possibility of his respondents' views developing in the course of their experiences at work (even though 11% of the sample had been to teacher training college – the only category of professional training which is specified in the questionnaire). For Parkin, these respondents already possess a radical political orientation which, presumably, does not alter for the rest of their lives: this supposition is not explored or justified by his research. Second, in accord with his essentialist and 'social scientist' outlook, Parkin presumes that all of his respondents will share a single common, reason for entering their chosen fields of employment. In reality, there are a variety of reasons why people can be found in particular jobs and their reasons share similarities and differences. The evidence which would support Parkin's presumption could only be found by taking the respondents' accounts of their motives seriously; this, of course, is outside the scope of Parkin's analysis. Third, because Parkin does not analytically engage with the members' own perceptions of their world, there can be no attempt to relate their occupations with their radical views; these views must, therefore, remain divorced from the social context in which they were expressed and the distinctive occupational location of CNDers must be explained in terms of an already existing common proclivity.

This prior orientation is, seemingly, to be accounted for by the middle class CNDers' class position and educational experiences. Parkin argues that, freed from the ideological constraints of
deriving their status and life chances from property ownership, and imbued with a disrespect for certain dominant social values by their education, the middle class CNDer is 'freer' in his or her choice of political allegiance and will favour 'minority or deviant' issues. This is a problematic argument which could only be supported by a consideration of the members' educational biographies. If the highly educated CND member is 'freer' in his or her choice of political allegiance, why do they favour left wing politics; presumably, they are just as free to support right wing organisations? And, why do they opt to join CND? Clearly, this argument, which rests upon the unproven classification of CND as a political campaign, is the product of Parkin's theoretical paradigm.

Although Parkin has identified an important correlation between occupation, education and membership of CND, he lacks the analytical tools with which to convert this correlation into either a causal statement or a useful heuristic. The development of this heuristic requires an appreciation of the formative relationship existing between context and meaning; this appreciation is absent from Parkin's analysis.

**Middle Class Radicals?**

In conclusion, I have argued that Parkin's analysis and characterisation of CND and CND members, in common with any other study, can be read as a reflection of theoretical perspectives which, although respectable at the time when the book was written, are now superseded by subsequent developments within the discipline of sociology. Parkin's general theoretical stance and
essentialist perspective served to produce a picture of the Campaign which must now be seen as inadequate. His analysis divorces meaning from context and does not shed any light upon the unique social creativity which constituted the first Movement. The main arguments and inferences in the study - that CND members are alienated, caught within a deviance syndrome and are already radical prior to entering their occupations, and that CND is a political movement captured by the concept of expressive politics - lack credible theoretical foundation. Parkin's interpretation of his empirical findings is only viable in terms of his theoretical paradigm, there is nothing intrinsic in his data which would support his analytical findings.

Parkin's theoretical perspective is outdated and inappropriate for a study of CND. This paradigm led him to devalue and subsume the members' own motives and perspectives and excluded an appreciation of the ethical protest which was a distinctive feature of the first Campaign. In his study, CND appears as an autonomous entity analytically divorced from the praxes of its supporters; in turn, the views and opinions of the members are divorced from the context of their expression. In order to gain an heuristical purchase upon the creative enterprise of CND a radically different approach is called for, a paradigm whose conceptual foundations do not rest upon an essentialist theory of categorisation and one which relates the members' accounts of their campaigning to their social contexts.
A Failed Movement?

In the Preface to their retrospective study of CND activists, The Protest Makers, Taylor and Pritchard state that:

'... this study is not intended as a history of the British nuclear disarmament movement. Our aim is two-fold: to explore the political and ideological dimensions of the Movement and the problems which its experience has posed for achieving radical change in modern Britain, and to analyse the current attitudes and activities of Movement supporters some 20 years later. On the basis of a questionnaire completed by over 400 'core activists', and in-depth interviews with leading figures in the Movement, we try to analyse and discuss these themes and draw some conclusions about the nature, purpose and significance of the Movement. The focus is thus political and sociological rather than historical.' (pVII, Preface)

Although this focus may appear somewhat similar to Parkin's, the actual flavour of the two books is markedly different for the following reasons. First, Taylor and Pritchard's research was mainly carried out in 1977 to 1978 and, consequently, their analysis is a retrospective study of an historical phenomenon; equally importantly, their research was conducted before the recent resurgence of CND activity. Second, despite the disclaimer in the Preface, the authors are concerned to locate the original Campaign within its specific historical context and are very knowledgeable about the development of CND and its various ideologies. Third, this book is not an isolated study but is, at least in part, an extension of research carried out by Richard Taylor for his impressive Ph.D. thesis (revealingly entitled 'The British Disarmament Movement of 1958/65 and its legacy to the Left' (11)). Fourth, the authors have a clear allegiance to both socialist politics and the disarmament cause.
Before beginning my discussion of the book, two general observations need to be made. First, this is a well presented and informative study which includes much interesting and useful historical information concerning the Movement and the Movement's leadership. Second, the authors are clearly well acquainted with their material and are aware of the historical origins of the Campaign. These are virtues which are not affected by the theoretical value of their analysis.

Taylor and Pritchard’s study is essentially an analysis of what the authors took to be a failed social movement and much of their work is concerned to show that, because of the internal conflicting ideological components contained within the Movement, CND was unable to develop an adequate political strategy with which to secure disarmament objectives. It is the authors' contention that none of the various ideological factions within the Campaign was able to formulate a strategy which could effect the necessary political changes. Neither the advocates of Direct Action, nor the New Left (as it was then), nor the Labour Party supporters within the Movement were able to overcome the inherently middle class nature and moralistic character of the Campaign, in order to build a Movement involving working class support which appreciated the need for economic realities to be incorporated within disarmament strategies. CND failed because it could not find a viable socialist articulation:

'The great moral and emotive spasm which gave rise to the Movement in 1958 did not find adequate political expression.' (p131)
This portrayal of CND as a failed social movement is rather less credible in the light of the dramatic resurgence of both interest and activity since late 1979. However, it should be remembered that Taylor and Pritchard carried out the bulk of their research in 1977 to 1978 and therefore felt able to state that:

'With the election of the first Wilson Government in 1964 CND rapidly disappeared from the public scene: the Aldermaston March, and other mass rallies, continued to be organised throughout the late 1960s - and CND became one of the constituent organisations of the Anti-Vietnam War Movement - but its days as a mass movement had ended by 1964/5.' (p137)

Nevertheless, such unfortunate statements are not solely the consequence of ill luck; in part, they are a logical product of the authors' theoretical and political perspectives.

Taylor and Pritchard argue that the impetus for the rise of CND came not only from a greater appreciation of the nuclear threat, but also because in the late Fifties certain political and social events had left a gap within British political life. The failure of the Labour Party to radically restructure Britain in a socialist mould, the 1956 Hungarian uprising and the Suez fiasco had produced 'an increased scepticism and mistrust of the old ideologies and the old institutions' combined with 'a heightened political atmosphere.'(p3) Thus, historically specific events engendered a distrust of existing politics and an increased political consciousness. In addition, the authors also cite two other related historical factors which may be seen as contributory: 'the growth of a new and unique youth culture', and the publication of the Sandys White Paper on British 'defence' policy (which 'affirmed vigorously the need for an independent British nuclear deterrent' whilst publicly recognising the
inability of the government to defend the British population from nuclear attack). (p5) So:

'By 1956 the time was indeed ripe for a 'new kind of politics' to rekindle the idealism and commitment of the radical strata in British society.' (p2)

These events of the late Fifties created a political vacuum, 'a vacuum which CND was shortly to fill.'(p5) Taylor and Pritchard go on to cite four episodes which occurred in the autumn of 1957 and which acted as catalysts to the formation of the Campaign: first, the launching of the Russian Sputnik; second, Professor G.F. Kennan's Reith Lectures in which he argued against the 'hard-line Cold-War orientation of Dulles' American policy'; third, Aneurin Bevan's denouncement of unilateralist policy at the 1957 Labour Party Annual Conference; fourth, J.B. Priestley's moral 'call to arms' in the New Statesman(12) which led to the famous meeting of concerned intellectuals at Canon Collin's home on the sixteenth of January 1958 and the subsequent, surprisingly successful, inaugural meeting of CND at Central Hall on the seventeenth of February 1958.

Taylor and Pritchard's theoretical perspective on the rise of CND can be characterised as a 'how-possibly' rather than a 'why-necessarily'(13) explanation in that all that is attempted by the authors is an identification of the historical factors which permitted the Campaign to develop. And, it should be noted that whilst the radicalism of some sections of the middle class is taken for granted, the motives of the members are not impugned
within this paradigm. However, in order to account for what they see as the failure of the Movement, Taylor and Pritchard are obliged to introduce a teleological element into their analysis. It is instructive to learn that 'some respondents strongly disagreed with [the] statement' 'I believe that the disarmament movement failed in its major objectives between 1958 and 1965 because ...' (which formed question 19 of the questionnaire). Indeed, some respondents objected so strongly to this question that they refused to complete the questionnaire. It is only within the authors' work that the achievements of CND assume such importance; if you are a 'protestmaker' you may be as interested in the quality of making a protest as in the effects of such protest. If one protests well, but without effect, this does not make one's protest a failure. By orientating themselves to the achievements of the Campaign, Taylor and Pritchard, in common with Parkin, have distanced the reader from the creative world of CND.

Although Taylor and Pritchard recognise that for the majority of the protestors CND was a moral issue, and although they recognise that the Movement had an undeniably moral character, they are not prepared to treat it as a moral phenomenon. The authors seem to suggest that whereas ethics may be an acceptable stimuli for social movements, they will inevitably prove to be an insufficient basis for actual achievements; nuclear disarmament is only obtainable by the recasting of CND in a New Left mould. Regardless of the validity of this belief, it is clear that this
analytical premise will not yield any understanding of the distinctive moral creative praxis which is being studied. CND, for the majority of the members, was not a political movement (this is repeatedly acknowledged by Taylor and Pritchard). An act of moral protest can be complete in itself and predicking one's analysis upon the effects of such protest will not further our understanding of the form which disarmament campaigning took in the first wave of CND activity.

For Taylor and Pritchard, the moral character of the original CND is to be explained by an appreciation of the intrinsic character of the nuclear threat ("a qualitative moral change as a result of this massive quantitative increase in destructive potential" p53), by a desire to realise 'Britain's potential as a world leader through moral example' (p55), and by the Campaign leaders' reluctance to sully their aims in political waters. However, accepting these arguments, an explanatory lacuna becomes evident for it is still unclear why it was that the moral form of the Campaign should have proved so attractive to a particular minority of the population, that minority who were to become CNDers and whose social praxes were to create the Campaign. In Taylor and Pritchard's analysis, this attraction would have to be explained by reference to the 'political vacuum' which had been formed in the mid-Fifties - once again, in the authors' theoretical paradigm, there can be no analytical purchase upon the Campaigners' ethical form of protest. In this thesis, I show that this attraction can be accounted for by the members' social location and that, rather than presuming a prior radicalism, this
social location can be seen as the generative context of their commitment to campaign.

Conclusion
The studies of Parkin, and Taylor and Pritchard constitute valuable resources for analysts of the peace movement and radical British politics in general. Both works contain useful insights and the authors draw attention to the socially specific basis of support for the Campaign and the ethical manner in which disarmament was expressed. However, these analyses are couched within the parameters of political sociology, employing questionable theoretical suppositions and perspectives. In particular, these analyses tend to take the radicalism of the middle class members of CND as a given fact or a prior predilection. Their work obscures the creative nature of the Campaign's social praxis, and does not further our understanding of the particular moral form which disarmament campaigning took. Consequently, these authors cannot adequately relate their conception of the Campaign to other aspects of British society; a sociology of CND has not been fully developed and questions surrounding the recruitment of individuals to the Campaign remain unanswered.

In this thesis, in contrast to the positivistic perspective of Parkin, I will be considering and analysing CND as a 'form of social life'. I seek to illuminate the creative nature of the Campaign and the ways in which the biographical experiences of the members, whom I interviewed, rendered them peculiarly
susceptible to joining the Campaign and expressing their concern over nuclear weapons in a particular form. In this way, the relationship between the social context of the members and the expression of their protest will be clarified without recourse to a priori judgements regarding the character and origins of their views and political orientations. Furthermore, I show that the Campaign's social base of support has a significance which was not fully realised in either Parkin's or Taylor and Pritchard's studies.
Chapter 1: Notes and References

1) CND did not become a national membership campaign until January 1967 and thus all estimates of the numbers of members before this date are only estimates. In addition, a large number of supporters are not formal members of National CND and it is easy to underestimate the measure of support which the Campaign enjoys (a point often made by CND spokespersons). Nevertheless, the following figures illustrate the dramatic revival from 1979/1980 onwards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31/3/67</td>
<td>National Executive Minutes</td>
<td>1,500 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of 1968</td>
<td>'Report on Membership'</td>
<td>3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/8/69</td>
<td>Acting Treasurer's Report</td>
<td>2,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>'The CND Story'</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980*</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981*</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982*</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Note this was only three months after the membership scheme came into operation.

References: Minnion, J. and Bolsover, P. (Eds.) The CND Story London. Allison and Busby. 1983. p150 *Figures for 1980/81/82 are 'approximate'. From 1979 onwards, an estimate of 'local members', derived from forms returned by group secretaries, were included in the figures.
All other sources are from: 'The Left In Britain: Part 5' The Archives Of CND (Section 1: Reels 1-16) Harvester Microform

N.B. Differences in the ways in which these figures were compiled mean that they are not strictly comparable.

2) Parkin, F. Middle Class Radicalism: The Social Bases Of CND London. Manchester University Press. 1968. Note that CND was in serious decline by the time that Parkin carried out his research.

3) In common with many writers of this period, Parkin usually employs the male pronoun when referring to the Campaigners. This is more than just a cultural assumption; as 'too many' women respondents classified themselves as 'housewives', Parkin only considers the (crucial) male occupational data in his analysis. Note also that Parkin only had data for 'activists' as lay
members were not sent questionnaires (see Appendix C).

4) It is interesting to note that this is not a point of view which was shared by the Organising and then General Secretary of CND, Peggy Duff, who wrote: 'Frank Parkin tried to justify a theory that for the Left the issue of the bomb was only a means to change the leadership. I don't agree with him. It is true that they fought the leadership on the Bomb, on Clause Four, but a direct fight for the leadership was remote, because there was no clear alternative.' Duff, P. *Left Left Left* London. Allison and Busby (Alternative Editions). 1971. p190

5) For the distinctive contribution of conversational analysts to a sociological appreciation of context, see: Maxwell Atkinson, J., and Heritage, J. (Eds.) *Structures Of Social Action: Studies In Conversation Analysis* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 1984. This excellent collection includes a 'Transcript Notation' and is a valuable source book and introduction to the esoteric world of sequential understanding.

6) I have in mind Davidson's arguments concerning the legitimate phrasing of reasons as causes of action. Crudely, Davidson argues that in order to achieve an acceptable separation of cause and effect, one should consider causal reasons in terms of desired future states. - Davidson, D. 'Actions, Reasons and Causes' *Journal Of Philosophy* 60. pp685-700


8) Parkin's approach is captured by Karl Popper's concept of 'methodological essentialism'. However, as will become clear, my objection to this approach stems from an adherence to the philosophical therapy of the 'later' Wittgenstein which, in my opinion, suggests a profounder and more viable alternative than the 'methodological nominalism' advocated by Popper. (See: Popper, K. *The Poverty Of Historicism* London. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1972. especially pp26-34).

9) Of course, the growing 'professionalisation' of these fields of employment means that this is truer today than in the mid-Sixties when parkin conducted his research. Nonetheless, the objection is still valid; as parkin only chose to list the category of teacher training in his questionnaire, we do not know how many of his respondents had undergone other forms of professional training.

11) Taylor, R. 'The British Nuclear Disarmament Movement of 1958/65 and its legacy to the Left' unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Dept. of Politics, University of Leeds. 1983. This thesis is, to my knowledge, the most comprehensive and thorough study of the first Movement, containing a wealth of material on the history and development of the original CND. A work of political and historical analysis, the thesis traces the origins and development of the Campaign and its component ideologies. Taylor argues that, whilst the New Left represented the only viable political strategy for the attainment of disarmament objectives, the middle class, moralistic character of New Left politics meant that this political faction was not adequate for the task at that time. This, in essence, remains Taylor's position (see Chapter 8).

12) This article is a fine example of what Taylor means by a moral stimulus underpinning the rise of CND: the flavour of the article is captured in the following quote:
'There may be other chain-reactions besides those leading to destruction; and we might start one. The British of these times, so frequently hiding their decent, kind faces behind masks of sullen apathy or sour, cheap cynicism, often seem to be waiting for something better than party squabbles or appeals to their narrowest self-interest, something great and noble in its intention that would make them feel good again. And this might well be a declaration to the world that after a certain date one power able to engage in nuclear warfare will reject the evil thing for ever.'

Priestley, J.B. 'Britain and the Nuclear Bombs' New Statesman Vol.LIV. No.1398. pp554-556. 2/11/1957 - Taylor discusses the historical background and importance of this article in The Protest Makers op cit p54

13) This self-explanatory theoretical distinction is taken from:

14) Obviously, this is only a summary of Taylor's arguments which are grounded in scholarly research and which, in my opinion, usefully and correctly relate the moral nature of the Movement to wider historical factors; in particular, the nation state position of Britain in the post-War world and the British wish to remain a superpower by the ownership of an independent nuclear deterrent.
Chapter 2
Theory and Method

Introduction
In the first chapter, I critically discussed two major analyses of the original CND campaign. In the case of both studies, I argued that the theoretical approaches employed by the authors were inappropriate and generated misleading portrayals of the Movement and its members. In this chapter, and following on from this critique, I outline the theoretical paradigm which informs this study and, as a corollary, its methodology and research design. The chapter concludes with a foreword to the original research component of the thesis.

Similarities and Differences
In the studies of Parkin, and Taylor and Pritchard, the members' own understanding and accounts of their Campaigning tend to become subsumed to the implications of the authors' theoretical perspectives. As I have already indicated in the first chapter, in Parkin's work in particular, an essentialist theory of categorisation underpins the analysis and the questions in political sociology which the study addresses. This covert epistemological position generates analyses wherein it is assumed that there will be common, uniform characteristics which, for example, all campaigners share and which licenses them for inclusion into the 'CNDer' category. Although both authors acknowledged that the original Campaign embraced different ideological factions, and recognised this diversity within their
analyses, the thrust of essentialism retains its potency for each sub-set of the category (for instance, the Labour Party supporters), is still considered in essentialist terms.

This commitment to essentialism gives rise to conclusions which are plausible only within sociological analyses which are themselves grounded in this theory of categorisation. For example, the form of Parkin's explanation regarding the occupational location of his adult male sample - that welfare and creative professions provide a comfortable sanctuary for the already radical middle class - does not jar the reader when presented as a conclusion to his study: nevertheless, reflection upon the varied and diverse reasons individuals give for entering particular jobs brings into question the viability of this mono-dimensional form of explanation. Why should we presume that there will be only one uniform motive which all Parkin's respondents shared? Such a presumption is a reflection of the analytical thrust of an essentialist methodology.

All sociological inquiries are informed by a theory of categorisation, although the theory is rarely made explicit. Fortunately, an alternative to essentialism is available to sociologists and social scientists in general. In this thesis, I will be employing the 'family resemblance' theory of categorisation and the related concept of 'lebensformen' in order to study the revived Campaign. Both of these philosophical arguments are taken from the writings of the 'later' Wittgenstein, writings which helped effect a paradigmatic shift in western philosophical thought. The influence of this
paradigmatic shift has made its mark on sociological theory and it is in large part this shift which has rendered obsolete the 'positivistic' approach which prevailed at the time when Parkin embarked upon his study. In particular, 'ethnomethodology', its sibling 'conversation analysis'(1) and the sociological study of science clearly reflect the impact of Wittgenstein's arguments and the development of 'ordinary language' philosophy: these modern schools of analysis have sensitised sociologists to the importance of studying the social world as an accomplishment, a continuous process whereby meaning is continually ratified in specific contexts.

The major spur to Wittgenstein's second philosophical enterprise came from his realisation that, in his important earlier work, he had been 'bewitched' by language and had misunderstood its character and its relation to the world. As is well known, Wittgenstein sought to highlight the traps which words and grammar set for us and attempted to point the way out of our language-induced confusions. In so doing, Wittgenstein outlined a profound philosophy of social praxis.

The family resemblance model of categorisation and the notion of 'lebensformen' are two key lynchpins for Wittgenstein's later philosophy. It is not my intention, in this short discussion, to elaborate upon the whole of this complex achievement; such an exposition falls far outside the scope and needs of this study. Instead, I will be utilising the philosopher's work in the spirit in which it was intended; as a corrective to the confusions
which result from the 'deceptive pointing' of language. Wittgenstein saw his own work as a 'therapy', as a cure for the ills which he thought beset academic philosophers and it is in this sense that I make use of his ideas.

In the first chapter I drew attention to Parkin's analytical quest for the reason why individuals became members of CND and for their engagement in what he termed 'expressive' politics. He explained their behaviour by arguing that they were all alienated from dominant social norms, partook in a (uniform) 'deviance syndrome' and accrued 'emotional and psychological' rewards from their political activity. These factors were not acknowledged by the activists themselves, rather, they were deduced by Parkin with the aid of his analytical paradigm. In this paradigm, there lurks the presumption that there will be a common explanation for the activists' behaviour and, by implication, this explanation will be valid even if the members themselves are unaware of its existence. Why should we accept the internal logic of this paradigm?

The bedrock of this approach can be found in Parkin's presentation and use of terms such as 'CND' and 'Movement'. In his study these terms appear as the name for a something; similarly, 'campaigner', 'supporter', etc. are used as the name for a particular sort of individual. Consequently, Parkin can ask: 'Why is it that people become members of CND'? And yet, CND does not have an existence comparable to, say, a building: I can ask, why do people go to X Hotel?, but where do people go to when they join CND? CND is a social praxis and not an entity, I
cannot bring you a piece of CND. Joining CND is a matter of completing a subscription form, being moved by a speaker, having a commitment etc., etc.

Nevertheless, it is not meaningless to talk of 'CND' or the 'the Campaign' - but the definition and understanding of such categories bedevils sociology. Whole books(2) have been devoted to the ways in which a 'social movement' may be defined and the adoption of a particular definition and theory of categorisation has a marked effect upon the resultant analysis. It is at this fundamental level that the ideas of Wittgenstein are both pertinent and fruitful, allowing sociologists to escape from their self-induced perplexity.

Wittgenstein's solution to the problem of categorisation is most clearly understood by examining his famous treatment of the example of 'games' which he gave in his most important mature work. *Philosophical Investigations Part 1.*(3)

'Consider for example the proceedings that we call "games". I mean board-games, card-games, ball-games. Olympic games and so on. What is common to them all? - Don't say: "There must be something common, or they would not be called 'games' - but look and see whether there is anything common to all. For if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that. To repeat: don't think, but look! - Look for example at board-games, with their multifarious relationships. Now pass to card-games; here you may find many correspondences with the first group, but many features drop out, and others appear. When we pass next to ball-games, much that is common is retained, but much is lost. - Are they all 'amusing'? Compare chess with noughts and crosses. Or is there always winning and losing, or competition between players? Think of patience. In ball games there is winning and losing; but when a child throws a ball against a wall and catches it again, this feature has disappeared. Look at the parts played by skill and luck; and the differences between skill in chess and skill in tennis. Think now of games like ring-a-ring-a-roses; here is the element of
amusement, but how many other characteristic features have disappeared! And we can go through the many, many, other groups of games in the same way; we can see how similarities crop up and disappear.

And the result of this examination is: we see a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing: sometimes overall similarities, sometimes similarities of detail.

I can think of no better expression to characterise these similarities than "family resemblance"; for the various resemblances between members of a family: build, features, colour of eyes, gait, temperament, etc. etc. overlap and criss-cross in the same way.— And I shall say: 'games' form a family.

And for instance the kinds of number form a family in the same way. Why do we call something a "number"? Well, perhaps because it has a - direct - relationship with several things that have hitherto been called number; and this can be said to give it an indirect relationship to other things we call the same name. And we extend our concept of number as in spinning a thread we twist fibre on fibre. And the strength of the thread does not reside in the fact that one fibre runs through its whole length, but in the overlapping of many fibres.

But if someone wished to say: "There is something common to all these constructions - namely the disjunction of all their common properties" - I should reply: Now you are only playing with words. One might as well say: "Something runs through the whole thread - namely the overlapping of many fibres".

One can summarise the main arguments in these well known passages as follows: first, words do not get their sense by being predicated upon a defining 'essence'; second, a practice does not qualify for inclusion in a category (such as 'game'), by virtue of it sharing a single common quality with the other practices included in this category; third, the relation between practices with a common name is best understood as a complex and subtle question of differences as well as similarities. These arguments are cornerstones of Wittgenstein's philosophical stance with, one would have thought, exciting promise for sociological analysis. This promise is substantiated by the philosopher's other main arguments relating to linguistic accomplishment.
If it is not through the apprehension of essences that we understand words, how is meaning achieved? Basically, Wittgenstein argues that language gains meaning through social usage in particular 'lebensformen'. This German expression is always given the literal English translation of 'forms of life', a convention which I follow in this thesis. However, a more sympathetic translation would be 'way of life'; this rendering brings out the sense of people using language as a tool for social accomplishment in their day-to-day affairs, whereas the phrase 'form of life' tempts one to think of a 'form' as a somehow independent entity. Regardless, Wittgenstein's argument is that particular forms of life are the homes of the grammar of 'language games': words and language are tools for doing things with, gaining their meaning in the social context which they help create.

These remarks on Wittgenstein's philosophical position are not intended as a summary of his extensive and complex arguments but, rather, as a prelude to a reconsideration of the most beneficial way in which to understand terms such as the 'Campaign'. I hope that it will be appreciated from the brief foregoing discussion that it is not at all clear that an essentialist definition of the practices which we call CND is possible; the onus is upon those who favour this approach to present us with the essence of the Movement. Nor is it clear that CND is the name of an 'anything', or that all the middle class members of CND would possess a uniform defining quality or state of mind which impels them to join the Campaign. The only way analysts such as Parkin
can justify this perspective is by inventing unacknowledged criteria such as 'alienation'; again, what are we to understand by such terms, yet more problematic essences?

In this study, CND will be considered as a form of life and it will not be assumed a priori that CNDers possess a common characteristic. Instead, similarities and differences are stressed and any commonalities will be understood as a question of non-essentialist family resemblance. Furthermore, CND will be shown to consist of a composite of only partially complementary ideologies, commitments, practices, etc. However, the CND form of life is not discrete, it is part of the wider British society. To make the Campaign sociologically intelligible requires an appreciation of the ways in which the CND form of life is imbricated within other prevalent social practices.

The Research Design and Methodology
The methodology and design of the original research component of this study reflects the theoretical concerns and approach which I have outlined above. The interviews which I will be analysing and discussing in subsequent chapters were carried out between April and September 1984 and the samples of members were drawn from two groups, New Town and Scots City CNDs. Prior to interviewing, I had attended meetings of various Scots City groups – specialised groups, locally-based groups and the group I was eventually to decide to focus upon. In the case of each new group whose meeting I went to, I first wrote to the Secretary asking for permission to attend, explaining that I was a student researching the peace
movement and that I wished to understand how the group organised itself. In all cases, permission was willingly granted and I would sit, usually at the back of the room, taking rather poor field notes. In this way, I gained at least an initial impression of the various memberships and how the groups conducted their campaigning affairs. In addition, I read extensively on the historical development of CND, nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons policy: this proved invaluable when it came to talking, especially, with members who had belonged to the original Campaign.

At this time, there were three types of CND groups active in Scots City: first, groups based in one locality from which the majority of their membership was drawn; second, specialised groups comprised mainly of members drawn from a particular profession or religion; third, the Scots City campaign. This latter group was the largest (350 members), with supporters living in different parts of the city. After some deliberation, I decided to concentrate solely upon Scots City CND; there were several reasons for this decision. I needed a sample of CNDers which could be compared with Parkin's adult male sample, with another 'control' group, and with the available survey data on the Campaign's membership; this requirement ruled out the specialist groups. The locally-based groups posed the obvious problem of reflecting the particular local conditions and character of the members' constituency. And, as I have said, Scots City was the largest group and the one with the highest public profile.
Scots City CND has elected officials (a secretary, membership secretary, treasurer, chairperson) and speakers, trade union liaising officers, and various specialist sections; a publicity group produces a monthly Newsletter which is distributed free to all of the members and is sold at outlets such as radical bookshops. A Steering Committee, which meets once a month, coordinates and plans the group's activities. General Meetings are also held monthly with an average attendance of about twenty-five, including all the elected officials. In a sense, Scots City CND is something of an anachronism as it predates the formation of the local groups and, consequently, is in something of a competition with them for new members. The group carries out the expected campaigning activities, leafleting, marches, group outings to national and Scottish demonstrations etc. and liaises with the local, Scottish, and national Movement. In addition, they maintain close links with the city's trade unions.

My second sample of CNDers was drawn from a group in the South of England. This sample was intended to serve as a 'control', a comparative sample chosen from a town markedly different from Scots City. New Town stands in the greatest possible contrast to the Scottish city. In common with the Scottish group, New Town CND has elected officers, a Steering Committee and monthly General Meetings (at which the attendance averages about twenty). At the time when this research was carried out, the group boasted approximately 250 members and carried out campaigning activities similar to its Scottish counterpart.
My decision to conduct tape-recorded, semi-structured interviews was a choice of methodology determined by three major factors. First, as a lone researcher, the size of the samples had, of necessity, to be reasonably small if the interviews were to be in-depth. Second, and following on from my critique of Parkin, I was concerned to reflect in my study the members' own perspectives and views rather than interpreting their responses by reference to a supposedly superior epistemology derived from some 'social science' paradigm. Third, because of my own theoretical stance, I was not attempting to quantify values or opinions. However, I did wish to be able to compare relatively unproblematically quantifiable characteristics such as age, gender, educational achievements, with Parkin's study and with the other available data on CND members. With these considerations in mind, semi-structured interviews seemed to be the best available methodological option.

Having chosen which CND groups I would study, I then set about obtaining the two samples of members. For both groups the same approach was employed, an approach which developed out of my attendance at Steering and General meetings of the Scots City group. Having attended this group's meetings for about two months, I asked the Secretary if it would be possible to interview a sample of his group's members. He replied that my request would have to be put to a meeting of the Steering Committee which met later that month (and which I attended). At this meeting the only objection to my request was made on the grounds of confidentiality. I was able to reassure them that the
research would be written in such a way as to preserve the anonymity of those interviewed. Fortunately, one of the members at the meeting suggested that the names of the members to be contacted could be selected from the membership file by the Membership Secretary and that my 'contact letter' to them could be posted by the group. In this way, the confidentiality of the membership file would be respected.

To obtain the New Town sample, I attended one of the group's General Meetings (having sought permission to do so from the Secretary). At the end of the meeting, in the 'any other business' slot on the agenda, I introduced myself, explained what I was hoping to achieve by my research, and suggested the method of obtaining the sample which had been agreed upon by the Scots City campaign. After answering questions from the members present, a vote was taken which approved my research project by a large majority. Unfortunately, some members of the New Town group were clearly unhappy with this decision. As I was to learn later, this unfavourable response at the meeting was occasioned by personal hostility from one or two members who were prejudiced against sociological research (having, so they believed, been misrepresented in a past study of the town), and by the rumour, spread by one of the older members, that I was covertly working for the government.

In the case of both groups, the Membership Secretary selected every fifth name from their membership records; these members were then sent my letter, asking them whether they would be
prepared to help me by being interviewed and asking what date would be convenient, and a reply-paid envelope (a copy of this letter is reproduced in Appendix A). Seventy letters were sent out by the Scots City group (one fifth of 350) and fifty by the New Town group (one fifth of 250) of which forty from the former group and fifteen from the latter agreed to be interviewed. In addition, all the elected officials from both the groups agreed to be interviewed; I felt this was necessary as I had learnt from my attendance of various meetings how important these officials were in shaping the character and strategies of the campaigns.

Whilst I was visiting New Town to conduct the interviews, I attended another of this group's General Meetings with the intention of bolstering the rather disappointing response rate I had obtained from my 'contact letter'. Again, I addressed the meeting and talked about my research and asked whether there were any questions or queries about what I was doing. Perhaps predictably, nobody spoke up. Nevertheless, I subsequently learnt from private conversations that the rumours and hostility, which I have referred to, had not abated (despite my having sent a letter from my supervisors and a letter from national CND to confirm my credentials). Furthermore, New Town CND was experiencing internal group conflict: at the group's Annual General Meeting where I happened to be present, a vote of 'no confidence' in all the elected officials was moved by one of the younger radical members on the grounds that they were 'elitist and undemocratic'. Although this motion was heavily defeated, it seemed to me that some of the other members were in sympathy with
the mover's point of view and I gained the impression that my research had somehow become identified with the present officials.

Nevertheless, despite these unforeseeable difficulties, I was lucky in that access was comparatively easy and in that I received a great deal of help from both groups' officials for which I was most grateful. In part, the difficulties I experienced with the New Town group could probably have been largely overcome had I been able to develop the personal relationship which I had established with the Scots City group: I was prevented from doing this by the simple fact that New Town is several hundred miles away from the university where I was based.

The interviews were conducted in either my university office or in the interviewee's own home or place of work, depending on the respondent's preference. The interviews lasted on average an hour and a copy of the semi-structured interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix B. The schedule was initially 'piloted' on friends, colleagues and postgraduate students pursuing a diploma course in social work. In the light of my theoretical approach, I was concerned in the interviews to examine the biographies of the CNDers in order to gain insight into their social world: in the interviews the members' idiosyncratic politicisations and campaigning perspectives are related to their social context; in this way, their opinions and commitments become sociologically intelligible. Any commonality existing between the members is treated as a question of similarities and differences, as subtle
family resemblances.

Unlike Parkin or Taylor and Pritchard, I interviewed both activists and lay members and in the discussion of the interviews I have grouped together respondents in terms of their occupational locations. Upon first reading Parkin, and having subsequently re-analysed the available data on peace movement supporters (see Appendix C), I was struck by the large number of CNDers who were employed in welfare state professions: this observation seemed to offer a heuristical purchase upon the correlation between membership and occupation which was highlighted, but unsatisfactorily accounted for, in Parkin's study. Consequently, I have separated the welfare state interviewees (teachers, doctors, social workers etc.) from those in other forms of employment. The viability of this distinction is borne out by the analysis and, as will become clear, this approach yields a stronger sociology of CND than alternative classifications of the members utilised in other studies.

For the sake of confidentiality, all names in this study are pseudonyms and I have omitted or slightly altered personal interviewee details which I felt might prejudice anonymity. Furthermore, I have deliberately not provided any details concerning either Scots City or New Town which, in the analyses, I occasionally abbreviate to 'S.C.' and 'N.T.' respectively. The effect of local characteristics upon campaigning practices are brought out, where applicable, in the context of the interview discussions. All quotes are, as far as possible, verbatim; any clarifications which I have added are placed in square brackets,
i.e. [.....]; when referring to CND I use a capital letter, i.e. Campaign, Movement. At first reading, some of the quotations in the discussions of the interviews may appear somewhat disjointed with repetitions and unfinished clauses in the sentences: however, in naturally produced talk, speakers will often start a sentence afresh as they search for an appropriate word or phrase. This striving for expression conveys a sense of intention to the listener and I have considered it worth preserving in the text.

Foreword to the analysis of the interviews

I have attended numerous CND and peace group meetings, been on national demonstrations, and have had many lengthy informal conversations with peace campaigners, but I have never heard anyone ask: "Why did you join CND?" Even when new and unknown individuals attend meetings for the first time they are not asked this question. It would seem, from my experience, that this is not a question that CNDers ask each other - the answer seems too obvious, the question has no place in the CND form of life. This is not to suggest that they would not have an answer if asked, nor is it to suggest that it is not a question which they have not asked themselves. Rather, their interest is in the reasons why other people do not join the Movement. Once someone has joined, or has come along to a meeting, it is presumed that they share a common reason for belonging, a taken for granted presumption on the part of the other CNDers. When initially gaining access to the campaigns which I studied, my major licence for entrance into the group was my own avowed concern with the
nuclear issue. What was required from me was a sincere commitment to the CND cause; an insincere campaigner is an inadmissible contradiction. And yet, nobody wished to know exactly what I was concerned or frightened about – for instance, whether I was motivated by terror of an all-out holocaust or whether I was opposed merely to some particular weapons system such as Trident. I intend to develop this point more fully later on, but it should be noted at the outset that this unspoken belief that 'we' are all fighting for a common end is a distinctive and important feature of CND with accountable origins and that it is one of the bedrocks of the Campaign, a sort of tacit glue for CND social interaction.

This observation can be illustrated by an incident which occurred in the course of my field-work. Out of interest, I attended the inaugural meeting of a new Scottish peace group. The meeting had been called by a local activist, named Brian C., and was attended by seven other individuals. The purpose of the meeting was to establish the group, to elect officials and to plan their campaigning activities, including a recruitment drive. All those who attended were enthusiastic, willing to take on time-consuming responsibilities and even, in some cases, to put up the funding necessary to launch the group from their own pockets. However, when it came to the wording of their specific aims, which was to act as a charter for the group, disagreements began to emerge. It soon became clear that all of those present had different conceptions of what nuclear disarmament meant and how it should
be achieved. In addition, key terms such as 'unilateral', 'multilateral', 'freeze' etc., were found to be open to different interpretations. After quite a lengthy discussion, the group decided they would ask Brian to draft a proposal which they would discuss further at their next meeting.

After the meeting had finished, Brian and I went for a drink to discuss my research. Understandably, he was disappointed and frustrated that his conception of the group's aims had been challenged and that they had been unable to agree on a charter. He confided in me: "I know you understand what I mean, it's so simple the whole idea ...". As the conversation progressed, it became clear that he regarded me as an understanding and sympathetic ally and that he believed that the others who had been present had failed to properly grasp the issues: "I mean, the whole strength of the idea is that it's so simple, everyone can agree on it." However, I had not said anything at all at the meeting, nor given any non-verbal assent, which would have confirmed his supposition.

Of course, this tacit sense of a common concern and point of view is not unique to CND (although what is presumed in the Campaign is distinctive). For those who attend meetings, what is not said, the opinions which are not voiced, confirm the members' sense of sharing values and aims. And indeed, it seems to be the case that there is a general consensus on social and political issues; for example, an opposition to the policies of the present government and a belief in the possibility of greater social justice (of my
two samples, only one or two respondents expressed any support for any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's politics).

Most of the members of the two groups which I studied were not activists, they did not attend meetings and did not regularly take part in campaigning activities. In the case of both groups, most of the campaigning work was undertaken by a small minority of the members. For the majority, the presumption of a shared point of view was not ratified by campaigning experience and as I will show in the analysis of the interviews, there is a surprising divergence of opinions on questions of disarmament and the nature of the Campaign. However, there is a real sense of commonality, a real sense in which the members all belong to a recognisable form of life. It will be argued in this study that one way to understand how it is that CND attracts individuals capable of creating a sense of shared aims is by examining their wider societal relations, the members' position in the British social structure. Such an approach will shed some light upon the unasked question of why they joined CND and why it is that only a particular minority of the British population develop a commitment to campaign.

CND has always embraced a very diverse group of individuals and ideologies. As Stuart Hall, writing of the first Campaign, asked in 1963:

'Can a political shape be imposed upon or rise from a movement which contains within its ranks such garden varieties as anarchists, non-violent revolutionaries, proto-Trotskyists, New Left socialists, soft shoe communists, constituency Labour Party members, renegade liberals, pacifist old-timers, beatniks and vegetarians, Peace News, Sanity, Solidarity, Anarchy and War and Peace. By any book, the answer should be 'No'. No single flag, no
slogan, no ideology can command so motley an army of the good.\(^{(5)}\)

My own impression of the revived 'motley army' is that they are at least as heterogeneous as their predecessors. Certainly, those members I interviewed were distinct individuals: this diversity is as important as any similarities which they shared and should not be neglected for the sake of supposed analytical convenience. As I have remarked, my respondents voiced markedly different views and opinions - even on fundamental matters such as the possibility of achieving nuclear disarmament. Their answers to such seemingly basic questions reflected their personal, social, histories and cannot legitimately be abstracted from these generative contexts. This is important in an analysis of CND, because there is little disagreement about who joins the Campaign. It is widely (even if sometimes implicitly) agreed that, in the words of Chris Rootes, CND appears to be especially attractive to:

'the highly educated practitioners of the service, welfare and creative professions of the non-market sector of the economy.'\(^{(6)}\)

The crucial question, however, is why should the Campaign prove so attractive to this section of society? To answer this question, I believe that I have as far as possible to let my respondents speak for themselves, and to take their accounts of their biographies seriously.
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4) I am grateful to my father, a native German speaker, for bringing this to my attention. Harrap's Standard German And English Dictionary defines 'lebensform' as a 'pattern of existence (of a tribe etc.)', and 'lebensformen' as 'aspects, traits of personality'. However, I use 'lebensformen' as a plural, as meaning 'forms of life', as do other writers on Wittgenstein. For the origins of this phrase, see: Janik, A. and Toulmin, S. Wittgenstein's Vienna New York. Simon and Schuster (Touchstone Books). 1973. pp231-234. The literal translation does have the merit of denoting a technical use of the term.


CHAPTER 3

The Teachers' Commitment

Introduction

All the studies of the peace movement have commented upon the fact that the members tend to be highly educated and that teachers, lecturers and students have a high profile in the Campaign (see Appendix C). Certainly, my own two samples of CND members contained a large number of teacher members, and higher education in some form was the norm rather than the exception for the majority of my interviewees. And yet, there exists no necessary correlation between higher education and CND membership; the majority of the highly educated population do not belong to CND or to any other peace group. How, then, can we account for this tendency?

The Teachers' Commitment

Geoff Keeling is a twenty-eight year old languages teacher who has been unemployed for the past two years. The son of continental immigrants, he has lived in New Town all his life except for a period when he was an undergraduate, a few months when he was employed as a student-teacher and three years spent abroad. His father works as a labourer in one of the light engineering firms in the town and his mother is a housewife. For Geoff, the single most important influence in his life so far has been his experience of university which has, so he believes, completely changed his views on society and his place within it, including his opinion of his New Town contemporaries.
At a large Midlands university, Geoff read for a languages degree. Whilst a student, he came into contact with a left wing lecturer, a man who, according to Geoff, was largely responsible for his transmogrification. The lecturer started Geoff "questioning things" and encouraged his capacity for critical thought. Geoff does not believe this was a matter of crude indoctrination, rather, he sees the dialogues he had with the lecturer as the Socratic agent of his own political awakening: "I suddenly realised that a lot of things were as they were, but I didn't believe they should be ... they were wrong." Following on from this, he began to take an interest in politics and chose to study the rise of the German National Socialist Party as a special option. By the time he left university he considered himself a Marxist.

A year spent on a Postgraduate Certificate of Education course (P.G.C.E.) was followed by a temporary job in a hospital which he enjoyed for its "charitable" character and for the personal contact and involvement which the work afforded. Geoff left the hospital to take up a teaching post in a large Midlands school, but he soon resigned because of his distaste for the corporal punishment meted out by the other teachers. He then decided to work in Europe, both to gain experience of teaching English and to take the opportunity to travel.

Upon returning to this country, Geoff settled in a small terraced house in New Town with his wife, also a languages teacher, and
their two young children. On the morning when I arrived for the interview it was raining heavily and Geoff, who was babysitting, seemed pleased to talk with me. He has been unemployed for the past year and is now reluctantly thinking of returning to teaching children; although he would prefer to teach adults, he has been unable to find any teaching positions in the local colleges of further education. Geoff now considers himself a "socialist" rather than a Marxist as he has come to believe that Marxism is impractical and outdated; a change of view largely promoted by his disillusionment with his fellow human beings. He does not belong to a trade union but intends to join when he starts working again. Nor does Geoff belong to any political party: he has thought of joining the Labour Party but was put off by what he sees as the unnecessarily large amount of bureaucracy and by the likelihood that he could not make enough of a personal contribution, that he would not be able to make his voice heard in the Party. In CND however, he feels that he will be effective and that he will be listened to.

Geoff and his wife (who shares and supports her husband's views), joined New Town CND a year before I conducted the interview. However, his interest in nuclear disarmament dates from the time he spent abroad as an English language teacher which coincided with the outbreak of the Falklands War. As a Britisher living abroad he felt "horrified" by his country's actions, but unable to protest because he was not doing, and had not done, anything to try change British political policies. Shortly after returning to New Town Geoff joined his local CND. With two young children
and a working wife, his campaigning activities are necessarily restricted to attending the group's monthly General Meetings as often as he can. He is dissatisfied with the ways in which the meetings are run, which he finds too business-like with too much discussion and not enough action: "Sometimes I find them a bit frustrating because everybody's got a different point of view and it's very difficult to decide on a certain line of action because everybody wants to approach it in a different way." He thinks the meetings would be improved by showing films and inviting guest speakers; nevertheless, he recognises that the administrative business is necessary "otherwise nothing would get done."

Geoff sees nuclear disarmament as the most important issue at the present time. He thinks that the majority of the population do not support CND mainly because they have been brainwashed by an anti-CND media (in particular, television), and also because the British, as a nation, are more conservative than other Europeans. This latter point of view is based on his experiences and observations whilst living abroad as a teacher. The former reason is directly related to his experiences as an undergraduate and teacher.

Geoff is acutely aware of the changes wrought in him by university and it affects how he sees his contemporaries and former friends in New Town: "It really has moulded my life. When I see other people [whom he knows] who haven't been to university
I think they haven't moved on at all, they're no different." He sees other people in New Town who have not been to university as unwitting dupes of the media, a media controlled by the capitalist class, and feels that he was lucky in Escaping their fate: "I became politically aware when I went to university. Before that I was just like one of the other sheep. I do feel that so many people are just like sheep in the way that they think and I left the pen when I went to university and began to think for myself. Well, basically, I was taught to think for myself. And CND was just a logical conclusion of that I feel."

Geoff does not believe that the membership of N.T. CND is drawn equally from all social classes: "Certain people aren't represented. It does tend to be people from a more middle class background, although there are a few trade unionists there. There are a lot of old people, not very many young people actually." He thinks that the predominance of older members can be explained by the fact that New Town has "no sense of community" and that most of the young people are "alienated, they don't really belong anywhere" and because of this they are "much more materialistically motivated, it's very materialistic in New Town and very selfish, I don't really like New Town." In addition, New Town "is very, very much a young people's town and very working class in general. And I think the young working class adult just doesn't relate to CND. I think very few of them have anything in common with the ideas of CND." Luckily for Geoff, he no longer counts himself as one of these alienated, media-duped, young working class adults; although unemployed, he has had the
advantages of going to university. As he says: "It wasn't until going to university that I knew what that [CND] symbol meant."

Geoff has never broken the law in the pursuit of nuclear disarmament, although he thinks it might be necessary to do so in some situations, because, "I come from a family where respecting the law is everything. No one in my family has ever got into any trouble ... I'm a little bit frightened of the law, if there's a situation where there's trouble it sort of gets to me inside." He found it difficult to answer my question on his attitude to non-violent disarmament protesting as he thinks it is hard to distinguish between force and violence. He is opposed to violence and claims that he would be a conscientious objector in the advent of a (conventional) war for he does not see himself as an "aggressive" person. Geoff thinks the main reason we have an arms race is because "basically the human being is not as intelligent as I had originally thought him to be. I had a lot more faith in human beings, people, before but I've quickly come to realise that they're a lot more stupid than I originally thought, and people just want for themselves and for their own and they don't really care for other people. They're all sort of personally motivated, and I think that's the reason there's total deadlock and there's no progress ever made [in arms negotiations]. Nobody is ever prepared to back down, and I don't think it's ever really going to change."

In addition, Geoff believes there is a tendency for males to be more aggressive than females, a point of view he supports by
citing evidence of male aggression which he 'saw' exhibited by young schoolboys at the Midlands school where he worked for a short time. Such male aggression is particularly pronounced, he feels, amongst the British and he is prepared to give some credence to the idea of a link between nuclear armaments and male behaviour.

As a socialist, and a Labour Party voter, Geoff does not agree with any of the Mrs. Thatchers government's policies. He thinks that the "cuts in social services and education are tragic" and he opposes privatisation and praises the welfare state. When I asked him whether he thought that CND's stance of not being aligned to any one political party was a good policy, he replied that he thought it was as CND "should appeal to as many people as possible" although, again, he believed that because of political indoctrination through the media the Campaign cannot effectively voice that appeal. Moreover, his undergraduate studies of Brecht and The Popular Front Against Facism in the Thirties in Germany have convinced him that CND's present party neutrality is best from "an organisational point of view", if the Campaign is to secure mass support. Nevertheless, he thinks that nuclear disarmament is "primarily a political issue". He recognises that there are moral dimensions to the Movement but, for him, they are secondary considerations. He described himself as an atheist and clearly dislikes religion for "its hypocrisy". Too young to remember the first Campaign, his impression of his predecessors is, rather scathingly, of people led by the Church who went on demonstrations "to have a nice day out, and that's all there was
to it." With his lack of faith in the human race, Geoff does not think that nuclear disarmament is in fact achievable, "but it doesn't stop me doing what I think is right."

At first reading, Geoff may appear to be an archetypal 'middle class radical'; certainly, his job is 'middle class'. He voices opposition to what he sees as society's norms and as there seem to be no tangible rewards for his campaigning activities, presumably he derives purely 'emotional or psychological' gratification from being a CNDer. Such a portrayal is misleading. It is not the case that Geoff is simply 'alienated' in Parkin's definition of the word; rather, he is opposed to what he sees as his contemporaries' materialism and he believes that his values are preferable.

In Britain, education has become the responsibility of the state and the majority of teachers are employed by local authorities. Similarly, the training of teachers has fallen into the province of the state. When Geoff decided to become a teacher he had to undergo a period of higher state-administered education and a state-run postgraduate teaching course, which can be likened to an apprenticeship, before he could work in a state school which the children are compelled to attend by legal injunction. In his own sixth-form, Geoff had intended to study geography but a careers visit to a local school convinced him that he would prefer to study to be a teacher and consequently he read languages (for which his family background gave him an advantage), with the intention of becoming a languages teacher.
In so doing, Geoff committed himself to a state-run apprenticeship and eventually qualified to become a legitimate member of the state; that is to say, he learnt to properly and legitimately create the social relations of the state of which he himself became a part. Not surprisingly, this process has changed his attitudes and perceptions.

At university, Geoff was encouraged to adopt a critical perspective to existing social institutions and ways of living. In addition, through his training as a teacher, he was made to feel responsible for his work, for state policy. This process of internalising state social relations transformed Geoff's life. When he sees his contemporaries, he sees benighted individuals, "sheep", without his capacity for critical thought, deluded by the media. Geoff believes he has a duty to campaign and to protest and to try to effect political change. In common with most of the members I interviewed, Geoff sees people who do not join CND as unenlightened; the idea that they might have sound reasons for not joining the Movement does not enter into his calculations.

In addition to the personal effects which university wrought, Geoff also received more concrete benefits, for example, the opportunity to travel and the avoidance of the manual jobs in which most New Town men are employed. Nevertheless, these advantages and opportunities were experienced by Geoff through the phenomenological social relations of a 'student' or a 'teacher' and when he compares himself with his New Town
contemporaries he castigates (though does not blame) them for their unthinking materialism, an outlook which he feels himself to have transcended. His contemporaries have 'dominant norms' which he believes are shallow compared with his own.

Of course, Geoff is not a 'typical' teacher. Part of the reason university and teacher training made such a big impression on him can be laid at the door of the class contrast between his New Town upbringing and his teacher status. Like many children of immigrants, Geoff sees education as especially valuable, "something they can't take away from you", and university permitted him to mix with students from different class backgrounds and with different social perspectives. His views on CND partly reflect his early family socialisation, for example, his reluctance to break the law in the pursuit of disarmament goals. Nonetheless, upon returning to New Town, he no longer felt himself to be a typical New Towner; he has become a teacher, a state professional with a set of values different from those of his contemporaries. These values include the belief that although disarmament may not be achievable, it is still the right thing to be a CNDer and to protest. This duty to protest also encompasses political action, for instance, travelling to the Grunwick film-processing factory to protest against the company's refusal to recognise their employees' legal right to join a trade union. (3)

When asked about his attitude to Mrs. Thatcher's government and its policies, Geoff's first and primary objection was to the cuts in the financing of education and the social services ("tragic"). When considering the government's handling of the economy, he
denounced what he saw as Thatcher's policy of privatising nationalised industries for the benefit of an already wealthy minority. For Geoff, Thatcher's politics represent an attack on the welfare state which he believes should be cherished rather than sold – especially the educational services which should be "planning twenty years ahead for the education of children to their future role ...." In a real sense, Thatcher's attack on the structure and ideology of the welfare state is an attack against Geoff.

A similar self-awareness of the effects of being a student and entering the teacher profession was shown in an interview I held with Malcolm R., a lecturer in a large college in Scots City. The son of a mining under-manager, Malcolm left school and worked for four years as a mining engineer apprentice in the Northern mining community where his family lived. During this time he took an Ordinary National Certificate (O.N.C.) by day-release and shortly afterwards went to work for a large electrical engineering concern. As a mature student, he attended Runcharge College for a year before becoming an undergraduate at a large Midlands university. Upon completing his first degree, Malcolm undertook an M.A. in Industrial Relations and, after carrying out research on health workers, moved to Scots City where he now has a permanent job as a lecturer at Cranmeer College. Thirty-seven years old, Malcolm is married to a senior health worker in a local hospital. An articulate and politically sophisticated lecturer, Malcolm agreed to be interviewed at his college where
we sat in a deserted class room. Interviewing Malcolm was slightly complicated by the fact that each answer he gave tended to be a mini-lecture rather than an opinion.

Malcolm joined Scots City CND two years ago "partly over Cruise and partly because my wife joined." He has never attended any of the group's General Meetings and has only been on one demonstration; his only activity is to take part in the group's 'telephone tree'. He believes that the political elites in Russia and America perpetuate the threat of nuclear war but that such threats are in reality only bluffs designed to sustain these countries' leaders. Non-violent protesting is, he thinks, a highly desirable policy because it encourages others to join the Movement. In addition, if one starts to use violence, "you throw away an enormous moral advantage."

A little too young to have been a member of the first Campaign, Malcolm only remembers feeling frightened at the time when his predecessors were marching. However, he had recently seen a television showing of Lindsay Anderson's film\(^4\) about the first CND and he had been struck by and admired the "disciplined" nature of the Fifties' marches. Furthermore, he felt that, on seeing the film, "Britain had qualitatively gone down since then" and that he would like to see today's campaigners acting in a similarly disciplined fashion. When questioned about the social class of CND members he replied: "My impression, from Scots City, is of an elite middle class group, or a middle class group with a reasonable amount of education experience and things like that. I hope they're not, but that's the feeling I get." He thinks the
majority of the population do not belong to CND because "there's a barrier on joining organisations" and that the British are, as a nation, "a mass of people who are open to fairly simplistic explanations of what's going on, who don't tend to join groups and are regionally fragmented." In common with Geoff, Malcolm does not credit the British public with the capacity for forming reasonable views of their own which he does not agree with.

Malcolm thinks defence "is far too important" to be left to the government. An ex-Territorial Army volunteer, he does not consider himself a pacifist and believes it would be necessary to retain a residual conventional force in the event of British nuclear disarmament. He agrees with CND's policy of not aligning themselves to any one political party because "given that you want to attract as large a number as possible at an early stage it's a good idea to spread yourself as wide as possible."

Describing himself as "right wing Labour" ("I'm right wing in my economics because I'm a technocrat"), Malcolm has been a member of the Labour Party since he was eighteen years old and has been a member of a trade union since he started work. The "extension of home ownership" is the only one of Mrs. Thatcher's policies which he thinks is desirable because it "increases people's stake in their homes" and because he thinks this policy is popular with the electorate. Every other one of her policies he opposes: he criticises Mrs. Thatcher for "cutting for dogmatic reasons, right across the board, when we have got a chance to qualitatively improve our higher education, destroying the state system, for what? To produce a whole lot of people from these
elite public schools who we've got chapter and verse research to show that these are the very people in our public service who've understood nothing about technology, nothing about manufacturing and nothing about social policy." He thinks that Thatcher is a shrewd, but not admirable politician, whose popularity rests on her ability to appeal to chauvinistic tendencies in the British; a national failing which he believes was clearly in evidence in the Falklands War. Malcolm is opposed to elites; this includes the elitism in education and he was quick to defend Cranmeer College's reputation in relation to Scots City University.

In contrast to Geoff, Malcolm's experience of higher education has not effected a political awakening; rather, it has been part of his maturing process. He sees himself as upwardly socially mobile and thinks that his years as a student "made me smoother, more middle class", giving him the time to study and reflect and the opportunity to mix with people from different backgrounds. Everyone, he argues, has an aggressive side to their character and goes through stages of maturity. He feels that he has now learnt to be less aggressive and would no longer be part of the Territorial Army (although he has no regrets at having been a volunteer when he was younger). Admiring the courage of the Greenham Common peace campers, he bemoans the lack of television coverage they receive. Malcolm's political views were formed at an early age: he was a Labour man before going to university "and wouldn't vote for anyone else in any circumstances."

Malcolm is proud of his mining background and his knowledge of
engineering which makes him more credible, he believes, in the eyes of the students he teaches on a 'Science and Society' course. Malcolm thinks that "science and technology have got to be considered quite thoroughly"; part of this thorough consideration involves the moral aspects and social dimensions of technology. He takes his role as teacher very seriously and endeavours to help his students resolve their moral dilemmas; for example, giving advice to a student who was worried that entering the army catering corps might imply a condonation of killing: "He knew that I'd been in the Reserve Army for years and he came to me for advice. I have to play the role of liberal teacher."

Interestingly, when I asked Malcolm about the extent of his campaigning activities he referred to his role as a teacher: "I'm also a teacher, I teach a lot of technologists and scientists, I make a point, and I think that's quite a powerful situation to be in, I teach about technology as much as anything, quite a lot of the work I look at is about, one of the lectures I look at is war and the economy and I've actually been accused by the students of putting a particular perspective across [he laughs conspiratorially]. As a liberal, I immediately put another perspective across." He sees these opportunities to influence the attitudes of future generations of technologists and scientists as being very important and his own role as one necessarily involving moral responsibility.

Unlike Geoff, Malcolm sees CND as being primarily a moral movement: "I think that's probably its greatest strength, CND has got to make that [moral] point again and again" for he believes
that everybody has got a moral side to their character which will respond to such an ethical appeal. Furthermore, "I think that as a bargaining tactic, the sort of stand for nuclear disarmament gives us an enormous moral authority which we're pretty short of in Britain. I mean, we haven't got any moral authority as far as I can make out, and it's getting worse internationally, that could give us some moral authority, but I think it was suicidal tactics during the last election [the 1983 General Election, Malcolm is referring to the Labour Party's support for unilateral disarmament]." These views of Malcolm's, that unilateral disarmament gives Britain moral authority, that the moral case is the Campaign's greatest strength and that Britain is in a state of ethical decline, find definite resonance in the ideology of the first Movement and I will be discussing them more fully in later chapters.

I was fortunate to have an ex-student from Malcolm's college in my Scots City sample. Twenty-three year old Brian, P. works for the local authority and is, in common with many others, a nominal member of S.C. CND. He has never been to any of the group's meetings, nor been on any demonstration or any other campaigning activity. The interview took place in my office and was not completely successful as Brian clearly felt unsure of his opinions and seemed a little intimidated.

Brian left school and went to work for the local authority where he served his apprenticeship as a fitter, an apprenticeship which included a day-release course at Cranmeer College. Whilst at
Cranmeer, he met "met people with diverse views. I come from Brackmoor which is a fairly small village outside Scots City. I'd never heard of CND, well in the papers like, but when you go to college you get interested in things like that because everybody's got an attitude like that. One of the instructors was a member of CND, peace badges and that white dove, and I was curious at the time and I didn't understand anything about it or know anything about it which is why I joined CND. The instructor brought the magazine in [S.C. CND Newsletter] and it had the address in and I filled it out."

In comparison with either Geoff or Malcolm, Brian's experience of state education was relatively short-lived and does not appear to have significantly altered his views. He admits to knowing very little about the nuclear issue and thinks this means that he "dunnae have the same interest I should have ... it's lack of knowledge I think." Not a member of any political party, which he thinks are all a "hotch-potch", he does not have a voting preference and has no interest in politics except for the issue of law and order on which he strongly agrees with the Conservative Party's stance and for which he thinks William Whitelaw is a good spokesman. Although not a pacifist, he is opposed to violence and favours the Campaign's stance of not aligning themselves to any one political party because "if they stuck to any one party and the party changed its policy, CND would have to change its policy." This non-aligned stance, he thinks, encourages people from all walks of life to join the Movement. Brian believes the reason the majority of the
population do not belong to CND is because of the Campaign's poor image: "The image of CND is linked with Greenham Common, student types and y'know lassies in long frocks." Brian does not think unilateral disarmament is possible but he still considers it worthwhile to protest: "If you do make a protest at least somewhere knows you're there and trying; if you make no protest at all you deserve all that's coming to you, it just means you're accepting it. Just making an effort, that's the idea."

Brian had given in his notice to the local authority the day before the interview and I asked him why. It seemed that he was shocked by the, as he saw it, immorality of his fellow workers and managers who indulged in minor infringements of the company's rules. Unwilling to be part of such unethical behaviour, Brian left his job to become a salesman. (5)

Brian's account of how he became a CNDer is not, I think uncommon. Simply, his O.N.C. course permitted him to enter into a social environment, the college, where "everybody's got an attitude like that", an attitude embracing social and political causes including CND and one not found in his home town. For many students, who comprise a large percentage of the Campaign (see Appendix C), joining CND is an opportunity afforded to them by a Freshers' Week stall, and for many the commitment is fairly short-lived. (6) Brian's case is somewhat similar to this: by entering into the social role of a student he was exposed to the extra-curricula attitude of CNDing promulgated by his lecturer. However, Brian's involvement with CND is nominal and he sees it as largely the individual's responsibility to join the Movement,
otherwise "you deserve all that's coming to you ...." Malcolm, on the other hand, has come to feel that he has a duty because of his role as a lecturer to, at least, bring the issue to the attention of his students. This is not surprising, for part of being a teacher entails adopting the ideology of the profession and having a sense of duty: in common with other welfare state professions, the internalisation of a sense of duty can turn a job into a vocation.

This notion of a duty to campaign and protest was evident in many of the interviews with teacher members in both of my samples. Donald D. is a thirty-eight year old teacher, married to a teacher, with parents who are also both teachers. Donald read for an English degree, and after a short period abroad spent doing voluntary work, came to teach in a school in Scots City. Donald's interest in CND is predated by an earlier interest in the anti-nuclear power cause. He joined S.C. CND after attending a teachers' meeting at his school which "turned out to be a subgroup of Scots City CND trying to widen interest" in the Campaign.

Whilst an undergraduate, Donald had joined his university's religious society and although he gradually lost his religious faith, these activities inculcated in him a desire to undertake "social service". When I asked him whether being a student had changed his views, he told me that after joining the religious society: "I decided my major interest was really social service and I got to the point where I thought 'why are we doing anything
else? Doesn't that matter most? It was then I started getting involved in summer camps and overseas in Europe, working with physically handicapped children."

Donald continues to have an interest in social service, subscribing to, and working for, Oxfam on a local basis. He supports non-violent direct action and agrees with CND's non-party alignment policy "as most people within CND probably do share widely differing views" and because he does not wish to see nuclear disarmament linked with other issues. He has only attended two of his group's General Meetings, partly because he "didn't feel part of it" and partly because he is short of time: most of Donald's free time is currently taken up with extensively rebuilding his house from which he kindly took time off to be interviewed (although conversation was made somewhat difficult by the incessant hammering of floor-boards in the next room).

Donald belongs to a professional teaching association (although not an active member), but he has never belonged to any political party. He would vote Labour at a General Election and describes his politics as "certainly left". He deplores the present government's "general and undiscriminating policy of cut-backs" on funding for the social services. This policy will, he feels, result in a sharp increase in social problems. The only good word he had to say for the present government's policies was a grudging admiration for their success in bringing down the rate of inflation.

The membership of CND is, Donald thinks, drawn from all walks of
life, and he blames the existence of the arms race on a "sinister conspiracy" of arms manufacturers who are motivated by the drive for profit. Unilateral disarmament is "possible within Britain, I don't see why a government shouldn't embark on it"; however, he thinks the British effort might be subverted by the Central Intelligence Agency or some other similar American organisation.

Donald thinks that schools and teachers in Britain are losing their former respect and status, a decline which he feels "is the cause of many of our problems." Governments have, especially in recent years, only "paid lip-service to the needs of education, not really recognising their [the teachers'] central place in the values of society." Greater government recognition of the importance of education would mean not only attracting higher calibre applicants to the profession and an increase in funds, but, also, a reconsideration of the dimensions of education; the government should "enlarge the scope of education, bringing peace studies into the curricula ..." as Donald has attempted to do (in the face of strong opposition from some parents and teachers), at his own school. Indeed, when I asked him what he thought was the best way to protest against nuclear weapons he replied: "Being in education, I suppose I would say education."

For Donald, teaching is not a 'sanctuary' (Parkin's phrase), from the harsh reality of private enterprise where his social and political values would place him at a disadvantage. Instead, it is an occupation which allows him to best fulfill his desire for social service; he has thought of taking other jobs but none
appear to offer him the contact, "the real contact", with people. For Donald, morality and politics are part of the human experience and should not be separated; and thus he thinks that CND is "a moral thing of course, but political as well ...." He believes that the majority of people do not support the Campaign because "they don't belong en masse to any movement at all"; all populations "are too ready to pass on their responsibility to others." For Donald, such an abdication of responsibility is unacceptable. Both as a teacher and as a CNDer, he feels that he has a duty to live out his values, values nurtured in his undergraduate years and practised through voluntary work and state employment as a teacher. Rather than a sanctuary from personal disadvantage, teaching is where Donald feels he can be of most social service.

Of course, such a growth and consistency of values and perspectives, from undergraduate days through to one's state profession, is by no means the one and only way in which an individual can be affected by his or her experiences of coming into contact with state training and employment. For example, Mrs. Janet Frierley, a thirty-nine year old married woman decided, after spending eight years as a housewife bringing up her two children, not to return to office work (she had previously been employed as a copy-typist). Instead, she decided to read for a Batchelor of Education degree, specialised in primary school education, and has been an infant teacher for the past two years. She finds her new career very satisfying despite
the long hours and low pay; as she herself says, "I wouldn't have
gone into teaching for the money!"

Janet joined S.C. CND about three and a half years ago at the
same time as she joined the Labour Party: "I just wakened-up to
the real seriousness of it." Her only campaigning activity to
date has been attending one demonstration and she has never been
to any of the group's meetings. In common with many of the women
I interviewed, Janet's home and family commitments do not leave
her as much time as she would like for her outside interests.
Being an activist, of the kind focused upon by Parkin, and Taylor
and Pritchard, is conditional upon having a fair amount of free
time to devote to CND. But it does not necessarily follow that
those who are not particularly active are any less committed to
the disarmament cause.

Janet thinks "people should stand up and say they're opposed" to
nuclear weapons and does not think that non-violent protesting is
realistic as "inevitably, there will always be conflicts ...." To
support this view, she drew a parallel with the current miners' strike, arguing that if one attempted to disrupt the existing status quo the powerful would inevitably move against you. She
disagrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment: "I'd prefer
them to be aligned to the Labour Party"; in fact, she sees CND as
properly part of the Party although she admits to not having thought through the implications and effects of such alignment on
the Movement's membership.
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Although she is opposed to all nuclear weapons, Janet does not consider herself a pacifist as she believes in "defence up to a point." She thinks that Britain could unilaterally disarm and cites the Dutch resistance to the siting of Cruise missiles as an encouraging example of what can be achieved by small countries. For her, the arms race results from "fear between nations and it's tied in with the capitalist system, I see it very much as tied in with the capitalist system." Although old enough to have been a member, the first Campaign did not make much of an impression on Janet. She thinks that people then "were still in a state of lack of knowledge" about nuclear weapons but that today the general public is better informed and the present Campaign leaders are more hard-headed in contrast to their predecessors who indulged in "Sunday demonstrations". Furthermore, today's Campaign has a "membership which seems to be a more fairer representation, I think it's increasingly so, but I wouldn't be surprised to find that there's not so many working class people involved in CND."

A member of her teachers' union and the Labour Party, and a staunch Labour voter, Janet describes herself as "a humanist Labour Party person" on the left of the Party. She sees capitalism as a "doomed" system and deplores Mrs. Thatcher's championing of individualistic self-sufficiency and "Victorian values." For Janet, society should be "a community of people" and she sees individuals, in a rather Rousseau-esque fashion, as the products of their socialization: "... I teach children, see children, they've all got good characters, what happens to them
along the way is a different thing."

Whilst admiring the Greenham Common 'women, she does not like to attach the blame for the arms race to men and does not believe that girls are naturally more passive than boys, a point of view substantiated by her observations at work: "I teach both boys and girls and I wouldn't say there's much of a difference." For Janet, gender differences are more a question of social upbringing which in this country, so she believes, is also responsible for the apathy and lack of commitment which characterises the majority of people who do not belong to CND: "I see that very much as the way young people are brought up, particularly in this country, a lack of education. Most of them leave school in ignorance of even their own political system, how it works, how councils work. How can people make choices if they don't have the education? And I think that leads on to the fact that they don't become political and don't get commitment; they see people and they think 'Oh well, they go in for that sort of thing, they take that upon themselves'."

Janet has become one of the people who "take things upon themselves", who thinks we have to protest (despite the siting of Cruise). She sponsors a child through Action Aid and sees this as "part and parcel of the same thing ...", the same commitment. And yet, her disarmament and political commitment is of quite recent origin, both came about when she decided to undertake a teaching degree. This experience deeply changed her views of herself and of others: "Teaching seems to suit me very well. In some ways it surprises me because I didn't think, hm [she pauses], I think a
lot of people who haven't been through the higher education system when they were young, I think confidence comes into it a lot, and if someone had said to me years ago the position I'd be in now I'd have just thought it was not on because I think people who are not in the higher education system see those who are as being people who have different qualities and it's not until you look back on it that you see with amazement 'well, you could do that', and so could just about everyone else you know [she laughs] and the myth sort of dissolves."

As someone who came to university as a mature student having worked for a number of years, I was able to identify strongly with Janet's experience of higher education. As Janet says, one of the most profound personal effects of university for many mature students and also for many working class undergraduates is, from my experience, the realisation that the commonly-held belief that those with degrees are more intelligent or gifted than you is, in Janet's phrase, largely a myth. And this realisation does change the way you see them and yourself; in Janet's words: "The world opened up, and I've heard other mature students who had not been in the higher education say the same thing. Suddenly you realise there are not whole areas of society closed to you, that you've almost oh, sunk into that way of thinking, and I think the people I meet, either in higher education, or the professions, you realise the people you know who've had no higher education who are every bit as intelligent and have certain qualities which make them good at this and that - especially teaching - there's people who have a very good way
with people, and yet because they haven't been through the higher education system are not in these positions."

Fortunately, Janet did manage to get her teaching degree and part of the hidden curriculum of her education was the dissolution of the elitist myth and the growth of a new-found confidence in her own views and capabilities: it would seem that one way of expressing these new-found capacities was through joining the Labour Party and CND whilst pursuing her teacher training. Her contact with the state acted as a particular catalyst to personal change and development whereby she could see herself as one of the people who "takes that upon themselves".

Being a teacher can also have other unsought effects which help promote attitudes conducive to creating CND. I interviewed Jenny Armlong at her own home where she was looking after her two children. Divorced, Jenny, in common with Janet, does not have as much time as she would wish for CND and her other activities. She has only been able to attend a couple of local marches and has never been to any of the group's meetings. She joined S.C. CND about three years ago after seeing a showing of the *The War Game* and hearing a talk given by the well known peace campaigner, Helen Caldicott. Her joining the group took place shortly after her divorce, a time in her life when she had resolved to "do things, I'm not just going to sit and vegetate, although in fact I didn't do very much, and it was particularly when the media was saying there wasn't very much popular support for disarmament and I wanted, if nothing else, just to be a statistic, someone
who showed they did support this."

Jenny saw *The War Game* and heard Dr. Caldicott speak "as a mother" and her concern for her children's future prompted her to send her subscription to S.C. CND. She favours non-violent campaigning and the non-party alignment policy and thinks marches and demonstrations are the best way to protest because "they raise public consciousness." We have a nuclear arms race, she believes, because of "suspicion and fear of other people, and not wanting anybody else to have more weapons than you have and feeling secure in that way." Jenny thinks the majority of people do not support CND because the Campaign has a bad image, that it is seen as unpatriotic and suspect. When I asked her whether she thought that the members were drawn from all walks of life she replied: "Well, I think people who join CND tend to be younger and perhaps on the left politically, but I'm always really pleased to see people like Joan Ruddock putting forward such a nice middle class, middle-aged image. I think she's a good spokesperson and that will attract people." She is also pleased to see Bruce Kent and Church spokespeople on the Campaign's platform as she thinks they counter the Movement's left wing image, an image which could deter would-be members, and "the broader the appeal the better."

Jenny is quite active in her teachers' union, has always voted Labour, but has never belonged to any political party. She dislikes politicians feeling that, as a breed, they are all liars; even so, Labour is the only party to which she feels she could give her support. For Jenny, nuclear disarmament is
secondary in importance to the current problem of unemployment. Jenny sees herself as somebody who has not "advanced beyond the Sixties." Whilst an undergraduate, she "was very apolitical" and although she wore CND badges and "long baggy jumpers" she "didn't know what it meant." Jenny attended a university with a strong right wing reputation, read for an English and philosophy degree and then enrolled at a teacher training college in Scots City to do a P.G.C.E. course. After a year spent abroad teaching English as a foreign language she returned to Scots City to become a teacher.

In the course of her career as a teacher, Jenny stopped being an apolitical person, her work engendered a political awakening: "I began to think about things more after I grew up I suppose, and when I started teaching I became more interested in everything." Working as an English and remedial teacher she "became more aware of the injustices in society and I saw the way that some families live and the way that some kids lived, and I became struck by the unfairness and the inequality of it all." Subsequently, she joined her teachers' union and CND.

I am not arguing that the cause of Jenny joining CND was solely the result of this political awakening. Clearly, in the interview Jenny saw herself as a Sixties person who had matured, and her concern for her children's future was a major factor in her decision to become a CNDer. Rather, I am suggesting that her experience of being part of the state, a teacher, inadvertently opened her eyes to the class inequalities in British society from
which she had previously been shielded by her privileged background. Her experiences of being part of the state had, inadvertently, acted as a catalyst in the gestation of her political and social perspectives. (Jenny is unusual in that, unlike the other teacher members I interviewed, she no longer wishes to be a teacher: "I don't like being a teacher, I'd rather be more directly involved with helping people.")

Jenny's experiences of teaching produced unsought changes in her social and political perspectives. The same was true, although in a different fashion, for Bill Racmullan who chose to be interviewed in my office in the early evening after he had finished teaching at a Scots City secondary school. Looking like everyone's idea of a thirty-eight year old teacher, Bill actually had chalk dust on his jacket collar. Bill considers himself an open-minded man who weighs up the pros and cons of an argument and then makes an informed judgement. He joined S.C. CND a year ago having, in characteristic fashion, bought some literature from the group's bookstall and assessed their arguments which "convinced me I should be doing something more than just sitting on the sidelines."

Bill thinks that any form of protesting which gains publicity is valuable although he believes that, in Britain, disarmament protesting must stay within the bounds of the law. The non-party alignment policy of CND is, for Bill, sound for he fears that alignment would lead to the Campaign being controlled by a particular party. He sees the arms race as simply a consequence of people wanting to make money and he is optimistic about the
chances of Britain achieving unilateral disarmament. Bill is reluctant to call nuclear disarmament the most important contemporary priority, as he explains: "Well, I wouldn't want to put anything in an order of priority as such. I think nuclear weapons is an important issue, I think getting rid of chemical and biological weapons is important, I think the problem of racism is important, and the distribution of world resources, they're all interdependent. I think that if we start off with nuclear weapons first we can go on to get rid of chemical and biological weapons using the [campaigning] techniques we've learnt."

Bill believes that the majority of the British public do not support CND because of our history as a great imperial power which has left a legacy of pride for our armed forces; in addition, he believes that the British are a naturally aggressive people. When I asked him whether he thought members of CND are drawn from all walks of life he replied: "I don't classify people. When I go into a meeting I try not to classify people. So, I don't make judgements as to the membership or where it's drawn from." Similarly, he refused to answer my question on whether he thought there was a connection between nuclear weapons and male attitudes as he regarded any answer as a classifying judgement.

This non-classifying attitude to people is linked to his own belief in his capacity to think 'reasonably' which I referred to earlier. Bill spent his undergraduate years as a home student
(that is, living at home with his family), and he read for a chemistry degree with a language option. As an undergraduate, he did not feel part of the university's student culture and he certainly did not belong to the first Campaign. At that time, he thought the dropping of the Bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had helped foreshorten the War. Furthermore, he "thought old Bertie [Russell] was round the twist and the people who were following him were being influenced by this once great thinker who had now gone into senility."

Bill now realises his assessment of the first Campaign was wrong. Leaving university was a disillusioning experience: "I used to think Highbrough University chemistry department was God's gift to the universe. But when I left I realised the lecturers all wanted to go to Oxford or Cambridge because that's where the really good people are." This idea of the brilliant and profound academic is very precious for Bill: "I'm always attracted to the idea of the medieval scholar who would walk hundreds of miles to sit at the feet of a great teacher. And I asked my wife [who is taking a teaching diploma] how far she'd walk to see her lecturers [he laughs], I wouldn't have walked very far to see any of mine. They just hadn't got the quality, the intellectual rigour to be great men you could go and converse with and learn really deeply from."

Disillusioned with his lecturers, and having decided that he did not wish to be a researcher, Bill decided to capitalise on his language option and take a P.G.C.E. course. He tries to live up to his ideal of the 'great teacher' and strives to emulate what
he imagines is their way of thinking - the questioning, non-classifying approach. During the course of the interview he told a revealing anecdote about a holiday he had been on with other teachers from his school, superintending the schoolchildren. In the evenings, the teachers had sat around debating and arguing over various issues; Bill had deliberately taken contradictory debating positions on different days, a process which, he proudly assured me, had puzzled his colleagues. Bill, however, thinks that such practices sharpen the mind permitting one to assess properly the merits of your opponents' arguments.

Bill tries to live up to his rather high ideal of the teacher in his own work. He told me that he thinks "teaching is a magnificent job. Their [the pupils'] minds are opening up to things and you have the opportunity to get them to think about things, to teach them about some of the more important issues in the world." After carefully weighing up the arguments, Bill has now decided that nuclear disarmament is, for him, one of these more important issues.

Bill's experiences of university and teaching are, I feel, particularly interesting and stand in marked contrast to those of Janet whose politicisation involved the dissolution of the myth which Bill cherishes. His answers to my questions, the form his answers took, clearly reflected his admiration for the chimera of the 'great teacher'. His whole attitude, and many of his views, are the result of his internalising and cherishing the ideology of his profession.
Indeed, it would be extraordinary if CND members like Bill were not influenced and affected by their careers and their careers' ideologies. In most of the interviews with state employed professionals, the interviewees referenced their opinions and views to their career experiences. For example, Mrs. Yvonne P., an unemployed primary school teacher in New Town, joined CND a year ago after visiting the group's bookstall in the town centre. She has been on a local march, attended the group's ceremony to commemorate the destruction of Nagasaki, and quite regularly attends meetings. A believer in non-violent protesting (she greatly admires the attitude of the women at Greenham Common), Yvonne recognises the need to break the law on certain occasions when "moral considerations" come to the fore. She agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy in theory, but in practice she thinks that "you're going to fall on the side of the party which represents your views. I think it would be nice if they were apolitical because then they would hold more weight and people wouldn't say you're out to get their votes. And from the moral point of view, you've got to hold to your one aim in view and not be swayed by suggestions and say 'I'll help you if you help us'."

Yvonne thinks that the members of CND are diverse: "Not just age groups, but different personalities, different backgrounds, many people who are totally different." She thinks that the majority do not support the Movement "because they're like I was when I was younger. Either it's natural or else they've been very subtly encouraged to concentrate on their homes, their gardens,
their children doing well at school. I think we're so comfortable we don't realise there is danger and I think people are more concerned with their new sofa, or their dream kitchen or whatever, there's nothing seems real to them outside their homes because they're so comfortable." This material comfort and inward-looking attitude is, she believes, the principal cause of the original Campaign's failure to mobilise the mass support necessary to achieve nuclear disarmament.

Going to teacher training college did not seem to make much of an impression on Yvonne in terms of changing her views or politicising her. She found college slightly unreal and thought that her fellow students were too hedonistic and "not CND ones." Yvonne thinks that she too, when young, was hedonistic and self-centred: "I was too selfish. I was single, I was happy, and I didn't think about the state of the world." However, since the birth of her children, and since leaving college, she has become interested in such issues. The spur to such considerations has come, in a similar fashion as it did for Janet, in the course of her teaching career. Yvonne describes herself as a "socialist", but "not a communist", and when I asked her about her political views she replied: "I would like to see more of our money spent on things like libraries and things that would help children for instance who are born in a slum situation in the inner city where there's no green, whose lives seem to be barren, I think far more should be poured into these situations because the majority of us are so lucky with our little houses. We look out on fields. We know, being educated, there's libraries and things and far more
should be done to educate people who don't have these sort of things and come from the sort of backgrounds where these sort of things are considered foreign. Far more public money should be poured into these things even if it means that the rest of us would have to tighten our belts." For Yvonne, her politics and her disarmament activities are predicated upon a moral imperative which she believes is superior to the materialistic selfishness of the majority; this attitude of 'their's, she believes, prevents them from joining CND. The spur to the development of her new moral attitude was, she told me, the birth of her daughter; even so, her experiences as a state employee are imbricated in the formation of this attitude as her championing of better education for the 'deprived' clearly shows.

Nor does the internalisation of such attitudes cease when the individual is no longer in employment. Mrs. Belinda Oumlann is a retired and widowed ex-teacher living by herself in a small New Town flat. In consideration to her age, Mrs. Oumlann is eighty-three, the interview was truncated; Belinda, like many older people, tended to wander from the point and, furthermore, I did not wish to over-tire her with my questions. However, Belinda was pleased to talk with me, for she feels that those in higher education should be studying issues relating to war and peace. Indeed, two weeks after the interview, Mrs. Oumlann went to the trouble of sending me a clipping from a Canadian newspaper which reported on a conference of psychologists who were calling for the introduction of peace studies into Canadian secondary schools.
For Belinda, nuclear disarmament is part and parcel of the wider issue of peace, a goal which she feels is best achieved through the correct education of children. Her concern with peace dates from 1924 when, after finishing at teacher training college she "went abroad with a friend to a [student] conference given by the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Denmark, all nationalities present, and the theme was 'No More War!', we believed in it, it was 1924", and Mrs. Oumlann was twenty-three. At the conference she met her husband-to-be, an English student of law who, after the conference, went to do famine relief work in Russia for a year. She described him as "touched by pacifism."

Mrs. Oumlann eventually married the pacifist English lawyer and settled in this country where she first went to work at Bertrand Russell's progressive school until the birth of her children. When her own children were old enough to attend a nearby pacifist school, Mrs. Oumlann began to take in 'problem' children which the local authorities were having trouble placing. From what she told me, these would seem to be, typically, aggressive, over-active children and Mrs. Oumlann's technique would be to have them as guests for a period of some months in her large country house on the outskirts of what is now New Town, where they could enjoy the country environment and benefit from the approach to education which Belinda had learnt at Russell's school. (The motto and theme of Russell's school was, Belinda told me, "teach them anything as long as their interested.") And, seemingly, Belinda was very successful at helping her charges; she proudly
showed me photographs and letters from some of her former pupils, many of whom keep in still keep in touch, though they have long since grown up.

Too old to attend meetings or to actively campaign, Belinda passively supports N.T. CND, which she joined two years ago. For her, this commitment is an extension of her long standing concern with peace. Not surprisingly, she is in favour of non-violent protesting: "To me, that's a principle, it's not done by violence", and she agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy which she feels helps to increase the membership. Having been a communist in the Thirties ("it was either communism or fascism"), and a Labour Party and Fabian member in the past, she would now vote for the Social Democratic Party (S.D.P.)/Liberal Alliance because she feels that the internal conflicts in the Labour Party are splitting the liberal opposition to the Conservatives. Mrs. Oumlann strongly dislikes Mrs. Thatcher: "I can't see how she's justified to do what she does and how she gets her support. She supports the wrong things, she should be supporting the arts, the schools, the hospitals."

Mrs. Oumlann is a little uneasy over the ways in which CND members campaign: "I'm not fully in agreement with them, they should discuss it at meetings" rather than going on demonstrations "where they have to be dragged away" [by the police]. This reservation is based on her rejection of violence of any sort, for any end. She is puzzled by the fact that the majority do not support CND and by the fact that so many people
seem to have aggressive tendencies; she feels that television is partly to blame and thinks that academics should be doing research to find the roots of human aggression. Because of her own experiences and beliefs, she thinks that education is the key to a peaceful future. When I asked her whether nuclear disarmament was the most important issue for her at the present time she replied: "No. It's education, education from the family: if a child has a good family life without violence then they grow up non-violent"; an argument which she supported by citing the peaceful nature of her own children and the beneficial effects of her Russell inspired treatment of maladjusted children. Although retired for over twenty years, this remarkable CND member thinks of nuclear disarmament and peace as inseparably linked in with the philosophy of education which she has practised for the greater part of her life.

Of course, not all teachers or students are as deeply affected by the world of education and its ideologies. As I have already remarked, some student members, whom I have spoken to, seemingly drift into CND as part of their more general, and temporary way of life. Furthermore, I am not suggesting that all teachers are compelled to join the Campaign solely by virtue of their experiences of higher education (a crudely deterministic view of social behaviour which is at variance with the theoretical position advanced in this study). Such experiences need to be related to their personal biographies which, as I have tried to show, affect their views on CND and politics and may be just as important spurs to joining the Movement as this final
interview, with a teacher member, clearly demonstrates.

Ellen Bauchline joined N.T. CND about nine months ago. The October national rally had brought the Campaign to her attention and she felt (this was at the time of the Falklands War), that "the way this government goes I just had to take a stand." A Quaker, Oxfam and World Wildlife Fund supporter with an interest in ecological issues, Ellen does not have much time left over to attend her group's meetings and has, in the relatively short time she has been a member, only been on one local march. She believes that disarmament campaigning must be "absolutely" non-violent, would refuse to break the law in the pursuit of disarmament and agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy as she feels that the Movement needs the widest possible base of support. She does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies and depletes the government's cuts in public expenditure. Ellen thinks that "the government is supposed to be us" and that the people who think that matters of defence are best left to government "deserve to get a bomb on their head."

Ellen emigrated to Britain from Germany in 1965. Being an arts student in a large German city did not provoke a political awakening in Ellen, nor did it affect her in the ways which the other interviewees in this chapter described. Her arts school was, she told me, intensively competitive and non-political. Ellen dislikes political labels and has not joined a British political party; she is unhappy with what she perceives as Labour's anti-European stance and with the S.D.P.'s defence
policy. "Reluctantly", she would vote Labour at the next General Election. Ellen is not, however, an apolitical person and she has perhaps more reason than most to be concerned about European and defence issues for her childhood was overshadowed by the Second World War and her parents were persecuted for their left wing political activities. As she says, "I was born and bred on politics."

Ellen thinks that the majority of the public do not support CND because "an awful lot of people like fighting" and she points to the "nasty euphoria through the Falklands campaign" as evidence of this unpleasant human tendency. The membership of N.T. CND is not, she is sure, drawn from all walks of life, "60-70% are teachers, possibly more than that", and they are "the same little crowd" who are involved in the town's other political, social and charitable groups. Indeed, "half the CND members I know as friends, we're that sort of school."

I interviewed Ellen in her own home in New Town. Clearly, Ellen did not wish to discuss her past with me and I felt it would be both tactless and tasteless to probe for details; in addition, her mother was present in the room during the interview. Nonetheless, from the tone of her voice, and by the tacit assumptions she expected me to make when she referred to her past, I was in no doubt that it was her experiences of the War that had been the most profound factor in the formation of her views. My inclusion of Ellen in this discussion of teacher members is by way of, I hope, stark illustration of the fact that CNDers who share a common profession can and do have very
important and different formative episodes in their personal lives which can act as elective spurs to their joining the Campaign and which can profoundly shape and colour their social and political perspectives.

Conclusion: Similarities And Differences
At the beginning of this chapter I posed the question, 'How are we to account for the fact that CND members tend to be highly educated and that teachers, lecturers and students have such a high profile in the Campaign?' Clearly, this is a tendency rather than a strict unyielding causal relation, otherwise all people who are teachers would be members of the Campaign, which they are not. Nor does it seem to be the teachers and students from just one particular discipline/s who feel compelled to join the Movement. Although impressionistic evidence and the history of the first Campaign would suggest that arts and the social sciences(7) are the most fertile breeding ground of CNDers, this is by no means an exclusive academic proclivity as the involvement of many eminent natural scientists in both the original and revived Campaigns shows.(8) Nor is it simply the case that greater knowledge or learning generates a pro-CND attitude; none of the teachers, lecturers or students I interviewed had been persuaded to join CND solely by virtue of a study of nuclear weaponry. Rather, I will argue, there is an affinity between becoming a teacher/lecturer and being a CNDer, that being a part of the welfare state renders teachers able and susceptible to becoming members of the Campaign.
In my discussion of these interviews I have tried to show that the teacher members in my two samples are individuals with different personalities and idiosyncratic biographies and that their views on CND and politics in general need to be related to their own histories; that, for example, whilst Geoff (the unemployed languages teacher) and Ellen may both be CNDers, the significance of the Campaign is markedly different for each of them. For some, disarmament is achievable, for others not; for some it is a political campaign, for others it is a single issue movement; some are pacifists, some not, etc., etc. There is no one common consensus of views on what CND is or should be. However, for all those I interviewed in this chapter, CND is imbricated within their experiences of (higher) state education and employment.

CND is a created phenomenon, it has literally to be made and without the members' creative endeavours the Campaign would be history, as the first Movement has become. The same is true of the world of education. What is the relation between these two spheres of creative social praxes? In the interviews, certain themes can be identified, for example, the teachers' feeling of a duty to protest, a moral concern with social and political issues etc. Furthermore, the interviewees' adoption of these views and attitudes clearly shows the influence of their experiences of higher education; such experiences either directly generated, helped nurture or were conducive to, ways of thinking and behaving which find expression in the interviewees' perspectives
on disarmament campaigning.

This is not to suggest that these CNDers do not sincerely wish to achieve nuclear disarmament; I had no reason to think that any of the members I interviewed were anything less than completely sincere in their desire for nuclear disarmament. But, millions of people sincerely wish that nuclear weapons could be abolished and yet they do not join CND or any other peace group. To be a CNDer requires more than sincere concern, it requires the individual to feel that joining the Campaign is appropriate and worthwhile. It is unlikely that this is simply a question of non-joiners disagreeing with the strategies of CND (I am thinking here particularly of unilateralism), as there are many other peace groups with different strategies and campaigning emphases and, alternatively, there is nothing to stop the formation of new disarmament groups with new strategies. In addition, the membership of CND is not drawn from all walks of life, it displays an over-representation of well educated welfare state employees. It seems to be the case that CND is particularly appealing to those whose work is a welfare state vocation. This sense of vocation runs deep in the consciousness of welfare state employees and can on occasion inhibit their political actions as in the case of teachers and nurses who are reluctant to strike at the expense of their pupils or patients: an unwillingness to put their own interests before their sense of duty.

There is no one common quality, or set of qualities, that CNDers necessarily share that impel them to join the Movement. Instead, I suggest, they creatively live within a category of social
praxis and concomitant attitudes; an understanding of the nature of this category, and an analytical purchase upon it, can be achieved by approaching it through Wittgenstein's family resemblance theory which I discussed in the second chapter of this study.

Let us assign letters to some of the teachers' attitudes to which I have drawn attention: thus, for example, a duty to protest = A; a responsibility to call the issue to the attention of one's students = B; desire to do social service = C; confidence inspired by becoming a teacher = D; mixing with pro-CND teachers = E etc. We could then represent teacher No.1 as:

1) A B C D E

The next hypothetical teacher, although similar to the first, does not feel a duty to bring the issue to the attention of his students, but he does feel the Campaign to be a moral movement which we will call F. Consequently, he is represented as:

2) A C D E F

The third example is of a Christian student CNDer without attitudes A, B, D or E but with the belief that CND is a moral movement and with a desire to do social service:

3) C F

The final example is of a politically inspired teacher who feels that she has a duty to bring the issue to the attention of her students, but that disarmament is only a vain protest against inevitable holocaust (G), and that the Campaign is part of a struggle for a better world (H):

4) B G H
If we now compare all four hypothetical examples:

1) A B C D E
2) A C D E F
3) C F
4) B G H

it will be seen that none of the four CNDers have all the attributes in common, and that numbers 3 and 4 have none in common. Even so, they all fit within the one category.

Seen in this way, it should be clear why it is the case that individuals with different views on disarmament and CND can feel themselves part of a Campaign whose members share the same aims, and why it is the case that questions of specific strategy can provoke disagreement.

Nevertheless, such views and attitudes which underpin the CNDers' form of life are not the unique product of isolated individuals; these are social attitudes, ways of creating the world which arise from wider shared social practices - in the case of teacher CNDers, largely from the creation of the educational dimension of the welfare state. The vocational aspect of teaching, the internalisation of a sense of duty which spills over into other areas of the teachers' lives, can also be found, with differences as well as similarities, in other welfare state jobs. I will be arguing that such socially formed attitudes render welfare state employees peculiarly susceptible to joining the Movement, that is to say, there is an affinity between creative welfare state praxis and CND praxis. It is with these themes in mind that I now turn to a consideration of other welfare state employees whom I
interviewed in the course of this study.
Chapter 3: Notes and References

1) The meaning of the term 'critical' in which it is used here is associated with the neo-Marxist cultural studies of the kind favoured by the Frankfurt School. The 'critical thinker' is one who does not accept the naturalness or reified character of existing social institutions or social practices but, instead, considers them as historically evolved and specific and capable of change. For a good and clear account of the theory and application of critical thought, see Fay, B. Social Theory and Political Practice London. Allen and Unwin (‘Controversies in Sociology’). 1975.

2) With, of course, the exception of private schools. Even this sector is staffed by state-trained teachers.

3) In point of fact, Geoff was unable to go to a Grunwick demonstration owing to ill health. His wife, also a teacher, had to go by herself.

4) The film referred to, is March To Aldermaston made in 1958 by Lindsay Anderson and shown on British television in 1984.

5) A couple of months after this interview Brian reappeared in my office to practice his salesman interviewing techniques. Such a reversal of roles seemed poetic justice.

6) This is certainly true of the Scots City University CND group which dwindles in size and vigour as the academic year progresses. By the time the student members are sitting their exams, the group is almost annually defunct - only to be revived again next year by a new intake of freshers.

7) I am thinking here particularly of the involvement of the New Left teachers and lecturers in the first Campaign who were drawn predominantly from arts and social science disciplines. For a history of the New Left and their involvement in CND and other radical groupings, see: Young, N. An Infantile Disorder? The Crisis And Decline Of The New Left London. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1977. (Especially Chapter 8).

8) Consider, for example, the involvement of scientists via Russell's international Pugwash group in the first Campaign and the establishment of groups such as Scientists Against Nuclear Arms in the recent revival of the Movement.

9) This ingenious portrayal of Wittgenstein's family resemblance theory was given by John Heritage, University of Warwick, Autumn Lectures, 1981.

10) For an interesting account of how archetypes are constructed
Chapter 4

The Commitment of National Health Service CNDers

Introduction

In the conclusion to the previous chapter, I suggested that there was an affinity between welfare state and CND praxes and that this affinity rendered welfare state employees peculiarly susceptible to joining the Campaign. It was argued that the interviewees' experiences of state education and employment had begot consciousnesses and attitudes which found expression in disarmament protesting. In this chapter, I discuss the interviews which I conducted with National Health Service CNDers (doctors, nurses, therapists, etc.), and I show that their experiences of being part of the welfare state has affected them in similar ways to the interviewees in Chapter Three. It is argued that these welfare state employed CND members participate in a common form of life which engenders particular social and political orientations and a duty and proficiency to express them.

The Doctors' Commitment

Dr. Johnathan Goole works in the obstetric and gynaecological unit of a large Scots City hospital and is married to a lecturer in child education. He joined S.C. CND approximately three years ago, shortly after he had joined the Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons (M.C.A.N.W.). His work as a National Health Service doctor and his political activities do not leave him much time for disarmament protesting; to date, he has taken part in a
'die-in' heard Dr. Helen Caldicott speak, and has attended a few of his group's meetings. Johnathan has not broken the law in the pursuit of disarmament protesting; however, he has recently been reading Gandhi's autobiography (My Experiment With Truth), and he admires his example and philosophy and felt that he "would be quite happy" to be involved in Direct Action protesting (that is, non-violent protesting) in the future. He described himself as a pacifist, but he was unsure whether he would be able to remain one if he were living in Poland or South Africa at the present time.

Dr. Goole thinks that the majority of the population do not support CND because they remember how close Britain came to being invaded in World War Two and because they believe nuclear weapons are a way of "guaranteeing our freedom." When I asked him whether he thought that members of CND were drawn from all walks of life he replied: "Uh huh. I've been impressed by the number of people who seem to me to have a much more solid working class [background], perhaps working in a university town, and also being a member of the M.C.A.N.W. I'm aware that there are a fair number of people from other social classes who are very interested in the issue. It's propaganda that says Tories aren't members, that CND members tend to be left wing."

Johnathan believes that Britain could unilaterally disarm, although he is worried that the Labour Party (which he sees as the vehicle for achieving unilateral disarmament) would not be
elected unless it adopted a more centrist position; Johnathan thinks it would be worth sacrificing some socialist principles in order to achieve disarmament. The son of a "very anti-communist" Polish immigrant who thinks his son is "mad" to support the Campaign, Dr. Goole describes his own politics as "slightly right to where I believe the majority of the Labour Party stand at the moment." He has been a member of the Labour Party for the last decade and attends about five branch meetings a year. His location of himself on the right of the party stems from his respect for the rule of law and for democracy: "I'm a great believer in democracy, and I wouldn't do anything to bring the government down. At least I can express my views without worrying about somebody listening at the door." Consequently, he found the miners' strike action without a (national) ballot "a difficult issue."

Perhaps predictably, Dr. Goole disagrees with all of Mrs. Thatcher's government's policies, especially the cut-backs in spending on health and education; the only exception to this is a reluctant agreement with the Conservative's championing of law and order (in the light of the miners' strike). Like many of the teacher members I discussed in Chapter Three, Johnathan references his politics to his work. For example, when I asked him whether he thought that matters of defence were best left to the government, he replied: "I don't see that the government necessarily has a monopoly view on what's right and I look at health, for example, where it seems crazy that we spend so much money on defence, the Falkland Islands, and yet here we are for
the very first time in our history, the Scottish Secretary of State actually reduced the budget to the N.H.S. in Scotland and at a time when the population in the country are getting older, and with the medical advances, the N.H.S. needs an extra 1% just to stand still. And yet we actually had a cut! And so yes, I don't see the government has necessarily made the right decisions."

For the past twelve years, Dr. Goole has been a member of the Hosta Community (a Scottish campaigning Christian group with a retreat on an island off the west coast of Scotland), and he has deeply-held religious views which permeate his political consciousness: "For me, one of the dilemmas is I can't see how capitalism fits in with deep Christian views." He sees nuclear disarmament as an ethical question, "... for me it's a moral issue. Obviously, like all issues in life it has political implications." The nature of Dr. Goole's moral and political outlook was beautifully illustrated in his reply to my question on whether he belonged to any charity, organisation or group working in the Third World: [Although not a member of any such group] "I suppose like a lot of people I'm interested in what goes on in the world. I'm a great believer in, well, really, in these lines of J.B. Priestley in An Inspector Calls where he says, y'know, 'anything you do is going to affect everyone else, we're all intertwined, we're not all individuals', and I think obviously at the moment, very obviously, we are all worried about what's going on in the Third World in the sense of, y'know, how we make things more difficult for them and how the gulf is
getting wider."

The lines from Priestley's play, to which Dr. Goole refers, are from the Inspector's final speech, a warning to the Birling family:

'Inspector: But just remember this. One Eva Smith has gone - but there are millions and millions and millions of Eva Smiths and John Smiths still left with us, with their lives, their hopes and fears, their suffering, and chance of happiness, all intertwined with our lives, with what we think and say and do. We don't live alone. We are members of one body. We are responsible for each other. And I tell you that the time will come when, if men will not learn that lesson, then they will be taught it in fire and blood and anguish. Good night.'

Priestley, the Vice-President of the original CND in its early years, wrote this play, in one week during the winter of 1944 to 1945 and the moral message of this play reflects the hopes of a large percentage of the post-War generation and perfectly captures the geist of CND. Interestingly, it was a moral 'call to arms' from Priestley in 1957 which acted as a major spur to the birth of the first CND and these themes - that we are all 'intertwined' and that we all have a moral duty to care for each other - could well stand as a motif for the CNDers' form of life.

And Dr. Goole tries to practise his ideals, fighting against the closure of a hospital threatened by cut-backs, donating money to help alleviate suffering caused by the drought in East Africa, joining CND and working as a doctor. For Johnathan, all of these issues are of equal importance, all intertwined.

However, Dr. Goole was not born with the Inspector's warning ringing in his ears: "As a boy, all my heroes were folk who
escaped from prisoner of war camps, and I was interested in pilots and flying and my heroes as a teenager were men like Leonard Cheshire and stuff like that. For me, the peace thing is something that gradually developed as I got older." Nor do his views reflect his parents' opinions; as I have already mentioned, neither of his parents support CND and his father thinks his son is crazy to belong to the Campaign. Similarly, his close friends do not agree with his disarmament views, as he told me: "We've had a good few arguments in the room you're sitting in about peace issues. My best man for example who's now down in Oxford is very much for the nuclear thing. I was wearing one of the stickers, 'Nuclear Power, No Thank You', and that created quite a stir!"

Nor was it the case that Johnathan possessed some innate urge to devote his life to the medical service of others. When he had completed his secondary education Johnathan had no idea which subject he wanted to study at university and, after a completely unhelpful interview with his careers master, decided to read for a chemistry B.Sc. "... simply because I was good at chemistry at school. That's all there was to it." During his first summer vacation from the university he took a job in a commercial chemical laboratory in a nearby city and on his return to his home town in the autumn he informed his father that he was not interested in chemistry and was sure he wanted to change to a medical degree. I asked him what had prompted this change: "It wasn't the chemistry, I quite liked chemistry, and I could do it. But I'd always liked working with people. It was largely, there
was one poor lad [in the commercial chemical laboratory] who wasn't getting on particularly well because he couldn't do his physics, he'd failed his physics exams a couple of times, and the boss took me aside and asked me if I'd like to tutor this chap for one hour a day. And I quite enjoyed that and it seemed to me that I was doing something worthwhile and I was doing it with a person and I think the contrast [with his chemistry degree and his likely future employment], and I think I realised I wanted to do something working with people. I think I'd vaguely thought about working with people when I was at school, personnel management, that sort of thing. I don't know why I chose medicine but I've never regretted it."

Dr. Goole sees the formation of his social and political views as a long process of development, a process which included the embrace of Christianity. It may be thought that his "vague" desire to work with people was present before he became a student and an aetiological analysis could be based on this desire. However, this line of reasoning predicates motives upon private innate characteristics rather than social relations. Without the existence of the university and the state run medical apprenticeship Johnathan could not have become Dr. Goole - and it is as a doctor, as a welfare state employee, that Johnathan helps others and expresses his political beliefs.

Johnathan joined the Hosta Community, the Labour Party, M.C.A.N.W. and S.C. CND after completing his medical training, as a doctor. And it is by reference to his welfare state employment
that he expresses his social and political beliefs (for example, refusing on principal to practise private medicine, concerning himself with hospital closures and joining the M.C.A.N.W.). It is as a part of the welfare state that Dr. Goole tries to live out the moral lessons of Priestley and Gandhi and his membership of CND is one facet of this socially practised form of life.

Of course, and as I stressed in the preceding chapter, Dr. Goole must not be thought of as a stereotypical doctor CND member, nor must his experiences of the state be thought of as in any way the norm. Rather, such experiences and their affects need to be understood as bearing a family resemblance to other welfare state praxes permitting them to fall within a common category. Clearly, considerable diversity exists between different CND doctor members.

For instance, Dr. Susan Stuart, a G.P. working and living in a small town on the outskirts of Scots City, joined an evangelical Christian group whilst at university and she still retains her faith (albeit in a somewhat tempered form owing to the lack of a local congenial church). Dr. Stuart describes herself as a "socialist, believing in more equality, but I'm not a communist" and admits to being "very influenced by my husband who being a social worker votes Labour." She joined S.C. CND three years ago and has taken part in a march and has done some door-to-door leafleting; again, and in common with other women members, Susan has pressing calls on her time from her work and from her two young children.
Unlike Dr. Goole, Susan is not a pacifist in that she believes "in some sort of conventional weaponry." Too young (thirty-one), to have been a member of the original Campaign, she has never thought about her Campaign predecessors' fate. Susan thinks she agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment stand, for she fears that otherwise disarmament objectives might become associated with party policies which the majority find unacceptable. Susan thinks that the reason the majority of the British public do not support CND is because "they stick their heads in the sand and think it's not going to happen. If they read a bit more about it and realised how close we are to it they might do a bit more about it."

Although describing herself as a socialist, Dr. Stuart is not a member of any political party and does not consider herself to be a particularly political person. When I asked her what she would call herself in political terms she replied: "I'm not very good at labelling myself. Well, y'know, where I live, a lot of the upper upper people and an awful lot of people, like farm labourers, with incredibly little. I'd like to see a bit more moving together. Again, I'm terribly simplistic about things, but there's a lot of injustice I see." When I asked which of Mrs. Thatcher's government's policies, apart from defence, she agreed or disagreed with, she replied that there were none she agreed with but that the (then) imminent denationalisation of British Telecommunications was the only example of a specific policy which she objected to: "... I can't think of anything else at the moment." I think it would be fair to say that Susan's
politics are more in the nature of a moral commitment to ease inequality rather than a studied political position. When I asked her if she thought that CND was a moral movement, she answered: "Yes I do. Firstly a moral issue, it's got to be a political issue too. That people can contemplate destroying, it has to be a moral issue."

Dr. Stuart does not believe that Britain could unilaterally disarm, however, she feels that she has a duty to protest against nuclear weapons for the sake of her children. Susan told me that she thought that the reason she first became interested in the nuclear issue was "probably thinking about having a family and a future, that sort of thing" combined with the publicity that the issue was receiving at that time (1981). She has two young children which she brought with her to my office (the eldest amused himself during the interview by jumping up and down on my briefcase). When I asked why, if she thought that unilateral disarmament was not possible, she still protested, she answered: "I don't think I could sort of live with myself without having tried to do something, particularly for my kids, and for their kids I suppose."

Susan's parents and her brothers are all doctors and she studied medicine at university more as a matter of course than to fulfill any deep-seated ambition; as she said, "I couldn't say it's a true vocation, it's just the direction I seemed to be pushed in to." At university, most of her time was taken up with studying for her degree and, apart from joining the evangelical group and
meeting her husband-to-be, Susan does not think she "experienced university life" and it does not appear to have been a politically formative period. Her views and attitudes, which she herself characterises as "simplistic", would seem to derive more from her husband's influence and from a concern for her children's future.

Dr. Stuart and Dr. Goole are both religious, describe themselves as socialists and are both doctor CNDers. And both, in different ways, are moral in their outlook. Nevertheless, the meaning and form of their politics, religion and morality, and the spurs to the development of their views, are markedly different. Both try to live out their ideals (Susan sponsors a child through the Action Aid charity and contributes to Oxfam); nonetheless, it is important to realise that their views on disarmament campaigning and their political perspectives bear a resemblance rather than identical duplications. Their respective ways of being doctors, and doctor CNDers, are akin to jigsaw pieces wherein each piece is unique and different from its neighbour and yet each piece shares features that allow it to be part of a single picture.

The remaining doctor CNDer in my sample, also from Scots City, is a psychiatrist with views and opinions which differ and converge with those of Dr. Goole and Dr. Stuart. Dr. Kenneth Macman is acutely aware of the effects of the present government's cutbacks in public expenditure; due to retire, he finds himself having to submit a written report to the authorities justifying his work so that the hospital can apply for a replacement for him.
when he leaves. In the interview, Dr. Macman's views and opinions clearly reflected his left wing politics and his professional training.

Having previously joined the M.C.A.N.W., Dr. Macman joined S.C. CND about three years ago. He agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy for he feels that the nuclear disarmament issue cuts, to some extent, across the boundaries of political allegiance and because CND needs as broad a base of support as possible. Kept busy with his work, Kenneth has only been on a few local marches and has only been able to attend a small number of his group's meetings which he found rather "cliquey". When I asked him if he thought that members of CND were drawn from all walks of life he replied: "Yes, but not equally representative. I know more people who are more middle class, social workers, socially conscious types of people from the middle-ranking professional groups."

Dr. Macman is very personally involved with his work and intends to continue on a private basis when he retires from the hospital ("I don't want to give up work at all.") Describing himself as a "socialist", he deplores what he sees as the present government's attitude to people: "I strongly disagree with the present administration's attitude towards people. Towards their whole concept, their tendency to depersonalise people and to treat people as merely factors in the means of production, not to be concerned with people as persons but rather, as I say, factors to be considered in evolving policies. I think there's a lack of
concern, a lack of caring for persons. And that to me, in my work, is fundamental! And I think that leads to all sorts of policies being adopted for theoretical reasons which don't have a brake put on them by caring for persons." Kenneth "would like to see twice the resources coming into the National Health Service, I think that most of the problems [in the N.H.S.] are due to lack of funding and government pressure."

Kenneth's professional training has been internalised into a paradigm through which he interprets the world. Thus, for example, when I asked him why he thought it was that the majority do not support CND, he replied: "I think people tend to go on undisturbed as much as possible, I think there's a natural tendency in people not to look at conflict as much as possible and to, to have their own domestic security, unless they're forced to do so. Again, it's something I see professionally; people can cope with conflict unless it dominates them, they'll only come to see me if it takes them over ... they hear the news and think 'I don't want to hear about this', it's a repressive mechanism. The more frightened they are, the more anxious they are, the more they tend to do that. That's the paradox. Again, it's for psychological reasons. The more anxious they are, the less likely they are to become involved, for psychological reasons. Becoming involved makes you more anxious, you become more aware of how awful the threat is." (As I have already remarked in the context of discussing the interviews with teacher CNDers, the idea that the majority might reasonably disagree with the aims of CND does not seem to occur to Dr. Macman.) (2)
Similarly, when I asked him why he had chosen to do medicine at university (a necessary prerequisite for a career in psychiatry), he replied: "That's an interesting question. As far as I can look back I've always wanted to, and I've been curious to know where that want comes from and I think I discovered it; I think this had been a secret ambition of my father's. He used to take a funny interest in my medical work, and he used to pretend he knew more about it than he really did and so on. And I asked him one day what was his interest and stuff, and he said 'Oh well, this had always been a secret ambition' but he'd never quite made it. And I have a feeling, before I was conscious of what was happening, and this was at least part of the origin of this."

In fact, Dr. Macman's father was a civil servant, a job which represented, for him, upward social mobility from his manual working class background. All of Dr. Macman's family were of a left wing political persuasion; his father was a member of the Fabian Society and Kenneth remembers as a boy listening to the family debating political issues. The family politics rubbed off on young Kenneth and as a child he helped distribute the United Nations' pre-War peace questionnaire.

Going to university proved to be a very significant episode in his life: "... it focused my mind, finding people of a like mind, I look back to that period even yet as a tremendously important period, very creative, oh yes" (although he feels that it was somewhat dampened by the spectre of the Second World War). As a
student, Kenneth joined the Communist and Socialist Societies and although never a member of any political party, he regards himself as a socialist. A life-long Labour voter, he would only be persuaded to vote for another political party if he thought that they would be more likely to achieve nuclear disarmament for he feels that this should be a primary aim to which all other political goals must be subordinate.

Clearly, Dr. Macman's views and opinions have been shaped by both his family's political attitudes and by his career as a psychiatrist; a career made possible by a state (university) apprenticeship and the state professionalisation of medicine and mental health care. When I asked Dr. Macman whether he thought that British unilateral disarmament was achievable, he answered: "I doubt it. I'm not sure, I'm not too optimistic." Nevertheless, he feels that he should protest; for violence in general, and nuclear war in particular, is repugnant to his political and professional outlook. When I asked him whether he thought that nuclear disarmament was the most personally important contemporary issue, he replied: "I would think it's the most urgent one. It's what I feel, on many levels, to be the most urgent one, not just because I've got a radical and emotional distaste for it, which I have, but, I mean, a professional objection; in fact as a doctor I've been trained to try to foresee epidemics, lethal epidemics and stop them. This is what really one can see happening now and, as I say, I have political objections as well, there's all sorts of things, it's possible
now to destroy the world."

A similar duality of perspectives, both political and professional, can be seen in his reply to my questioning him on what he thought were the main reasons for the existence of the arms race: "Well, there's various ways of answering that. I think it's an extension of basically a political power struggle, it's the logical extension of that, you can see it sort of extending from there, the massed armies of the frontier, to various ways of, of, each side trying to increase its power. And I think it goes on because people don't step outside this and take an overview of what's going on, what's happening, they just go on, y'know, hm, shouting their own slogans as it were, and I think basically each one hoping to win. Psychologically, I think this is a problem which arises when people exclude one side of an argument, a conflict, and seal their own side, and disassociate from the other half of the problem. So that instead of it being a problem on each side, y'know, you project one side into the other, into the enemy and feel you're entirely good and they're entirely bad, instead of feeling the good and the bad is in you and also in them, in which case you could negotiate. I'm a psychiatrist and this is the sort of thing I see with individuals all the time, and I suppose when you're dealing with groups and issues of tremendous concentrations of power that you tend to get an emotional regression, people behave in a less mature way than they do as individuals. And that is rationalised by all sorts of intellectual arguments to make it seem very adult and mature and so on, and you can talk yourself into believing anything and you
talk yourself into believing that you're right and the other side is wrong."(3)

Dr. Macman's answers to my questions very clearly reflect the two profound paradigmatic influences in his life - his politics and his profession. It would be misleading to imagine that his experiences of the state, as a student and as a psychiatrist, had caused him to join CND; rather, as with many of my interviewees, the effects of his contact with the state are imbricated within and co-exist alongside his own unique and personal biography (which in Dr. Macman's case includes the important political influence of his family). This interplay of individual experiences and state social relations produces the diversity and similarity which state employed CNDers share. Dr. Goole, Dr. Stuart and Dr. Macman are distinct men and women each with their own personal perspectives on the Campaign, nevertheless, there exists an affinity between their professional concerns and their objection to nuclear weapons.

Indeed, it would be remarkable if at least some of the men and women who work in the National Health Service did not feel that nuclear weaponry was an affront to their professional ethics; the ultimate antithesis to their work. And in the revival of CND, the M.C.A.N.W. has been an important element producing high quality campaigning material which is often taken seriously by the media, for the social standing and non-political nature of their profession ensures that their views cannot be lightly dismissed.

The Nurses' Commitment
Of course, it is not only doctors in the National Health Service who are personally affected by the nuclear issue. Melanie L. is a twenty-eight year old statistician working for the Scottish N.H.S. She joined S.C. CND about three years ago and has, to date, visited Greenham Common once, been on some local and national demonstrations and went to "a few" of her group's meetings when she first became a member. Melanie agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "because I think it's important to get as many people involved as possible and a lot of people are just not interested in political parties. I think that one of CND's greatest strengths is having lots of little groups like 'Vicars Against the Bomb', 'Market Gardeners Against the Bomb'. I think that people, what makes people go to groups is being interested in the issue, being concerned about the issue. But what makes people continue going to groups is feeling that they've got something in common with the other people going to the group, apart from the issue in question." Melanie has not broken the law in the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and when I asked her how she felt about illegal protesting(4) she told me she was "ambivalent; I'd have to do some research on how it would affect my job, I wouldn't want to lose my job."

Describing herself as a pacifist, Melanie is against all weapons, both nuclear and conventional, and she is unsure why we have an arms race: "It seems to generate itself and be self-perpetuating, I really don't know." Melanie does not think that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life, I asked her what sort of people she thought belonged: "Well, middle class lefties are over-
represented. There are a lot of older people, but I think it's worth making an effort to get other people." When I asked her why she thought "middle class lefties" were over-represented she told me that she thought it was because "they're used to going to meetings, they're used to being in political parties and standing up and giving their opinion." Conversely, she thinks that the majority of the British public do not support CND "because they're not used to getting involved in things, not used to going to groups and they're not used to having any opinion or thinking they can do anything to change things."

Melanie is a member of the National Association of Local Government Officers (N.A.L.G.O.), and has been a shop steward for the Association. When I asked her what she would call herself in political terms, she told me that she was "... a feminist. I might call myself a socialist but that would come second after feminist." However, she does not think that male attitudes are solely responsible for the arms race for she does not believe that women are naturally more pacific than men.

Melanie's first degree was a mathematics B.A. and following on from this she took a postgraduate Masters course in statistics. I asked her whether her time at university had been a formative period in her life: "Oh yes! Absolutely. I came from a small town, so it was escaping from a small town - which was wonderful - into a set-up where you're fairly well looked after, and it was just finding people with the same ideas as me. In fact, both universities were formative, because coming to Scots City was
escaping from home, then going to Watermouth I started getting involved in the Women's Movement, I was very involved at that time [1977 to 1980]." Melanie had not been involved in any political or feminist group whilst an undergraduate at Scots City University and I asked why she became interested when she went, as a postgraduate, to Watermouth: "It was chance, just meeting people. The woman who lived next door to me in halls ran the Women's Group stall at the Freshers Week so I joined. Before that I'd read some of the books and agreed with some of the ideas, but I'd thought that feminists were all humourless, man-hating, etc." The Women's Group which Melanie joined was both a consciousness-raising and campaigning group. One of the campaigns it was involved in was opposing the anti-abortion Corrie Bill: "It was the first time I'd been on a demonstration. The Women's Movement made me realise that I am the sort of person who can go to demonstrations."

Melanie chose to become a N.H.S. statistician mainly because she was professionally interested in the organisational structure of the Health Service. As I have already noted, she has been active in her union and not surprisingly opposes the privatisation of the N.H.S. and the cut-backs in expenditure on health care: "I strongly disagree with what she's [Thatcher] doing with the Health Service. That's the one that affects me most at the moment." As a statistician, Melanie is well placed to gauge the effects of the cuts and she sees the role of N.A.L.G.O. as being politically educative. Unlike the three doctors I discussed at the beginning of this chapter, Melanie's
relationship to her work is more in the nature of a professional and political concern, rather than Dr. Goole's relationship as a caring state practitioner.

Melanie became involved in the peace movement and her union at the same time; media publicity was the spur, she felt, to her joining the Movement. Clearly, her own personal biography (the escape from a small town, the chance meeting with the woman who ran the Women's Group book stall) needs to be considered alongside her formative experiences at university; nevertheless, as she herself says, it was meeting feminists in the flesh whilst a postgraduate and finding they were not the harridans of media fiction, and the confidence she found from Women's Movement campaigning, which gave her the background to join CND and her union when she left university and started to work. And, of course, she also obtained the qualifications to enter into state employment.

However, not every National Health Service CNDer has been to university. For example, James F. is an extremely active member of New Town CND having held office in the group and the group's precursor, the New Town World Disarmament Campaign. James also co-founded a small, short-lived, local disarmament group called Peace Action which was intended to be a radical fillip to N.T. CND and he has taken part in many disarmament actions including blockades at American airforce bases. James agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "... because I personally think that all the parties stink and the last thing I'd want is
to be aligned to any of them." However, he does see nuclear disarmament as a political issue and he dislikes having to work with Conservative and Christian members of N.T. CND. Describing himself as a "very impure" pacifist, James considers violence against people to be "an absolute no-no" but he strongly favours Non-Violent Direct Action (N.V.D.A.).

James does not think that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life: "No, I think New Town CND is very much those people who are either involved in other political campaigns in the town, those people who because of their Christianity have what they believe is a moral conscience, and those people involved in community politics." He thinks that "New Town CND operates way above the heads" of ordinary people and he believes that there is a high percentage of the population "out there who are scared shitless" but do not join the Movement because they lack the confidence to take on the roles which the Campaign demands from new recruits. James feels that this failing is certainly true of N.T. CND; he dislikes the bureaucracy of his group, (what he sees as) the dominance of old-timers on the group's executive, and the members' general conservatism and their unwillingness to engage in radical N.V.D.A.

An ex-member of the Socialist Workers Party, James would "actually class myself as a socialist, but many people wouldn't." He supports political separatism, "self-organisation for oppressed groups", and votes Labour as "an anti-vote" to the other parties. Although only twenty-four years old, James has
taken part in a surprisingly large number of political campaigns and disarmament activities including Amnesty International, a miners' strike support group and squatters' rights; during the interview he proudly showed me a scrap-book of press-clippings covering N.T. CND from its inception; many of the clippings mentioned James. He sees himself as more radical than the other members of N.T. CND and he believes that politics should rightfully be based on the greatest possible democratic participation with the least amount of bureaucracy and elitism. James has a high profile in N.T. CND and tries to mould the group according to his political convictions.

James first became interested in politics whilst living in a squat in his parents' home town. At the age of fifteen he started to take part in self-help projects for minorities and his belief in non-formal democratic politics dates from these early activities. Two weeks prior to the interview, James had started working in the long term ward of a psychiatric hospital. He has "always been in the social work industry of some sort" and has worked with adolescents, old people and on community projects. I asked him what attracted him to this sort of work and he replied: "If I've got to work I want to be doing something that's fulfilling to other people and also has a good political input. I actually see social work as giving you the opportunity to work politically within any organisation you're working for."

James has no educational or professional qualifications and his
politics derive from his experiences of voluntary social and community work which he undertook when he was younger. In the style of Sixties left wing activists, he believes in living out his politics in his everyday life and considers conventional politics to be corrupt. In addition, he feels himself to be a member of an oppressed minority and this social location gives an extra edge to his politics, promoting an identification with other minority group struggles. Unlike many of the interviewees I have discussed, James' political and social perspectives were already formed before he entered into state employment. Nevertheless, these views were engendered in the context of his experiences of voluntary social and community work. For James, there is no separation between his work and his politics and his membership of CND is an extension of his personal commitment; a commitment which includes attempting to re-shape his local CND group into a form which squares with his conception of what politics and social life should be like. This conception, this ideal, developed in the course of his experiences of social and community work; first as a volunteer, and now as a professional state employee.

Such commitment can spring from very different sources and may be expressed in a variety of forms. Tina B. is a thirty-two year old nurse who joined S.C. CND approximately three and a half years ago. So far, she has only been to one of her group's meetings which, although she did not wish to seem critical, appeared to her rather cliquey. In addition, she felt that she lacked confidence at the meeting for she thinks that she is
insufficiently well informed about the arms race and disarmament issues. In common with many women CNDers, Tina's disarmament activities are curtailed by her family commitments; however, she has been trying to remedy her supposed lack of knowledge by reading disarmament and related literature.

This study involves reading books about Mahatma Gandhi and she believes that "theoretically" Non Violent Direct Action is a good strategy but that in practice it would be impractical in all circumstances and this reservation prevents her from calling herself a pacifist. (Tina's reservation about N.V.D.A. and pacifism were both illustrated by the example of a hypothetical attack on her child, a circumstance in which she feels that she might well have to resort to defensive violence.) She believes that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is sound, nevertheless, she thinks that "... just by its very nature more left wing people tend to join, just because of Conservative policies." Tina thinks that the arms race started as an attempt to secure peace by deterrence but that with the escalation in the quantity of weapons it has now become a "mockery".

Although "generally speaking" Tina would call herself a socialist, she does not favour political labels as "I think you all believe in the same goal. It [labelling] often creates a lot of barriers I think." Predictably, she is opposed to Mrs. Thatcher's administration and thinks any alternative would be preferable: "Anything but these Conservatives with these policies, and not just about disarmament, but obviously I'm very
concerned with the running-down of the Health Service, y'know they seem to be churning out 'of course we care' but people have seen through all that and realise."

Tina supports various charities, buys Campaign Coffee and works for the One-World organisation through her local church. She is a practising Christian and regularly goes to church, although she does not think that regular attendance is a sign of inner spirituality; rather, "I think we all need, as in all walks of life, we all need to join together, we can't do things alone, and that you reach that goal much better by joining with other people of like mind." Tina's parents do not support CND, her father believes in the concept of a nuclear deterrent which she finds surprising: "I was absolutely amazed, and I said 'but dad, y'know as a Christian this can't be morally right'."

The daughter of a civil servant at the Board of Trade, Tina left school at fifteen without any educational qualifications and after five years working at various jobs joined the army, where she trained to be a nurse and took an army nursing certificate. During her service in the army she began to take an interest in religion: "I suppose that I began to think about Christianity when I joined the army. I think I got involved with a Christian group when I travelled abroad. In fact, I was in Cyprus in 1974 and this again made me think a lot about war and how ridiculous it was ultimately, and I saw the casualties of it in a military hospital, and we had both Greek and Turkish people with gun-shot wounds. And you know when they're in a hospital bed, does it
matter who they are? and you take care of them and this seems to me what it's all about."

Tina left the army after five years and, following a short stay with her parents in the South of England, she moved to Lancashire where she mixed with her student boyfriend's circle of friends, an environment which began to change her views and opinions. When she was in the army she "was a different person if you know what I mean. I'd always liked the North of England and I moved up to Lancaster, this was before I met my husband, and I had a boyfriend who was at Lancaster University and I think that maybe meeting that group of people he was connected with, they were sort of into peace and harmony and that sort of thing. And a couple of really good friends we made sort of worked on organic farms and I think that probably, and one chap in particular was very interested in CND, hm, I think that probably sowed the seeds then, about five years ago, and I thought perhaps that's what I should be doing, joining this sort of Movement, but I hadn't I suppose thought it out properly, why I was joining."

After living in Lancaster for about three years, Tina came to Scots City where she worked as a nurse with the physically disabled. This job opened her eyes to social class differences. As a preliminary to the interview, I had been discussing my research and telling her how interesting it was to interview the Campaign's members and she concurred saying, "many different people from different walks of life now, just from the people I've met in CND, completely different." However, when I asked her
later in the interview whether she thought that members of CND were drawn from all walks of life she replied: "Yes I think so. Hm, I don't know, having said that. I don't think people know enough. One thing that bothers me, I used to work at the Clan Foundation at Moilfield [a working class area of Scots City], it's a sort of community of houses for the disabled, and I'd never known areas like Moilfield or really run-down areas like this before and I got to know it really well and I got to realise that those sort of people are really not interested at all, that just their basic day-to-day life is just about all they can manage or all they're interested in. I'm not quite sure why that sort of thing is, and they tend to say 'oh, that sort of thing is just for the middle classes and we don't want to get involved in that sort of thing' and I don't know whether that's true. Hm, certainly when it started it did draw in more middle class people and going back to the beginning, whether this was the reason it petered out, whether that was the reason, people thought it was too high-faluting and people thought they couldn't compete."

Such seeming inconsistencies of views were not uncommon in the interviews; like many other people, CNDers do not always have clear-cut coherent views and opinions. In point of fact, when I asked Tina why she thought it was that the majority of people did not support CND, she told me that she thought it was because they were too frightened to think about the issue, a reaction with which she sympathises. As in the case of most of the members I interviewed, Tina had not previously considered some of the questions and issues we talked about; indeed, after the
interview she kindly sent me a letter which began: "Having just returned from my interview with you this morning, it has occurred to me that I didn't answer one of your questions very fully" (the question was concerned with the possibility of achieving unilateral disarmament). This is also true in relation to the events which prompt people to join the Movement; I have found that sometimes people simply cannot remember what event or feeling etc. prompted them to join.

In Tina's case, a number of factors combined to persuade her to join S.C. CND. These included the birth of her baby, a reading of *Protest and Survive* and general media publicity on nuclear matters. However, these factors were predated by an earlier objection to nuclear power which arose from Tina discussing the ethics of nuclear energy with a friend who worked as a nurse at the Torness nuclear power station. In addition, Tina's Christian beliefs cannot be separated out from her political standpoint and general attitude. She sees herself as having matured since leaving the army: "In the past four to five years I started forming my ideas, my philosophy." From my conversation with her, it would seem that it was her work in the Cyprus hospital and the socialising with the students from Lancaster university which engendered her personal philosophy, an attitude conducive to promoting the feeling that she has a duty to protest against nuclear weapons.

Especially in the case of Tina, it would be foolish to attempt to
identify a single causal event or factor which makes her a CNDer, rather, it is more profitable to see her biography as an entrance into social relations (as a nurse, mixing with students), which comprise a particular form of life. I think it pertinent to note that as a nurse in Cyprus and as a nurse in Moilfield, she perceived, respectively, the futility of war and the differences in class consciousnesses and ways of life - that these perceptions were made whilst she was a state employee. It is perhaps not surprising that when Tina found herself nursing the casualties of nation-state conflict in Cyprus she began to question the nature of war and that this reinforced her newly-acquired Christianity; nor is it surprising that she was "amazed" at her father's support for the nuclear 'deterrent'; "as a Christian that can't be morally right". Unlike her father, Tina's state employment as an army nurse had shown her the effects of fighting and, unlike her father, her subsequent career was to promote a perception of herself and the world which involved protesting at the most monstrous manifestation of nation-state weaponry.

Conclusion
In the foregoing discussion of interviews which I conducted with CNDers who were employed in the National Health Service,\(^7\) I have tried to follow through the analytical approach which I used in the Third Chapter when discussing teacher CNDers. The intention is to show that the CNDers I interviewed are distinct individuals with idiosyncratic biographies who enter into welfare state social relations which, in a variety of ways,
render them susceptible to joining the Campaign. Such an analytical approach reveals a richer picture of the CNDers' form of life, wherein similarities which they share can be seen as the 'overlapping and criss-crossing' intermesh of categorisation to which Wittgenstein refers in his theory of 'family resemblance'. Moreover, it will be appreciated that the category of CND, or CND form of life is blurred at the edges, permitting a great variety of views and attitudes to be contained within it and allowing other categories with fuzzy boundaries to merge and adjoin it. I now turn to the remaining respondents in my samples who were directly employed in welfare state professions: social and community worker CNDers.
Chapter 4: Notes and References

1) Priestley, J.B. 'An Inspector Calls' (Act 3) p311 in The Plays of J.B. Priestley Vol. 3 London. Heinemann. 1950; and see Chapter 1, reference No. 12 for Priestley's moral 'call to arms' which acted as a rallying cry for the formation of the first Campaign.

2) In fairness, the respondents' form of answer may be coloured by the question; that is to say, they are being asked to come up with a reason why the majority do not support the Movement. Nevertheless, I think this observation is still pertinent.

3) Dr. Macman's remarks on the concept of the 'other' as a projection of our own failings echo the arguments advanced by E. P. Thompson to explain our present Cold War mentality. I do not know whether Dr. Macman had read any of Thompson's work, I have no reason to believe he had. (c.f. Thompson, E.P. Beyond The Cold War London. Jointly published by E.N.D. and Merlin Press Ltd. 1982).

4) In the interviews, I explained that I was thinking of minor infringements of the law such as trespass or the cutting of wire fences around missile bases.

5) The interview with James was particularly rich and interesting. However, James has a personal characteristic which if discussed would, I believe, amount to a breach of confidence and perhaps to his identification. Consequently, my discussion of the interview is shorter than I would wish and may appear impressionistic, lacking the quantity of substantiating quotes; this is unavoidable.

6) Tina's letter expressed support for the Freeze Campaign. It ends: 'May I say how much I enjoyed being able to discuss something so relevant to the future of mankind!'

7) The remaining three health service workers (two nurses and a speech therapist), which considerations of space prevent me from discussing, are similar, idiosyncratic welfare state CNDers.
Chapter 5
The Commitment of Social and Community Workers

Introduction
In this chapter, I discuss the interviews I conducted with the remaining campaigners in my two samples who were employed in the welfare state sector. The discussion follows, and develops, the analytical approach which I utilised in the preceding two chapters when considering the teacher and National Health Service CNDers.

The Social Workers' Commitment
As I remarked in Chapter 2, when discussing the interview with Belinda the retired teacher, a commitment to the ethic of one's profession does not expire upon retirement. Mrs. Patricia Wadeley is a sixty-two year old retired social worker and a member of New Town CND. She has never attended any of her group's meetings, but she has been on local and national marches, marches which seem to her less attractive than those she went on as a member of the original Campaign in the late Fifties and early Sixties. Patricia is unhappy with the atmosphere of today's marches and suspects that for some of the members, whom she refers to as the "punk" and the "noisy element", the CND logo is "just another badge ...". She thinks that yesterday's marchers were politer, quieter and better behaved; however, she believes that today's Movement has the merit of a more socially representative membership: "nowadays there's a much broader band of the population, I think it was a very middle class effort and
this is a much more mixed bunch."

Patricia thinks that "intellectually" nuclear disarmament is the most important contemporary issue even though "I don't do very much." She believes that the majority of people do not support CND because they are "afraid of communism" and because "the majority of people do go along with the government and not just the Conservative government." Disarmament is achievable, she believes, not just because of the efforts of the peace movement, but by virtue of a change in "the climate of opinion" (a climate which the Movement helps to create). She is sceptical as to whether the Labour Party would fulfill its manifesto policy on disarmament for she suspects that this policy would be jettisoned if the Party came to power. Patricia agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy as she thinks that CND should aim to attract as wide a membership as possible, moreover: "I think it's a good thing that there are sort of things which are above politics and attract a broader spectrum of people."

Mrs. Wadeley first became interested in politics during the Second World War when she joined the Common Wealth Party(1) and became a member of 'Acland's circus' contesting local by-elections in opposition to the war time coalition. In 1948, following the demise of the Common Wealth Party, she joined the Labour Party and the Fabian Society to which she still belongs; indeed, on the day of the interview she was preparing for a Fabian dinner party which she was giving at her home that evening.
It was in 'Acland's circus' that she first met her husband-to-be who was standing as a Common Wealth candidate. After the war was over, she took a job as a domestic science teacher and after two years became a school dinner supervisor, a job which she left to marry the would-be Common Wealth politician. Whilst her family grew up, she undertook voluntary family planning counselling and then studied part-time for a Diploma in Social Work: "I decided that's where I belonged." After twelve years as a social worker she retired; nonetheless, she still works part-time for the Citizens Advice Bureau, a local community association and a day care centre for the physically disabled.

Predictably, Patricia is opposed to Mrs. Thatcher ("I just can't stand the woman"), and her administration's policies of cutting back on public expenditure which she regards as a "weakening" of the welfare state. A Labour voter, Patricia was an active member of the Party from 1948, when she joined, until approximately 1975 when she ceased to be politically active. However, a short time before the interview was conducted Patricia resumed her Labour Party activities for she fears that her local branch is being taken over by members of the Militant Tendency. As a Fabian and ex-member of the Common Wealth Party, she finds the Militant Tendency's particular brand of politics distasteful. I asked her, 'What kind of socialism do you yourself favour?': "I don't know. I don't think that what I want to see is achievable because people would not let it be achieved. [What is it?] Well, it's incomes to start with. People are looking after themselves and
trade unions are strong and people are protected by their trade unions until they're out of a job and then nobody wants to know and they don't belong to anybody. I mean, possibly as a result of working with the Citizens Advice Bureau in particular, one again and again comes across people who can't afford to take a job, they'd be worse off than on supplementary benefit; it is subsistence, people can manage on it for a short time but not indefinitely, so that's got to go up, minimum wages have got to go up, and so some have got to come down. And people will not let their standard of living be eroded, and to produce socialism that has to happen. I mean, I have a very comfortable home here and a very comfortable life-style and so that's got to go. And I think I'm getting back to what one thought was achievable with Common Wealth, I don't think I've changed at all, I would still think I'm working for it, but whether one can realise it ... [her voice tails off]." 

In the same way that she dislikes the Militant Tendency in the Labour Party, Patricia was unhappy with the presence of the Committee Of 100 in the first Movement: "There was a feeling it was going too far." Patricia's political perspective prioritises the climate of opinion as the motor for change with which we could secure disarmament - rather than revolutionary socialism or Direct Action. And this climate of opinion must be produced by men and women responding to a recognition of their social duty rather than individual economic interest.

Mrs. Wadeley did not adopt this social and political perspective
solely as a result of her contact with the state in the form of social work training; rather, such employment training would seem to be a natural extension of her development from a Common Wealth supporter, domestic science teacher, family planning counsellor and Workers' Educational Association tutor. Studying for her social work diploma "didn't change my views. I realised that work would no longer be a chore and that it was where my real interests lie." These interests first arose when she joined the Common Wealth Party ("I think it was very youthful, life before property, that sort of thing, the 'Golden Age'") and remained with her, nurtured in her employment, for the rest of her life. At sixty-two, she finds herself still adhering to the Common Wealth ideals and rejoining the nuclear disarmament movement: "Very often if I march from the old town to the new town it's because people will look at me and see I'm making my little bit of a stand."

This notion of making "a stand" against nuclear weapons would seem, from my interviews, to be of important personal value for CNDers. Naomi J. "would like to hope" that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life, "but I think that people that actually join are drawn from middle class groups of people who band together and talk about it in their private lives, at their dinner parties or whatever they do, or they go and see the movies about it." I asked her, 'Why do you say it is the middle class groups?': "Hm, it's probably occasioned by the unison of the press they're likely to read, the newspapers they're likely to read and by more time they have to consider things outside of
their daily lives. It [also] matters to some people who just don't have so much time outside their daily lives, they're not going to spend a lot of time worrying whether they can afford to go off on a peace camp this weekend, they're going to be worrying about washing nappies or something like that. Other people have more leisure time and more thinking time."

Naomi believes that the majority of people do not belong to CND for "the same reason as me, a lot of the time up till the point when I actually joined. Actually joining something is quite a commitment, even if you do nothing after you've joined it, it says something to you about where you stand, and I think a lot of people are wholeheartedly sympathetic with the aims of the peace movement and believe in a safer more peaceful world for them and their families - oh, and everybody else they hold close and dear - and they really believe in that, but joining something, it makes you feel as if you, well a lot of people don't join a party if they're left wing, very few people actually put their name to the list."

Naomi was interested in the peace movement "a long time before I actually joined, it took me a long time, I think it does with a lot of people, to get round to actually becoming a member, it's [her interest] probably going back a long way, ten or twelve years." I asked her why she became interested at that time: "It was the tail end of the Vietnam War, I'd become aware in my late teens at the end of the Sixties as to what was going on ... I became aware of what was not coming on the screen [regarding
America's involvement in the Vietnam War]." Naomi actually joined S.C. CND "about one and a half years ago, that's to do with the present situation. I've always felt like I do about it, but it's to do with the present situation, the present escalation of the Cold War y'know. [Was there any one event which triggered you into joining?] Not so much an event as a place, Greenham really triggered it for me. I haven't actually been, it's the feeling, it's the movement. For me, it was especially important as a woman that I actually signed my name up, not just to support it, not just to go along to buy something when they have sales and stuff like that, but actually putting my name to it as well."

Naomi has helped deliver S.C. CND's Newsletter, taken part in letter-writing drives and has been to two of her group's meetings which, she feels, should concentrate more on debating "future modes of action." For Naomi, Non-Violent Direct Action is the best way to protest against nuclear weapons and she describes herself as a pacifist. She "is not totally decided" about the Campaign's non-party alignment policy: "I do feel it [alignment] might alienate some members who are members of other political parties from one that CND might choose to affiliate with, it might alienate some people, I don't think that alienation is something we want to get into."

However, Naomi is interested in politics and sees herself as a "privileged left winger." Although not a member of any political party, she has worked as a shop steward for the National
Association of Local Government Officers (N.A.L.G.O.) when she was employed as a social worker. She sees the arms race as "capitalist against socialist" and ranks nuclear disarmament "alongside the sort of political policy I'd like to see", as the most important contemporary issue. Although not a member of any charitable organisation, or any group working in the Third World, her "job used to be social work, I used to be involved in the Scots City council for single homeless, I got considerably depressed by the Third World inside our world if you understand my meaning, the disadvantaged, the oppressed."

Naomi's political stance is not derived from her parents: "It's not something I got from my family, I worked it out as I went along." Naomi went to Steelbrough University to study for a fine arts degree: "When I left home I didn't really have any idea about how I would vote except that my mother had always voted Tory: I thought that Winston Churchill was wonderful, I thought the Second World War was a great idea, we saved the world, really all that sort of stuff! - but with a few ideas that things were changing and that things were wrong in Vietnam for example, with a few minor ideas like that. I used to argue with people at college on behalf of Tory ideas. But by the time I'd finished I really had lots of other ideas which weren't actually formed by being involved in a political party but which were really owing to knowing people who were left-minded."

Having left university with her fine arts degree, she spent two years as a self-employed artist and then went into a commercial
artists' studio in the city of Cartcester: "I spent two years doing my own work and a year in a commercial situation, all the nonsense and the exploitation of it all, because it was in Cartcester in a very small non-unionised factory; the wages the girls were getting for standing about all day, every day, the general pay and the conditions were nonsense. I started getting involved in their problems while I was there. Y'know, they'd come and say things like: 'My dad and the [inaudible] say they can take my baby away from me, can they take him away from me?' things like that, and by the time I moved back to Scots City I was really much more interested in the people I'd worked with than the minimal bits of design work for Marks and Spencer I was doing, so then I wanted to work with people and I went into the social work department and said, 'How do I go about it?'. At that stage you could go into residential care without formal qualifications."

Naomi was employed as a social worker for nearly five years working with the elderly, the homeless and adolescents. During this time she took a Diploma course in social work and met the man she was eventually to marry (also a social work student). Three months before the interview, she left her social work job to take a post as a director of a non-profit making company which aims to assist aspiring artists and craftsmen. I asked Naomi if she 'was quite involved in her work?': "Totally involved! a bit beyond what I actually wanted to commit to. I wanted to be a bit less committed than I had been in social work but it's not
possible, it's twenty-four hours a day. I don't know, I actually used to think it was me in social work, but I think it's me anyway, y'know."

As one would expect, Naomi does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies and strongly disagrees with the government's cut-backs on social services expenditure and local council rate-capping. Naomi believes in "the ideals of nationalisation, I support non-profit distribution, I support the ideals of redistribution of wealth, uh, I support the ideals of a National Health Service and I support the ideals of those who are healthier and stronger and better-off for whatever reason supporting those who are weaker and less healthy and less better-off so that not a general low standard of living is provided but a much higher standard is provided. I don't feel bad about the way I live because I just feel more people should live like it, reasonably well. But for those who don't, I wish that what I could do is help raise their standards to where they would like to be."

The daughter of a mining engineer, Naomi was not brought up with this point of view; her parents voted Conservative all their lives up until the 1983 General Election when their own personal worsening circumstances persuaded them to vote for the Alliance (in Naomi's words, "a major change"), and we have seen how, as a young undergraduate, Naomi would champion Tory politics. However, meeting "left-minded" people at university engendered a change in her political perspective and standpoint, a political point of
view which found the exploitative conditions in the commercial artists' company repugnant: helping her exploited workmates persuaded her that her interests really lay in the social work profession. Naomi is now fully committed to her job; indeed, in the course of the interview, which was held in the evening at Naomi's home, we were interrupted three times by work related telephone calls. As Naomi says, it's a "twenty-four hour" commitment.

Her membership of CND is an extension of this commitment. As she told me, although Greenham Common(2) was the trigger to her actually joining the Campaign, her interest in the peace movement dates from her late teens when she began to have doubts as to the validity of the American involvement in Vietnam. Her biographical experiences involving her contact with, and employment in, the welfare state have spawned a form of personal ethical commitment which, as we have seen, is very important to her. I asked Naomi if she thought that today's Campaign was a moral issue: "Yes. If there's any deflection from that it's maybe because of the vast variety of people who are involved in it, but for me it's absolutely, fundamentally a moral issue." This ethical orientation to nuclear disarmament is a reflection and expression of Naomi's personal ethical commitment to her work, a commitment also expressed in her political stance.

A similar biographical progression can be seen in the case of Mrs. Karen Landing, a thirty-five year old single parent living in New Town. Karen joined N.T. CND in 1981 shortly after
divorcing her husband: "I wanted to join for a long time but my husband worked for Nearmorte Ltd." (a large New Town company which manufactures conventional weapons systems). She has been on a few local marches and has attended a few of her group's meetings which, she feels, are "very much steered by one or two people." Karen has not taken part in other campaigning activities and would not be prepared to break the law because of her children; as a single parent she has little free time and in addition, as she says, "I can't afford to get arrested" for there would be nobody to look after her children.

Karen thinks that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is "probably" a good idea because "political parties can always let you down." She thinks that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life and that the majority of people do not support the Campaign because "they don't think about it. If they saw The War Game and really imagined it happening to them, maybe then [they would join]." A principled Labour voter, Karen belongs to the Party and regularly attends her branch's meetings. When I asked her what she would call herself in political terms, she replied: "At the moment I'm sort of thinking around this sort of thing of Christianity and Marxism. I'm sure that I'm the only divorced Catholic-Marxist you're likely to ask!" As a Catholic-Marxist, Mrs. Landing does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatchers government's policies: "Where shall we begin? You name a policy and I'll disagree with it." She does not believe that nuclear disarmament is achievable: "I felt very depressed after the last
Election, from a CND point of view in particular, because here is Labour with their manifesto, it's their policy and Callaghan turns round and backtracks. I don't feel very hopeful about it."

The daughter of an infant teacher and the principal of a college, Karen left school at eighteen after taking 'A' Levels and went to work as an executive officer in the town's Labour Exchange. Although she enjoyed this job for the contact it afforded with people, she became dissatisfied: "I found it frustrating in the Labour Exchange because you couldn't help the people, you just had to administer rules, pay them or not pay them, say to them 'go and see the social security officer', but you'd know fully well what to do." As a consequence of this frustration, she decided to study for an Applied Social Sciences degree at a large Midlands college; I asked her whether being a student had changed her views: "Yes, thinking about it. It was quite left wing, we did politics as a subject, we did different methods of elections and all that. Did economics, did sociology but I don't remember it having any effect on me at all, I don't remember sociology. Yes, I think it did, made me more politically, I wasn't very politically aware before I went."

After a year and a term as an undergraduate, Karen reunited with her husband, became pregnant, and had to leave college prematurely before completing her degree. Last year, having divorced her husband and with her two children now both going to school, Karen started a Certificate of Qualified Social Work (C.Q.S.W.) course at a nearby college. She enjoys this course:
"It's very fascinating, it's all people", and when qualified she hopes to become a hospital social worker. In common with Naomi, Karen's biography reveals a progression of experiences which helped nurture the Catholic-Marxist social worker who joined CND. Because of the delicacy of some of the areas in Karen's life, and because she was obviously very tired (having only just returned from studying when I arrived), I felt it would be impolite to probe too much for details of her life. In particular, it is unclear from the interview how she is affected by her Catholicism (she became a convert at the age of twenty), and what influence her ex-husband has had on the formation of her views. Nevertheless, I have included Karen as a comparable example of how contact with the state can nurture social and political perspectives which can find expression in disarmament matters.

In the interviews with these three social workers it is clear that, in common with my other respondents, their social and political views which find expression in CND are best understood as an interplay of their idiosyncratic biographies and the influence of their entrance into the welfare state, mainly through their experiences of education and employment. This interplay generates and spawns a cultural category of considerable diversity embracing, for example, religious doctors, apolitical students and a Catholic-Marxist social worker. The remaining social and community workers in my two samples exhibited similar differences and commonalities.

For instance, Albert B. joined S.C. CND six months ago when he
moved to Scots City having previously been a member of another local group in Westsea since 1980. He has been a peace group coordinator, public speaker and publicity organiser and since joining S.C. CND has regularly attended their meetings which he thinks are "terrible. I think it's inexperienced people running it, even if they've been doing it for some time, but they're inexperienced in working in groups, understanding how people function in groups, and probably inexperienced in understanding how groups can be part of an organisation. I think they've got their own model of groups which they bring from political models and they don't really fit."

Albert agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy for he thinks that alignment would "frighten off some supporters", and he believes that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life ("Yes, definitely"). He thinks that we have an arms race because an initial belief in deterrence was subverted by the 'military-industrial complex' putting pressure on politicians and because of the spurious logic employed by N.A.T.O. strategists. The majority of British people do not belong to CND, Albert believes, because "I don't think the arguments have been presented, or reached enough people. I think the propaganda has. I think most people don't join organisations, no matter what they are, and that we can't actually expect the majority to support CND. I don't think that's part of human nature, certainly not British nature. British people are in general conservative in their attitude to politics, there's an attitude of 'it's somebody else's problem' or 'other people know best'; people don't have a
great idea of community politics, community involvement."

Unlike the officials of S.C. CND, Albert does consider himself to have an understanding of 'group dynamics', and unlike the majority of the British public he understands community politics; for Albert is a trained social worker. He told me that he would "like to see far greater possibilities for those who have received social work, basically far greater opportunities for non-academic working class people to become social workers. I think that's a fundamental change I would like to see. I would like to see far more community-based social work schemes where more people combined to solve their social problems themselves without having to consult academically trained people. More popularisation of the profession."

From "quite an early age", Albert "was interested in doing some sort of work with people but that was particularly confirmed towards social work when I first of all started work as a surveyor and found the removal from human beings, who were clients, convinced me I didn't want to do that sort of thing. I think academically I was being geared towards that and it was a very definite decision I'd move away from that sort of thing. I was sixteen, it was a summer job, and I knew I definitely wanted to work with people in some problem solving capacity." Subsequently, Albert went to a Scottish polytechnic where he studied for a social work qualification. This was a formative period in Albert's life; at college he started reading Peace News
and studied politics but, as he remarked in the interview, "this wasn't really the right time to become a pacifist."

Nine years later in 1980, whilst employed as a social worker, Albert "became aware for the first time of E.P. Thompson; he came to Westsea, I think it was the college hall, my mates started to join CND, and what mainly got me interested and committed was N.A.T.O. I decided that if I'm going to join CND it's not going to be out of propaganda, or a radical whim, or I'd like to believe what they stand for. So I made a deliberate point to become educated and enrolled on a course that was put on at Cheltenham by pro-N.A.T.O., pro-nuclear speakers and enrolled for a N.A.T.O. magazine. And I didn't need much convincing after that!" Subsequently, Albert became very active in Westsea CND.

One unsought effect of Albert's CND membership has been a rethinking of his political views: "For a long time I called myself a left wing socialist. Only when I joined CND did I actually start meeting left wing socialists and I've been very disturbed by what I've seen. [What disturbed you?] The tactics over their behaviour in CND, their ignorance, their dogmatism, at times their intimidation, and quite definitely their preparedness to subvert or divert the actions of CND for their own ends. Therefore, I've had to do a great deal of thinking about where I stand politically." Nevertheless, Albert does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies and is still a long way from his "raging Tory" parents. He has recently joined the Labour Party in order to prioritise the issue of nuclear
disarmament within its ranks.

Albert's views on CND, and the language he employs, reflect his state employment and training. Similarly, Nigel, a thirty-four year old recently unemployed Scots City community worker told me that: "The most important aspect of CND is the educational one, it's what people learn. What people can achieve materially is important, but looking beyond community politics, well, one has to realise that there are severe constraints on that. Just to jump back to S.C. CND for example, there has been debate over a number of years as to what should be the role of S.C. CND given the way in which the anti-nuclear movement in Scots City has got so many facets of groups that are geographically based, locality based, other groups that are based around areas of work or whatever. My own feeling is that an important role for S.C. CND is really to act as a resource, an educational and material resource, to the activities which are going on in those other facets. That is a model I've used as a community worker."

Nigel agrees "with the position that it should not be party political, I don't think it's a non-political issue, I think it is an extremely political issue but there's no one political party I would trust to implement nuclear disarmament." He is uncertain whether nuclear disarmament protesting should always be non-violent: "The short answer is, I don't have a clear view on that." Nigel has broken the law (a minor infringement) whilst on an anti-nuclear weapons demonstration and considers this to be "perfectly acceptable in some cases and necessary in others, I
don't think all laws are necessarily favourable to us." He sees
the nuclear arms race as a consequence of the superpowers
defending their spheres of interest, geopolitical spheres which
emerged in the aftermath of World War Two.

Nigel thinks that the majority of the British population do not
belong to the peace movement because "the nature of society is
such that people are not encouraged, indeed they're positively
discouraged from becoming politically active." Not a member of
any political party, Nigel would vote Labour at a General
Election "without a great deal of enthusiasm" for he is sceptical
as to what Labour could actually achieve if they came to office.

He described himself as a "socialist" and I asked him to
elaborate: "Hmm, I'm not sure. I'm not a member of any political
party or organisation which is a contradiction if one thinks of
oneself as a socialist; as to spelling it out, well, as I've said
already, I don't see socialism as being brought about by purely
parliamentary means, I don't see the Labour Party bringing
socialism about, or any other party by purely parliamentary
means." As one would expect, Nigel disagrees with all of Mrs.
Thatchers government's policies, in particular their "attitude to
unemployment and the ways in which their policies affect women."

The son of an English teacher (his mother has never been in paid
employment) Nigel told me that he came from a background where
"it was assumed that one would go to university." After six
months spent working on a voluntary housing project in his home
town, Nigel went to university to read for an economics degree
but after a year switched to politics which he found more interesting. He does not see the time he spent at university as being the most important formative period in his life: "I see the period after I left university as being more formative. [Why was that?] Eh, it was because I had a job when I left university and in my spare time I became increasingly involved in sort of housing campaigning, and that became quite militant, and that really opened my eyes to a great deal, y'know, how politics and society in this country worked."

Shortly before the interview, Nigel had finished working on a three-year community housing project in a run-down working class area of Scots City. As the community education officer on this project he worked "with tenants and housing associations, around housing issues supporting, educating, advising, helping people to work out their campaigning strategies and so forth, a certain amount of education and advice work on a more individualistic basis, with a whole range of community groups." Nigel has done this sort of work "for the great majority of the time since I left university" and I asked him what attraction it held for him: "What interests me about the work is that what you are doing most of the time is working with people, helping them to develop a better understanding of how, for example, a local political system works and decisions about housing, how money is allocated, how decisions affect them, how they might become better equipped to become more involved in that sort of decision-making process. So what very broadly speaking interests me is the way in which it's about raising people's consciousnesses, raising people's
questioning about how the world is, how they might perhaps be involved in changing it a bit."

Now unemployed, Nigel hopes "to develop certain areas of skill around sort of writing or publishing or whatever, that has always been a sort of part of that work. Sort of information research work, I'm not quite sure, that's the sort of thing that interests me." Not surprisingly, he brings his work related experiences and perspectives to bear on CND and would like to see his local group "act as a resource, an educational and material resource." Unlike the majority of the population, whom Nigel sees as "positively discouraged from becoming politically active", Nigel's social and employment experiences have positively nurtured a political concern for the well-being of others and have given Nigel a self-image whereby he sees himself as the raiser of other people's consciousnesses.

Like Nigel, Carol C., a thirty-two year old Scots City community worker also feels that her work involves a duty to educate and inform. I asked her whether she was involved in any organisation or charity working in the Third World or on community issues: "Well I'm a community worker, that's my occupation. So, yeh, I'm involved in community issues. I think it's a really important part of my work to help raise these sort of issues at my work, and I do. Only last night I showed The War Game and Protest and Survive to a group of kids I'd taken to France on an international peace camp in July. So I'm quite involved like that. I've also shown The War Game at an unemployed workers'
centre and a women's discussion group that I ran for a year. So yeh, I try to use my job like that."

Carol thinks that the majority of the British public do not support CND "because I think the majority of people tend not to belong to things full stop. I mean, I think they can support it without joining. Not everyone has the time or commitment to join. Perhaps they don't join for that reason." She thinks, speaking from her own experience, "that the majority of people in CND are middle class, educated people" which she feels is not just peculiar to the Campaign, "it's not just CND, it's endemic in lots of organisations. I suppose it's because of more confidence, more politically articulate."

A life-long Labour voter, Carol has belonged to the Labour Party for the past five years and is a "very active" local ward member. She disagrees with all of the Thatcher administration's policies: "I just don't like capitalism. It's about her basic philosophy. It's her approach to politics I disagree with, it's about profits and capitalism and not about people." Carol is also on the local executive of her union, N.A.L.G.O., as is one of the officials of S.C. CND and they "keep the issue alive; if anything to do with CND comes up it's disseminated, and we send a delegate group to take part in demonstrations and so on."

The daughter of Conservative voting working class parents, Carol studied for a primary school teaching qualification at McCalling
House (a teacher training college in Scots City) and then took a one-year course in youth and community education: "Teacher training college taught me the last thing I want to do is be a teacher! The community work course gave me a lot of self awareness and I suppose that probably changed my life quite a lot. Just being at teacher training college I realised how dry it was and how awful the people were and I thought 'I don't want to be part of this'. And that's when I thought 'well, what else can I do?' So I did the community work course and I found the lecturers there were a totally different breed of people, I was on first name terms with them and it was a much more relaxed course. It was about self-development, that was the difference I suppose. [What's 'self-development'?] Well, we did a lot of group-work stuff, and I suppose that a lot of the placements I went on were places I'd never thought of or encountered before. So that was all sort of learning for me."

After successfully completing this course, Carol became a community education worker in a small town on the outskirts of Scots City. In common with the majority of welfare state employees, Carol's education was in the nature of an apprenticeship, an apprenticeship qualifying her to legitimately work as an agent of the state. Inevitably, the attitudes which she has assimilated in the course of her state training and employment spill over into her orientation towards nuclear disarmament; for example, feeling that it is her responsibility to educate and inform people about CND - "it's part of the job."
Of course, there are a myriad ways in which the individual can become involved in the state apprenticeship process. For example, Ian G. went to Southsea University to read for a degree in politics and international studies, not so much out of interest but "because I was part of that education process and my parents expected it of me." Ian left university with a third class degree and an urge to prove to himself that he could better this disappointing performance. Shortly afterwards, he enrolled on a C.Q.S.W. course (partly because, at that time, the entrance qualifications were not very demanding). His political and social views were shaped and changed during this time: "I suppose my views changed when I was a student, both on the undergraduate and the C.Q.S.W. courses. Hm, I suppose now I'm still very vague on my idea of politics, in fact talking about them just points out how vague I am. I remember when I first started university I was very interested in Red China and convinced myself I was a Maoist. I'm sure I didn't have a clue what being a Maoist meant at the time. Very rapidly I found at university that what I had thought of as political commitment disappeared. First of all I was finding out more about myself and clarifying my views about the world, it was only in the second and third year that I got into the hippy thing, all the sort of attitudes and beliefs that are seen as going along with that sort of culture. And when, as I say, I was a hospital porter [a temporary job] I decided I was interested in doing some kind of social work. When I actually started on the C.Q.S.W. course I suppose my beliefs did begin to firm up, for the first time I began to see things in perhaps a more mature way. The first, what I would call adult type, of like
political decision or awareness that I took was actually [when] doing the C.Q.S.W. course when I realised that I couldn't be involved in social casework because that's crudely something that says the world's at fault because of the people in it, or a particular neighbourhood is at fault because of the people in it. I realised that the main problem is to do with the structure in society, and power and wherever it rests in society."

Upon completing the C.Q.S.W. course, Ian moved from Southsea to Scots City where he took a job as a community worker and completed an M.Sc. degree in social administration. Not a member of any political party, Ian voted for the Ecology Party in the last Election, partly because he did not think the Labour candidate could unseat the Conservative M.P. in his ward. He describes himself as "a vegetarian Luddite Digger" (he admires the Diggers for their communal ideals): "I suppose basically in principle I'd vote for the Ecology Party, hm, I suppose I don't think the English Ecology Party is radical enough, it smacks a bit too much of the S.D.P. approach - 'you don't have to be political, just join us' - and it's not hard-headed enough. I'd support an ecology party that was more hard-headed, but was also aware of some religious input, when I say religious I'm talking about some sort of Eastern religion, very informal."

Ian thinks that the majority of the British public do not support CND because, as a nation, they see themselves "as non-political and are not involved in any social group, they seem to be more
interested in C.B. radio or stock-car racing than in changing the way society develops." With his interest in Eastern religion, the Diggers and hippy ideals, Ian brings to bear on CND a rather, as he described it, "eclectic" political point of view. I asked him what he thought was the best form of disarmament protesting: "It has to be peaceful, one thing that does worry me about the peace movement at the moment is the, um, some of the more sort of aggressive organisations that are showing an interest in it. I suppose being an ageing hippy [Ian is twenty-nine], I tend to think the way that it spreads and the way it should affect national policies is by the gentle art of persuasion and impressing upon other people how many other reasonable people think that the kinds of politics that CND supports are what we need the national government to take on. It's [his campaigning prescriptions] rather vague." Although he thinks that nuclear disarmament is a political issue, he agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy for he believes that CND is a "one-issue" Movement and that alignment would mean taking on board all of the affiliated party's policies.

In addition to the idiosyncratic eclecticism of Ian's political perspective, he also, in common with other radical welfare state employees, finds himself in a rather paradoxical socio-political position. For Ian, his job is "what the papers would call a vocation rather than a means of getting money. It's important to me that I do what I consider basically a competent job and I have something to offer people in the area I work in." I asked him if he was happy in his job and whether there were any changes he
would like to bring about?: "The structure in which I work is not sympathetic. Community work is ... [break in tape] ... anti-state as it exists at present. Therefore, to be actually employed by, in this case, the local state is a bit of a contradiction in terms. That's not to say I see the job as being first over the barricades, that's not the way the people I work with on the ground see things and you have to start at the point where they're at. So as I say, there's that kind of tension. It would be o.k. if the state operated in the way I think it needs to. [Which is?] More, a greater level of decentralisation, I think that's basically it. I wouldn't describe myself as falling into the group of those who see community work as being about advancing the cause of socialism, though it tends to be seen as a left wing activity, but that's because there are more people who see themselves as socialists who believe in the decentralisation ethos which is what community work is basically about."

This political 'contradiction in terms' is a well known theme in social and community work literature\(^3\): like many other welfare state employees, Ian finds himself with a vocation to remedy what he sees as partly the state's own failings. And in common with his counterparts in other welfare state professions, Ian is uniquely well placed to perceive the failures and shortcomings of state policy. As we have seen in the discussions of some of the other interviews, coming face to face with the conditions in which people require the help of welfare professionals can act as a politicising experience.
In the case of the final interviewee in this chapter, her politicising experience would appear to have occurred at an early age. Gina V. is a thirty-one year old social worker who joined S.C. CND approximately three years ago. She has taken part in local and national demonstrations, distributed leaflets and has been to one of her group's meetings; she "wasn't impressed" by this meeting for she felt that what she saw as the group's inner circle did not make new-comers feel very welcome.

Gina supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy because: "I think it's got so much sense, the whole principle that CND stands for, that we could get just about everyone, if we could just argue our point I'm sure the whole of the population [she pauses] I don't know, I just can't understand how people can't agree with us and join. And I think that if you just attach it to one party you just lose people because folk identify themselves as Tory or Labour or whatever. And it's, to me, it's a big issue to do with the whole of mankind so to speak, I would think it would appeal to more folk than just one party had."

Gina thinks that the Campaign's national demonstrations attract people from all walks of life, "but I suppose that on the whole I would think it's much more middle class folk, social workers, university graduates. [Why do you think that is?] It's partly generational, I would think the majority would perhaps be Sixties, Seventies generation, because a lot went on and they got into political issues, tasted freedom. The class thing? I mean
there's a whole lot of apolitical folk, as well as folk who are saying, folk with low incomes, who are saying 'my priority is to get enough money to live on'. And I think they're not always relating that to the bigger issues." When I asked her why she thought it was that the majority do not belong to the peace movement, she replied: "I think it's because they've fallen for the anti-Russian thing. That's what I find when I talk to people who don't support us. And I think that's absolute rubbish."

Gina belongs to N.A.L.G.O. and although she has never held an official post in her union she has been active, attending meetings, going on union demonstrations and taking part in strike action. A Labour voter, she has never belonged to any political party and describes herself as: "A wishy-washy leftie. No seriously, I'm definitely left of centre. I'm not a communist, I believe in a democratic system. I would call myself a socialist."

And in common with the majority of the CNDers I interviewed, Gina does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's government's policies and deplores the cut-backs in public expenditure, especially the cut-backs in National Health Service funding.

Gina thinks that her interest in politics started at an early age: "I was very young, about twelve, and I started getting into politics. I mean at that age it was probably a rebellion against my father, that's why I'm a social worker now! [said in a mocking tone of voice]. Hm, but it's funny, I don't know who influenced me at that time. Maybe it was because I had quite a few working class friends, I think that probably influenced me. Being a lot
in their houses or whatever; we were quite well-off, and maybe the contrast started getting me into politics."

After leaving school, Gina went to university to read for a degree in politics and anthropology and upon completion took a part-time job for a year as a volunteer social worker. She then took a C.Q.S.W. course and has worked ever since as a member of a Scots City social work team: "I've sometimes thought about other jobs, but I always come back to it. I need to feel committed to something." In fact, Gina was about to go abroad to work with a voluntary services organisation in the Far East as a community worker: "I'm going because it's something I've wanted to do for years. I did politics and anthropology at university, and at that point it was either social work or anthropology, so I did social work because I wanted to do something rather than study, so I went into social work rather than become an academic. But it's kind of lingered on, the wish to be in the Third World. So anyway, it's now become possible that there's now something I can offer."

Gina's experiences of being a student affected her "immensely. I don't think it changed my views, I was on the right track before." From the interview, it would appear that 'before' refers to her pre-university childhood political awakening; however, this is by no means certain and, furthermore, Gina herself is unsure why she developed an interest in politics at such an early age. This was a poor interview in the sense that Gina was reluctant to voice her opinions and seemed to suspect that the
questions contained hidden psychoanalytical import (hence the mocking answer in the foregoing paragraph). I have included this final interview with Gina because although the effects of her education and employment appear to be important in her biographical development, it is unclear what exactly these effects were. The interview is intended as an antidote to the impression that welfare state CNDers' biographies are always clear-cut (and to the impression that the author always conducted illuminating and successful interviews). I suspect that many people, like Gina, are unsure why they have come to adopt particular points of view and standpoints; nevertheless, it is clear that in Gina's biography the state has at least proved a fertile environment for the gestation of her political and social orientation.

Conclusion: Welfare State CNDers

In the foregoing three chapters, in which I discussed the interviews which I conducted with teacher, N.H.S. and social and community worker CNDers, I have pursued an analytical line of inquiry which is underpinned by, in particular, Ludwig Wittgenstein's family resemblance model of categorisation. My intention has been to show that this portion of the revived 'motley army of the good' is comprised of a great variety of individuals each with their own idiosyncratic perspectives on the Campaign but that, nonetheless, these diverse individuals and points of view live within a common form of life and share an intermesh of similarities as well as differences.
In my presentation of the interviews, I have focused upon the respondents' experiences of the state, primarily through education and employment, as an important factor in the biographical development of these CNDers' social and political ways of life. However, I have also stressed that, just as there is no one definitive characteristic which renders a person a CNDer, there is no one common experience of the state; as the interviews show, the effects of state education and employment upon the individual are varied and often need to be related to other features in their social histories. Nevertheless, in the majority of cases, their experiences of the state are notably imbricated within their lives nurturing recognisably similar beliefs and attitudes.

Indeed, it would be extraordinary if it were otherwise: a doctor does not stop being a doctor when he or she joins the Campaign, rather, he or she brings to the Movement a doctor's socio-political experience. Typically, welfare state employees undergo a period of formal state-run training in order to qualify as legitimate teachers, doctors, etc. In contrast to the majority of students, their education involves a substantial amount of time being spent as trainees in their prospective places of work, for example, schools, hospitals, or on social work placements. In this sense, their education is more akin to an apprenticeship. In addition, as state apprentices, they also learn the ideology of their profession, the ethics and rationale of their work. For welfare state professions, this ideology includes the notion that
their employment is a vocation, a personal commitment to their professions' ideology and practices. In this way, welfare state employees become personally committed to socially evolved and defined creative praxes. And, as the interviews show, this commitment is often deeply-held and valued and spills over into other areas of their lives. As I have previously remarked, this internalisation of the vocational ideology can often inhibit such employees from taking political action which would further their own interests yet risks violating their professional ethics.

When welfare state employees join CND, when they create the Campaign, they also express the other social relations which they have learnt and live out in their daily lives. It can be seen from the interviews that such social relations and concomitant ways of thinking inform and act as reference points for understanding disarmament issues; thus, for example, Dr. Macman explains the failure of the majority of the British public to join CND in psychoanalytical terms, teacher CNDers advocate 'educating' the public about the dangers inherent in nuclear defence policies, etc. In addition, these social relations serve to distinguish welfare state employees from other members of the community whom the interviewees often see as 'embourgeoisified' and intellectually benighted; (as Geoff Keeling, the New Town teacher, expressed it, "so many sheep").

Frank Parkin stated in his study of the original Campaign that:

'Involvement in CND was a token not only of an individual's attitude to nuclear weapons but also of his [sic] position on a wide array of other radical and humanitarian issues. Identification with CND could be taken to be a capsule statement of a distinctive moral and political outlook, and support for its
activities a means of affirming this outlook through symbolic acts. (4)

I believe that Parkin's observation is pertinent to the revived membership but that it stands in need of further clarification and a grounding in social life. When individuals create CND they are also creating a particular form of life, or culture, and this culture is moulded from wider social relations, in particular, welfare state social relations. Thus CND also expresses the ideology and politics of the state and this partly accounts for the fact that membership of CND acts as a 'capsule statement' of particular socio-political attitudes and stances.

Furthermore, it can be seen from the interviews that the CND culture also embraces other ideologies and political beliefs; in particular, Christianity and socialism. That this variety of beliefs can happily exist within the CND culture is a tribute to the 'fuzziness' of the CND category. Rather than a category with sharply defined and excluding boundaries, CND shares similarities with other forms of life such that, for instance, the ethics of N.V.D.A. can strike a receptive chord for Christians.

In the next chapter, I discuss those campaigners whom I interviewed who did not hold a welfare state position and were not necessarily fortunate enough to have experienced higher education. It will be seen that their reasons for belonging to CND are engendered by other socio-political factors and that, concomitantly, their form of commitment varies in character from that of their welfare state peers: whilst the welfare state CNDers are an important and pronounced facet of the Campaign, CND
is a composite of only partially complementary perspectives and positions co-existing in both harmony and tension.
Chapter 5: Notes and References

1) Founded in July 1942 by the, then, Liberal M.P. Sir Richard Acland, the Common Wealth Party grew out of a merger between J.B. Priestley's '1941 Committee' and Acland's 'Forward March' movement. The Party campaigned on the platform of egalitarianism and an early end to the Second World War. These aims were to be achieved by the British public demanding a new moral order, a common ownership of the means and fruits of production and an immediate end to colonialism. Acland had been working with other disenchanted intellectuals and religious leaders (including J.B. Priestley and Richard Calder), since the late Thirties and Penguin published several of his short books which propagated the new moral view. See especially, Acland, Sir Richard Unser Kampf (Our Struggle) Penguin. 1941, which tells the reader that 'We have failed because of our selfishness and we need a new standard of morality.'(p31); and The Forward March London. Allen and Unwin. 1941. Following the post-War demise of the Common Wealth Party, Sir Acland joined the Labour Party in 1947. In 1955, he resigned from the Labour Party over the nuclear issue. Some discussion of Acland and the Common Wealth Party can be found in Angus Calder's excellent book The People's War London. Granada Publishing Ltd. 1971.

2) Naomi does not appear, from the interview, to be motivated by feminist politics. She does not believe that women are naturally more pacific than men and does not give credence to the view that the arms race is the consequence of male aggression.


Other Commitments: members of CND not employed in the welfare state sector

Introduction

In Chapters 3, 4 and 5, wherein I discussed the respondents in my samples who are employed within the welfare state sector, it was argued that their experiences of state education and employment had rendered them peculiarly susceptible to joining the Campaign. In particular, the commitment of these CNDers to the Campaign reflected their assimilation of, and identification with, the practices and ideology of their welfare state professions. In this sense, such members experience little disjuncture between their personal social world and the culture of CND and are, in the great majority of cases, prepared to subordinate other political or religious goals to the transcendental disarmament cause. Thus, such members support the Campaign's non-party alignment policy and aim to build an ecumenical Movement. For many of these welfare state Campaigners, the notion of 'commitment' was accorded a high personal value and non-supporters of CND were seen as materialistic, apathetic and benighted.

In this chapter I discuss those respondents who are not employed in the welfare state. It will be seen that, in contradistinction to their welfare state CNDer counterparts, these members exhibit attitudes and opinions which have often been engendered by experiences shaped by forces such as social class or religious
conviction that may retain a vitality of a strength which does not always live happily with the CND cause and culture. Consequently, these members' commitment to the Movement often assumes a form which is, in varying ways, of a different character from that of the welfare state members.

Other Commitments

Thirty-two year old Simon T. joined New Town CND in early 1984. He does not think that the membership of his group is drawn equally from all walks of life: "No. I think a lot of them are middle class, semi-professional. The ones I've met are fairly, shall we say, teachers, doctors, that sort of thing. It seems to be a middle class clique, that's what's happened here. This is one of the reasons I suppose I did join, but with everything else that's going on I haven't got a chance to get in there and stick the boot in. The Church seems to have a lot to do with it, which is probably one of the reasons it's still not political." Simon strongly believes that it should be a political Campaign and disagrees with the non-party alignment policy: "You've got Tories Against the Bomb etc., etc., yet if they really wanted the country to be brought to a stage, by what they would consider a bad government, whereby to rebuild it into a nuclear stockpile would cost too much, they would really have to vote Labour. Really they ought to swing their votes behind the Labour Party, whether they agree with their economic policies and so forth, in order to achieve getting rid of these nuclear weapons."

Simon's political activities and hours of work do not leave him
much time for CND campaigning: "I meant to go to a meeting but it clashed with a Labour one and in my view the Labour Party gets major concessions because the Labour Party, should they get in, are going to get more or less what CND are asking for; so it's better to try and get something done rather than go round the country having Easter holidays, holding hands round nuclear bases, if you know what I mean." Simon believes that the policies of Mrs. Thatcher's government have "unfortunately, pushed us into the position where you have to break the law to get your voice heard." He holds the view that, "ideally", peace protesting should be non-violent, "but I'm afraid her [Mrs. Thatcher's] new secret weapon in blue tend to often aggravate to a point where people can no longer be passive shall we say. I mean, someone like myself, I can be extremely violent if provoked. Y'know, basic working class background."

For Simon, the arms race is a consequence of self-interest on the part of arms manufacturers ("making a few readies I would imagine"), and he thinks that even if nuclear disarmament was achieved there would still be a conventional arms race because Britain's conventional forces have been allowed to deteriorate in order to pay for nuclear weaponry. The majority of the British public do not support CND, Simon thinks, because: "They don't like to be seen as pacifists, I think that's one of the major reasons. You start talking about peace to men, so-called men, all swigging beer at the bar and that, and they think you're a poof. Y'know, 'What about those lessies at Greenham Common?' and all
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that stuff, it's unbelievable. And of course they don't read any newspapers as such, they read The Sun - that's a comic. Well, they don't read it, a quick glance at the headlines, Page 3 for a quick drool, then to the back page for the sport and then back to the middle in case there's a few more tits hanging around. But that's the mentality of the majority round here for a start. Unbelievable. Their own little concepts are confined to keeping up with next door. Next door have double glazing they've suddenly got to find the money, or the credit, to have double glazing. They're so tied up with their stupid little world they can't see what's happening around them and of course the literature they get through the door, as I say, The Sun and The Express and that sort of stuff, my God!"

An active member of the local Labour Party, Simon is hoping to stand as a councillor and he describes himself as a "hard left socialist". Not a member of any charitable or voluntary organisation, Simon makes the occasional donation to Oxfam and tries to live out his socialist principles; for example, shopping only at the Co-op and making his own wine in order to avoid inadvertently donating money to the Conservative Party. With regard to Mrs. Thatcher, he disagrees with "virtually everything she says and does." Although Simon thinks that the case for nuclear disarmament is "morally correct", he sees it, of necessity, as properly a political campaign.

Simon was brought up by "pro-Tory working class" foster parents in New Town. He left school without any educational
qualifications and worked for some time in a variety of dead-end jobs spending his leisure time as a 'biker', riding down to the ritual clashes between mods and rockers at English seaside towns in the Sixties. Having become dissatisfied, he enlisted in the Royal Air Force and became a skilled ground-crew propulsion engineer. In 1972, "they threw me out. They don't like socialist thinkers there, especially when they're getting lots of their little fascist rules questioned. I guess I've always been a rebel. [Did you go in as a socialist?] I went in as a Labour supporter, er, a sort of righter of wrongs shall we say, that sort of childish principle. Some of the things the military make you do are so moronic, you're supposed to obey without question, and of course when you do question the order then it's a disruptive influence and you don't fit in with the team." Simon came out of the R.A.F. a socialist and his perspective on CND reflects the primacy he ascribes to his political commitment. For him, unemployment is the most pressing contemporary issue, "unemployment first and then the nuclear issue." Although proud of his working class origins, he sees himself, as the above quotes make clear, surrounded by unthinking, materialistic and sexist individuals in contrast to whom he is enlightened; a self-perception which accords with the view of many of the more middle class members of the Campaign.

Like Simon, Harold A., a member of Scots City CND, is also thirty-two years old and is also an ex-R.A.F. man. Joining the R.A.F. had been a boyhood ambition and at first the life of a ground-crew officer appeared to live up to his expectations,
"wearing a uniform, strutting about, people saluting you, that sort of thing." However, after a while, Harold found himself teaching new recruits and his views began to change: "When I had to teach new people when they came in as recruits I began to question what I was actually teaching them. And at the end I really could not do that, I just couldn't teach what I did not believe in and did not agree with at all and I had to leave. If I had not sat down and thought about it [he pauses], when I was teaching I had to plan out the lessons and things and I thought 'I don't believe in this so I'm damn well not going to teach it'."

The final straw came on the day of the Queen's Silver Jubilee celebrations at Harold's R.A.F. camp: "Would you believe it, Her Majesty the Queen, she had to pick the station I belonged to and, er, there was a large influx of other officers and things. And I remember having a discussion with a man I hadn't seen in years; I'd trained with him, and he's a great believer in 'drop the Bomb first before they drop it on us' and I just couldn't understand this attitude. Not just limited to him, it was all around me. And if it hadn't been for that I suppose I could have soldiered on for a while. But when I heard the attitudes and I saw the attitudes that I was actually helping to develop, y'know, it was time to get out."

Upon leaving the service, Harold "swanned about for a year, I had my gratuity which I spent. Travelled a lot, went to America and Russia. Went to Moscow. I flew straight from America to Russia,"
I'd never been to America and the opportunity came and I had the money to go. I'd been teaching that the Russians were 'baddies' and the Americans were 'goodies' if you like, in this sort of simplistic attitude, and I thought I'll do this. And when I was in America I saw this [flight] advertised, straight from New York to Moscow. I just wanted to compare the goodies and the baddies, if you like, at first hand. I found plenty of baddies in America but I didn't find many baddies in Russia [he laughs]." On returning to Scots City, Harold took a temporary job as a teacher in a secondary school which he left to try to become a freelance humourist journalist. On his return, he also joined Scots City CND.

Harold believes that members of S.C. CND are drawn from all walks of life and he thinks that the majority of the British population do not support the Campaign because: "I think a lot of it is sheer apathy, bone idleness, and not wanting to get involved, this reservedness of not wanting to be involved, of being interested - 'Yes, it's doing a good job, yes I agree but I don't want to be involved' - there is in Britain this terrible reservedness and I think this comes out in everything ... it's foreign to them." Since joining his local group, Harold has helped with leafleting, attended local and national demonstrations and has been to a few of his group's meetings which he intensely dislikes for he feels that far too much time is taken up with deciding who should do what campaigning task. He thinks that the arms race is a consequence of "distrust, complete
and absolute distrust and fear of the unknown", and he favours mass non-violent Ghandian inspired demonstrations as the best form of protesting.

Harold's father is a member of the Liberal Party whilst his mother is non-political ("she picks a name with a pin"). Never a member of any political party or trade union, Harold would vote Labour in the event of a General Election and he describes himself as a "democratic socialist, I am a socialist, I do believe in democratic ideals so I would say I'm a socialist." He does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies for he feels that "her whole policy is a complete disregard for people." Harold supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "because if you get linked in with the Labour Party or the Conservative Party, S.D.P. or anything it will be tagged on with a political tag it shouldn't have. It should be open to all members of any political persuasion. I know Conservatives that are members of CND, I know Liberals that are members of CND, that's fine, it should be open to all of these and if it becomes tagged on all it will do is attract adverse publicity. It shouldn't have a political philosophy because it's not there to decide policy. It's only there for one specific issue."

Although not a member of any charitable or voluntary organisation, Harold buys Campaign Coffee, goes to Anti-Apartheid and Chilean Aid concerts and he argues that the arms race impoverishes the Third World. For Harold, nuclear disarmament is
the most important contemporary issue and he would be quite prepared to be arrested in the pursuit of Non-Violent Direct Action protesting. I asked him whether he thought that nuclear disarmament was a moral issue?: "Yes, I would say it's a moral issue. Disarmament to me is tied in with the entire morals and ethics of violence. All I really see nuclear weapons is as an extension of man's violence. The thing about man is that he must dominate, I don't know why it is. The only way we can achieve disarmament is if we learn to control our own violence, our attitudes to other people. So it is a moral issue, a very moral issue."

Clearly, for both Harold and Simon, their experiences of the state, in the form of the R.A.F., was highly important in their lives and in the formation of their views. Nevertheless, the effects of their contact with the state are disparate: for Simon, it has resulted in a hardening of his nascent socialist politics; for Harold, it provoked a reassessment of his beliefs and attitudes. In both cases, their experiences of the R.A.F. acted as a catalyst in their biographical development. Simon sees himself as working class, although not benighted and materialistic, and his political commitment takes priority over his allegiance to CND; nuclear disarmament is something to be fought for by and through the Labour Party. For Harold, on the other hand, nuclear disarmament ranks as the most important contemporary issue to be achieved by a mass non-political single-issue movement. Becoming an instructor in the R.A.F. inadvertently rendered Harold personally responsible for the
policies of the state - a personal moral responsibility which became repugnant to him. Both men's personal commitment has been engendered by their experiences of the state but whereas Simon's commitment is overtly political, Harold's commitment, which is closer in character to the commitment expressed by many of the welfare state CNDers, is overtly moral.

Of course, there are a myriad ways in which an individual's work or profession can act as a catalyst to personal change. For example, twenty-four year old Shirley M. joined S.C. CND in the summer of 1983 and since then she has been to a few of the group's General Meetings which she dislikes for she finds that "nothing really gets done." Sceptical about politicians in general, Shirley favours the Campaign's non-party alignment policy despite the fact that "I sway towards Labour", and she is unclear as to why we have an arms race: "I'm not really very sure. I think it's just distrust, they [the Superpowers] won't sit down and trust one another." She thinks that the majority of the British public do not belong to CND because: "There's still a lot of people in this country who like this glory, y'know, Great Britain, get the flags out, we're one of the top countries. And I think there still is, especially in Britain, they like, they seem to thrive on, the War, y'know, the fact that we won. The British Empire and all that. Some of them still think that. And they're brought up to think that Russia is the enemy." In her opinion, members of CND are probably drawn from all walks of life: "I think so. I'm not very sure. I think probably they are. But most
of them tend to be – oh – I don't know now because I've met miners who support it so I would say they are drawn from all walks of life. A lot of people have the opinion that the peace movement is just the plaything of the middle classes, but most of them I know aren't."

In the event of a General Election, Shirley would vote for Labour and she would like to join the party but is unable to do so because her membership would be conditional upon her bringing her union back-payments up to date which, at present, she cannot afford. Describing herself as "left wing" ("If I was a member of the Labour party I think I'd be in the centre"), Shirley disagrees with "everything she [Mrs. Thatcher] does"; in particular, Mrs. Thatcher's administration's economic and immigration policies and the running down of the Health Service. For Shirley, nuclear disarmament is "a big political issue", but not the most pressing contemporary issue: "No, the state of this country, unemployment like, does come into my mind more. That's why I have to get involved in the Labour Party."

The daughter of a now unemployed construction engineer, Shirley left school with five 'O' Levels and went to work as an electronics component assembler for Misdex Ltd., one of this country's largest electronics companies with a heavy involvement in military production and research: "When I left school I worked in Misdex. But I eventually got to sort of thinking, I mean everything that Misdex built was all military and that's when it all started, y'know, I left there and decided to change my job
altogether." Shirley's questioning of her work was prompted by a company training visit when she was taken from her assembly desk to see the finished product of her labour power: "It didn't really hit me at all until one day there was a few people from every department taken to McHeath Airport. And I happened to be one of them and I got sat in a Warrior jet and I saw it all and thought, y'know, this actually gets involved in, I didn't really - I mean I was still too interested in going out and enjoying myself and I didn't really think about what I was doing, just went along and done it - and that really started to, y'know, I thought about it, this is a fighter plane, this kills people, and I thought, it started to prey on my mind for quite a while." Upon leaving Misdex, Shirley "started working for a company that did medical electronics, ultrasound scanners and that, so I felt that was o.k. But now this company I'm with, now they're starting to trade with South Africa, for the military and that, so I am actually leaving it at the end of the month."

For welfare state CNDers, the ideology and practice of their professions does not entail a separation of labour and morality; indeed, their professional ideology seems to encourage them to feel personally responsible for their work. For most workers in capitalist industries this is not the case; a high division of labour, the cash nexus and the production of commodities serve to alienate the labour force from the moral qualities and ethical implications of their work. Thus, Shirley could escape the full import of her electronics assembling and only a chance encounter
with the finished product, a fighter plane, caused her to question the validity of her employment. This questioning led her to the conclusion that such employment was morally unacceptable and she gave in her notice. She appears to have retained this attitude for now, faced with another ethical dilemma; she is on the point of again resigning her job as a question of principle - a courageous personal stand in these times of unjustifiably high unemployment.

In my sample of Scots City respondents I also had another Misdex employee. Thirty-eight year old Adrian N. joined S.C. CND in 1981; he has never been to any of his group's meetings and his only campaigning activities to date are having taken part in two local marches. Brought up by working class foster parents (his father was a postman), Adrian is, in formal activist terms, a nominal member of the Movement. He believes that the arms race is a symptom of "greedy mankind" and he supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy and non-violent protesting. Adrian has not broken the law in the pursuit of disarmament protesting and found it hard to imagine himself doing so. He believes that the majority of the British public do not support CND because of "tradition, traditional views. The establishment. We come from a background of a patriotic nation" and he ranks nuclear disarmament "on a par" with ecological concerns as the most pressing contemporary issue. A Labour voter, Adrian was a member of the party from 1980 to 1981, leaving out of disillusionment with what he saw as the other members' narrow-mindedness. Politically, Adrian describes himself as "very near to Neil
Kinnock so I suppose it's slightly left of centre", and he
strongly disagrees with Mrs. Thatcher's administration's economic
policies which he feels are the "capitalism of a byegone age"; in
preference, he would like to see public expenditure used to
reduce (in a Keynesian fashion), the level of unemployment.

In the interview, Adrian tended to give clipped, one-word answers
and seemed reluctant to express his views; consequently, it is
difficult, from the interview material, to reconstruct his
biography and its relation to his disarmament and political
perspectives. Nonetheless, when speaking of his employment
history, Adrian gave an interesting insight into the ethical
dilemmas faced by a Campaign supporter forced, by capitalistic
circumstance, to manufacture military equipment.

Adrian left school without any educational qualifications and
became employed as a sheet-metal worker, a job which he left in
order to undertake a government re-training scheme with the
intention of becoming an electronics assembler. He then joined a
small company which manufactured medical equipment but, six years
later ... "It's a bit ironic, they got into financial
difficulties and I had to leave that." Adrian then went to work
for Misdex Ltd. where he helps to assemble the flight-deck
instrumentation for the Revered combat plane. This unsought for
change in his employment is not to Adrian's liking: "The
conditions [in the two companies] are about the same. But you
felt as if you're contributing something towards society, a wee
bit proud, y'know. Now I don't feel I'm contributing anything towards society, using up world resources for nothing."

Adrian has a few workmates who are also opposed to nuclear weapons and share his distaste for their work: "There's two or three people I can talk to, who are sympathetic towards it and realise it's ... in fact, there's a bloke who works beside me who was in Hiroshima for about three years after the War and it was still flat, no tar on the roads. He said it looked like, reminded him of one of these films you see of the Klondike where the mud's up to there." Adrian thinks that most of the workforce at Misdex are aware of the dangers of nuclear war; however, they are not sympathetic to the peace movement: "I know that there's people I work beside at the moment and when Greenham Common was on and the girls were trying to rip the fence down and that, what they saw was a load of hippies and yobbos. They didnnae see the actual thing, the actual thing they were trying to do, trying to explain and get over." I asked Adrian what he thought could be done to gain the support of such people: "It's hard to say really. How do you change people? People are influenced by The Sun newspaper, the depth of their political thinking comes from there."

In the foregoing interview with Adrian it is unclear as to why he, unlike the majority of his workmates, feels ethically perturbed by his present employment: it seems reasonable to speculate that the change from manufacturing medical equipment to producing fighter aircraft may have heightened his moral perception. This difficulty notwithstanding, I feel that Adrian's
remarks on his work allow an insight into his position as a CND supporter, a position he has 'taken up in the world'\(^{(1)}\); it is only by placing the commitment to CND within the social world of the members of the Campaign that one can understand its fuller meaning. A commitment to CND is not discrete, it lives alongside, and is an expression of, the individual member's other social stances and positions.

Matilda A. joined S.C. CND a year ago after watching *On The Eighth Day*\(^{(2)}\) on television. Matilda's only contribution to the Campaign is her subscription and she has never attended any of her group's meetings. She believes that the membership is drawn from all walks of life and that the majority of the population do not support the Campaign because "I don't think they know much about it."

Matilda is first and foremost a Labour Party activist and she believes that the most effective way in which CND could achieve its aims is by getting "more involved in political issues. That's why I said I didn't think I'd be a great help to you because I'm not actually an active member of CND. As far as I'm concerned after seeing that film I was really quite horrified and I felt I had to make some form of commitment but it was purely financial, I do get the Newsletter every month which I pass round at work, so my involvement is purely financial. Mainly because I don't have time to get more involved. I'm very active in my local Labour Party, in my local branch and in the constituency, and I'm
also very active in my trade union, and I do hold a position in my union and that takes up most of my free time. So I really don't have a lot of time left for CND. But I feel that the organisation isn't political enough and, hm, I've often been rather irritated about CND especially during the last General Election campaign. Everybody in the local Labour Party was working very hard to try to get a Labour government elected, who certainly have peace more in mind than a Conservative government do, and yet CND were busy organising mass demonstrations down South. I was really annoyed. [You know that the official CND policy is not to be aligned to any party?] Oh, I appreciate that. But I do feel that during the General Election campaign, hm, to me, they were playing into the hands of the people who are against the peace movement. [Do you think they should be aligned?] Personally I think they should. But I can understand why there are people involved in CND that don't want to get involved in political issues, but I would say that it's probably lack of information that makes them feel that way."

Matilda's parents are both "out and out Tories" and, until recently, owned and ran a small hotel. Matilda left school with three 'O' Levels and went to work as a receptionist for a large nationalised hotel in Scots City, an experience which radically altered her political outlook: "At work I used to complain about the conditions, and I used to say 'they' should do something about it. It's quite amazing, you hear people say 'they' should do something. And one day someone turned round to me and said 'Who are they? Why don't you become they?' and that's why I
decided to get involved in my own union. And I think it's the same with CND, there's no point in sitting around waiting for someone else to do something, if you feel strongly enough you should do something about it yourself."

When Matilda first became active in her union she still held faith with her parents' political outlook; however, a little while later her union sent her on a training course: "I was very active in my union and they sent me on a summer school ... and at night we used to go down to the pub with the Kent miners [who were also attending the school], and there were quite a few members of the Labour Party. We started having political discussions with miners and they said they couldn't understand how someone who was so active in the union could vote Tory, and I said as far as I was concerned - this is maybe something a little like CND - what I did in my union had absolutely nothing to do with politics. And it was just absolute ignorance on my part that I'd never connected the two together but it was the way I'd been brought up. It was just everything I'd heard from my family and my parents, that being a Conservative it was up to yourself how you progressed through life, it was everything I'd been brought up to believe and I'd never thought there was any other way until I went to the summer school and actually started to think about it."

"For a few months" after the summer school "little brown paper parcels kept arriving through the door from Kent and other places in the country. It was people on my own course and miners sending
me books. I was getting sent things like *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*. I was sent things like this and I started doing a lot of reading and then I decided that I was right and my parents were wrong and I was going to join the Labour Party." Matilda now feels that she "would never go back, no matter what happened. I would never, ever leave the Labour Party" and she describes herself as "a left winger, I'm a great supporter of Tony Benn." As one would expect, she does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies and she believes that the present high level of unemployment is a deliberate and classic capitalist ploy designed to oppress and exploit the working class.

In contrast to the more middle class respondents, Matilda's main concern is with the local effects of the cut-backs (for example, street-cleaning, local housing conditions) rather than with wider welfare state issues such as education and the N.H.S. In addition, and again in distinction to the interviewees in the preceding chapters, Matilda is not prepared to subordinate her political aims for the sake of the nuclear disarmament cause. I asked her why she thought some members of CND did not want to be involved in politics: "I think there's still the old fashioned bogey, about the Labour Party anyway, about reds-under-the-beds and all this sort of nonsense that frightens a lot of people. Whereas they genuinely believe that working for a peace campaign is maybe not giving them quite as much commitment as it would if they joined a political party, whichever one."
Matilda's own form of commitment makes for an interesting comparison with those welfare state members who, like her, were politicised by their experiences of work. Unlike, for example, teacher and doctor members, Matilda became committed to a party political form of life rather than to her world of work and its ideology; indeed, Matilda is committed to changing her world of work rather than merely protecting it. The following interview, with an extremely active and involved member of the Movement, reveals the more orthodox perspective on CND, a perspective engendered by a state nurtured career as a campaigner on a variety of social and political issues.

Thirty-year old Peter I. first joined S.C. CND in 1981 but his interest in nuclear disarmament and the anti-nuclear power movement is of long standing and derives from a slow biographical gestation. He believes that "in the last resort" Britain's ability to disarm "depends on the result of the next General Election", in that if Labour were to come to power we would be well on the road to unilateral disarmament. However, Peter thinks that the Campaign's non-party policy is "absolutely right. Because, er, I'm a member of the Labour Party, I'm very active in the Labour Party, um, I support, er, consider myself a socialist, but I do see having worked in pressure groups, that for a pressure group, or a campaigning group to be effective it has to keep itself free of any direct political affiliation. Pressure groups, campaigning groups, are more effective at changing public opinion when they pull in people from all political spectrum. I
actually think that's a cardinal principle of all effective pressure group work. If CND aligned itself to a political party it would become something different, an adjunct of a political party. That's a different animal, seeking political power; but if you're going to remain a successful campaign, which I think CND has been, you've got to be able to bring in all shades of political spectrum."

Peter thinks "an array of complex political and social reasons" are responsible for generating the present arms race and he is "very impressed" by E.P. Thompson's argument that a 'logic of exterminism' has developed in the conflict between the superpowers. Peter has an unusually sophisticated grasp of disarmament issues and in the interview he spelt out a step-by-step programme incorporating the abandonment of nuclear power plants as well as the more usual rejection of nuclear weapons and weapons bases. He believes that the majority of the British public do not belong to the peace movement because "the majority of the British public don't belong to anything. I think it's extraordinary the number of people CND has managed to get involved and out on the streets. And it's beginning to tap on that, improve on that, by using better marketing techniques, better management techniques, which I think is excellent. If you compare the membership of CND with the membership of the Labour party, or any political party, it does very well. Hm, most people are not 'political', using that in its widest sense, are not politically active, and that's all to do with reasons of television, the way our society is constructed, and that's a flaw
in itself. But why it is ... [his voice tails off]." Peter believes that the membership of the Campaign is drawn from all walks of life "with the reservation that one very rarely finds right wingers there. There is a very wide spectrum and it isn't often appreciated. My parents got involved with the new wave of CND before I did; my mum's a socialist but my dad's a Liberal and they live in a very right wing suburb just outside London and it's amazing the amount of sympathy they found amongst Church people and people you wouldn't expect. It is very wide but there is a preponderance of radical left wing views, I think that's inevitable."

The son of a now retired actuary and a nursing sister, Peter joined Friends of the Earth when a schoolboy: "I started off as a kid, I really loved the natural environment. We had a badger in the woods at the back of the garden, I can remember from the earliest days finding this tremendously exciting. The council wanted to put a road through the wood, which put the badger set at the other side of the road - God knows what happened to him - and this was all happening in my adolescence and it made me very angry, and it was from that I got involved in anti-road groups and it was a short step from that to Friends of the Earth who were being formed locally at that time." Peter left school and went to university to read for an English degree out of an "intrinsic interest in literature"; however, at university his interest in literature became eclipsed by his development as a professional campaigner: "The issue I really got into, because of
my association with Friends of the Earth, was the nuclear issue because it seemed the most politically exciting and relevant. And a lot of us went along to the extremely good and wide range of lectures that were available on that topic; I even considered in my second year taking a year's break from my course to work full-time on anti-nuclear power campaigning. But I was persuaded against that, I think rightly really, to finish my course, but I got, y'know, a 2:2 and there's no doubt that if, I guess I would have spent half my time at university involved in anti-nuclear power environmental campaigning rather than doing my course. We organised meetings, I got on telly a couple of times, and I found I thrived on the process and became much more politically aware, both on the environmental movement and general political issues. And, er, it was certainly my time at university that made me decide I'd have to spend time involved in campaigning, political work, in one way or another."

Upon leaving university, Peter acted on this career decision and worked for a variety of anti-nuclear power, charitable and environmental organisations. At present, he is self-employed and devotes a considerable amount of his time to the anti-nuclear power and nuclear disarmament campaigns. He considers the anti-nuclear power/weapons issue to be the most important and pressing contemporary question and he describes himself as an "eco-socialist." A prominent member of the national Campaign, Peter brings his extensive experiences and skills to bear on CND and his view of the Movement, as a mass pressure group, clearly reflects his university fostered career as a professional
campaigner. In Peter's words: "From opposing a road through a wood I became aware of all the issues involved in it. Then through opposing nuclear power stations in the countryside you become involved in a political education process of how things are linked into much wider concerns. And I think that the educative political process is one of the most valuable things that the pressure group movement does. People go through it and come out with, you start off saying 'It's outrageous that they should build this road through my wood or power station in my back garden' and it takes you right on to - people end up in different places - but it took me right on to y'know, a kind of eco-socialism."

Unlike the previous interviewees in this chapter, Peter is fortunate in that he is able to work in areas of employment in which he feels politically and morally comfortable and his commitment to CND lives amicably alongside his eco-socialist convictions. In contrast to, for example, Matilda or Simon, Peter does not experience any conflict between his political affiliation and his membership of the Campaign and he is convinced of the need to remain unaligned to any political party. It is only by relating the membership of each member to their social world and idiosyncratic biography that one can understand their commitment to, and participation in, the Campaign's culture. The commonality of the welfare state CNDers' participation in this culture, and their characteristic commitment to it, rests upon a shared experience of, and identification with, their state
apprenticeship, welfare vocation, and the concomitant ideologies. This commonality of experience does not exist for the majority of the non-welfare state CNDers and their commitment to the Movement, therefore, reflects other, diverse, generative influences which may not be fully compatible with the geist of the Campaign's dominant culture.

Clearly, Peter's university nurtured career as a campaigner and his personal identification with his employment closely mirrors the typical biographical experiences of the welfare state CNDers, and, subsequently, so do his views on the Campaign. Similarly, seventy-six year old Michelle N., a member of New Town CND, has also been to university and although never a teacher, doctor or social worker etc., she has been in an akin form of employment and her commitment to the Campaign resembles that expressed in the welfare state CNDers' form of life. (The welfare state category is blurred at the edges and it is not always possible to locate unambiguously occupations within it. I have chosen to discuss Michelle, who has worked in local authority housing management, in this chapter for comparative purposes).

The daughter of a civil servant and a mother who undertook voluntary work until starting a family, Michelle went to university in 1929 to read for a degree in mathematics. Like many undergraduates, Michelle chose her degree subject on the basis of it being her best subject at school; she now wishes that she could have done a course in social work: "I think I would have done something a bit more, but in those days they didn't have
degrees in social work, it was too early." Upon leaving university with her (titular) degree, Michelle spent a year as a voluntary worker in an approved school and then went into housing management, which remained her field of employment until her retirement: "I was a socialist, and I thought it was terribly important to administer things humanely and housing was a good example." In addition, Michelle had become an admirer of Octavia Hill's housing policies and, although now retired, she still receives literature from the Institute of Housing (a successor to the Octavia Hill Housing Society).

Whilst at university, Michelle had also been involved in the Labour Society, had joined the League of Nations and was interested in contemporary political campaigns of the time (for example, Indian home rule). She "has always been a Labour voter, and I shall go on being a Labour voter, Mrs. Thatcher has made me even more determined. There was an argument at one time that there wasn't much between them, but you can't say that now." Describing herself as a socialist, Michelle thinks that "things should be run for the good of the community and not for profit" and she disagrees with all of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies: "It's all, um, all profit motive isn't it. And these cuts too, it's increasing unemployment by cutting services, spending money on all the wrong things." Not a member of any charitable or voluntary group, Michelle supports their aims but: "It's a matter of time. I'm very much in favour of the world development movements, and I subscribe to these things, but I
think you have to decide what you give most of your time to and I
give mine to CND." Similarly, Michelle "goes to ward meetings [of
her local Labour Party], and I canvass when the Election comes
along. Again, it's a matter of what is most important, the Labour
Party or CND. I mean they're both important, and it's very, very
difficult. This is one of the difficulties I think."

Michelle dates her interest in the peace movement as starting
with her student involvement in the League of Nations and
although she had been "in sympathy" with the original Campaign
she did not become a member because, as the Housing Manager for a
local corporation, she did not wish to be seen as 'politically'
involved. In the late Seventies, she attended a meeting of the
World Disarmament Campaign in London and she subsequently joined
this Campaign's New Town branch (which evolved into N.T. CND). An
active member of her local CND group, she regularly attends
meetings, goes on demonstrations and 'mans' the group's
bookstall. Michelle thinks that peace protesting "should always
be non-violent, yes, definitely" and believes that, in the right
circumstances, it may be necessary to break the law in the
pursuit of nuclear disarmament.

Michelle thinks that the arms race is a consequence of "fear,
largely. I know it's augmented by people making profit, but I
think that wouldn't in itself make an arms race if the public
weren't convinced it was the way to keep the peace. Unfortunately, it's the public that support it." Relatedly, she
believes that the majority of the British public do not support
the peace movement because they fear that disarmament would render Britain vulnerable to attack. Michelle thinks that members of N.T. CND are drawn from all walks of life: "Yes, I think so, it's a difficult thing to answer. But I think, as far as age group and background and so on, I think we're pretty varied." Although Michelle "approves of a lot of the things that Greenham Common women do", she is worried that "some of them are over-emphasizing, I don't like placards up against men. I think it's a pity that some of the Greenham campaign has become that type of feminism. After all, a lot of women are jolly militaristic, and a lot of men who, after all, were conscientious objectors because it was men who were called up, they've been foremost in the peace movement. There's a lot to be said on the feminist movement on other things, I'm not decrying that for a moment, but I think it's a pity to bring that too much into CND because I think for one thing it's divisive." And, despite being a member of the Labour Party, she agrees with the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "because you want the support of people in other parties." Michelle sees today's Campaign as "moral primarily, but you've got to get it through politics haven't you. But I often think that the best arguments come back to the moral one. The nuclear Bomb is immoral full stop, and it's immoral to talk about pressing the button and killing millions of Russians."

Michelle's father had been a Liberal Party supporter, her mother was a socialist, and Michelle remembers as a child listening to her parents discussing political matters. At university, she
became involved in the Labour Party society and the League of Nations and developed an interest in the Octavia Hill Society. After a year spent as a voluntary worker, Michelle chose employment in housing management which allowed her to put into practise her political and ideological convictions, convictions which she retains to this day. Although her's is an ambiguous welfare vocation, Michelle's local state employment, her experiences at university and the symmetry between her work and her political convictions closely resemble that of, for example, teacher members of the Campaign. In addition, her perspective on, and commitment to, CND is in sympathy with the welfare state CNDers' position; like them, she is prepared to give priority to disarmament campaigning and is opposed to what she sees as divisive or partisan strategies. In this sense, her campaigning position is close to that of Peter, the preceding interviewee, and notably different from the overtly political (left) stance of Simon or Matilda who both believe that CND should be incorporated within the Labour Party. It could be argued that this is a consequence of class differences in that Michelle and Peter are 'middle class' whilst Simon and Matilda have had working class biographies; however, it is, I suggest, more analytically precise and heuristically useful to view the former pair's biography and class location as being akin to the state creativity of the welfare state CNDers - clearly, Michelle's and Peter's views and opinions have little in common with, for example, the traditional 'petty bourgeoisie' (a social group notably absent from the Campaign's membership). Like the welfare state CNDers, Michelle and Peter do not favour partisan politics; eco-socialism, the
anti-nuclear power cause and humane housing policies are, in common with the N.H.S., education and the social services, for the common good. In this socio-political paradigm, the nuclear disarmament cause can take priority for it is not in conflict with other aims; instead, it is the most pressing issue in a set of interrelated threats to the common good.

A commitment to a Campaign which transcends partisan politics or ideologies may, of course, derive from a variety of sources. For example, Walter W. is a young lawyer and a member of Scots City CND who kindly agreed to take time off from his busy legal practice to be interviewed at his place of work. Walter first became interested in nuclear disarmament in the late Seventies, "largely through my development of my religious beliefs, through becoming a Christian and becoming concerned with broader issues in general. And also through being at university." He had recently joined S.C. CND and Christian CND and attended the preliminary meeting of the (then) fledgling Lawyers Against Nuclear Armaments group. For Walter, the best form of protesting is through 'consciousness raising' of the general public and he believes that any disarmament protesting must be non-violent as a question of principle.

Walter holds the opinion that the majority of the British public do not support CND because "perhaps it's perceived as anti-establishment, anti-government. That may be a fault of the way CND presents itself, it may be a fault of how CND is presented by
others, particularly the Conservative party, but I think it probably is seen as anti-establishment in some ways, and for the vast majority of people their lives are within this fabric of the establishment and if you start attacking any one corner of the establishment you're threatening to attack the whole thing, you're left with no certainty or structure ...". He believes that "there's a certain picture of the average CND member in the press, the sort of, y'know, vegetarian, quasi-anarchic, woolly-hatted brigade, which in my experience is true of only a very small minority. I mean, there was eighty odd folk at the meeting I went to for the proposed Lawyers Against Nuclear Armaments thing and these were lawyers in private practice and one or two senior members of the Bar. The Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons is large and strong and these are not all quack doctors or weird types at all but ordinary people. Probably on balance there's a slight preponderance of left wing political views, but I think it probably is true to say that people concerned with the peace issue are drawn from all walks of life."

Having vacillated between voting for the Liberal and Labour Parties in the past, Walter would now definitely opt for the latter and, although never a member of any political party, he classes himself as "a socialist of some description. I was going to say a 'progressive socialist' but, um, I'm not sure if that's the right term. Let's say I'm a mildly right socialist if that's accurate enough." As a "mildly right socialist", he "disagrees with one of the fundamental principles of Conservative philosophy which is if you leave people to get on with their own thing, give
them as much freedom as possible, it will all work out o.k. in
the end. I agree with them that there's selfishness in human
nature but I strongly disagree with their conclusion that you
shouldn't fight it, because the results are disastrous for the
majority who end up at the receiving end. So on that basic level
I disagree with them."

Walter's father worked "in life assurance" and his mother has
been a secretary with a number of private companies; both parents
are agnostics. Walter went to university to read for a degree in
law, an experience which "didn't particularly change my views. It
would be truer to say it gave me an opportunity to do some
prolonged reflection and thinking which I don't think I would
have had if I'd gone straight into my job. So in that sense
particularly it changed my views. But also there were
opportunities for discussion on issues in a way that doesn't
quite happen in a full time job ...". During his time as an
undergraduate, Walter became interested in politics and
disarmament issues; his interest in religion, however, predates
his student years. It is his religious faith which allows him,
unlike in his opinion the majority of the population, to live
outside "the fabric of the establishment".

Walter's religious conviction is the pre-eminent feature of his
personal socio-political paradigm and it provides him with a
transcendental authority which can act as a court of appeal in
matters of personal and political ethics. For Walter, the
existence of the arms race can be explained "in religious terms. The basic reason has got to be human sinfulness and self-centredness and a combination of fear of others and fear of the differences in others and innate hostility and aggression. I think these basic and psychological facts are reproduced in international relations as well." In his personal life, "the primary issues are Christian and spiritual issues, but that's not to say that CND and nuclear disarmament is not part of that because it is, very much so. So it's an important issue for me because it's a part of that." He sees the nuclear disarmament cause as "a moral issue, and a spiritual one as well. And a political issue, it has many dimensions. At root, I think it's a moral and spiritual issue, and political issues are concerned more with the details and practicalities. But it certainly goes deeper than a political issue." Consequently, he supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy: "If CND was to be aligned to any of the official parties presumably it would be the Labour Party. Now I don't object to the Labour Party, in fact I vote Labour myself, but I feel that the issue of nuclear disarmament is a broader one than a party political issue and, um, that in a sense would be to play into the hands of those who would like to reduce it to a party political issue." I asked Walter how he would feel about breaking the law in the pursuit of nuclear disarmament, a provocative question to put to a practising lawyer: "I really don't know. I think in principle there has got to be a higher law than the mere law of the state - and whether you're talking about moral or divine law - there's something above that and the law of the state is not absolute. I think for
a Christian that's clear, the law cannot be the last word, and if the law is in fundamental conflict with what one believes to be correct then, in certain circumstances I feel I would have to break it. I wouldn't on principle say I'd never break it, I would have to be careful."

In common with Walter, seventy-four year old Heather M. and her husband, both members of New Town CND, also place their commitment to CND within their paradigmatic religious form of life. Although very articulate, Heather was somewhat prone to wandering away from the subject under discussion and is physically infirm; consequently, this interview was truncated. Heather and her husband hail originally from the East End of London where Heather worked in the print trade and her husband was employed as a salesman for a bakery company. Like Walter, Heather and her husband see their commitment to CND as an extension of, and concomitant with, their strong religious faith. I asked Heather, 'When did you first become interested in the peace movement?': "Well, you see, it goes back to when I felt Jesus or God or whoever you call Him was talking to me. I was watching my daughter getting married and I felt I'd got to do something more about my Christian life, that's my opinion about it. From then onward, er, I made inquiries about going to, er, a Christian community for my holidays. I felt that something seemed to tell me that that was the right thing to do, which we did, and, er, we went to Calvary Abbey [a Christian holiday centre], went there several years running, and I was greatly impressed
with them. They're quite Evangelical, although it's an Anglican base, as we're Anglican, but it was very Evangelical. This daughter, she had a lot of trouble with her husband ... so I was going to the Abbey one night and I thought to myself well, perhaps these people - this is leading up to, I'm going a long way round, but this is my way of explaining why I threw myself into all these peace movements - and I wrote on a piece of paper 'please pray for these people' and they asked me who they were and I said 'my daughter and her husband' and they said 'would you like to intercede for them?, can you tell us anything about them?' and I said 'God knows all about it.' You see, I link my peace movements with the spiritual thing. Anyway, as I was having this laying on of hands as they call it I felt 'I'm not going to worry anymore', and I don't now, y'know, even if it worries me I just put it in God's hands. From then onwards I seemed to hear of different things; World Development was one of the first ones, somebody told me about that, and I became quite concerned. I read the papers quite a lot and listen to the radio and I was hearing about these people starving and all that, and I got involved with the World Development lot. My husband got this job as a verger and caretaker and we used to have a lot of meetings, people used to come there from different meetings, Amnesty International and all that sort of thing, and I used to go into them because he was working quite late at night, and I got involved with them and I felt that if only we could become a more spiritual country we wouldn't have to worry. I support quite a lot of them, I support the miners and all that sort of thing and I feel, you see I link mine to the spiritual thing.
Heather and her husband regularly attend their group's meetings and they think the members of their group are "good and sincere" and they admire the other members' activism. Heather's husband thinks that the majority of the British public do not support the peace movement because "they're frightened of the red bogey"; Heather has a somewhat different, and familiar, point of view: "That's my husband's opinion. But I think a lot of people are apathetic, especially when they're not doing too badly for themselves. People are fools, Carlyle said this, people are mostly fools, people are idiots. The more I look at mankind, the more stupid I think they are [she laughs]." Both Heather and her husband think a "good cross-section" of the public are represented in their local group and they cite the membership of both an avowed communist and an ex-Justice of the Peace in support of this opinion. Heather does not "like politics pushed too much John [the author], I think it would be quite a good idea to make it Christian. My daughter belongs to what they call Christian CND, they did speak about it in this area but they didn't get enough support for it really because quite a lot of good people wouldn't call themselves Christians. But I think Christian CND would be better than political CND myself."

Not members of any political party, Heather and her husband describe themselves as "Christian Socialists", vote Labour and "don't like the capitalist system" which they regard as immoral, materialistic and un-Christian. As Christian Socialists, they
"don't think much" of Mrs. Thatcher's administration: "They're so much against our point of view that we feel rather sorry that the people were stupid enough to put them in, and it will be years before we can get them out. It's a selfish, unfeeling, unthinking lot of people. That John Gummer who she's recently given five thousand pounds extra to, we've had tea with him! He's only an ordinary man, they don't need all that money. There was a man named Peter Tatchell, he was going to be put forward for Bermondsey, and he said if he was elected he'd have been willing to accept eight thousand pounds instead of, I think they get about fifteen thousand pounds. He wasn't even accepted. You see, this country worships money, especially Mrs. Thatcher, especially the Conservatives, and you can't worship God and Mammon, Mammon being money, and people do worship money. I don't think much of the Conservatives."

In addition to supporting CND, Heather and her husband also belong to, or support, an astonishingly large number of other campaigns and causes, including Amnesty International, the Anti-Apartheid movement, the Greenham Common women, and the (then) striking miners, to name but a few. They visit the sick in hospital, correspond with a jailed South African priest and are disgusted by the working conditions of Indian tea plantation workers and the existence of the E.E.C. surplus food mountains. A devoted couple, they see themselves as different from the materialistic, money-worshipping majority: "When we had this social worker come along the other day she said 'you're rather unusual, everybody else moans about their lot and how much they
want and how they haven't got enough'. We said we were quite comfortable and happy about it. Apparently, we must be something out of the ordinary to think that way."

In their personal lives, in their approach to social and political issues, Heather and her husband try to express their conception of Christian witness, a witness incorporating a strong component of moral duty. Heather has a firm faith in this transcendental moral force: "I'll tell you this, take my advice John, if you do the right thing in this world you never get let down. There's a higher power than our's, you can call it a moral law of the universe. If you do the right thing, things work out and I've found this all through my life." Their membership of CND is an expression of this witness, a commitment which is one facet of their religious form of life. Just as the ideology of the welfare state CNDers' vocations impelled them to take responsibility for their work, rendered them susceptible to joining the Campaign and caused them to feel superior and distinct from the materialistic and unthinking majority, so Heather and her husband's religious beliefs serve to engender a similar personal stance: both the transcendental Christian moral law and the universalistic ideology of the welfare state separate their adherents from the everyday acquisitive and self-seeking ethics of British capitalist society. This is, I feel, a more useful formulation of the distinction which Parkin draws between 'instrumental' working class politics and the supposedly 'expressive' politics of middle class radicals. Moreover, it
heuristically permits an understanding of the cultural glue which allows a merging and assimilation of different forms of life within the CND culture. Both Heather and Simon (the ex-airforce Labour Party interviewee discussed at the beginning of this chapter) are working class with working class biographies; however, the generative social context of Simon's commitment has spawned a very different allegiance to the Campaign wherein Labour politics, rather than transcendental ethics, are the ultimate referential standard to which the disarmament cause must be subordinated.

Forty-four year old Sarah J. is also a working class member of New Town CND. The daughter of a baker ("thirty-six years on nights"), Sarah has been unemployed for the past four years during which time she has undertaken voluntary work for a local unemployed person's group and a, now defunct, local organisation which helped to provide facilities for the town's West Indian youth. Sarah is, obviously, a political activist and her kitchen, where the interview was conducted, was festooned with evidence of her activism; at the time of the interview, Sarah was especially preoccupied with the miners' strike. Sarah's parents were Labour voters but politics were never discussed in the home and her own political awakening took place two years after she started work as an office junior: "I was called 'a red' when I was eighteen. I was working in a department, there was a guy who was a trained architect, he got the job over the 'phone. And they [the management] said 'well, come up and see us and we'll talk about your holidays etc. etc.' and when he turned up they said 'sorry,
you haven't got enough qualifications'. He was West Indian, he was black. And he came back, told us what happened, and I went loopy. And I only knew one black family, so I didn't have, I wasn't surrounded by black people, I didn't know any black people apart from this family. I didn't know what West Indians were, I thought West Indians came from West India, I really did, I was that naive. And I just thought it was immoral, and somebody said to me 'you're a red', and I said 'pardon?' and they said 'you're a red' and I thought 'what do you mean?'; I was literally looking at my skin, I was that naive at eighteen. And he said 'you're a bloody communist', and I didn't even know what a communist was! That's how naive I was about politics. My father would never discuss religion or politics at home, never. [How did you get interested in politics?] It was after that, and I thought, well, if that's what a red is, and then I met up with an old boyfriend of mine - and I mean I didn't know his father was a member of the C.P. [Communist Party of Great Britain] - we used to have discussions, and Alan and me always used to argue against the others in the kitchen and I used to agree with everything he said, and I thought I'll never join and then I met my first husband, and I hadn't known him very long, and I literally thought 'right, this seems to be the party for me', it's the party that seems to have the most things I agree with in it, like non-racialist... so you can say I'm a socialist or a communist, you can put names on me, but basically I'm concerned about humanity but I like to have time off to enjoy myself.
Marching under the flag of the Young Communist Party, Sarah took part in the 1962 Aldermaston March (on which she was arrested and subsequently fined): "I literally jumped in feet first, I'm like that." For personal reasons, Sarah went into the "political wilderness" until the late Seventies when she became reactivated and joined New Town CND which she thinks is "very different from when I first joined. I would say I was one of the very, very few that were not of the sort of the duffle-coat brigade, and I'm not sort of putting anyone down. But they were basically professional people, there were only one or two people, although their parents may have been working class they were very thinking backgrounds, they had been involved in things. It's widened out now. I think it's broadened out into incorporating people from a lot of areas. Most of the people that I knew in the [original] New Town CND were teachers, but that was because my husband [and hence the people she was likely to meet] was a teacher. My husband came from that sort of background where he was always surrounded by books and thinking, I came from a completely different kind of background. So I suppose in some ways I was the odd one out because most of them, as I say, were professional people. There's one or two people in the town who, ever since I've known them, have been lecturers at college. But that might be peculiar to New Town, it's broadened out far more in New Town than when I joined in '61."

Sarah thinks that the majority of the public do not support the Campaign because: "I think the British are peculiar to themselves. They've never ever, unlike Europe, lived under a
fascist regime. Therefore they haven't been occupied for hundreds of years and therefore, we also tend to be insular being an island, we tend to be, certainly in Europe, I think we're the most unpolitical, non-political. Basically, we're ignorant about politics. But then basically, once again, it comes back to education. Our young people are very different from the young people in Europe, we flounder for a lot longer. We get thrown out of school at sixteen and it's twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three before we've shaken off that silly little er, I mean, our attitude towards sex is very, very childish. We tend to regard it as smutty. It's an unsophistication we tend to have here." Sarah would be quite prepared to break the law in the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and she supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy because "I think it might be politic not to because it does embrace people from all parties. Yeh, I think it's good, because if people know you belong to a particular party up go the barriers straight away. Whereas if you talk to them it could be that you're both agreeing on the issue, party politics may be different. Educate them into seeing it's part of a system that is producing these things for their own ends, maybe you'll get the education through." Sarah sees the arms race "as part of, well, my own theory is that there is no manufacturer of nuclear arms that wants a nuclear war. They keep the fear going so that they can make a fast buck and also I think it's part of the policy of the American government to economically break the Soviet Union. I think that's the main reason we've got an arms race. In fact, I think that's the only reason we've got
an arms race."

No longer a member of the Communist Party, Sarah now belongs to the Labour Party and votes Labour "because I see it as an anti-capitalist vote." Not surprisingly, she strongly disagrees with all of Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies which she regards as perpetuating inequalities of power. I asked her what she would call herself in political terms: "What would I call myself in political terms? I don't know because I've been accused of so many different things. I'm an atheist in so far as I don't believe in God, I believe in Christ as an historic figure and if what he preached is true then I believe in that 100%. So I've been called a Christian, as I say, I don't believe in God, I'm an atheist. I have certain moral things, whether that comes from a gut feeling, which I suspect it does, or whether it comes from conditioning, I'm not sure. I was a member of the C.P., my first husband still is; I never actually left ... after my first divorce I sort of went into a political wilderness. When I came back to New town I thought I'd never join another political party. I joined the Labour Party because I thought it was the way to get the the kind of world I'd like to see, I suppose it is the best way, by working through a large movement. Hm, I suppose basically yeh, I believe in the ethics of Christ but I'm not a Christian. I believe that you can call it pure Christianity, pure communism, pure anarchy, as, if you like, a sort of utopian world. I think it's immoral that people are going hungry while us in the Western world are going on diets. And yes, it has to do with politics, it's the politics that make that situation arise
in the first place and that is born out of greed and man not
giving a damn for his fellow human being. That to me is
pornography, that to me is immoral. We all do it to a degree, I
mean I throw food away so I'm immoral, but I try not to do it."

Clearly, Sarah's moral form of politics bears an affinity to the
Christian witness of Heather and Walter (the Christian lawyer)
and shares a family resemblance to the welfare state CNDers'
socio-political stance. Sarah believes that the original CNDers
saw the Campaign "in that narrow context of being a moral issue.
These were obviously people within it who saw it as part of an
immoral economic system and that's how I see it, it is part of an
immoral economic system and I didn't see it then, I saw it as a
separate thing, 'Get rid of the Bombs and everything in the
garden will be lovely'. I didn't realise why these Bombs were
there, y'know, political naivety." Twenty-five years on, Sarah
sees herself as more politically sophisticated and now imputes
immorality to the 'economic system'; nevertheless, her political
opposition to nuclear armaments retains the ethical thrust which
resonates through the composite forms of life which go to make up
the Campaign's culture.

Sarah's moral indignation at the racist employment policy of the
company for whom she worked, and her subsequent political
awakening and membership of the Communist Party, came about
largely by chance. Similarly, twenty-six year old Isobelle O., a
member of Scots City CND became involved, at an early age, in the
revived disarmament movement through a chance encounter with a
boy from a different social class from her own. As a schoolgirl, Isobelle "was terribly fortunate, he [a teacher] opened our eyes to a great deal, I mean, he didn't pull any punches. He was a very good teacher. So that was when it all started happening." Isobelle left school, and her parents' home, when she was sixteen and went to work in a bank. At about this time (1974), she met the man whom she was to later marry, a local government employee: "I became involved with sort of people who were very different from me, I never got to university; hm, I was terribly interested and I had studied the First and Second World War at school and I was basically against killing. So I knew that this [CND] was the next step. I was sixteen, that was when I met my husband. He was older than me and obviously I was learning things. I think I'd have joined then anyway but he was very politically minded so that probably influenced me, and the people he knew."

Isobelle's involvement in the nuclear disarmament movement coincided, and was integrally related, with her involvement in housing and community issues in the large West Coast of Scotland town where she was living. After two years working for the bank, she left to spend a year with a local community housing association, a form of employment for which she feels she was especially well qualified by dint of her own childhood experiences: "I enjoyed it tremendously. And also, me coming from Ringmire; these people were comparatively frightened because housing associations were new then [1976 to 1977] and they could identify with me, I'm not just being boastful." In addition,
Isobelle was, in the company of her husband ("an idealist architect") and her husband's friends, also involved in a radical community campaign which produced a news pamphlet called Scotside Action. At this time, the revival of CND was not yet in full swing, but in September 1977 Scottish CND organised a fairly large demonstration during which Isobelle and her husband mixed with other activists and sold copies of Scotside Action.

After a year of working for the community housing association, Isobelle left to take a course in art at her local college; having decided she lacked the required talent and motivation she abandoned her studies and, unfortunately, her marriage began to fail and she moved to Scots City where she took a job in the fine arts trade. Three years ago, having heard Dr. Helen Caldicott address a public meeting, she joined S.C. CND, but a recent serious illness has prevented her taking part in any disarmament activities. Isobelle supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy because "I think it's up to the individual. I don't care who belongs to what party. I personally am obviously not a Tory or anything like that. I'm a bit mixed up about politics but, er, I mean I think it's been shown at marches and at these rallies and meetings that it really cuts across the board. I think there's a great many Tories, and I think Tories are actually given a bad name - apart from being members of the Tory Party - I think that an awful lot of them are against these, y'know, missiles and things. I think people have a great ostrich mentality, they don't want to think about it, well this is what I've found amongst my circle of friends where I work. I don't
tend to bring politics into things, but certainly a party like the Labour Party that promises to decrease the weapons would certainly swing me to vote for them. [Are you a pacifist?] Yes. That's basically what it is, it's not from my political angle because I'm not terribly clear politically and it's more a gut reaction. I just think the whole business is crazy."

For Isobelle, nuclear disarmament is the most important contemporary issue: "I think it supersedes anything else", and she thinks the present arms race "is like the other wars. It's power against nations and, well, it's being used as a fear thing. I don't like the idea of fear being involved to keep countries oppressed or people oppressed." She believes that the majority of the British public do not belong to the Campaign because "an awful lot of them are very lackadaisical, and do not really think. I mean, my sister - I cajole everybody and send them Christmas gifts of CND membership - and she just doesn't know, and she won't know. I mean, I don't really get in touch with her very often, she's a housewife, completely different from me, we're both from the same very, very poor background but she didn't go to school, my parents didn't send her, and I did. She doesn't want to know ... [unintelligible] ... I feel I'm just banging my head against a brick wall. I feel that people just don't see, or else they feel 'we need something, we need something' [i.e. a deterrent]. I don't think we're taking as much interest as we used to, politically, it's all kind of gone 'woof'. They just want to sort of watch T.V. and have the video."
Although Isobelle believes that "women are too practical to have wars", she is unhappy with, what she perceives as, the stance of Greenham Common women for she does not believe in the exclusion of men. She thinks that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life: "Uh huh. Old people, young people, punks, very sort of straight people, it really is. That's what gives me some heartening feeling because it isn't just people who are sort of angry young men and women out to sort of have a cause. It's not like that." Never a member of any trade union or political party, Isobelle "would vote preferably for the one that's doing most about the arms race but it would probably be Labour." The daughter of unemployed, Tory-voting, working class parents, Isobelle described herself in political terms as "a pacifist. I'm against violence of all sorts. Hm, I think probably socialist. I don't like banner terms for me, I mean, I could say that I just care a lot for people. I've seen a lot of suffering, I've suffered a lot myself which has probably helped me do things a bit more. But it's not just that, I just have an innate feeling inside; it's the feeling I have for art and music. It makes me terribly upset to see suffering."

With regard to the policies of Mrs. Thatcher's administration, Isobelle told me, "I think that housing is possibly the only one I agree with at all [Possibly a reference to the sale of council houses]. I think the one's I disagree with always reverberate back to the spending and cut-backs and unemployment although I do feel a bit that there will always be a certain amount of
unemployment no matter what. But it's the amount. I know a lot of people in the medical profession and it's just hellish, and the teaching profession as well, it's just not on." Isobelle feels personally "terrorised" by the prospect of nuclear annihilation and she admits that hearing aeroplanes overhead sometimes "scares the shit out of me." She thinks that CND is fundamentally a campaign for survival: "There is a moral question, but I just want us basically to live in harmony, it sounds so twee, but I just don't want us to be engulfed in a nuclear war where there are no survivors; well, it's just the end, isn't it?"

The victim of an extremely deprived working class childhood, Isobelle benefited from a state education and has enjoyed upward social mobility. Whilst at school, her history teacher awakened an interest in the issue of war and this interest, in combination with the influence of her husband and her husbands friends' milieu, facilitated her entrance into the world of disarmament and community campaigners: Isobelle's remarks on her sister's political myopia show that she is aware of this personal development. Unlike her sister and the majority of the British public, Isobelle does 'see' the issue.

In the foregoing interviews I have been concerned to show how various other forms of life (political and religious) and various social experiences affect the members' perception of, and participation in, the culture of CND. Despite the diversity of influences and experiences, the generative contexts, all of the above members are recognisably similar; once again, it is
similarities and differences which form the cultural category of CND. In particular, there exists a notable similarity between the personal stances of these members and the stance of the welfare state CNDers; crudely expressed, this is a moral posture in which those who do not agree with one are seen as apathetic and benighted. However, as the above interviews show, participation in other forms of life can affect one's commitment to the Campaign, as can personal attitudes.

For example, sixty-three year old Mrs. Beverly Loxman was a member of the original Campaign and in the late Fifties and early Sixties went on marches and attended meetings: "There were only marches and meetings, there wasn't anything to do in between as I recall." As "soon as the question of the Bomb came up again", Beverly joined New Town CND; her "membership of the Movement hasn't been constant but the support's always been there." Beverly thinks that, in today's world, the disarmament issue is "much more frightening, complicated and dangerous" and that "people are more aware" of the dangers. Now prevented from taking part in any disarmament activities by a personal disability, Beverly strongly believes that CND protesting should always be non-violent and she considers herself to be a pacifist. She is puzzled by the arms race: "I don't know. I've often sat down and wondered about this. Who is it that wants to take over the world? I just don't know. Except, you always get back to power, everybody's got to be powerful. But why we should be involved I can't imagine because we're no power at all, only under the
Americans. We're nothing, we're [Britain] nothing."

Beverly thinks that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life and she believes that the majority of the British public do not belong to the Campaign "because people have got an in-built thing about fighting and the glory of their country. And I think that came over very clearly in the Falklands War. Margaret Thatcher was a hero only because of the Falklands and people were saying 'look what she's done for us'; she did nothing but murder people if you look at it logically. Take the Belgrano on its own, she murdered people, but because it was a foreign force and she was seen to send the troops in she was a hero. And I find that sick-making. And the bloody Sun, 'kill an Argie'. What are we turning to if that's all we care about? No, I never recovered from the Falklands War, that was a very big, well none of us [her family] did, we all feel totally bitter about that. And the money, that's another thing that gets me, the money we're spending on maintaining them, however many millions a year it is, look what we could do. Hospitals, health care, you name it."

Up until the early Seventies, when she became partially disabled, Beverly had been active in Oxfam. In addition, she is very concerned with animal welfare and lives with a small menagerie of pets (some of whom tried to make a contribution to the interview). Although considering nuclear disarmament to be the most pressing contemporary issue, she is also deeply worried by nuclear power and its concomitant ecological threat. Beverly went to a convent school which she "loathed" and left at the age of
After the end of the Second World War, following a short spell of employment in the Ministry of Works, she married a librarian, and she has not been in paid employment since. As she left school at a young age, Beverly has no formal educational qualifications but she does have a wide knowledge of, and an interest in, many areas: if she could choose, she would opt for a job in "something like engineering, something creative, making things." (Beverly had been a W.R.N.S. engineering officer during the War). In the event of a General Election, Beverly would vote for the Labour Party: "I'm not saying that because of I've always voted Labour and I'd never vote anything else. I just feel - I know they've had their ups and downs, I've hated them at times, I've criticised them - but I'd never vote for anything else. Maybe because I don't see anything in the other parties that I would want, even when the S.D.P. came along. I didn't like that, you don't run away from something because you think it's wrong, you stay and try and make it better."

Beverly believes that her interest in politics rests "on a very simple basis of fairness and unfairness. I hate unfairness. And I've always cared about people and I care about conditions. I've always cared about underprivileged people and that there's such an imbalance between rich and poor, and the balance never seems to even out and I've always been against it. And I suppose to be a member of the Labour Party is a logical follow-on from that." She "regards the Tories as two parties, I respect the real Tories, I respect people like Prior, Whitelaw, hm, well you know
the ones I respect, the caring ones, the old caring types. I never agreed with them but I respect them because I do think they care. I don't respect Margaret Thatcher and people like Heseltine at all. I think it's probably because of her, because I think she's destroying so much. You see we come back again to the question of armaments; she's cutting back on the Health Service and she's cutting back on the education service, she's cutting back on all the social services which I think are so important and I think that is totally wrong. And she's arrogant, I don't think she's an humane person. I don't think she knows, she doesn't know about poverty, she doesn't care about poverty or people hungry or out of work. She doesn't care, that's what I resent about her, she has no caring in her."

Beverly joined the Labour Party in the mid-Fifties and she describes herself as "veering towards the left." Nevertheless, she supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "because I can't see the advantage of them being aligned or affiliated to any political party. I can't see where they'd benefit. It often seems to me that there are more Labour supporters in CND than there would be Conservatives, but then to me that's a natural progression anyway. But I can't see there would be any benefits if they had affiliation because there are pro and anti-Bomb in each party." In her support for this policy, in her concern for 'caring' politics and in respect of her views of non-supporters of the Campaign, Beverly's personal socio-political stance shares much in common with the majority of the members whom I interviewed. However, unlike them, she is not very certain about
the efficacy of CND; I asked her whether she thought that it would be better to leave matters of defence to the government: "No, I don't agree. I think everybody should have a say in it personally. I think they should, but we never do get one. If you do, like CND, nobody takes any notice of you. I don't suppose there's a louder voice at the moment than CND, but is it achieving anything do you think? I don't. [I think it's keeping it in people's minds.] Yes, but if they can't do anything in the long run; I would never, I'm not decrying CND because it's got to be there, there's no question. But if you look at it logically, what good have they done? If you're being totally blunt about it, what have they done? What influence have they had? I think these doctors might have some influence, but whether in the long run the influence would ever be enough to achieve disarmament, I very much doubt. I doubt that any government would." Similarly, Beverly thinks that "the Greenham Common women are tremendous, and I've got the greatest admiration for them. But whether, I'm afraid I'm very cynical now and I think the Cruise thing's here, and there's no way they're going to be stopped. You can protest as much as you like, like at Greenham Common, but I can't think it's going to do you, in the long run, any good." This less than sanguine perspective is unusual and gives an idiosyncratic character to views and opinions which would otherwise closely accord with the orthodox members' position; cynicism is not a feature of the Campaign's culture.

In his study of the early Campaigners, Frank Parkin noted that a
number of his adult middle class respondents had 'creative' professions: unfortunately, Parkin's data is not fullsome enough to permit one to discover precisely what form of creative employment these respondents engaged in (see Appendix C); however, the archive of CND would seem to suggest that the musicians and artists who supported the first Campaign were, in the main, politically orientated. As the following interview shows, support for CND may well owe more to social influences than to the creative muse. Malcolm R. is a professional musician and a member of Scots City CND. His disarmament activities include benefit concerts for the Movement and he has also played in productions staged by a left wing theatre company. Malcolm thinks that disarmament protesting must always be non-violent and not "over-dramatic, die-ins, that sort of thing. I'm always afraid of alienating the average person who hasn't given it much thought. Marches, debate, reasoned publicity, that's the sort of thing I'm interested in and also, because I'm a musician, I look very hard at songs and theatre - I used to be a member of the Red Act Theatre company - that's the world I'm in. I think very much of music and arts in general as a method for changing people's attitudes. Protesting by blockading would work in the short term but you've got to change people's attitudes to bring their awareness up."

A pacifist, opposed to all weaponry, Malcolm thinks that the existence of the arms race can be attributed to the workings of a "self-perpetuating system." He believes that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is correct because "you just keep away
from all the nonsense of party politics. It's a one-issue thing and no party would look at it as a one-issue thing, they'd look at it as part of their package of policies." The majority of the public do not belong to the Campaign, he thinks, because of "apathy. There's a possibility that they might feel alienated from that sort of thing, they might feel worried about it. Don't want to commit themselves." Malcolm does not believe that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life: "No, I don't. I think they seem to come from a certain kind of person, not just to do with income class. It usually seems to be the kind of person who are fairly heavily motivated anyway, that are joiners; hm, you often find that they often work hard at something else. I don't know, the kind of people that don't seem to be involved is the lower middle class to use that very broadly, people who have decided to buy a house and have a family. So, not from all walks of life, no. But from, I suppose, from the middle class, working class people who have been to university and mixed with other ideas are more likely to be in it."

Malcolm comes from a religious family, his mother is a housewife and his father is a company director for a medium-sized Scots City company; both parents are "Tories." Malcolm went to "an all male [private] school in Scots City with military traditional style and attitude, I was never at one with it. I hadn't really mixed with people except people like that. It was quite a shock when I went to university and found all sorts of different people and found the questioning of attitudes, that wasn't desperately
encouraged at my school. ... [break in tape] ... It came as quite a shock, there were International Socialists; at first I thought it was a bit of a laugh, but, yeh, it definitely did, not so much the content of my courses, but the social life."

Malcolm studied English and psychology with the intention of becoming a journalist; unfortunately, he failed to gain a sufficiently good class of degree for this profession and upon leaving university he worked for a short time in an audio-visual library and then became a professional musician. In addition, he foresook his parents' Conservative politics and he now considers himself to be "a small 'l' liberal, a trendy leftie, I don't know. I've never given it much thought. I mean, I vote socialist or ecology if there's a chance." An inactive member of Equity, he is "worried, particularly worried about their [the government's] whole attitude to the, well welfare state's a broad word, but the whole government caring agencies. I fear that, although they say this is just the operation of the free market, they would prefer, I think at bottom I'm afraid that they want to create a prole class, a worker bee class of people that are given sufficient to keep them alive but are kept away from the centres of education and decision making. Rather than any one policy, that's what would worry me."

Malcolm has never belonged to any political party and, as his foregoing remarks show, he does not consider himself to be a particularly political animal. Nonetheless, he performs at various benefit concerts ("not always CND, but that sort of
thing"), and he has persuaded the initially reluctant members of his present band to do likewise ("at first it was just Greenpeace but now we do all sorts"). His interest in the nuclear disarmament issue dates from "discussion at university rather than reading a particular document or seeing or hearing a particular speech and becoming converted or anything like that" and he joined his local group "because I had been living with a group of people who got the Newsletter and I moved away and went to live on my own and I wanted to keep in touch."

For Malcolm, "the main thing in my life is my job"; however, in the formation of his views it has been his experiences of university which promoted his political awakening and his political interest and awareness has been furthered by his engagement with the left wing theatre company and the social culture of musicians: "Other issues do get brought up. Er, feminism, world development, you know, you hear more about it, hm, the whole concept of the way the police behave is brought into question." It would seem that it is these influences, this particular form of life, and not the lure of Euterpe, which has rendered him susceptible to forming a commitment to campaign.

As Malcolm observed, members of CND tend to be 'a certain kind of person ... it usually seems to be people who are fairly heavily motivated anyway ... you often find that they often work hard at something else.' In the preceding interviews, it can be seen that the respondents often have a commitment to other forms of life,
political or religious, the moral import of which closely resembles the ethical stance which welfare state CNDers have internalised from their state-apprenticeships and vocations; however, as I have discussed, a commitment to another form of life may lie somewhat uneasily with membership of CND. Of the remaining five respondents in this chapter, three fall comfortably into this heuristic pattern: thus, seventy-three year old Elizabeth D., a Catholic working class member of N.T. CND joined the Campaign after "we had a meeting about Christian CND at my local church and that's what made me go to my first meeting"; Keith E., a hard working Labour Party and community activist personally knew the founders of N.T. CND, although he feels that the disarmament issue is "very important for me" he is more concerned with the issue of old age pensions and the "poor getting poorer" and cannot spare the time from his political and community activism to attend his group's meetings; Philip K. has a long history of political and trade union activism and, as a "revolutionary socialist", has "always been critical of CND on its restricted policies. I know the argument about restricted single issues but it's demonstrable in my eyes that single issues will not survive on single issues; either they die or they're driven into discussion of other political issues. Life is a good deal more integrated than CND realises" - nevertheless, this stalwart revolutionary socialist told me that "I must say that my own reaction to Hiroshima - I'm arguing against myself to my own surprise - my reaction to it was totally moral. It was the immorality of it that totally staggered me."
However, the remaining two respondents from my samples do not conform to the heuristic approach which I have developed in this study: neither respondent participates in any other complementary form of life and they have not been influenced by state education or state ideology. In this sense, they can be seen as counter examples to the arguments I have been developing.

Ronald G. joined Scots City CND in 1983: "Things began to look a bit dodgy with Reagan and all. They had a stall outside The Academy in Fuller Street, signatures, y'know, so I signed it and gave my address and then I got an introductory thing. So that's what it was really." Since he joined the Campaign, Ronald has not taken part in any disarmament activities but he thinks that the best form of protesting "the thing I would most like to see, is such a dramatic increase in membership that it would just be impossible, that they had to, sort of sheer weight of numbers." In favour of N.V.D.A., Ronald thinks that he is too old for protesting and, besides, "I don't feel strongly enough about it." He believes that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy "is almost essential. If you were restricted to one party you'd get a drastic fall in the membership. I don't know, I've no idea of a break-down of the figures, but I would imagine that most of them would be Labour or left wing of Labour, but there must be a considerable proportion of S.D.P., Tories, all sorts."

In the light of his memories of the Second World War, Ronald feels ambivalent about pacifism but he would like to see all
nuclear weapons abolished: "I know it's possibly an idealist dream, but that would be my wish." He sees the arms race as a consequence of a "struggle for power" and he thinks that the majority of the British public do not belong to the Campaign out of "fear, they're afraid of the situation as it is, but they're more afraid of facing up to the realities of an about-turn in the situation and the uncertainty attached to it. And I think, the people I come into contact with anyway, that's the impression I'm left with anyway. It's, er, 'the status quo is bad but God knows what would happen if this was all reversed.' Apart from three years membership of the Scottish Nationalist Party between 1975 and 1978, Ronald has not belonged to any political party. In the event of a General Election, he would vote Labour and, politically, he locates himself on the left wing of the Party. Ronald "disagrees with so much" that Mrs. Thatcher's administration has accomplished and "in the present time what I disagree most about is, whatever economic arguments she can bring forward for unemployment, there was no need to do it on the scale that she's done it. That's the thing I hate most about what she's doing, what she's done."

The son of a building worker, Ronald was employed for most of his working life as an accounting clerk in the civil service. Ronald would have liked to attend university but he was forced to leave school at the age of fourteen in order to help support his family: "I don't know what I would have wanted to study, but just the thought of it, the thought of books, I was always glad to get books in my hand. As a schoolkid I used to read the lot, even
mathematics which I detested." A young victim of the Thirties Depression, Ronald has no formal educational qualifications but he has attended some evening classes out of interest. Reticent in the interview, Ronald lacked the privileged confidence which underpins the middle class articulateness of many of his Campaign counterparts. A decided atheist, and never a member of any other campaign or group, Ronald's membership of CND is not linked to any other form of life, nor is it augmented by a complementary moral posture or by an ideological stance inculcated by his experiences of education or work. Unlike the majority of the membership, and contrary to Malcolm's observation, Ronald is, in his own words, "not a joiner at all."

The final interviewee and counter case was, at ninety-four, the oldest respondent in my two samples; despite his age, Dr. Claus Stein is an articulate man, at ease in interviews - an ease probably born of experience, for Dr. Stein is a distinguished classical composer and author of several books on music. Dr. Stein thinks that as nuclear disarmament "is a question of existence or non-existence, it certainly is the most important" contemporary issue, and he believes that "mutual fear" underpins the arms race. In his judgement, members of CND are "probably" drawn from all walks of life, however, "I mean people who are able to think are in a minority and they've always been in a minority." Never a member of any political party or trade union, Dr. Stein has "always been a Liberal, all my life" and in the event of a General Election would vote for the Liberal Party. He supports the Campaign's non-alignment policy: "It's perhaps
better to be outside the party and not to be influenced by
decisions taken by the party. It is outside politics in so far as
the idea of the nuclear armament is simply unacceptable in every
respect. One cannot inflict this, one cannot accept it." Dr.
Stein thinks that there may be some link between male attitudes
and nuclear weapons: "I think this is the truth, in some respects
men are more stupid than women and this may be the cause of it."
With regard to the possibility of achieving nuclear disarmament,
Dr. Stein thinks that "reason should prevail if it were
sufficiently well known to everyone [but] I'm old enough to have
become sceptical with regard to my fellow human beings."

Dr. Stein has personal and reasonable grounds for this
scepticism. The son of a doctor of medicine, he studied music at
a continental university and, when he graduated in 1912, turned
professional. His career was interrupted by the First World War
after which he returned to composing and playing and, in 1929, he
took an appointment as a director of a music college. Shortly
before the Second World War he was compelled to emigrate to
Britain where he has lived ever since. An erudite and cultured
man, Dr. Stein "belonged to CND ideally before it existed.
Practically, since one of the worst days in my memory, August
1914, when the First World War started through a coincidence of
idiocies. Since then I have become mistrustful with everything
that happens in this world because worse couldn't happen. In 1914
the chief forces were the coincidence of chance events connected
with personal stupidities, this is what leads to catastrophies."
Dr. Stein "would never trust any government with things like that [nuclear weapons]" and he holds the opinion that faced "with a distrustful and heavily armed enemy it is a lesser risk to be unarmed than armed. That is a simple fact for me."

Very clearly, Dr. Stein's membership of CND is not an expression of the social influences which impel his younger counterparts; in his own words: "If I think back to the catastrophes of my life – 1914, 1918, the end of the First World War with its incredible catastrophes for central Europe, 1933, 1938 – I have lived through four catastrophes. Uprooted everytime. And in a practical sense having to start again, every time. It's a little much, for one man." Sadly, at the end of his life, Dr. Stein is witness to yet another conflict between nation states, the outcome of which may well eclipse even these catastrophes.

Conclusion
In this study I am investigating the social and political world of CND members; membership of the Campaign is not discrete and the meaning of a commitment to the nuclear disarmament cause can only be adequately understood by an appreciation of the generative social context in which it was spawned and nurtured.
In the preceding chapters, wherein I discussed the interviews with welfare state CNDers, it was clear that these interviewees' views and opinions on nuclear disarmament matters (and social and political issues in general) were an expression of their wider social position: typically, these interviewees had formed their political opinions whilst undertaking a state apprenticeship at
an institute of higher education or in the course of their employment. These interviewees personally identified with their vocations, were politically and ethically committed to the welfare state and their biographical development as welfare state employees had engendered a particular socio-political stance which rendered them susceptible to joining the Campaign. In this sense, the welfare state CNDers' participation in the Campaign culture is an expression of the ideology of their social position.

By virtue of their educational histories and their relation to the state, the welfare state CNDers share in a common form of life. In contrast, the respondents in this chapter, with their various jobs and educational experiences, are diverse; these respondents have social class locations whose effects are not nullified by a common form of life. In this chapter I have pursued the same analytical approach which I employed when discussing the welfare state members of the Campaign — relating the respondents' politicisation, socio-political views and membership of CND to their social biographies. In contrast to the majority of welfare state CNDers, the respondents in this chapter do not necessarily enjoy the educational and vocational ideological underpinnings which have nurtured their welfare state CND peers' socio-political stance. Instead, the spur to a commitment to CND has been generated by, and is an expression of, their affiliation to other religious and political forms of life; this is particularly true of those respondents from working class backgrounds who have not been privileged to higher education.
For some, seemingly chance events have provoked a personal political reappraisal of their personal stance.

As I have stressed in previous chapters, there is no one common defining CND essence, the members share complementary similarities and differences. This is true of both the relation between members and the relation between CND and the affinitive religious and political cultures which combine to form the cultural Campaign category. In terms of a sociological heuristic, the affinity existing between the members is best understood as one of a similar stance towards the social world. In the same way that welfare state CNDers feel responsible for their vocational praxes, the respondents in this chapter, in various ways, see themselves as ethically accountable and concerned social agents. Just as the welfare state CNDers work for, and identify with, the public good, so too the respondents in this chapter identify with some transcendental moral aim. This affinitive concern finds expression in a similar personal stance and a similar socio-political commitment involving a taking of a responsibility for their social world.

The generative context of an individual commitment gives it a particular character and form. In common with their welfare state counterparts, most of the respondents in this chapter support the Campaign’s non-party alignment policy; the exception to this support comes from those interviewees whose primary commitment is to the Labour Party rather than to a transcendental authority such as a moral law or religious ethic. Pertinently, regardless of any criteria of social class, all the respondents in this
chapter see non-supporters of the Campaign as benighted and/or materialistic; it is in relation to those perceived of as furthest outside the cultural category that the members' expression of a commonality of commitment and shared identification is clearest. Unlike themselves, the members see non-supporters as crassly materialistic and morally remiss, lacking a 'proper' personal stance.

It is this shared personal stance, this common commitment, which, in harness with an unspoken fear of nuclear weapons, acts as a cultural glue binding individuals in a common cause. Faced with an indiscriminate nuclear threat, and championing a unilateral policy, CND can accommodate otherwise divisive political and religious ideologies for the commonality of commitment is predicated upon a transcendental aim which subordinates partisan strategies born of only, in the last resort, partially compatible forms of life.

However, as the interviews in this chapter clearly show, the intermeshing of opinions and perspectives, and the affinity of commitments, contained within the cultural category is a subtle matter not easily paraphrased or captured in the language of formal sociological analysis. For the purposes of understanding social life, description, rather than obfuscating explanation, can yield the richer picture. In the next chapter, I discuss the interviews I conducted with those respondents who hold elected offices in either Scots City or New Town CNDs.
Chapter 6: Notes and References

1) The allusion is to a remark of Wittgenstein's:
'The will is a sort of taking up of a position to the world.'
'Only within the framework of this taking up of a position do things in the world get their meaning.'

2) Shown on British television in 1983, On The Eighth Day was an American made, and controversial, film powerfully depicting the effects of a nuclear counter strike upon a mid-western American town.
Chapter 7

The Elected Officials' Commitment

Introduction

Unlike most other analysts of the peace movement, I have not focused solely upon the Campaign's 'activists'. All the interviewees in the previous chapters are 'lay members' of the Movement, as are the majority of the Campaign's supporters. These interviewees do not regularly attend meetings of their group and nor do they engage in very much formal campaigning (such as leafleting, publicity drives, etc.). Most of the administration and organising for both New Town and Scots City CNDs is undertaken by a small minority of the groups' members.

I am unhappy with any a priori equating of formal activism with greater personal radicalism. A prerequisite for being an activist is a fair amount of free time and, as can be seen from the interviews in the previous chapters, this is unavailable to many, especially women and welfare state CNDers, who have occupational and familial commitments which militate against the degree of activism in which they would wish to be involved. Holding a post, such as Secretary or Chairperson, in a CND group is not an opportunity which is open to everyone; mundane reasons such as being too shy or simply living too far away from where the group's meetings are held all play their part. Nevertheless, as the foregoing chapters show, lay members often informally campaign at their place of work and amongst their family and friends.
An analytical focus upon activists seems to suggest that these individuals will possess a greater, or stronger, degree of radicalism than the lay members. This, albeit implicit, argument is only credible if one believes that there is a common, uniform essence of CND radicalism; if this were not true, of what could one say the activists were a stronger case? This essence of 'CNDism' clearly does not exist in lay members who share only partially complementary similarities and differences, and this is also the case for activists. What is interesting about the office holders is that they must organise and administer a campaign; the composite factions of which exist in a state of both harmony and tension; this involves pursuing a policy of building a non-partisan Movement designed to attract the greatest possible public support.

For the sake of confidentiality, I have not specified the group to which these interviewees belong, nor the office which they held. The respondents in this chapter were sent a draft of their particular interview together with a letter inviting them to comment upon what I had written. Seven of the interviewees replied to this letter and, in all but one case, they were happy with the draft and suggested only minor changes or clarifications which I have incorporated into the text. In the case of the dissenting respondent, objections were raised to some sections of the interview on the grounds of confidentiality and I have omitted these passages in accordance with her wishes.
The Elected Officials' Commitment

Sally Almond's support for the anti-nuclear cause dates from the official formation of CND in February 1958; her membership of the national Campaign has never lapsed and at the age of sixty-six, she is one of her group's most active and energetic members. Sally's perspective on nuclear disarmament reflects her long involvement with the Movement, an involvement which has convinced her that if CND is to be successful it must remain primarily a one-issue campaign.

The daughter of a shipyard engineer, Sally left school in the mid-Thirties to take a job as an executive grade clerical officer in the Civil Service. Shortly after the end of the Second World War she married and, under the Civil Service regulations pertaining at that time, had to resign her job and she has never been in paid employment since. At her secondary school she had been encouraged to adopt a critical, questioning attitude: "I was lucky. A lot of those teachers we had at that school would have been university lecturers but because of the Thirties' depression everything was run down. And looking back on it we were very lucky, and our English teacher had this attitude to life which was very sceptical and he used to say to us, 'Don't believe anything I tell you! Question everything!'. So I grew up thinking he was marvellous and I never forgot that and I think a lot of our year were influenced by that. I think you often are influenced by a teacher in your adolescence. And I think he must have been quite radical. Looking back on it, a lot of the things he taught us were pretty radical. And I've always had that
Naturally, Sally was relieved when the War ended and she was pleased with the outcome of the Election: "We thought, with this Labour government, 1945 and all that, never have to worry again." However, this feeling of security was to prove fairly short-lived: "I didn't think about politics until Suez [1956]. We were in London, and I'll never forget waking up that morning and hearing the radio people say that the British air force had bombed Cairo. That was what set me off. And the first thing I did then was that I rushed away and I thought 'I must do something', here was all these kids that we thought were safe and this blinking government's dropping bombs and we picked the kids up – I remember putting the baby in a carry-cot - and we got into the car ... we said 'we just can't sit here, something's bound to be happening in London', and we went into London. We parked the car near the Embankment and the whole place was seething with people. It was a most amazing experience, and this was the big Tralfagar Square demonstration against Suez [October 1956]. That was what, I suddenly realised 'God!', we could have another war, these stupid people, and I blame myself for not thinking more about it. So anyway, that triggered me off and I went and joined the United Nations Association."

Shortly afterwards, in 1957, Sally and her husband moved to their present home: "We were just getting settled here, and I opened the paper one night, I think it was January 1958, and there was this advertisement for the Hockton Hall meeting [the inaugural
public meeting of her original CND group] and so I went along to that and you signed the usual piece of paper and before long I was on the committee, and that's been that ever since."

Although Sally had not been politically active until the Suez debacle, she came from a family which had lost relatives in the Great War and in the interview she speaks of the "sadness" of her mother's generation in the inter-war years. Consequently, she became a pacifist, opposing conscription ("I was in the Civil Service, it was my friends, my generation, that were being conscripted"), and these personal experiences made the cessation of fighting in 1945 all the more precious and heightened her disgust at Eden's gun-boat diplomacy during the Suez affair. As for many of her generation, 1956 was to prove a watershed year, a time of political awakening.

From 1958 until 1963, Sally actively campaigned in the original CND and in the early Sixties joined the 'Liaison Committee for Women's Peace Groups'. From the earliest days of the original Campaign, Sally has been concerned that the Movement should not be party political but should concentrate solely upon the one issue of nuclear disarmament. She believes that the original national Campaign went into decline because many members of the Movement were under the impression that the 1963 Labour Party manifesto would commit Wilson's administration to a renegotiation of the Nassau Agreement and the scrapping of Britain's Polaris Force: consequently, many of the early CNDers diverted their energies into working for a Labour electoral
Of course, when they came to office, Labour went ahead with the Polaris programme, albeit somewhat reduced in scale, and the promises of the 1963 manifesto were largely forgotten. Sally believes that this disappointing performance disillusioned many, especially younger, CNDers who subsequently left the Movement to work for other causes such as the Anti-Apartheid and the Anti-Vietnam War campaigns: "This disaster after 1964 completely disillusioned a whole generation of young CNDers and they would have nothing to do with them [the Labour Party]." This sense of disillusionment and betrayal was deeply felt by Sally herself and in the interview she spoke at some length about national and local politicians she had known who, after the 1964 General Election, had forsaken their commitment to CND in favour of what she sees as political opportunism; Sally has come to the conclusion that "in politics your career is more important than your conscience."

Sally's mistrust of conventional politics and politicians has remained with her and she tries to use her influence to prevent the present day CND from falling prey to the errors of its predecessor. For example, at a General Meeting of her group which I attended Sally tried to oppose a motion, put forward by one of the younger left wing officials, which would have committed them to supporting and attending a National Union of Mineworkers' rally (this was at the time of the miners' strike). Sally argued that the purpose and business of CND was to pursue nuclear
disarmament and that CND was a single-issue Campaign; whilst the proposer of the motion argued that nuclear disarmament was tied in with other political struggles such as the miners' strike. In the event, Sally lost the argument and failed, on this occasion, to maintain the single-issue strategy which she believes is essential for CND's success.

Sally thinks that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life ("Oh yes, even more so now") and that unlike in the early Movement, CND now has the added strength of support from specialist sub-groups such as the M.C.A.N.W. and the anti-nuclear power lobby. She believes that the majority of the public do not support the Movement because of "lack of information" and that the government tries to suppress public debate on disarmament matters unless provoked by CND. Sally agrees with Bruce Kent's view that to possess and to threaten to use nuclear weapons is illegal "so it's a human right and a public duty to object to an illegal act", and she has always supported Non-Violent Direct Action (N.V.D.A.) protesting. As one would expect, she thinks that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is "absolutely essential, from the very beginning and now" for disarmament is "primarily a moral issue, it's also a very practical issue, people of differing views can work together in CND."

Also predictably, Sally does not support the policies of Mrs. Thatcher's administration which she considers to be "possibly the worst government we've ever had." Not a member of any political party she would vote for the Labour Party if they would firmly
pledge themselves to implementing their present Conference policy on nuclear disarmament and she describes herself in political terms as "an agnostic, I suppose I'm just obsessed with defence. I could never vote for the Tory Party. I suppose I am a socialist in the basic sense that I believe in social justice and that there should be things like equal rights, basic subsistence wages for everyone, dramatic things like that. But I've no time for the political wheeling and dealing of the political system as it is now and I applaud people like Tony Benn who've tried to clean it up; to my mind he seems to be bringing some sort of principle back into the thing." Sally thinks that "unfortunately politics has got a bad name. People don't go in with shining armour any more as they did in our generation when they thought to go in to politics was the best possible public service you could do ...." In contrast to the sordid political world of "wheeling and dealing", Sally sees CND as morally untainted: "there's nothing for people in CND except hard work", and certainly Sally works impressively hard for the Campaign's cause. Nevertheless, despite her grave reservations, she thinks that if the disarmament issue had not existed she would have gone into the Labour Party "because despite the failures of the past, it is the party for social justice."

Sally's parents "always voted Labour, but I wouldn't call them political people. The atmosphere in our house was always anti-war." As I have already remarked, Sally and her family mourned the 'lost generation' and as a young woman she saw her friends conscripted into the army. Naturally, the post-War peace and the
promise of the Attlee Government would have been especially precious to her and the crass handling of the Suez crisis came as a deep shock to her expectations; once again, the lessons of war had not been learnt. Once again, the state was failing to live up to its ideological image.

One year later, Sally was to learn of an even more dramatic failing of the state - the poisoning of the environment through nuclear weapons testing - and in 1958 she joined her local CND which had recently been formed by members of The Anti-Nuclear Weapons Testing Campaign (2) (a group founded by teachers from a local school, university lecturers and Church ministers). Her experiences of disarmament campaigning have embittered her towards politics and politicians and, 'twenty years on', she strives to keep the Movement out of their sordid clutches. Although disillusioned with politics, she keeps faith with the morally unsullied aims of CND: "There are times when I feel low and I think 'Heck, it's not going to happen', and then I feel angry and pull out another bit of energy and think 'I'm not going to let it happen'. As long as there's life there's hope, that might be trite but I'm not going to let it happen." Sally's biography and her views on CND represent an important strand within the Campaign which has been remarked upon in many studies of the Movement. This strand intertwines and finds resonance in today's Campaign, in which 'old-timers' attitudes intermesh with present day disarmament perspectives.

At twenty-eight, Barbara W. is thirty-eight years Sally's junior,
born too late to remember the original Campaign and the failures of the 1964 Labour government let alone Suez or the end of the War. Barbara is on the National Executive of one of the specialist sections of the Movement and has held two elected offices in her local group which she joined five years ago when it was first founded. Excepting N.V.D.A., Barbara has taken part in the whole gamut of disarmament activities and regularly attends all her group's meetings which she thinks have "changed a great deal, I'm going to have to sit down at some point and work out why. There's a small hard core now, we used to have very large meetings, thirty to forty people, now it's only about fifteen. You used to be able to discuss things when we had bigger meetings."

Barbara would not put herself "in a situation of being arrested unnecessarily. I'm in employment and I wouldn't want to lose my job, it would be rather pointless. It would have to be a very, very important event for me to take that step." She believes that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is "essential. I am a member of the Labour party, I think the strength of CND is its broad base and as soon as you align to any political party you're going to lose a section of your support. And there's also the fact that the party you affiliate to might let you down - and I say that as a member of the Labour Party - in which case you have a mass campaign to put pressure on that party which you would not be in a position to do [if CND affiliated]." Barbara sees nuclear disarmament as the most important contemporary issue, "although I don't see it as separate from any other issue."
No matter what I look at, or what I'm involved in, there's always a link of some description" and she thinks that the arms race is mainly the result of "economics. As I see it the main powers in the world need markets and they're flexing their military muscles." She thinks that the majority of the British population do not belong to the peace movement because "I think the majority of the British people throughout history have been rather - what's the word? - people don't tend to involve themselves in campaigns, I think it's a British characteristic. [Apathy?] Yes well, maybe a bit apathetic yes, but isolation as well, 'nothing to do with us'; people tend to shut their minds to things they don't like. That's the impression I get from talking to the family for instance, they just don't want to think about it."

As usual, Barbara disagrees with all of the policies of the present government, in particular the anti-union legislation and the championing of supposed 'Victorian values'. An active member of the Labour Party for the past three years, Barbara locates herself on "the far left of the Party"; in addition, she is also a member of a white-collar union and has sought to get her own union branch affiliated to CND. For the past three and a half years, Barbara has worked as a shorthand typist with a small firm of solicitors. She enjoys her work "because it's very busy and varied" and allows her some measure of independence. Barbara was unemployed for two years before finding her present job: "That was my politicisation, when I decided 'there's something wrong with this society'. And that was the start of my campaigning."(3)
Although of different generations, Sally and Barbara both strongly support the Campaign's non-party alignment policy. Yet clearly, their understandings of CND and politics are coloured by their diverse biographies and this is true of all the elected officials whom I interviewed. In their participation in the CND culture, the similarities which occur are of the same character as those shared by the lay members - an intermesh of partially compatible points of view and desires brought to bear on the task of building a mass social movement which aims to attract the greatest possible public support.

In contrast to Sally and Barbara, Clive T.'s perspective on CND is born of a distinctly working class biography. In 1979, Clive co-founded the local branch of the World Disarmament Campaign which was to evolve, in 1980, into CND and he has held two elected posts in his group. He believes that the majority of the British public do not belong to the Movement "because the majority of people don't see clearly the danger. And when they do see it they don't feel they can do anything about it and they're so immersed in the problems of daily living, and the media encourages this way of thinking, and they just shut it out." When I asked him whether he thought members of CND were drawn from all walks of life, he replied: "Yes and no. There are people from all walks of life, but its activists, dominated by people like myself." He thinks that these activists often brings methods and models for campaigning into CND derived from their previous
experiences which, whilst often valuable, are sometimes restrictive. Nevertheless, in his written comments on the draft of his interview Clive told me that he believes 'there has been a growing number of people, without such previous connections or experience, who are becoming active in the Campaign, bringing with them fresh and vigorous ideas.'

For Clive, the arms race is a direct consequence of the drive for profit by the companies involved in arms manufacture. He sees nuclear disarmament as an essential prerequisite to any other political or social ambition and he believes that the aims of CND are "the most important political issue of the century." Clive completely agrees with the Campaign's non-alignment policy because "we are not a political party, we are a pressure group, but one of the most powerful pressure groups that's ever existed. If we get large enough, if people understand that such a group can really influence government, and providing that it works hard enough, it can change government policy and can, in my way of thinking, which might be a bit exaggerated, save the world. And therefore, if you're going to involve the majority of the people you've got to recognise from the start that people have different politics, different standpoints, different religions. And you can't allow these differences of opinion to dominate. And we do have this problem in ——, and people don't realise it. They just don't realise how they're tending to bring their ideas and prejudices into it. I have prejudices, which I struggle to overcome; I do believe that you've got to submerge your prejudices." Clive believes that "we have all got to work
together and try to understand the other person's point of view" and that the problem of people bringing particular prejudices and "sectional ideas" into the Campaign can be seen on both a local and national level; instead, the members of CND should remember "that this is the central aim, nuclear disarmament, and we should keep this aim in front."

However, Clive is certainly not apolitical; indeed, he believes that his lengthy experience of working in the British Communist Party helps him to overcome his own prejudices. Born in London in 1917, his father (whom he described as "a skilled artisan") died when Clive was only ten years old leaving him to be brought up by his mother who worked for most of her life as a waitress. Clive became politically involved in the Thirties: "The reason why I joined the C.P. [in 1937] eventually - because I toyed with pacifism and I toyed with the Labour Party, and I joined the Left Book Club - but I found in the Communist Party the most sincere, the most understanding people I felt had an answer, they weren't waffling, they had a clear-cut answer. [Why did you get interested in politics at that time?] I don't know, it's a question you can ask anybody, I think it's part of your make-up, that's all, a rebel I suppose. I think it's partly because what I saw happening to my own mother and the way we were treated, and the landlord, and we went through all that saga of the rentman calling. And I used to get very angry, I can remember, although I was only a youngster at the time, really getting angry with him at the door when he was calling for the rent and I could see my
mother struggling to keep the place together and there was this
man calling for his arrears and I thought that was wrong. And I
suppose I had that in me, and I still have. I just can't stand
oppression of any kind whatsoever, wherever it might be, and I'm
old enough in the tooth to recognise that all things aren't rosy
everywhere, anywhere. Human nature has its strengths and
weaknesses in the Soviet Union and in the United States of
America."

Now retired, Clive has worked all his life as a skilled engineer
and has served as a shop-steward in his union both when working
in London and in ----. Still a member of the C.P., Clive would
wish to vote for a Communist candidate in the event of a General
Election, but if no such candidate were standing he would vote
Labour "as I always have done." As one would imagine, he strongly
disapproves of Mrs. Thatcher's government: "Well, her whole
policy is aimed at turning the clock backwards in my opinion to
one where sheer personal advantage is the sole arbiter of success
which brings in its train all the evil things which society has
always been subjected to. That's the whole point about it, if you
leave human gain, personal gain, profit, whatever term you want
to call it, to be the sole arbiter then it's the law of the
jungle. And the ultimate result of the jungle is nuclear weapons
of course, but everything else goes with it, the attacks on the
trade unions, the run-down of all the facilities of the so-called
welfare state. You name it, it's being hived off for private
enterprise. And the people with the least moral concepts, whose
main aim is self-advantage, are the ones who come out top-dogs
everytime. It's the law of the jungle, and that's what Mrs. Thatcher wants us to get back to; whatever she might think she's doing that's what it boils down to."

Clive believes that on occasions in the past his views have been misrepresented by the press and he was perhaps understandably cautious when I interviewed him, for he is aware that his membership of the Communist Party may provoke prejudice. I found Clive articulate, sincere and tolerant of other people's points of view. As a very active member of CND, he tries to live out his belief that nuclear disarmament is the supreme contemporary issue and that members of the Campaign must not, albeit unconsciously, allow their personal political or religious attitudes to dominate the Movement. For example, he has voluntarily resigned an elected post with the aim of injecting fresh ideas and enthusiasm into the group and he tries to share his present duties as widely as possible so as to encourage the maximum involvement of other members. Strategically, he welcomes the input of sub-groups such as Christian CND although, once again, he feels that it is important that these groups' views and attitudes are not allowed to prevail at the expense of mass support for the cause. I asked him whether he thought that CND was a moral Movement: "It's difficult. Yes, it's a moral Campaign if you like, but like every other word in the dictionary it gets a connotation and gets stuck-up so people can decry and say 'Oh, you're a moralist', or whatever. Ultimately, whatever people want to say about it, all the great achievements of humanity in the history of mankind, in
the sciences, the arts, and in trying to build a caring and loving society, are being defended in this Campaign. If that's moral, then yes, it's a moral Campaign; but it has to be practical and deal with the realities of the situation in which we live."

Unlike Sally or Barbara, Clive's biography and politicisation is decidedly working class in character and is not referenced to experiences of state education or employment. All three elected officials express strong support for the Campaign's non-alignment policy and see nuclear disarmament as 'above' party-political considerations. The threat of nuclear genocide seems to all three members to call for a subordination of personal politics - the issue seems too momentous, too all encompassing, to allow such potentially divisive factors to come to the fore. Of course, this is not just a characteristic of the elected officials, nor of just today's campaigners; this belief was much in evidence in the original Movement. There is a sense in which this attitude acts as a cultural glue, allowing very diverse individuals and attitudes to merge in a common culture. I am arguing that the nuclear threat emanates from the state and that it is thus not surprising that those individuals who perceive weaknesses and flaws in other areas of state policy should be susceptible to protesting and are over-represented in the Campaign. Not wishing to express their opposition in the language of conventional politics, nuclear disarmament is voiced in moral terms, in the language of the state's legitimating ideology.
In the interviews with welfare state CNDers, I argued that a commitment to their professional ideology spilled over into other areas of their lives and it was seen that such commitment was often deeply felt and positively evaluated: this commitment constitutes an ethical stance and can be engendered by a variety of sources. For instance, as a boy, Derek S. won a scholarship to a private school where he joined the Anti-Apartheid campaign (A.A.): "I felt especially at the school I was at there was a thing, er, some people's attitudes really disgusted me and I felt it was important to show the way you felt about something like that." Derek's participation in A.A. was, he told me, an act of schoolboy rebellion against what he saw as the privileged attitudes at the school and only amounted to a nominal membership; his political activism was to begin some years later: "I sort of felt all the time I was at school, and after I started university, that I'd never really done anything, and I felt guilty about that. But I felt I hadn't really found anything in which I could really direct my energies usefully, mainly 'cause I'd never come across anybody. Some of my friends were in the Communist Party for instance, but I didn't want to join any political party because I didn't really trust any political party at that time and I felt at that time very reluctant to join anything because I was scared stiff of getting too involved because I knew there was so much out there which needed changing that if I joined anything I would have to commit myself to it and I wasn't ready to commit myself to anything. I was afraid of getting into something I'd have to commit so much time to, I'd have to lose everything else. It wasn't till a friend said 'come
along to this Oxfam group', which I joined. And that was when I started getting involved and of course it did happen: I thought that things have got to be done, you've got to change people's minds before it's too late and, hm, for quite a number of years I was very active in the Young Oxfam group in ---- and that was where I met my girlfriend in fact."

In 1982, Derek and his girlfriend(4) became joint office holders in their local group "because I thought that we should be able to handle it, and y'know we wanted to do something and we felt we could probably do it reasonably well." Derek believes that members of CND are "predominantly middle class, professional or semi-professional" which he thinks may be a result "of the image we present because of that; the working class in general, who we haven't been so successful in drawing into CND, are not in such a good position to be able to go out and join groups and go to meetings and maybe broaden their education at an earlier stage as we are, they're more concerned with going out and earning their daily living." Derek thinks that the majority of the British public do not belong to CND because "the majority of people that you ask on the street would say 'Yes, I think it's absolutely wrong that you allow people to starve in the Third World', and would also say 'Yes, I think nuclear weapons are a terrible thing' but when it actually comes down to actually doing something about it they are scared stiff about committing themselves, because once they do they would feel that their cosy little life-style isn't the same any more; they can't go on
ignoring it any more. So people are very willing I think to believe the sort of propaganda that's put out to justify nuclear weapons. The government have a far greater opportunity to get their message across than the peace movement. I think if people really understood the reasons behind it they would be members of the peace movement."

In his own biographical progression from rebellious schoolboy, Oxfam worker and now CND activist, Derek has lost this debilitating fear of becoming "committed". At university, Derek read for a degree in engineering; being an undergraduate was not to prove the formative period, experienced by many of the CNDers of previous chapters, for Derek's interest in politics and general social issues had already been awakened during his earlier rebellious rejection of the attitudes he had encountered as a scholarship boy in his private fee-paying school ("that damn school"). Upon leaving university, Derek took a job as an engineer with the local council and, in addition to campaigning through his union on CND matters, he joined Engineers for Nuclear Disarmament (Eng.N.D.) which, he explained to me in his comments on the draft of this interview, 'is a professional group similar to M.C.A.N.W. or Architects for Peace. We are naturally a minority group being in such a conservative profession but we have an active local group. It is encouraging to find dedicated peace campaigners in a profession which at the institutional level is very pro-nuclear'.

Informally recruited into the peace movement, Derek and his
girlfriend now find that all of their close friends also support their views on disarmament: "I think it's the kind of person you are. If you're that kind of person, if you don't feel the same way about things like that, you're unlikely to get along socially for very long." Derek believes that his local group needs to re-examine its relationship to other CND groups and that many members are unhappy with the way in which their group organises itself; he would like to see more of the members actively involved and thinks that every individual should campaign in the way which they feel is most appropriate to their particular circumstances.

A Labour Party member, Derek supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy because: "CND is a single-issue Campaign, and CND's policy should be to win as many political parties to its policy as well as many non-political people." He sees the task of CND as being one of convincing the public of the need to get rid of nuclear weapons and thinks that "if we've done our jobs properly", people can be credited with sufficient political common sense to vote for the party which seems most likely to carry out CND's aims. In common with some of the other CNDers, whom I interviewed, Derek found it hard to draw a clear-cut distinction between ethics and politics; however, he told me that he thought nuclear disarmament "is first and foremost a moral issue. For us involved in the Movement it's a moral issue, but for the people who are building the Bomb, for the government of the day, it's a political issue. So it's a political issue whether
we like it or not. But wanting to get rid of them is a moral issue." Derek's personal involvement in the Campaign stems from his slowly evolving commitment to activism and it is not difficult to perceive how this ethical stance finds resonance with the moral standpoint which is fostered, by state apprenticeships and employment, in the lives of welfare CNDers. This intermeshing of similar perspectives allows a commonality of culture to exist for CNDers, a culture of individuals committed to non-partisan ethical protest.

Thirty-three year old Lilliane U. joined CND at the time of the 1983 General Election; she had wanted to join before but was unable to do so because of marital obligations. Her campaigning activities for CND have, to date, been confined to attending group meetings but for the past eighteen months she has also been involved in 'People for Peace', helping to paint murals on peace and disarmament themes. Like Derek, Lilliane was informally recruited into the Campaign. Her friend Sally (whom I discussed at the beginning of this chapter), "was the one who said 'come along, have you heard there's going to be an Election? We'll have to get something done about this!'" Shortly after she joined CND, Lilliane was persuaded to help Sally with her office's duties. Lilliane finds the meetings "rather boring" and too business like and she counts herself lucky to have known Sally in that she did not feel an outsider when she first joined the group.

Lilliane decided to become involved in CND because "I think I
just felt cross about things and decided I wanted to do something. I don't think it was sort of 'I saw my daughter growing up' and sentimental reasons like that or anything, I just felt I wanted to do something. It was all very well [just] sitting back and feeling in agreement with whatever was happening." The daughter of a now retired miner, Lilliane grew up in a political environment in a staunch Labour constituency. Her father is a communist and a committed union member whom she described to me as a man who "thinks Scargill is a soppy right winger". However, it would seem that Lilliane has not followed in her father's political footsteps: although opposed to the policies of Mrs. Thatcher's government, and despite describing herself as "probably a left wing socialist", Lilliane has never belonged to any political party or trade union. Instead, she sees herself as acting on her 'feelings'; nuclear disarmament "is something I feel rather than reason", and she told me that "I feel I'm sort of the family conscience."

Upon leaving school, Lilliane was employed as a trainee librarian until she married and stopped working in order to bring up her daughter. During her marriage she read for a part-time degree in history but she does not think that being an undergraduate changed her views ("although my friends all said that I'd changed"): because of her family commitments, Lilliane does not feel that she was able to participate fully in student life. Approximately three years ago she became divorced and in October 1983 joined a voluntary community project organised by Oxfam and centred on a run-down working class housing estate. As a part-
time volunteer worker, she places her artistic skills at the
service of the community.

Working on this project has caused Lilliane to reassess some of
her political priorities; I asked her whether she thought that
nuclear disarmament was the most important contemporary issue: "I
think until recently I would have unhesitatingly said yes, but
there's things like, how can you expect people to care much about
nuclear disarmament when their first problem is keeping body and
soul together? I think since I've been around in Pomona [on the
Oxfam project] I can realise how unimportant that seems to some
people. I think maybe for me it still is, but I don't think it's
as overwhelmingly the most important issue as it might have been." Nevertheless, when I asked her a few minutes later why she
thought the majority of the British public do not belong to CND,
she replied; "I think in a lot of cases it's apathy. I'm
surprised how many people are in sympathy but are not standing up
and being counted." Unike the apathetic majority, Lilliane is
"standing up and being counted", acting on her feelings of anger
against a threat which is "so horrible, I wouldn't feel justified
at all for Britain to use nuclear weapons against anybody. I
can't think of any justification which would be great enough and
I think when I read about the horrors of Hiroshima I think I do
see it in terms of it's not morally right to do that."

Lilliane's perception of nuclear weapons as a gross moral affront
echoes the welfare state CNDers' perception of the Bomb as
athema to the internalised ideology of their profession. This
moral outrage, and the subsequent wish to 'make a stand', to show commitment, may derive from a variety of social sources and idiosyncratic experiences; notably, and as argued by Parkin, it is a commitment very similar to the notion of religious 'witness'.

Alec R., a forty-three year old CND office holder, joined his local group four years ago and has been a member of Pax Christi (the Catholic Church peace campaign) for the past twelve months: "I'd always been thinking about the issue, I think through a Christian concept through the morality or immorality of the arms race and the arms race in general, and the World Disarmament Campaign got Bruce Kent down to speak and I signed a piece of paper saying I'd been to the meeting and every month they pushed the Newsletter through my door, and he [Bruce Kent] was at the national demo. of 1980 and I thought 'right, I must get off my backside and do something' and I went to the local meeting and signed on as a member and that was it."

Alec thinks that the Campaign's non-party alignment policy is essential: "I think it has to be, who can trust politicians? One can support a party because you think that will be the party that will bring about a more just society, but when it comes to so-called defence I don't think I'd trust anyone." He sees himself as in the process of becoming a pacifist and believes that disarmament must and should always be non-violent as a question of principle. The existence of the arms race is, for Alec, a product of profit-hungry capitalists in the West and the fear of
invasion in Eastern Bloc countries.

When I asked Alec whether he thought that members of CND were drawn from all walks of life, he replied: "I was thinking about this the other day, and I can only speak from my own experiences; we've got no members from the council estate [the particular estate close to his home], there isn't one member from that estate. I get the impression it's all middle class people. I think that in the main that they're people who've thought about it, who've taken the time to think about the issue and joined. But there is a very strong Christian element in —— CND and that's become very pronounced in the past twelve months." He believes that the majority of the British public do not belong to the Campaign because "the majority of the British people are apathetic, always have been. It's been shown, it takes something quite dramatic to stir them into action. The last time was in the Second World War when the good old British spirit came to the fore. And I think it's a sad reflection of our society that it takes something like that to, despite all the education that people have had over the years. They don't want to think themselves and they object and attack people who do try and make them think about it."

Alec left school with seven 'O' Levels and one 'A' Level and entered the Civil Service. He was not involved in the first Campaign, or in politics until quite recently ("too busy enjoying myself to get involved in political things"). However, he is a
practising Roman Catholic and prior to his joining CND, had been one of the founding members of the local Ecumenical church and was very involved in Church sponsored charitable projects in the Third World. For Alec, disarmament and Third World issues are "all interrelated, no matter how you look at it, it's all robbing the poor. The money that's spent on armaments is so obscene, it's depriving people all over the world as well as in this country."

Alec now channels his energies into CND campaigning which he sees as the most pressing contemporary issue. His political awakening came about, in a truly Marxist fashion, during the course of an industrial dispute: "It was when I was Chairman of our union branch and we were involved in strike action. And that was when I became politically aware. That was when I became really politically aware; then I joined the Labour Party, then I joined CND." Alec regards his experiences during this strike as educative; I asked him what had prompted him to become active in his union: "I don't know. Maybe I've always had this sense of justice, y'know, that if you want anything done you've got to get up and do it. Obviously, if things are unfair we should be doing something about it and 'we' starts with yourself. It's just finding the courage to get up and do it." For Alec, this "courage", was forged in the course of the strike and it is a resource he can now draw upon for CND campaigning. He would "class myself as a socialist. I believe in a more equal and equitable society, each according to his needs", and predictably, he dislikes Mrs. Thatcher's administration's policies and Mrs. Thatcher personally; "she's just got no consideration for other
people's problems."

In common with the other CND office holders whom I interviewed, Alec told me that "most of my close friends are now from CND." He decided to take on the office, which he has held since joining, because "I'd had a lot of experience as a trade union activist, Chairman and Secretary of our branch, and I felt I could use the experience I'd had over many years for helping —— CND. I just felt it was something I could contribute to it"; Alec found that his new duties quickly came to occupy all of his free time. Before joining the Campaign, Alec had not known anyone in the Movement but in the four years in which he has been a member he has become acquainted with most of the town's activists for, as he told me, "we've got a lot of members, but —— is a funny place, it doesn't matter what you're involved in it's still the few who do all the work."

Alec's parents were both Roman Catholics, he was brought up in the faith and his Church campaigning and involvement in the Ecumenical movement predate his membership of CND. His religious faith, his sense of justice and his political awareness (deriving from his union activism) are all intermeshed in his participation in the culture of CND; they are resources which he employs and which intertwine with the social relations that other members exercise in the creation of the Campaign. Alec's biography has engendered a personal ethical commitment and the confidence to express it; CND embraces this commitment which bears similarity to the personal stance of other members who view the Movement as
a non-party and non-partisan crusade for survival. Clearly, however, it is distinctly different in character and origin from the world view of Clive (whom I discussed earlier in this chapter). Interestingly, when I asked Alec what sort of work he would choose to do, he replied: "I think I'd like to be a teacher, to influence the younger generation". I have been struck by the career choices of respondents such as Alec and Sally; notably the choice is often for a welfare state post.

Gloria U. also belongs to the Ecumenical movement, chairs her church's Social Responsibility Group and sponsors a child in the Far East. Gloria supports the Campaign's non-party alignment policy for she feels that CND "should embrace everybody" regardless of their political views and she believes that the profile of her group is "quite representative with a large Christian membership." For her, the arms race is a consequence of "fear, pure fear on both sides." The majority of the public do not support the peace movement, Gloria thinks, because they feel powerless and because "they don't like to think too deeply about it, it becomes uncomfortable. It's a bit like a drug, you sort of go into CND not knowing very much about nuclear weapons and then you start finding more and more out and then you can't stop. I think most people don't want to be disturbed, they've got enough problems of their own, they don't want any more."

Gloria joined CND four years ago: "They had a thing down the town, a video, and I thought I really must join and it dragged on
from there." She took up her present office six months ago: "They just asked me to do it and as there was no one else who wanted to do it I said alright." I was present at the meeting which elected Gloria and it was clear that she is a popular member of the group, a popularity stemming, at least in part, from her vivacious personality and her record of activism. Previously employed as the manager for a firm of insurance brokers, Gloria is now a full-time housewife and she told me that, if she could choose, "I suppose I would probably like to do social work." Not a member of any political party or trade union, she describes herself as "generally a socialist" and would vote for the Labour party at a General Election "as long as they stuck to their present defence policies." She does not agree with any of Mrs. Thatchers administration's policies and she told me that "I don't like to see the way the welfare state is going, education, health services, the social aspects of life today, it's going so bad. I find that really worrying."

As the Chairperson of her church's Social Responsibility Group, Gloria brings matters of social concern to the attention of the congregation and it was my impression that it was her religious conviction, rather than a political or work-induced perspective, which forms the basis of her campaigning stance. It was unclear, from the interview, what exactly had prompted Gloria to take an interest in Christianity; fortunately, in her comments on the draft of her interview, she clarified this for me: 'It's not an interest in religion, that sounds like a hobby or something. My Christianity has always been important to me, as a young child I
enjoyed Sunday School and stopped going only when, at the age of ten, I discovered horses!! As the riding lessons were on Sunday mornings, religion took a back seat for a few years. It was when I was sixteen that I realised how much I missed my Church. There was no sudden event or happening in my life, tragic or otherwise, which some people think one has to experience before finding religion. I'm not being over-sensitive here, but it's hard to explain how strong my Christian convictions are and how even as a child it was so natural to follow Christ's teachings. Indeed, it is my Christian conviction which is the cornerstone of my peace activism.'

Gloria adopted a self-deprecating style of speaking and she sees herself as unknowledgeable on matters of weaponry technology. This is not, of course, to denigrate her sincerity, her record of activism is a testament to her belief in the Campaign's cause. Rather, it is probably a reflection of my poor interviewing technique and the nature of Gloria's commitment which is tied in with her private religious morality. She believes that disarmament is achievable "otherwise I wouldn't be doing it. It's going to be a long, long struggle but it's just like any other issue that a minority have taken on, like the slave trade or anything else. It's going to take a long time, let's hope we've got long enough. If people are not be blinded by the media which is terrible. It's got to come politically, I suppose: I wouldn't like CND to be used for political purposes but I'm not opposed to using politics for CND purposes."
This rejection of, or ambivalence towards, party politics helps atheistic Communists and non-political Christians to work together to prevent the potentially divisive ideologies and perspectives which exist in the Campaign coming to the fore. In this endeavour, the socio-political ethic of the dominant culture in the CND form of life, the welfare state members' stance, is clearly of value. CND itself is in this sense, ecumenical, embracing any individual who believes in the aim of disarmament regardless of their other political or religious predilections; and as in ecumenicalism, it is inappropriate to champion a partisan form of witness which may jeopardise the ability of others to share the faith.

Marianne W., a fifty-seven year old CND office holder, joined the Campaign approximately three and a half years ago. She finds herself "in a bit of a dilemma" with regard to the Campaign's non-party alignment policy: "I believe we're never going to get anywhere unless a political party is strongly supporting us. But at the same time, I do think there are people in different parties who can unite on our aims. So I feel we should welcome everyone." Describing herself as "99% a pacifist", she "would strongly oppose involvement in anything that wasn't going to be non-violent." Marianne believes that members of her local CND group are reasonably representative of the population at large: "We have a fair range, we have men and women, we have varied classes, I think it's reasonably well spread. We have people from churches. I think perhaps it's weakness - oh, I don't know if it
is a weakness - it is very largely Labour Party, although we have a few Liberals and S.D.P.s. But I think a better spread than I would have expected. I would have expected it to be sort of rather middle class, middle income and so on." Drawing upon her experiences of talking to people who are not supporters of the Campaign, Marianne thinks that "there is an attitude of 'it's so awful, it doesn't bear thinking about, so I won't think about it'. There's others who think we must be able to retaliate and there's the awful feeling of revenge that people have, if they're going to hit us we're jolly well going to hit them ... but I think it's mainly fear that if we haven't got it [the Bomb] we become a sitting target."

Marianne joined the Labour Party fifteen years ago; she "attends the ward meetings, canvasses before the Elections and that's about the extent of it" and she regards herself as "moderately left, but I'm not Militant Tendency." For Marianne, "there was no major political thing that made me join [the Labour Party], it was just a gradual feeling that I must stand up and be counted"; at this time, her brother-in-law was standing as a parliamentary candidate in the 1970 General Election and she had just moved from a Conservative Cornish constituency to a more left wing environment in the North. Marianne deplores Mrs. Thatchers administration's "general attitude of 'you pull yourself up by your bootstraps'", an attitude which she thinks "seems to work out in just about every policy, on privatisation and education and health and social services and moving as much as possible away from public ownership and public control."
Upon leaving her secondary school, Marianne went to university to read for a science degree. Unfortunately, a recurrent illness prevented her from finishing her degree course and she had to leave university prematurely. She then went to work in the office of a firm of solicitors, studied for law 'articles' and practised as a solicitor until the mid-Seventies when, once again, her recurrent illness forced her to retire prematurely. Since her enforced retirement, Marianne has been the Secretary of the (now defunct) local World Development Movement, has been involved in her church's Third World charity projects, undertaken voluntary work for the Citizens Advice Bureau and is currently the Secretary of a residential housing organisation for the aged. The daughter of a Methodist minister, Marianne is herself a practising Christian: "I've always had an interest in Third World issues. My parents were missionaries, and I've sort of grown up with that idea. I've worked for a missionary society myself in this country at one time."

In the last three years, Marianne has held two offices in CND: "I was pushed into it. I was sort of pressing for getting more people involved so someone suggested, sort of pressed the job onto me." A stalwart member of her group, Marianne would appear to devote most of her time to CND and her voluntary social work duties; she lives with another voluntary worker and during the course of the interview, which lasted about one hour, we were interrupted several times by telephone calls concerning her
voluntary duties. Clearly, in her biography Marianne's religious faith, presumably learnt from her missionary parents, has been a great and continuing influence. But not all of her friends in her church share her views on disarmament, dissent which she finds somewhat disturbing: "There are certain close friends who are active in the peace movement. There are others who I just assume, they may not be active but I just sort of assume [their support for the nuclear disarmament cause]. But there are others, and this is where I feel my greatest anxiety in a way about what I should be doing, people within my church who definitely are not. They may not be my closest friends in the church, but they are friends, people for whom I feel a great respect in many ways. And I find it very difficult with them to try to press my views, for it seems to me to be sort of impugning their faith, they see their religious faith leads them in one way and it's very difficult to impugn those beliefs. And yet I feel very strongly that Christianity should lead one into this [that is, support for CND]." I asked her whether she saw today's Campaign as a moral issue: "It is for me. I think that nuclear arms are immoral, and that even to threaten to use them is immoral. It is a moral issue. For me, irrespective of whether or not it makes ourselves a target, I just say it's wrong. And I would stress that as one of my arguments against armaments."

Marianne, in common with the lay members whom I interviewed, takes a socio-political stance which is only partially complementary with that of the other supporters. Her ethical commitment is nurtured and finds expression in her religious life
and in her voluntary work and it is interesting to note the inner conflict which Marianne experiences when she finds the ethics of some members in one of her generative forms of life (the Church) does not completely square with the morality of the CND culture. Given the choice, Marianne would wish to be employed as a social worker.

Celia S., the remaining CND office holder in my sample, has not worked since 1963 when she gave up her job on the shop-floor of an electronics company to become a full-time housewife. Now that her children have grown up, she occasionally helps her husband with his small business: if she could choose, Celia would plump for "something in the caring, not with people, I think I'd find something in the social services, something in welfare, interesting." Unlike Marianne, Celia comes from a working class background (her father was a building worker and her mother worked in cotton mills and served in building site canteens), and she describes herself as a "left wing socialist." An active member of her local Labour Party, instrumental in getting her town declared a nuclear-free zone, Celia blames "money, power, the big monopolies" for the arms race: "They're not interested in disarmament because they're making too much profit, it's down to capitalism really. That's a personal opinion really, and a lot of people would be horrified, but that's what I really believe."

She thinks that the majority of the British public do not support the Campaign "out of ignorance for a start. Many people think that governments know better and that Russia is such an awful
thing." For Celia, "governments are a puppet of capitalism" and if matters of defence were left solely to the government "they'd go on rising and rising out of the public purse and the Health Service and education and the Third World are suffering greatly through it. We've got the technology to bring these people water yet we spend it on bloody destructive things. I don't know, I'm an idealist, but it just screws me up." Celia thinks that members of CND are drawn from all walks of life and she does not support the view that nuclear weapons are merely an extension of male aggression. Although she recognises that social institutions of war are traditionally male dominated, she is "not a feminist. I've got mixed feelings, I can't really say so when you've got people like Thatcher, not really, I don't go with that line [of thinking]."

As a young woman, Celia did not belong to the original Campaign: "I was very unaware really. I was one of those people that annoy me now. I was too busy having a good time I suppose." She joined CND "about '79ish I suppose. What it was, I was one of those people who hated the thought of nuclear weapons but believed in nuclear deterrence, burying my head in the sand really. I think it was when they started on about Cruise I thought 'Jesus, this has gone too far'. I joined the World Disarmament Campaign [the precursor of her local CND] and I became involved from there. Then more and more active." At the same time, she joined the Labour Party, and she now sees herself as a left wing activist, using the language of contemporary radical left politics. Celia was elected to her present office in CND following the
resignation of her predecessor some eighteen months ago. Since joining the Campaign she has become increasingly interested in radical politics and she believes that as a result of her political activism her telephone is 'tapped' and that, following a visit to Greenham Common, she is being spied upon by the Ministry of Defence.

Celia's mother died when Celia was eighteen: "So I don't really know what she was politically. She was quite rebellious in lots of things; I've got a feeling she may well have been a socialist because she was always on about the Health Service, how wonderful it was and that sort of thing, so I would think she would have been a socialist, especially coming from Cottonbrough at that time. My father I think used to vote Liberal, he now votes Labour, I've sort of educated him." Twenty-five years after the death of her mother, Celia is witness to the current attack on the public sector: she agrees with none of Mrs. Thatcher's policies and especially, and emphatically, disagrees with "privatisation, cuts in health services and education, I don't agree with any of her bloody policies!" As I have already remarked, Celia is very active in her local Labour Party, sees herself as a political animal, and employs a left wing perspective and lexicon when discussing nuclear disarmament issues. Even so, when I asked her opinion of the Campaign's non-party alignment policy, she replied: "Yes, I think it is in a way because CND is a non-political organisation. You've even got Tories in it, Liberals, Communists, Labour Party. Yeh, I think
they've got to keep that line, it can be off-putting for other people who might be interested because either it's a socialist organisation or whatever. Yeh, I think it needs to be non-political."

Although she donates money to, and supports the aims of, Amnesty International and Greenpeace, Celia has never been involved in any charity or undertaken any voluntary social work for she feels that it is better for her to concentrate her energies on what she sees as the more pressing issue of nuclear disarmament. In addition, her political commitments take up a lot of her time: "My family didn't see me for months on end before the [General] Election!" The only other post which she has ever held is that of School Governor. Celia left school without any qualifications and she clearly believes that with improved facilities and better teachers she would have been capable of passing exams but, "our education was very poor John, [the author]. Y'know, secondary modern school, that sort of thing. Now I look back on it, it was disgusting. We didn't even have a chance to take them [exams] unless you were in the top class." As a School Governor, Celia feels helpless in the face of the recently imposed cut-backs in education expenditure: "As I say, in the Sixties it did become, I noticed at that time because my Amanda was born in '66, and Paul was a couple of years older, and they went to school and you just couldn't compare their schools; their's was a private education compared to our's. I mean it was incredible, the amount of resources. My kids just missed the cuts y'know, Amanda caught the tail end of them, so she was fortunate. But the kids that are
coming up now: I’m a School Governor and I feel like throwing the
towel in, because there's nothing you can do as a School Governor
except write letters. We really ought to get organised on that
one."

Celia thinks that her local CND group is "fairly successful, I
think it could be more successful" and I asked her, 'What would
you do to make it more successful?': "Well, we rack our brains
all the time. Education, that's what it is, educating the
public." In common with her more middle class office holding
counterparts, Celia sees those who do not support CND as
"ignorant", benighted and duped by the media: "You get a few each
time you have a stall or something like that, you get a few. An
awful lot of people can't bear to even think about it so they
bury their heads in the sand. They'd rather not even discuss it.
What annoys me, what I can't believe, women with kids passing our
stall and looking the other way. But it is horrific. All they
want to do is to get on with their lives, they don't want to
worry about war and destruction. It must be nice to be like that,
I can't be like it I suppose."

Before joining CND in 1979, Celia knew very few members of the
local peace movement and had not been involved in any form of
political activism. The media publicity surrounding the siting of
Cruise missiles and a meeting of the World Disarmament Campaign
provoked a political awakening and five years later she is a
heavily committed political activist and CND office holder. In
common with the majority of CNDers whom I interviewed, Celia's
primary objection to the present government is directed against the running-down of welfare state provisions and, in her capacity as a School Governor, she tries to resist the erosion of state educational services - a political right of which she feels herself deprived. Celia's political views, which are intertwined with her perception on disarmament issues, have a decidedly and particular ethical character, as does her personal commitment. It seems likely that Celia was influenced by her mother's political views, although without unwarranted speculation it is not possible, from the interview, to decide that this was the origin of Celia's present stance. Regardless of origin, Celia's commitment, her belief that non-supporters of the Campaign are benighted and her advocacy of the non-alignment policy have a place within the culture of CND - a culture which has, without doubt, nurtured her development.

Conclusion: The Office Holders' Task
In the foregoing chapters, I showed that CND is a composite of only partially complementary ideologies and perspectives: in this composite, the welfare state CNDers' contribution is notably pronounced. However, even the welfare state Campaigners are characterised by similarities and differences and this incomplete commonality is accentuated if supporters of CND, who are not employed in the welfare state sector, are also taken into consideration. Although I have highlighted certain features of the Campaign's culture (for example, the belief that non-supporters are in some sense benighted, the ethical nature of the
Campaigners' commitment), these elements should not be thought of as a necessary set of defining qualities which comprise an essence of CND: rather, they are like threads in the tapestry of the Movement's culture.

The office holders whom I discussed in this chapter are also characterised by similarities and differences. They joined the Campaign in various ways, became office holders by disparate routes and have diverse socio-political stances. As I argued in the Introduction, they do not express a uniform radicalism and they are not necessarily more committed to the nuclear disarmament cause than their lay member counterparts. Like many of the interviewees in Chapter 6, their commitment to campaign has been engendered by their participation in other forms of life such as the Church or party politics: these generative biographical experiences and commitments are not always fully compatible with each other.

Nonetheless, despite this diversity, all the respondents in this chapter are pledged to building a non-partisan Movement. Faced with a truly indiscriminate threat and a multi-faceted membership, they strive to nullify potentially divisive strategies and political differences in order to build a Campaign that is open to the greatest possible public support. This is done despite, in most cases, their own strong allegiances to other party-political and religious beliefs; thus Labour Party, Catholic and Communist office holders consciously champion the transcendental ethic of nuclear disarmament in their attempt to unify the Movement. However, this ecumenical strategy proves
especially appealing to only a particular minority of the population, a minority whose vocational morality also features a transcendental ideology—welfare state employees. Paradoxically, then, the championing of an ecumenical ethic actually serves to attract a socially unrepresentative basis of support for CND.
Chapter 7: Notes and References

1) This now defunct national group published a monthly newsletter and tried to encourage women's involvement in the nuclear disarmament movement: 'The monthly newsletter of the Liaison Committee for Women's Peace Groups written for those women who, regardless of party political beliefs, are united in the conviction that they have a special responsibility for safeguarding children, and society, from war.'

*Call To Women* London. Mid-October, 1964.

2) This was an autonomous initiative predating the formation of national CND (documentary evidence held by author). In March 1958, the group affiliated to the fledgling national Campaign.

3) In her comments on the draft of her interview, Barbara asked me to delete certain passages concerning her education and employment history in order to safeguard her anonymity. This is a pity, for the omitted passages reveal an interesting, thwarted, welfare state biography which was the generative context for her present political position.

4) Unfortunately, through ill luck, I was unable to interview Derek's girlfriend. Although they act as a team in their jointly-held office, it was my impression that at the group's meetings Derek was the vocal and dominant partner.
Chapter 8
Summary and Conclusions

Introduction
This chapter begins with a summary of the salient findings and features of my study which is followed by a brief discussion of the limitations of the research. I then give an overview of other accounts of the revival of CND and compare and contrast these accounts with my own work. The chapter concludes with a consideration of some of the issues arising from this study which would benefit from further research.

Summary
In the first chapter of this thesis I gave a detailed critique of two of the major studies of CND (by Parkin 1967, and Taylor and pritchard, 1980). I argued that, whilst these studies constituted valuable resources and contained promising insights, the authors failed to develop an adequate sociology of the Campaign and were prevented from doing so by their theoretical approaches and concomitant analytical tactics. Parkin was seen to employ a questionable causal paradigm involving an essentialist understanding of categories such as 'campaign' and 'member', to classify the Campaign a priori as a 'political' movement, and to draw an untenable distinction between 'instrumental' and 'expressive' politics. In consequence - an implication of his essentialist perspective - the study took the form of a misguided search for uniform qualities or characteristics which Parkin presumed all CNDers shared.
Taylor and Pritchard approached the original peace campaign as a failed social movement and predicated their retrospective analysis of activists upon the ultimate 'political' achievements of the Campaign: this teleological aspect of their work was found to rest upon the authors' own predilection for a particular form of socialism and this predilection served to overshadow the campaigners' own accounts of their behaviour. It was noted that both studies focused solely upon activists. Both works tended, in various ways, to devalue the CNDers' own reasons for their campaigning and membership of CND and both studies, although recognising the moral character of the first Campaign, failed to further our understanding of this important characteristic of the Movement. Moreover, neither study developed a satisfactory heuristic to relate the members' social class location to their protesting and neither study recognised that it was the fact that the crucial group of members were welfare state employees, rather than the 'middle class', 'middle class radicals' or 'welfare and creative' professionals, which held the key to understanding CND.

In my own research I drew upon some of the philosophical recommendations of the 'later' Wittgenstein; in particular, Wittgenstein's 'family resemblance' theory of categorisation. Accordingly, I did not presume that there would be a uniform definitional 'essence' of CND, or that all members of the Campaign would share a common quality which qualified them for inclusion into the Campaign category. Instead, I approached the revived Movement as a composite 'form of life', a cultural
category produced by social praxes. In the discussions of each interview, I presented a biographical account of the respondents' opinions and perspectives, concentrating upon their educational and employment histories and their idiosyncratic politicisations. Their personal socio-political stances were referenced to their generative social contexts, and the concept of a 'commitment' to the Campaign and the interviewees' perceptions of non-supporters of the Movement, were presented as understandable expressions of their socially nurtured positions and standpoints. It was argued that it is only by relating the respondents' opinions, sense of 'commitment' and political stance to their generative social contexts that one can properly appreciate their meaning and character. Furthermore, it was argued that membership of CND is not bound off from other aspects of its members' lives and thus, consequently, in the creation of the Campaign the members would utilise and express the social praxes of other forms of life in which they were engaged. These theoretical perspectives inform the analysis of the interviews and underpin the heuristic which is developed in the course of this study.

In accordance with the theoretical thrust of this research, I assumed that members of the Campaign would share both similarities and differences, as would the composite forms of life which comprise the Campaign. Having noted the high profile of welfare state employees in my samples of respondents, and in the other available data on the Campaign's membership which I re-analysed, I began my analysis by separating the interviewees into three groups: welfare state employed CNDers,
members who were not employed in welfare state professions, and the elected office holders of the two groups in the study. Pursuing the analytical approach discussed in the preceding paragraphs, I showed that the welfare state employees in my samples had, to varying degrees, assimilated and identified with the ideology and practice of their state vocations and that they were likely to have become politically aware either as students on what one might call 'state apprenticeships' at institutes of higher education, or in the course of their welfare state employment. Their views on, and commitment to, the Campaign, and their general socio-political perspectives were presented as a reflection of their experiences of creating the welfare state and it was argued that their state apprenticeships and vocations had rendered them peculiarly susceptible to joining the Campaign and expressing their commitment to it in a particular manner. These respondents usually favoured the Campaign's non-party alignment policy and saw non-supporters of the Movement as, in some fashion, apathetic and benighted. It was suggested that their protest against the nuclear threat was, in part, a reflection of their vocation's championing of the public good; an ethical aim for which they had become personally responsible. Throughout the analyses of the interviews, I was at pains to stress both the similarities and differences between the respondents.

By virtue of their similar educational and employment histories (their relation to the state), the welfare state CNDers were held to be participants in a common form of life which acted as a
generative context for their views and political stances: only by relating their views and opinions to this generative context could one fully appreciate their genesis and meanings. Thus, for example, these respondents favoured not merely 'left wing politics', but a particular form of left wing politics in which the welfare state was cherished.

The interviewees in the remaining two chapters were not participants in the welfare state CNDers' form of life and were disparate when considered by criteria such as class, gender, education and employment. Utilising the analytical approach employed when discussing the welfare state employed CNDers, I presented their commitment to the Campaign as a reflection and expression of their participation in specific religious and political forms of life. Although these members were similar to their welfare state counterparts in the Campaign, it was noted that a primary commitment to another form of life, particularly the Labour Party, engendered markedly different perspectives on the Movement. It was shown that these respondents' opinions and perspectives were only partially complementary and that the composite forms of life that comprise CND do not unite under the banner of any one essential unifying characteristic: this partial complementarity can lead to uneasy alliances and tensions within the Campaign category. The elected officials of the two groups were seen to favour an ecumenical campaigning strategy intended to attract the maximum possible public support for the Movement's cause; this strategy was favoured despite the officials' often strong commitment to specific political programmes. It was noted
that, paradoxically, this ecumenical strategy actually sponsored a socially unrepresentative basis of support for the Campaign as it particularly appeals to a specific social minority - welfare state employees.

In the discussions of all the interviewees, the moral aspects of their commitment to the CND cause, and their general socio-political stance, was highlighted. It was argued that there was a specific form of ethics engendered by common social biographies rather than an expression of any innate moral quality. The similarity between the legitimating ideology of the welfare state and the transcendental authority in the religious forms of life (or a belief in a 'moral law'), was commented upon. The similarity of commitment, the ethical stance of the members, was presented, in harness with the unspoken fear of nuclear destruction, as a 'cultural glue', binding the membership together in a tacit presumption of agreed aims.

However, as I remarked in the Conclusion to Chapter 6, the intertwining of attitudes and perspectives and the affinity of commitment contained within the cultural category is a subtle phenomenon, not easily paraphrased or captured in the language of formal sociological analysis. For the purpose of social understanding, as I also stated in the aforementioned Conclusion, descriptive investigation rather than attempted causal explanation yields the richer picture. If this study is judged to be successful in furthering our understanding of why it is that
only a specific minority feels compelled to protest against the threat of nuclear annihilation, then it also illustrates the feasibility of social inquiry based upon the spirit of Wittgenstein's philosophical position.

The Limits Of This Study

From the outset, I decided that this research should be focused solely upon the revived CND, rather than attempting to encompass other organisations which fall under the umbrella term 'peace movement'. The principal reason for this narrow focus was a wish to compare and contrast my research with that of Parkin, and Taylor and Pritchard, and a wish to supplement my modest sample with a secondary analysis of Nias's invaluable data on the current Campaign's membership. Moreover, the theoretical perspective which I favoured demanded detailed ethnographic analyses of the interview material and I did not consider that I could reasonably increase my sample size to include a significant number of interviews with members drawn from other peace groups. In addition, CND is the largest component form of life in the revived peace movement and the only major component with a history.

As a consequence of this focus, the heuristic developed in this research is not applicable axiomatically to other peace groups such as E.N.D., or to specialist sub-groups, for example, Scientists Against Nuclear Arms (S.A.N.A.). Nonetheless, there would seem to be no reason in principle why these organisations should not be studied in the same manner employed in this study.
Of these neglected component forms of life, perhaps the most sociologically interesting is the women's peace movement and the Greenham Common settlement. (1) The deliberately non-bureaucratic and non-hierarchical character of Greenham Common, which confronts social analysts searching for recognisable leading activists and an 'essence' of the Greenham phenomenon, would seem to be more analytically approachable if considered as a composite form of life and if the women protestors' social praxes were related to their generative social contexts. Clearly, for practical reasons, such research would be more easily accomplished by a female researcher.

The second shortcoming of this research is the lack of a comparison between the original and revived Campaigns. Such a comparison falls outside the scope of this study for it would merit a large doctoral thesis in its own right. Nevertheless, such a comparison would permit the Campaign to be located within its general socio-historical context, enabling an analytical purchase to be made upon wider political debates regarding the character of the post-War British state.

Of necessity, in this study there is an in-depth focus upon individual Campaigners; the analysis requires this focus for it demands detailed consideration of campaigning and context which, as I have shown, can be a subtle relationship without essentialist uniformity. Nonetheless, the available data contained in Appendix C, which highlights the preponderance of welfare state and student members in the peace movement, gives every reason to believe that the arguments in this study could be
extended to cover the social bases of support for the peace movement in general.

Further substantiating, or falsifying, evidence could be obtained by two other research strategies. First, by interviewing the same samples of Scots City and New Town members at a future date to see if their opinions and sense of commitment bore a relation to changes in their biographical experiences of the welfare state. Second, by a comparative study of the social bases of support for peace movements in other countries to ascertain whether or not their memberships display characteristics which can be reasonably portrayed as reflections of the form which their nation states take. In addition, it would also be interesting to conduct similar research with members of other 'new social movements'.

Other Accounts Of The Revival Of CND

In terms of the strongest original research component (and subsequent resource value for successive researchers) Peter Nias's 1983 study\(^{(2)}\) of 'the recent rise of the Nuclear Disarmament Movement in Britain' is the pre-minent academic work on the present peace movement known to this author. Revealingly entitled The Poverty Of Peace Protest, Nias draws upon his large-scale survey data (see Appendix C) in support of his claim that: "the nuclear disarmament movement in general, and its component organisations in particular, cannot legitimately be called a mass movement because the membership base is too narrow ...."\(^{(3)}\)

Nias argues that in the Seventies a number of events and
influences emerged which provided an atmosphere conducive to the growth of 'protest movements in general and nuclear disarmament movements in particular'. These events and influences include the Russian intervention in Afghanistan, the publication of *Protect and Survive* and the debates on the introduction of the 'new' weaponry (the Neutron Bomb and Cruise and Pershing missiles). In addition, following the arguments of Tony Benn, Nias cites the demise of consensus politics in the Seventies as responsible for provoking a re-examination of political ends as well as means. In his survey data, the social class of the members is categorised in accordance with Registrar General definitions and thus, consequently, Nias did not notice the high profile of welfare state employees in his samples of CNDers. He argues that:

'The movement's chances, by itself, of changing society sufficiently for such nuclear disarmament in Britain to take place are limited both because it is not a mass movement but a loose coalition of social groups and organisations, and also because there has been concentration upon protest rather than upon dialogue or social change.' (4)

All the available data on the Campaign's membership supports Nias's claim that CND is not a 'mass movement' in the sense of attracting support from a wide social base. However, it is debatable whether the Campaign's being a 'loose coalition of social groups and organisations' disqualifies it from being seen as a 'proper' mass movement. Nias experiences theoretical difficulty when confronted by the problem of categorising peace movements and remarks (in an unpublished paper) that 'the modern peace movement is quite different from many of its predecessors, and in many ways defies conceptual labelling.' (5) It would be
fair to say that Nias's work is more in the nature of a commentary on his survey results than a fully developed analysis; nevertheless, as a source of data on the Campaign's membership it is unequalled and, as he points out, whilst 'many social movements have been studied only after they have gone into decline, or succeeded in their aims ... this study was carried out during a period of intensive campaigning.'(6)

One difficulty in Nias's work, in common with many other accounts of the revival of CND, is that whilst he describes the events and influences that could have proved conducive to the growth of protest movements, this wider context is not drawn upon to explain the content of CND politics; a form of protest which is notably similar to its predecessor in the late Fifties and early Sixties. Furthermore, he does not draw upon this wider social context to account for why it is that only some people (and not the whole population) chose to respond to these events by joining CND. Consequently, these events etc. remain only a catalogue of historical incidents.

Another example of this problem can be found in the Introduction to Debate On Disarmament,(7) wherein Clarke and Mowlam state that 'there are some very obvious and immediate reasons why disarmament should have become such a live issue since 1979'(8) and then present a very comprehensive list of national and international events which formed the backdrop to the growth of the peace movement. But again, what is not analysed is why the Campaign proves attractive to only a minority of the population drawn largely from a particular social stratum - without whom the
Movement would not exist; nor is it clear why the present peace movement has assumed its present form which is so akin in character to the original Campaign. Similarly, Pamela Bartlett in her study (9) of The Nuclear Disarmament Movement in Scotland traces the history of the Campaign and its revival, cataloguing the growth of the Scottish Campaign and related events in the Seventies. However, Bartlett attempts to explain the revival of the Movement by reference to Down's five stage 'issue-attention cycle' (10) and she does not incorporate into her account the Campaign's socially unrepresentative basis of support.

This focus upon allegedly precipitating events is naturally also to be found in activists' own accounts of the revival of CND. Understandably, peace movement activists often regard the need to protest as being palpably obvious and are more interested in further encouraging support than indulging in sociological analysis. In fact, the dramatic revival of the Campaign, in late 1979 to early 1980, appears to have surprised the Movement's national leaders and was certainly not planned for in terms of organisational capacity. As Monsignor Bruce Kent stated in his General Secretary's Report to the 1980 Annual Conference of CND, 'the vast increase of interest in disarmament issues in this country in recent months has left most peace movements trying desperately to keep up with the endless (and welcome) demands of all sorts. There has not been much time for reflection on what has been going on.' (11) Accounts of the peace movement's revival, written by activists, are usually catalogues of the disturbing nuclear issues which surfaced in the Seventies, reports of
particular protest actions and calls for support.\(^{(12)}\)

Analyses of the revived Movement focusing more specifically on politics have been provided by Day and Robbins, Keane, and Taylor: of these three, only Day and Robbins' is based on original research (see Appendix C); given this, I find it particularly encouraging that there are several convergences between their approach and mine. Entitled *Activists For Peace: The Social Bases Of A Local Peace Movement*,\(^{(13)}\) Day and Robbins' study of the Aberystwyth peace movement is an attempt to 'examine some features of the peace movement as it appears at a local level to see how far it can be said to exemplify the 'new politics'.\(^{(14)}\)

Day and Robbins criticise Parkin's study of the original Movement for an over-reliance on secondary sources and for 'a consistent unwillingness to take CNDers' motivations on their own terms.'\(^{(15)}\) This unwillingness to accept CNDers' avowed motivations is, the authors believe, a reflection of a 'fundamental restriction arising from the imposition of a particular conception of political action which he [Parkin] shares with many others';\(^{(16)}\) in other words, a methodological and analytical myopia engendered by Parkin's allegiance to what Day and Robbins term the 'old politics'.

Acknowledging the important influence of writers such as Poulantzas and Gramsci, Day and Robbins appear to regard the 'new politics' as a welcome 'loosening up [of] the connections between
determining conditions and political outcomes: the 'relative autonomy' of the political argues the need to pay attention in detail to the way the political is constituted.'(17) This conception of political analysis is in contrast to the 'old politics', of which Parkin is said to be an adherent, in which, it is implied, a deterministic tendency exists and in which 'formalized bureaucratic institutions, systematized doctrine, and strategic policy formulation'(18) are held to be the proper means for achieving political change. In contrast, according to Day and Robbins, 'both theoretically and practically, the new politics is alert to the importance of limited, transitory, shifting struggles of highly disparate kinds, and the need for continuing efforts to achieve some sort of controlling direction over the diversity of practices, ideas and groupings.'(19)

Following on from this distinction between 'old' and 'new' politics, Day and Robbins provide an interesting ethnography of the Aberystwyth peace movement, noting the wide range of different ideologies ('Welshness, socialism, libertarianism and Christianity'), the educative role which membership of the peace movement serves to sponsor, and the tensions caused by the members' ideological diversity. They conclude their study by suggesting:

'that in its attempts to bring together a variety of ideological themes and negotiate appropriate organisational structures, the peace movement is rehearsing many of the problems that will be faced by any broader alliance of the Left. The success or failure of such efforts is likely to determine the fate of the new politics.'(20)
Day and Robbins' acknowledgement of the educative and formative effects of peace movement campaigning - of the way (not sufficiently recognised by Parkin) that peace campaigners may not be the 'same people' as they were before starting to campaign - is analytically important. However, in a sense, I feel that they fall into the same trap as Parkin and other 'old politics' analysts in that disarmament and the members' own reasons for campaigning, and the distinctive content of their politics become somewhat subsumed beneath their attempt to present CND as an exemplar of the 'new' politics.

Day and Robbins' substantive findings closely and encouragingly replicate mine: in their 'Profile of the Activists', the authors:

'find a notable absence from the scene of the working class. In occupational terms, CND activists belong squarely to the intellectual/artistic/educational middle class: a quarter of our respondents are teachers or lecturers; another six work in the 'arts' and the remainder are nurses, librarians, secretaries and students. Their educational profile is remarkable: only three have not been involved in further or higher education ... They are also pretty firmly cut off from the less educated, from manual workers ... when we questioned our sample about ways of increasing the effectiveness of the movement, there was a general lack of perception of this as a problem ...'.(21) (see Appendix C)

In addition:

'Their concern with both peace and social issues was consistently moral in tone and their proposed solutions were more often seen in terms of changing individual values and attitudes than in terms of changing social structures.'(22)

Day and Robbins do not try to account for this narrow social basis of support. The membership is analysed and discussed in terms of ideological beliefs rather than by reference to social experiences and position; nor is there any attempt to relate the moral expression of the peace movement members' politics to their social locations or their views on disarmament.
Richard Taylor's writings\(^{23}\) on the revived CND are consistent with his analysis of the original Movement and true to his pervasive belief that, if CND is to be effective, it must adopt and pursue his particular conception of New Left socialism:

'The persistent and fundamental problem of the movement since its inception has been its inability to translate its undoubted popular appeal into real tangible achievement. Although the movement has had a very considerable impact on public opinion, and thus, arguably, indirectly upon formal political structures and policies, it is quite clear that its central objectives have not been achieved. ... The problem then is essentially political: how to articulate with effect the peace movement's dynamism and strength. The inability to find a solution to this problem was one of the central reasons for the movement's decline and disintegration from the mid-1960s and threatens again to undermine the strength, dynamism and self-confidence of the movement in the 1980s, both in Britain and elsewhere.'\(^{24}\)

Taylor recognises that British political life has moved on from the 1960s; in particular, there has been a 'partial disintegration of the seemingly stable and secure Western economic system', and in Britain, the 'era of crisis' has meant that 'the material base of the 1950s and 1960s, within which the integration of the working class has been rooted, has been significantly eroded', leading to 'political demoralisation and disorientation.'\(^{25}\) With regard to the middle class, Taylor, drawing upon the work of David Coates\(^{26}\), argues that:

'there has been a considerable expansion in the number of radical tertiary educated professional and intellectual employees whose public sector occupations and general background of critical thinking, have resulted in an ideological stance opposed to the market individualism of competitive capitalism. Such a disaffected, radical middle class has of course existed throughout the twentieth century. It has been from within this constituency that most of the impetus for direct action movements in the past has stemmed. The crucial development in the 1970s, however, has been the expansion of this social group, as a result
primarily, of the expansion of higher education and public sector employment ...')(27)(my emphasis added)

Taylor, again drawing upon Coates and writers cited by Coates, identifies three major groupings involved in the growth of the contemporary radical middle class:

'trade union activists in the white collar unions (white collar union membership has grown from 1.9m in 1948 to 2.69m in 1964, and 4.26m in 1974); new artisans ('a set of often college educated young people denied access to bureaucratic occupations because of the recession, who have turned instead ... to petty commodity production - in wood, textiles, paint and so on - ') and welfare bureaucrats (those working in schools, welfare agencies, etc, who, as Cotgrove and Duff have observed, have rejected, at least to an extent, the ideology and values of industrial capitalism and opted instead for careers 'outside the market place').')(28)

This growth of the radical middle class is, according to Taylor, a source of political hope, and the 'structural strengthening of the basis of the radical middle class left' (29) augurs well for the development of a 'humanistic socialist' political strategy; the very strategy which the original New Left working in the original CND failed to articulate.

Leaving aside the validity of Taylor's political position (30) and the problems associated with his characterisation of CND and the peace movement as an organisation which must politically articulate its disarmament demands (analytical standpoints which I have considered in some detail in the first chapter of this study), Taylor's remarks on what I have termed the 'state class' are both interesting and stimulating. However, I feel that Taylor has not adequately related the distinctive political and moral orientation of this expanding group to its social class location
and, as in his earlier work, his main point of reference remains the development of 'humanistic socialism' rather than an initial understanding of the forces in capitalist society which have spawned the newly enlarged constituency upon which he pins his hopes for political change and the realisation of British nuclear disarmament. Crucially, Taylor does not give adequate analytical weight to the significance of a high profile of welfare state employees (or those likely to have been influenced by their experiences of the welfare state, especially of higher education), and consequently his analysis relies on undeveloped concepts such as 'critical thinking' and 'disaffection' to account for their susceptibility to radical politics and the characteristic form which it takes. In this study, I have argued that by focusing upon the CNDers' relationship to the state we can make their membership of the Campaign, and the expression of their protest, sociologically intelligible. The viability of this approach is borne out by the analysis of the interviews in this study and suggests rather different political lessons from the ones which Taylor urges us to learn from the demise of the first Campaign (this point is elaborated upon at the end of this chapter).

In an interesting paper cited by Taylor in his account of the revival of CND and entitled Environmentalism, middle class radicalism and politics,(31) Cotgrove and Duff note:

'the almost complete omission of any discussion of the particular faction which has been identified in this analysis: those operating in those subsystems of industrial societies concerned with the pursuit of non-economic values, and functioning outside the market, and in this sense, non-capitalist elements persisting within capitalist societies.'(32)
Comparing samples of 'environmentalists', 'industrialists' and the 'public', the authors find:

'particularly striking ... the high proportion of environmentalists in our sample occupying roles in the non-productive service sector: doctors, social workers, teachers, and the creative arts.' (33)

Cotgrove and Duff's study is heavily informed by Parkin's conceptualisation of 'middle class radicalism':

'To the extent that schools, hospitals and welfare agencies operate outside the market-place, and those who work in them are dedicated to maximising non-economic values, they constitute non-industrial enclaves within industrial societies and are the carriers of alternative non-economic values. And they may well provide a more congenial environment for those whom the values and ideology of industrial capitalism do not win unqualified enthusiasm and unquestioning support. In short, those who reject the ideology and values of industrial capitalism are likely to choose careers outside the market-place.' (34)

This uncritical adherence to Parkin's work means that Cotgrove and Duff are not alert to the possibility that there may be a connection between welfare state and environmentalist forms of life. In addition, it is unclear what is meant by the phrase 'subsystems of industrial societies', or how 'non-capitalist elements' could exist in capitalist society; such phrasing suggests an analytical understanding predicated purely upon the the level of values and ideology without a consideration of the social influences experienced by environmentalists which have sponsored an engagement in their distinctive social praxes. Moreover, as can be seen in many of the biographical histories of the interviewees in this study, it is not simply the case that welfare professionals choose this area of employment because they reject the values of industrial capitalism: this study suggests
that state apprenticeships and/or vocational practices, that is to say the welfare state form of life itself, encourages the identification with, and assimilation of, the distinctive ethic which finds expression in disarmament campaigning: to believe that these professionals already possess this ethic prior to entering the world of work is an unwarranted assumption resulting from questionable analytical premises.

Writing from the perspective of a political analyst (and E.N.D. member), John Keane(35) offers a novel view of the relation between the peace movement and the British state. Keane argues that the contemporary movement 'in respect of its anti-statism undoubtedly constitutes an important and new phase of the struggle for renewing and enriching old British traditions: parliamentary democracy, independent public criticism, and suspicion of overextended state power.'(36) Keane proposes that the peace movement not only implicitly challenges the power of the state but, in addition, its own decentralised and diverse internal organisation stands in strong contrast to the bureaucratic apparatus of the state itself. This leads Keane to suggest that:

'If these anti-state and pluralistic features of the new British peace movement are considered together, it is not implausible to suggest that the decisive significance and political potential of the movement lies in its militant defense of a democratic civil society against the state.'(37)

In Keane's article, members of the peace movement are characterised as agents of civil society resisting the imposition of newly extended 'state power' issued in under the guise of strengthening the British deterrent. Keane, after castigating the
peace movement for its 'tendency to moralism', its chauvanistic aspects and negative aims, proposes an E.N.D. inspired strategy involving the inclusion of wider European political goals and the adoption of the recommendations contained within the report of the Alternative Defence Commission, Defence without The Bomb. (38)

Keane's article is undoubtedly thought provoking and original; however, it rests upon the questionable belief that members of the British peace movement are best seen as defenders of 'civil society'. All the available evidence on the social bases of support for CND, and the peace movement in general, seems to contradict Keane's central position; in the membership of the peace movements, welfare state employees have the highest profile. This is especially true of the European Nuclear Disarmament movement; E.N.D. is very largely comprised of teachers, lecturers and students. (39) Rather than an opposition of civil society to the state, the peace movement can be perhaps more accurately described as one section of the state (the welfare section), protesting against the practices of its 'warfare' counterpart: that British post-War society should have evolved in this fashion, spawning its own fiercest critics is, I believe, the most significant implication of my study.

Welfare State Radicalism

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is a composite, and the constituent ideologies and praxes share both similarities and differences; that they exist in a state of overlapping harmony and tension is a most important characteristic of CND as a form
of life. Nevertheless, one of the strands that goes to make up CND is of particular importance: the social bases of support for the Campaign is largely drawn from a socially formed constituency which has a special relationship to the state.

The genesis of this 'state class' with its distinctive politics points to a post-War duality in the structure of the British state, a significant and possibly insufficiently recognised social dynamic; (if, as seems likely, this 'state class' has provided the membership bases for the 'new' social movements, then their political impact has already been marked). The British state is both welfare Dr. Jekyll and nuclear Mr. Hyde: the concomitant problems of legitimation to which this potentially gives rise might have been containable in the past, but in a period of increased weapons deployment and attacks upon the welfare state this problem becomes more acute.

Recognition of the dangers of a nuclear 'deterrence' policy and its political ramifications seems to have eluded many social analysts. Like the actual historical event itself, the crucial decision to build a national nuclear deterrent does not figure as the harbinger of a major change in the structural character of post-War society in standard political and social histories of the period. (40) Not until public concern mounted over fall-out from weapons testing, Duncan Sandys made Britain's reliance on nuclear weapons explicit in his 1957 White Paper on Defence ('Outline of Future Policy'), and the British government exploded their first hydrogen Bomb in May of the same year, did
the Mr. Hyde of the state make a truly public appearance. However, the social forces sponsoring this immensely important strategy have their roots in the national and international arenas of the War years. This duality in state functions, and the growth of a social class of welfare employees who were to prove the sharpest critics of the state's defence policy, deserves further attention.

Clearly, it would be foolish to deny the importance of the profit motive and the influence of the 'military-industrial complex' when considering the development of the arms race. Nevertheless, right from the earliest days of the M.A.U.D. Committee, it has been the state which has initiated and controlled the production of nuclear arms. Weapons programmes have always been conceived in the light of inter-state politics and in terms of legitimation, social presentation and political control: the Bomb is a state weapon. It should come as no surprise that those who identify most strongly with the ethic of the welfare state - those whose creative praxes is the welfare state - are most affronted by the failings of Britain's defence policy. The protesting and politics of these welfare state employees is couched in the language of the legitimating ideology of the state; they believe they are acting in the common interest and that their Campaign is above politics - as, purportedly, is the state itself.
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Appendix A

Copy of the letter sent to the samples of New Town and Scots City CND members:

No.

Dear ——— CND Member,

I am writing to ask for your help. I am carrying out a study of CND and I would like to talk to you as part of a sample of CND members. I am interested in your views and opinions and your reasons for being a member of the peace movement. Your name was randomly selected for me by your group's secretaries.

I am writing to ask if you would be prepared to help me with my research by being interviewed. In the interview I would like to ask you some informal questions on your views on CND, disarmament matters and general questions. I would like to interview you sometime between the ————; the interview could take place either at your own home, at your place of work, or at my office. Naturally, I would treat any information you give me as being strictly confidential and my research thesis will be written in such a way as to make it impossible for you to be identified individually.

My research is being carried out with the permission and full knowledge of ——— CND's officers who have drawn up a random sample of members for me. If you would like to help me with my
research by being interviewed, please would you fill in Section A overleaf and return this in the enclosed pre-paid envelope. If you decide that you do not wish to be interviewed, please would you score out Section A and return the form blank.

I should perhaps add that I personally support the peace movement and would hope that the findings from my research will be of use to CND and other peace campaigns. It is only by discovering the views of the membership that I can give an accurate portrayal of CND; without the members' co-operation my research will be impossible. If you would like any information about my research, or about the interview, please ring me at the above number or on ______ after 6pm.

I know that in all likelihood you are a very busy person, but I would be very grateful indeed if you would spare me just a little of your time to ensure that my study of CND is as good and representative as possible,

yours sincerely

John Mattausch
If you would like to be interviewed please fill in Section A and return it in the enclosed pre-paid envelope. If you do not wish to participate in this study, just cross out Section A and return the form blank. If you agree to help me, I will be in touch with you soon to arrange the time and place for your interview.

SECTION A

Name:

Address:

Tel. No.

Which day of the week, and at what time of day, would be most convenient for the interview?

Would you prefer the interview to be conducted at your own home, at your place of work, or at my office?
Appendix B

Copy of the semi-structured interview schedule:

Preliminaries:
No. Name: Age: Sex:M/F
Marital Status:
CND and disarmament questions:
Do you just belong to --- CND, or are you a member of National CND as well?
Do you read Sanity?
Do you belong to any other organisation which is against nuclear weapons, or any organisation which is against nuclear energy?
When did you first become interested in the peace movement?
What was it, do you think, that made you become interested at that time?
When did you first join --- CND?
How did you find out about --- CND?
[If applicable] Does your wife/husband support the peace movement?
Do you have close friends who also support the peace movement?
[If subject is old enough] Were you a member of the original CND Movement? [If yes] Do you think it was different in any way from the present Movement? [If no] Why was it, do you think, that you
didn't join?

What sort of activities have you taken part in, in support of the peace movement? (e.g. leafleting, national and local demos, etc.)

What's the best way that people can protest against nuclear weapons?

Have you been to any of CND's meetings? What do you think of them?

Have you ever held any office, like secretary or treasurer, in CND?

Have you ever taken part in any peace protests where you broke a law? [If yes] How did you feel about taking part in this? [If no] Would you feel happy about taking part in peace protesting if it meant breaking the law?

Do you think that peace protesting should always be non-violent? Why?

As you may know, CND's official policy is not to be aligned to any political party; do you think that this is a good policy?

Would you call yourself a pacifist?

Are you interested in, or do you support, campaigns on issues such as poverty in the Third World, or local politics or charities? Do you see any links between these issues and nuclear disarmament?

Why do you think it is that we have an arms race?

Why do you think it is that the majority of the British public don't belong to the peace movement?

Some people argue that matters of defence are best left to the government; what would you say to this?
Would you say that since joining CND you have become more interested in politics in general?
I don't know whether you've got any opinions on this, but why do you think it was that the original CND movement failed to bring about nuclear disarmament?
Do you think that --- CND's members are drawn from all walks of life? How about the national Campaign? [Probe]
Some supporters of CND, for example some of the women at Greenham Common, believe that there is a link between nuclear weapons and male attitudes; do you think there's any truth in this?
Do you believe we will achieve nuclear disarmament?

Employment
Have you got a full-time job? [Probe for details on present employment and work history]
Are you/were you employed by local government?
If you were completely free to choose, what sort of job would you like? Why?
Would you say that you're happy with the way you have to do [the job], or are there any changes you'd like to see brought about?
Do you/did you feel personally involved with your work?
Can I ask what your parents do/did for a living?
And can I ask what your husband's/wife's job is?

Education
Non-Student
Can I ask what exams you've passed? What subjects were they in?
Did you study for any of these qualifications because you thought
they would help you to get a particular job?

Student

Are you an under/post-graduate?

What are you studying?

Did you choose [subject] because you think it will help you get a particular job when you leave college/university?

What sort of job do you hope to get when you leave college? Is this the job you'd want if you were completely free to choose?

[Probe for any work history]

All

Would you say that being a student has changed your views in any way? [Probe for experiences at university]

Politics and miscellaneous

If a General Election were called tomorrow, which party would you want to vote for?

Have you ever belonged to a trade union or a political party?

[Probe for details of activism]

Can I ask you what you would call yourself in political terms?

What about your parents, what would you call them/have called them in political terms?

Apart from her government's defence policies, are there any other of Mrs. Thatchers government's policies that you strongly agree or disagree with?

Are your parents supporters of the peace movement? Did they support the original CND?

And can I ask you about your parents' religious beliefs? Were you brought up as a [religion]? What would you call yourself now?
Many members of the original Movement believed that the original Campaign was a moral issue; do you think that's true today?

**Additional questions for office holders**

How long have you been [office]?

What made you become [office]?

Have you ever held a similar office in any other group you've belonged to?

It must mean a lot of work for you, how much of your time does it take up?

Do you think that —— CND is a successful group? What do you think that —— CND could do in the future to be more successful?

Thankyou very much for your help.
Appendix C

This appendix contains data on the membership of CND and peace movement from studies referred to in this thesis: Parkin (1968), Taylor and Pritchard (1980), Nias (1983), Day and Robbins (1985), from my own two samples, and from a piece of research in progress by Nigel West.

The data in this Appendix cannot be simply compared; each study employed different methodologies and sampled different groups. The purpose of the Appendix is to show, where possible, the high profile of those whom Parkin classified as 'welfare/creative' employees. In addition, where possible, the secondary analyses show the educational attainments of the members. As the data is non-comparable, I have concentrated on highlighting 'welfare/creative' occupations, rather than trying to utilise Parkin's somewhat idiosyncratic three-fold classification (which he only applied to male respondents in social classes 1-4); this focus highlights the over-representation of what I have termed the 'state class' in the membership bases of CND and the peace movement.

I would like to thank Peter Nias and Day and Robbins for kindly lending me their data for secondary analysis. I would also like to thank the Bradford School of Peace Studies for permitting me to visit their department in order to re-analyse Nias's National Demonstration data. Unfortunately, Parkin's and Taylor and Pritchard's data has been destroyed; in Parkin's case because of the passage of time, in Taylor and Pritchard's case in order to preserve the confidentiality of their sample. I received Nigel West's data too late to undertake a secondary analysis.
Table 29: Occupational breakdown of middle class males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Welfare and Creative</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office managers and supervisors</td>
<td>Schoolteachers - 40</td>
<td>Engineers and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clergymen - 11</td>
<td>draughtsmen - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising and sales</td>
<td>Physicians - 10</td>
<td>Civil Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientists - 10</td>
<td>and L.G.O.s - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and banking</td>
<td>Architects - 9</td>
<td>T.U. and Co-Op - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Lecturers - 8</td>
<td>Mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>Social Workers - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>Journalists - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artists/Novelists - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.P.s - 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians - 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p 180) NOTE: these are male respondents in Social Class 1-4 only; the 163 respondents in this group =approx. 80% of the male sample:

"Because so many of the female respondents classified themselves as housewives or part-time workers it was decided not to include them in the table. However, amongst those who were employed a pattern similar to the male respondents was found - with teaching again being by far the commonest occupation."

Table 30  Commercial and non-commercial employment (male respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Social Class(^{(1)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial, profit-making organisations</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-commercial, non-profit making organisations and freelance</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 100 100
(N=53) (N=110) (N=39)

(p 189)

(1) Hall - Jones scale

\[ \text{N: Committee of 100 (C.100) } = 206 (51\%) \text{ of which 68\% male} \]
\[ \text{32\% female} \]
\[ \text{The Rest = 197 (49\%) of which 62\% male} \]
\[ \text{38\% female} \]

Total N = 403

Would you please state your occupation (please be as detailed as you can):

a) at the time of your involvement with the disarmament movement between 1958 and 1965:

Social Class\(^{(1)}\)  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8
C.100 5 11 50 24 8 1 1 1
Rest 11 22 46 16 6 0 0 0

b) now:

C.100 24 27 26 7 5 1 1 8
Rest 22 29 24 6 3 0 0 16

(1) Registrar General classifications
At what age did you complete full-time education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13+</th>
<th>15+</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>18+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details of your educational qualifications (e.g. GCE; Diplomas; Degrees):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>O-Levels</th>
<th>A-Levels</th>
<th>Diploma and Professional</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(pp 149-150)
CND National Membership Survey: Summer 1982

'Method A two page postal questionnaire and a covering letter were sent to a random sample of the national CND membership in late August 1982. From the 413 sent out, 299 or 72% replied. This is a good response from a postal survey (which included a SAE). It is a statistically representative sample of just over 1% of the national membership (the sample error on the whole sample is 6%). This means that the results can be applied to the national membership as a whole within that safety margin.' (Nias, p1 of Survey Report).

Mattausch: Secondary Analysis

Total analysable = 282 (148 male and 134 female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Welfare/Creative</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Student/Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men (%)</td>
<td>64 (43%)</td>
<td>53 (36%)</td>
<td>31 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (%)</td>
<td>70 (52%)</td>
<td>32 (24%)</td>
<td>32 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men + Women (%)</td>
<td>134 (48%)</td>
<td>85 (30%)</td>
<td>63 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men + Women: Welfare/Creative + Students/Pupils = 70%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Rest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare/Creative</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Welfare Workers</td>
<td>Clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Reps./Salesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists/Media</td>
<td>Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>*Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists</td>
<td>Engineering Exec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians</td>
<td>Telecomms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>Banker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign Organiser</td>
<td>Insurance Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Sales Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Building Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculptor</td>
<td>Factory/Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodworker</td>
<td>Civil Svts./LGOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Clerk of Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Vice-Principal</td>
<td>Riding Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>Toolmaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Info. Officer</td>
<td>Taxi-Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>Houseperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab. Technician</td>
<td>Postal Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draughtsman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students(1)</td>
<td>- 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Pupils</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                           | 31                            |

* working in industry
(1) includes mature students
### Females

#### Welfare/Creative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Welfare Workers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses/Health Workers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity/Voluntary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers/Novelists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists/Media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Gospel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Adviser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Guide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Assts.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Ops.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booksellers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servants</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housepersons</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Students (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (1)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total               | 32    |

(1) includes mature students
Method A statistically representative random sample of 768 marchers was interviewed by students from Bradford University. Each interviewee wore a CND identification badge signed by Bruce Kent. The three legs of the march were surveyed equally while the march was in progress. There were very few refusals (under 10%). The statistical error on the whole sample is 4%, which means that the results can be applied to the march as a whole within that safety margin.' (Nias, pl of Survey Report)

Mattausch: Secondary Analysis

Total number of questionnaires available for analysis = 755 (387 male, 360 female, 8 unspecified).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MALE(\%)} & \quad + \quad \text{FEMALE(\%)} & \quad = \quad \text{TOTAL(\%)} \\
1) \text{NO OCCUPATION GIVEN:} & \quad 60 \quad & \quad 70 \quad & \quad 130 \\
\text{ANALYSABLE:} & \quad 327(53\%) \quad & \quad 290(47\%) \quad & \quad 617 \\
2) \text{WELFARE @ CREATIVE:} & \quad 129(39\%) \quad & \quad 141(49\%) \quad & \quad 270(44\%) \\
3) \text{STUDENTS:} & \quad 43(13\%) \quad & \quad 63(22\%) \quad & \quad 106(17\%) \\
\text{SCHOOL PUPILS:} & \quad 20(6\%) \quad & \quad 24(8\%) \quad & \quad 44(7\%) \\
4) \text{REST:} & \quad 135(41\%) \quad & \quad 62(21\%) \quad & \quad 197(32\%)
\end{align*}
\]

Notes

1) Questionnaires where no past or present occupations were given. 'Analysable' refers to questionnaires giving past or present jobs; note that the person interviewed may have been unemployed (approximately 13% of total sample) but has given a previous occupation.
3) On the questionnaire this is given as one category ('school/student'). I have classified those marchers aged '16 and under' as school pupils, those aged 17-24 as students (figures also include mature students).

4) 'Rest' means occupations which do not clearly fall into the 'welfare and creative' category; again, may include unemployed marchers who gave a previous occupation.

5) Percentages of total analysable questionnaires.

It should be noted that this demonstration was held whilst the Falklands War was in progress and that the demonstration may have attracted those wishing to protest against the government on this issue (88% of the total sample disagreed with 'the British policy on the Falklands issue.') Moreover, these were demonstrators and not necessarily members of national CND or any other peace movement.

Clearly, when conducting a survey of this kind it is unlikely that those approached will give usefully specific answers regarding their occupations. Predictably, the sample contains many 'clerks', 'administrators', etc. I have only selected those for the 'welfare and creative' category where it is clear that they are eligible; it is likely that more specific answers would have revealed more 'welfare and creative' workers.

FEMALE

N = 360

1) No occupation given = 70 (Housepersons = 34, Unemployed = 20,
Retired = 11, Other = 5)

2) 'Welfare and creative' = 141

   Teachers = 43          Arts and crafts = 5
   Social/Community Workers = 27       Scientists = 3
   Nurses = 16          Librarians/Archvsts = 3
   Lecturers = 10        Media = 3
   Voluntary/Charity work = 6          Doctors = 2
   Therapists/Analysts = 6          Researchers = 2
   Journalists = 6        Other = 9

3) Students = 63

   School
   pupils = 24

4) Rest = 62
MALE

N = 387

1) No occupation given = 60 (On govt. scheme = 3, Illegible = 6, Retired = 7, Unemployed = 40, Other = 2)

2) 'Welfare and Creative' = 129

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Community workers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and crafts</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutors/Instructors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal sector</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.U./political workers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Students = 43

School

pupils = 20

4) Rest = 135

Mattausch: Secondary Analysis

N = 47, of which 46 analysable (23 male and 23 female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Welfare/Creative</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher Education/Professional Qualification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes students*
MALE

Welfare and Creative = 15 (15)

Designer and Artist (Teaching diploma)
University Lecturer (Ph.D.)
University Professor (Ph.D.)
Research Assistant (Degree and Teaching diploma)
Retired University Lecturer/Author (Degree)
Congregational Minister (Degree)
Organiser for Student Christian Movement (Degree)
Working in Community Project (Degree)
Retired University Lecturer (Ph.D.)
University Lecturer (Degree)
Retired University Lecturer (Degree)
University Lecturer (Degree and Postgrad.)
Community Psychiatric Nurse (Teaching and Nursing Qualifications)
Teacher and Political Activist (?)
Lecturer (Degree and Ph.D.)

Rest = 7 (6)

Self-Employed Carpenter (Degree)
Administrator in Arts Centre (Degree and Teaching Diploma)
Ex-Government Civil Engineer, runs wholefood cafe (Degree)
Ex-Wing Commander R.A.F., now Arts Centre manager (Left university to join R.A.F.)
Retired Civil Servant (Diploma in Agriculture and Estate Management)
Virologist Civil Servant (Degree)
Retired Shop-keeper (-)

Students
1
FEMALE

Welfare and Creative = 10 (9)

Teacher/Artist (Degree)
Librarian (Librarian qualifications)
Ex-Teacher (Teacher training)
Teacher/Author (Degree)
University Lecturer (Degree)
Social Worker (Degree)
Librarian (Degree and Librarian qualification)
Teacher/Artist (Degree)
Journalist/Television Presenter (Degree)
Music Tutor (Singing qualification)

Rest = 10 (8)

proprietor of wholefood shop (Degree and Postgraduate courses in nursing and teaching)
Secretary at Library College (Degree)
Housewife (Training College)
Wife of Presbyterian Minister (Degree and Teaching Certificate)
Administrator for Theatre Company (Degree)
Secretary in Arts Centre (shortly returning as mature student)
Pensioner (-)
Civil Servant (Degree and Librarian qualification)
Not working (Degree and Teacher training)
Housewife (Degree and Nursing qualification)

Students

Student (Ex-Nurse, nursing qualifications)
2 Mature Students
MATTAUSCH, J.

NEW TOWN SAMPLE

N = 20 (14 female and 6 male)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WELFARE/CREATIVE</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HIGHER EDUCATION/PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scots City Sample

N = 42 (19 male and 23 female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WELFARE/CREATIVE</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*HIGHER EDUCATION/PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes students
New Town Sample

MALE

Welfare and Creative = 2 (1)

Unemployed Teacher (Degree and P.G.C.E.)
Psychiatric Therapist (-)

Rest = 4 (0)

Ex-R.A.F. Engineer (R.A.F. Engineer trained)
Retired Building Worker (-)
Civil Servant (O and A-Levels)
Retired Instrument Maker (-)

FEMALE

Welfare and Creative = 8 (7)

Teacher (Degree)
Teacher (Teacher training)
Retired Housing Manager (Degree)
Retired Social Worker and Teacher (Diploma in Social Studies)
Unemployed, Voluntary Worker (-)
Retired Teacher (Teaching certificate)
Ex-Solicitor, C.A.B. worker (Articled lawyer and uncompleted degree)
Unemployed Teacher (Teaching certificate)

Rest = 6 (1)

Ex-Labour Exchange Officer (now studying for Social Work Diploma)
Retired Mill Worker and Shop Assistant (-)
Housewife, never worked (-)
Retired Print Worker (-)
Housewife, never worked (-)
Insurance Clerk (O-Levels)
Scots City Sample

MALE

Welfare and Creative = 11 (11)

Community Worker (Degree and C.Q.S.W.)
Doctor (Degree)
Lecturer (O.N.C., Degree and M.A.)
Ex-Social Worker, now Manager of voluntary scheme (C.Q.S.W.)
Teacher (Degree and P.G.C.E.)
Psychotherapist (Degree and Psychotherapy Diploma)
Teacher (Degree and Teaching certificate)
Composer and Author (Degree)
Musician (Degree)
Freelance Journalist (Degree)
Solicitor (Degree)

Rest = 7 (3)

Retired Bookbinder and T.U. official (School Leaving Certificate)
Ex-R.A.F., now unemployed (O.U. Degree)
Retired Civil Servant (Lowers)
Electronics Assembler (City and Guilds)
Assurance Salesman, Ex-Gas Fitter (O.N.C.)
Engineer (Degree)
Civil Engineer (Degree)

Students

1
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FEMALE

Welfare and Creative = 17 (15)

Teacher (M.A. and P.G.C.E.)
Housewife, Ex-Nurse (Army Nursing Certificate)
Community Education Worker (Teaching Certificate)
Director of Charity, Ex-Social Worker (B.A. and C.Q.S.W.)
N.H.S. Statistician (Degree and M.A.)
Unemployed, Ex-Community Housing Worker and Arts Trade (Lowers)
Unemployed, Ex-Community Worker (Degree)
Housewife/Speech Therapist (Speech Therapy and Drama Diplomas)
Social Worker (Degree and C.Q.S.W.)
Teacher (Degree)
Staff Nurse (Nursing Certificate)
Unemployed, Ex-Nurse (Lowers)
Retired University Lecturer (Degree and M.A.)
Doctor (Degree)
Ex-Librarian, Voluntary Community Worker (Degree)
Teacher (Degree)
Unemployed graduate (Degree)

Rest = 4 (1)

Electronics Assembler (Lowers and City and Guilds)
Clerical Officer with hotel group (O-Levels)
Typist with firm of solicitors (Teaching Certificate)
Housewife (Highers)

Students

2
Survey Of People Travelling To The National C.N.D.
Demonstration, London, October 26th, 1985

The survey was completed by people on six coaches travelling from Bradford, Leeds, Norwich, Retford/Doncaster and Sheffield.

N = 241
Female = 60%
Male = 39%
n.k. = 1%

Occupation
Teacher/Lecturer = 13%
Other public sector non-manual = 14%
Private sector non-manual = 7%
Public sector manual = 3%
Private sector manual = 2%
Self-Employed = 4%
Student = 39%
Unwaged Childcare = 3%
Registered Unemployed = 12%
Retired = 2%
Other = 1%

Educational Qualifications
Higher Education
(e.g. Degree, Cert.Ed., C.Q.S.W.) = 52%
To 'A' Level = 14%
To 'O' Level, and still studying = 13%
To 'O' Level = 8%
To C.S.E. = 1%
None, but still studying = 10%
None = 2%
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