same general, but to make sure that he was in civilian clothes and not in uniform. If Kissinger, after the briefing by the general in civilian clothes, still found the doctrine convincing, he, Adenauer, would be happy to listen to him seriously.

A very insightful perspective of civil-military relations in the US is afforded in Manchester's "Death of a President." McNamara, then secretary of defence, and under the president the civilian boss of the entire US military establishment, had gone to Arlington Cemetery to see the grave site of the slain president, John Kennedy, before the funeral ceremonies, when it began to rain heavily. With the defence secretary were two other cabinet officers, Interior Secretary Udall and Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Standing in pouring rain for over an hour, without raincoat or protective gear, McNamara was quite drenched. The military brass present were "buttoned up in foul-weather gear and never thought to share their protection with the civilians." McNamara, reportedly, was not surprised that not one of his subordinates among the military offered him his own oilskin. The man in uniform in the US defers to only one civilian, his Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States!

General of the Army, Bradley, in his memoirs, was emphatic that a general should never aspire to the presidency. I do not know if a similar inhibition weighed down General Colin Powell -- his successor several times removed as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- who declined to run for president in 1996, notwithstanding that successive polls showed him to be easily the strongest Republican candidate. An American friend attributed Powell's reluctance to Mrs. Powell's distaste for the hustings and, perhaps, also a shrewd assessment that one could not realistically hope to be the first black president of the US without the wholehearted



endorsement of the major black organisations.

Generals, more than any other breed or category of people, are primed for, and are often the products of, war. With very few exceptions -- like possibly Patton -- they are not as a class "war lovers" because, again more than any other class of people, they know what war is about. General Sherman (West Point, 1840), next only to Grant (West Point 1843) in fame and renown among the Union generals during the US Civil War, characterised war at different times very succinctly and aptly as "cruelty" that cannot be "refined," as "at best barbarism," its glory being "all moonshine," and as "hell."

Generals assuredly need to be professional and realistic, ready for whatever task they may be called upon to do. For as General Marshall put it so wryly in his Biennial Report to the US Congress as Chief of Army Staff in 1945: "If man does find the solution for world peace, it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known."

In 1945, Unesco was set up, as its preamble puts it, to construct the defences of peace in the minds of men. It has had only limited and unspectacular success. Former UN Secretary General Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali in his seminal report, Agenda for Peace, wrote in 1992 that since 1945 there had been over 100 major conflicts around the world resulting in over 20 million deaths. In the intervening years since the report was written, these numbers could only have increased. Lester Pearson, the Nobel Laureate for Peace, once made the startling, or not so startling, admission that men liked war: "We like the excitement of it, its thrill and glamour, its freedom from restraint ... And we like taking chances with death." Another Nobel Laureate -- for literature -- and also a pacifist and philosopher, Bertrand Russell wrote in 1967 of having discovered to his amazement that "average men and women were delighted at the prospect of war."

Is there then to be no answer to the threat of war? US philosopher William James, writing in 1902, offered a plausible if abstract prescription which almost anticipates the preamble of Unesco and supplements Dulles' observation to which referred earlier. James wrote: "What we need to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war: Something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does, and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible."

Megasthenes *is an eminent Bangladeshi columnist.*