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Highly appropriate to Lord Soames' speech herein, this cartoon by Cummings appeared in The Daily Express on 29 January 1954, when the cacophony for Churchill to retire had reached a crescendo. The new ICS logo, from the Churchill side of the Coat of Arms, was provided by Harvey W. Greisman.
WOULD CHURCHILL SUPPORT SDK

Never since his death has Sir Winston Churchill been more quoted than during the current twin debates on Strategic Defense and Disarmament. Pamela Harriman's article herein, stressing the "Plea For Peace" in Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech, suggests that Sir Winston would be among the strongest supporters of that final understanding with the Soviet Union which proponents of the INF Treaty say is now possible. Her article, latest in our "Opinion" series, will certainly spark debate — as did Jim Courter's "Sir Winston's Wisdom and SDF" (FH 52).

Of course it is hazardous for anyone to use Churchill's words "both to validate and to condemn," as Professor James Callahan put it in FH 56. Sir Winston's thought was too complex to be reduced to simplistic, single-issue formulations. It is presumptuous to insist that he would react this way or that to today's issues. But likewise to conclude, because we now face ICBMs and hydrogen bombs instead of German airplanes and TNT, that Churchill's wisdom no longer applies is equally simplistic. People haven't changed, and on the world stage Churchill was a shrewd judge of people. I would not sit in the editor's chair if I did not think Sir Winston's words had an almost eerie applicability to the present. Studying and learning from them is one of the reasons why the Churchill Society exists.

There is room to argue that Mrs. Harriman and Mr. Courter are both right: that Churchill would probably support both the INF Treaty and the Strategic Defense Initiative. I say "probably" with great caution. We must not mistake con- jecture for certainty. Churchill often said that defensive weapons were preferable to offensive ones. In his 1924 article, "Shall We All Commit Suicide?" (Woods C114, and A33, reprinted in Thoughts and Adventures), after predicting the advent of guided missiles carrying fearsome bombs — quoted eloquently by Mrs. Harriman — he gives an almost uncanny description of what today we call SDF:

In the sombre paths of destructive science there was one new turning-point which seemed to promise a corrective to these mortal tendencies. It might have been hoped that the electro-magnetic waves would in certain scales be found capable of detonating explosives of all kinds from a great distance. Were such a process discovered in time to become common property, War would in important respects return again to the crude but healthy limits of the barbarous ages.

There is nothing in the Churchill canon that might lead us to believe Sir Winston would feel any differently about "detonating explosives from a great distance," in outer space for instance, 64 years later.

The argument that Churchill would simultaneously favor the dialogue now going on between Moscow and the West is equally strong. As Lord Soames said in his 1979 Edmonton speech (also published herein), this possibility, "tired and weary though he was," kept WSC "battling on." The supreme disappointment in his life was the failure — after Yalta and again after Stalin's death — to achieve unequivocal peace. He remained, however, a realist. It is fascinating to consider how he would react to Gorbachev, working downtown Washington crowds.

America's Public Radio, in a rare burst of reality, offered this warning by commentator Peggy Noonan: Gorbachev's attempt to humanize himself "is done so well we feel ungracious to point out the truth. But, you have heard of the Gulag, yes? Well he is the warden. You have heard of the toy-bombs that the Afghan children pick up, and lose their hands? He is the foreman of the toy-bomb factory . . . See those teeth? Those are the bars Christians and Jews cannot get past." Churchill might say: Don't misunderstand him — but recognize reality and deal from strength.

"The dangers which threaten the tranquility of the modern world come not from those powers that have become interdependent upon others, interwoven by commerce with other states," Churchill said. "They come from those powers which are more or less aloof from the general intercourse of mankind, and are comparatively independent and self-supporting."

Was he referring to Nazi Germany, or the Soviet Union? No. Churchill spoke those words in the House on 8 March 1905, at the age of 30.

— RML
BOOKLETS
NEW HAMPSHIRE, JAN 17th — The Churchill Literary Foundation will produce two booklet-style publications this year: The Annotated Chartwell Bulletins, 1935, and Proceedings of the International Churchill Society, 1987. The Bulletins, Churchill’s fascinating letters to his absent wife about life at Chartwell and contemporary politics, are being annotated by official biographer Martin Gilbert. Publication will occur as soon as Prof. Gilbert completes the manuscript.

Society functions in Britain and the USA last year resulted in eight speeches of varying length, notably by Robert Hardy, Sir Fitzroy Maclean, Grace Hamblin and Representative Jim Courter, all highly illuminating, on diverse themes. Since publishing all these in Finest Hour would require the bulk of two full issues, we have decided to publish them as a group, together with the introductions, in the Foundation’s Oral History Series. Work on the Proceedings is now in progress.

SMITH ON NEILSON
Stanley Smith’s reviews of revisionist Francis Neilson’s attacks on Churchill’s war memoirs (FH 51, 53, 55) will continue next issue.

ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA
In J.K. Galbraith’s article on the Companion Volumes (last issue, pp 8-9), we failed to provide the complete credit line, which we now publish, with apologies to Houghton Mifflin:


On page 17 of our last issue, the Highland dancer is Eileen Ross (not “Elaine”). Sorry!

In the “Collected Works” story on pp 12-14, we have now examined a set and find that the Marlborough text is from the US first edition (not the 2-volume British), and the Malakand is from the Silver Library edition (not the Nelson).

NEW "FH" FEATURES
Two new columns will appear periodically one starting in this issue: "Churchill Trivia,” (questions arranged in six categories to eventually be played with special cards on “Trivial Pursuit” boards); and “English-Speaking Peoples” (a news column designed to keep members abreast of important news in the five English-speaking nations which receives inadequate attention outside their borders.)

CHARTWELL GROUNDS DEVASTATED
WESTHAM, KENT, OCTOBER — The freak hurricane which demolished vast tracts of southern England wrecked particular havoc at Chartwell, which many believe will never look the same again. The morning after the storm, not a single tree was left standing in the orchard, and the vista shown in the photo last issue (page 17) has disappeared. Although I live only a mile down the road from Chartwell, it was a week before it was possible to negotiate all the fallen trees across the road. It is tragic.

Certain proposals are being placed before the ICS Board of Directors to assist in the mammoth job of repair and replanting; members will be hearing about these directly. - EA RODWAY

International Churchill Society invites you to join the Hawaii Chapter

HAWAII CHAPTER ORGANIZING
HONOLULU, USA, JAN 6TH — Cdr. Larry Kryshe, USN, is circulating an attractive ICS membership invitation to ten military bases on Oahu and several British pubs and restaurants. When the Hawaii Chapter reaches 100 strong, Larry, please organise a convention for us! Bravo Zulu.

BLENHEIM IN THE DUNES
JEDDAH, SAUDI ARABIA — An astonishing near-replica of Blenheim Palace is arising here: a concrete and stucco version of Vanbrugh’s masterpiece by Jordanian architect Akram Abu Hamdan, created for an oil magnate. The £5 million replica is, however, on a much smaller scale and the detail architecture is simplified. When questioned as to why he did not seek any permissions from the Duke of Marlborough, Hamdan says, “Did Vanbrugh ask Palladio’s permission?” Hmm . . .

PEACE IN OUR TIME?
LONDON, SEPT 3RD — Westminster Council and the Department of Transport are considering closing Parliament Square to private cars, which would rescue the Roberts-Jones statue of WSC from the roar and fumes of one of London’s busiest roundabouts. “We are trying to make Parliament Square more user-friendly,” say Halcrow Fox, the engineering firm which spent eight months studying the problem. Their proposals, which include tunnels to relieve congestion, are said to find favour with Mrs. Thatcher, who has privately expressed concern at the need to give Parliament a more dignified setting. -LONDON DAILY NEWS

"WINNIE" OPENS APRIL 15TH
VANCOUVER, BC, OCT 21ST — Marlborough Productions Ltd. announces the opening of the stage play based on Sir Winston Churchill (see FH 53 p. 6) on Friday April 15th at the Opera House, Manchester, England, and move to the Victoria Palace, London for May 18th. ICS honorary member Robert Hardy plays the title role, with Albert Marre (“Man of La Mancha,” “Kismet”) directing. Ticket sales opened in December in both London and North America.

There will be no "dark nights" between the Manchester and London productions, and the first two weeks in London are designated as a Royal Charity Production, with press night set for May 31st. With a weekly gate of £163,000, the play needs only 44% of capacity to break even.
Rest in Peace

William Sterling Cole

MARCH 18TH — The outspoken American congressman who once explained the hydrogen bomb's power to Sir Winston died this day aged 82.

The PM had said that nuclear weapons would be "unlikely to be more dangerous" than conventional weapons. Cole put him right on a visit to Washington in 1954, and WSC sang Cole's praises on returning home. "I was astounded by all he said about the bomb," Churchill told the House of Commons. "Considering what immense difference the facts he disclosed made for our whole outlook on defence, I was deeply concerned about the lack of information." Cole's plain-speaking, which highlighted the extent to which the Americans had kept Britain in the dark about atomic secrets, did much to reestablish free exchange of US-UK nuclear research.

Sir John Colville

LONDON, NOV 16TH — ICS Honorary Member Sir John Colville, principal private secretary to Prime Minister Chamberlain in 1939, and in September that year flew on 40 operations as an RAF pilot. He stayed at Number 10 when Churchill succeeded Chamberlain in May, 1940, and, with an interruption for further RAF service, remained through 1941 including 1942 which he founded the European Integration Society.

Clare Boothe Luce

WASHINGTON, DC, OCTOBER 14TH — I think back on her career . . . Look, you are a young, beautiful woman. Pearl Harbor was only yesterday, and you have spent several months poking about disconsolate Allied fronts in Asia and the Middle East. You have already written a long analysis, cruelly objective, about Allied disorder, infinitely embarrassing to the Allies and correspondingly useful to the Axis powers. On the last leg of your journey, a sharp-eyed British customs officer in Trinidad insists on examining your papers. His eyes pass over your journal, he reads in it, snaps it shut, and calls in British security, which packs you off under house arrest. What do you do?

Well, if you are Clare Boothe Luce, you get in touch with the American consul, which gets a message through to your husband, Henry Luce, who calls General Donovan, the head of U.S. Intelligence. General Donovan arranges to appoint you retroactively an intelligence official of the U.S. Government. The British agree to let you fly to New York, and there they turn your report over to the British ambassador. He is so shaken by it that he instantly advices Winston Churchill of its contents. Churchill pauses from the war effort to cable back his regards to Clare, who meanwhile has been asked by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to brief them on her analyses, which, suitably bowdlerized, appear in successive issues of Life magazine and are a journalistic sensation.

Thus passeth a week in the life of the deceased.

On October 14th in Washington, Clare's doctor confided to the White House that Clare would not live out the week, and that no doubt she would be pleased by a telephone call. The President called that night. Her attendant announced to her who it was who was calling. Clare Boothe Luce shook her head. You see, she would not speak to anyone she could not simultaneously entertain, and she could no longer do this. The call was diplomatically turned aside. The performer knew she had given her last performance, but at least she had never failed. - WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.

Lord Duncan-Sandys

LONDON, NOVEMBER 26TH — One of the last survivors of Sir Winston's wartime cabinet and a statesman who presided over the dismantling of the British Empire died today aged 79. Married to Diana Churchill from 1935 to 1960, he was the father of a son and two daughters, the latter, Edwina and Celia, being complimentary members of the Churchill Society.

Duncan Sandys ran Britain's bombing program during World War II, after which he founded the European Union, precursor to the EEC. Between 1960 and 1964 he was Harold Macmillan's chief minister in charge of steering 11 colonies and territories to independence. Later he was appointed to the House of Lords where, like Macmillan, he developed a reputation as a political maverick.

Said former PM Edward Heath, "He was always admired for his fearless integrity in political life and for his immense command of those subjects in which he was dealing."

 Fluent in French, Russian and German, Sandys was sent to Berlin as Hitler came to power, and promptly infuriated his ambassador by getting himself an appointment with the Nazi chancellor. Disenchanted with protocol restrictions, he left the foreign service in 1933. Elected to Parliament in 1935, he was one of Churchill's few allies in the battle against appeasement. An Army officer in 1939, he was wounded in Norway the following year, and sent home. He was charged with the defense of London when Hitler unleashed the V-1 and V-2 rockets.

After 1974, Lord Duncan-Sandys pursued business interests and became chairman of the Lonrho conglomerate in 1983. - SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE

Mr. Buckley's words are excerpted from his obituary for Mrs. Luce from the 6 November 1987 issue of National Review, by kind permission.
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Christopher Soames: Tributes By His Friends

Remembering The Late Lord Soames of Fletching, C.H.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Soames of Fletching, CH, GCMG, GCVO, CBE, PC, who died on 16th September last, was one of this Society's most distinguished and beloved Honorary Members. Beyond our own tribute, which appeared last issue, we thought it appropriate to request a few lines from certain individual members of the Society who knew him well. These include a tribute by the late Sir John Colville, another ICS member who died exactly one month later; they are probably the last ever of Sir John's notable contributions to history.

We commence with a piece by a member of the Loyal Opposition, whose generous remembrance shows how well Christopher Soames was respected on both sides of the aisle, a status also enjoyed by his father-in-law before him.

EUROPE'S BIRD OF BRIGHT PLUMAGE

Christopher Soames was a man whom it was difficult not to notice but easy to misjudge. The superficial case against him, I suppose, would be that he was a noisy hedonist who based a successful career on a wise choice of father-in-law. This is unfair on every ground except that of noise. Nepotism may have given him a useful start but it can hardly be argued on the form that a filial relationship to Churchill was an automatic passport to political success. It was very much Soames's own verve and judgment, combined with the confidence and affection which he had previously earned from Churchill, which enabled him in 1953 to exercise far more power than any other parliamentary private secretary, before or since, has ever contemplated. Furthermore, he had three times to remount his own career, and did so with considerable success, long after Churchill had disappeared from the scene.

He was a hedonist in the sense that he enjoyed the pursuit and giving of pleasure. He was a very good guest and a spectacular host, but just as much because of the buoyancy of his companionship as because of the quality and quantity of his victuals. But indulgence was only fully satisfying to him if it was part of the trappings of a major political enterprise, like the bottle of champagne which is smashed when a great ship is released into the water.

And his political purposes were never petty. There was a touch of bombast about him, but it was all above the surface. Underneath there was a large reservoir of imaginative statesmanship. His most persistent loyalty was to the European cause. I do not think that he saw the light until the late Fifties — in this he was like most of us. But once he had done so, he was unfaltering in his commitment. It influenced
his work as Minister of Agriculture in the early Sixties, as
ambassador to Paris from 1968 and (obviously) as a vice-

His four years in Brussels were a clear success. I do not
think that the Commission had ever before had a bird of
such bright plumage. Much of its work is humdrum. There
was an obvious danger that Soames's high-style, broad-
brush approach would fail to mesh with the Commission's
attachment to cautious detail, that he would become bored,
and his colleagues and officials critical of his degree of
application.

Nothing of the sort happened. I am told that the work of
the Soames cabinet was conducted more by shouting
through ever open doors than by quiet reading and
ratiocination, but the results were spectacular. He imported
a new panache into the external relations of the Com-
munity (which was his portfolio), without any loss of
negotiating depth, and he quickly made himself a key figure
in the hierarchy of the Commission. A little more poire was
consumed during afternoon sessions both by Christopher
himself and by those who wished to follow his style, but the
effect was beneficial for Europe and for Britain.

People liked working both with and for him. In 1977 we
inherited his cook, a Belgian lady of uncertain age, con-
firmed spinsterhood and untitillating appearance. When he
came to dine and stay nearly a year later it did not surprise
me that she produced a dinner even better than usual. What
did impress me, however, was that she most exceptionally
insisted on going and getting her hair done in preparation
for his arrival.

With all this Brussels achievement behind him he might
very reasonably have expected to become president after his
first four years, particularly as a British appointment was
appropriate. Harold Wilson would gladly have nominated
him. But there was some difficulty with Giscard, no doubt
stemming from Soames's robustness, either in the Commis-
sion or when he was ambassador in Paris. Helmut Schmidt,
as often, rallied to Giscard. So I got the job, and Soames
came back to England and spent 18 months unsuccessfully
looking for a seat before he threw his hand in and became a
peer.

The scene was therefore almost perfectly set (and was
further aided by my first six months going fairly badly) for a
little head-shaking bitchiness, no doubt delivered in sten-
torian whispers, from Christopher. How sad it was that my
inexperience of Brussels and lack of Continental feel sym-
bolised by his much superior French was messing up a great
British opportunity in Europe.

Most people would have done it. He did not. Of that I am
certain. The kindly bush telegraph of Europe would have
relayed it back to me only too quickly. Nor do I think that
he avoided it only by a rigid self-discipline. It was more a
spontaneous generosity allied with a feeling that he and I
were playing on the same British European side.

I had long appreciated the zest of his personality and the
sense of most of his views. After 1977 I knew that they were
accompanied by exceptional generosity and loyalty. The
combination made him both formidable and lovable.

- ROY JENKINS

HE WAS MAGICAL

Any misgivings which Sir Winston's "private office" may
have had about the arrival of Christopher Soames on the
domestic scene in 1947 were soon to be dispelled. They had
passed through the grey days of recouping and re-grouping
after the War, and were settling into a pattern — never dull,
but perhaps routine — and his arrival proved to be a tonic
and an uplifting experience. Not only his helpfulness, but
his good nature and sense of fun spilled over from the family
circle, into the office and throughout the household.

Much has been said about his help to Sir Winston on the
political scene. He also entered enthusiastically into his
plans on the home front. He encouraged him to buy the
farm adjoining Chartwell, to enter the field of racing, and to
acquire a stud farm. When Sir Winston expressed a wish to
have his own private cinema, he encouraged him in this
too. In so many things he was Counsellor, Companion and
Friend to both Sir Winston and Lady Churchill, and it was
obvious how much they loved him.

In 1970 I went with my young goddaughter on a short
visit to Paris, and Mary Soames kindly invited us to lunch at
the Embassy. The impression Christopher made on this
young woman will last all her life. She had not seen him
since; but when we spoke the other day about his death she
said, "I feel very sad. He was magical" ... a strange word
perhaps to use about someone of his intellectual and
physical proportions. But I know what she meant.

- GRACE HAMBLIN

SO MUCH LEFT TO CONTRIBUTE

I first met Christopher shortly after World War II when he
was looking for a constituency. A rather diffident young
man, he was at the beginning of what became a notable
public career. Supremely fortunate in his marriage and with
the encouragement of his great father-in-law, he soon
gained confidence and was able to take advantage of the op-
portunities for which his quickness of mind and judgement
of people, grasp of detail and strong common sense fitted
AN ABILITY TO DISTINGUISH

Among Christopher Soames' many qualities was his ability to distinguish what mattered from what did not. His comments were brief, pungent, to the point; and they were the antithesis of verbosity. When he saw an opportunity he followed it tirelessly, and he nearly always scored a goal. — SIR JOHN COLVILLE

THE FAMILY MAN

Those who had the good fortune to meet Christopher, however briefly, could not but be struck by a charm that immediately put one at ease.

Christopher's achievements are now history and have been acclaimed by his many friends.

But I will always retain a memory of a lesser known Christopher. A Christopher at home amidst his family and children and grandchildren, always finding a spare room or attic available for their frequent visits.

Christopher could not only superintend the cooking, but himself concocted the 'piece de resistance', the sauce, and accessories the ingredients of which, like all good chefs, he kept secretly to himself.

There must be few who knew so well how to enjoy living and also have such a devoted family to share the pleasures at home and also aid the toils of public life. We will miss him very much. — PEREGRINE CHURCHILL

SEMPER PARATUS

During the course of my work on the final volume of the life of Sir Winston Churchill, spanning the years 1945 to 1965, I have come to realize, with every file that I opened, and every episode that I examined, the extent to which Christopher Soames was a supremely devoted son-in-law, companion and guide, ready at all times to help his father-in-law, whether in matters of State, or in the management of Chartwell's farms, or in the challenges of the Turf— always ready to serve, as indeed in the years that followed his father-in-law's death, he served the British people in a series of varied and onerous tasks, all magnificently fulfilled.

— MARTIN GILBERT

SO MANY JOYFUL MEMORIES

On 16th July 1946 Miss Mary Churchill, visiting us for supper, confided that she was in love with a "big cuddly bear." this image Christopher retained in the family for years: bigger, perhaps, but no less cuddly!

He responded immediately to his father-in-law with deep love and affection — never submissive, but ever ready to give a fair appraisal of a situation, whether or not it was what Sir Winston wanted to hear.

As the years passed Christopher took the greatest care of Sir Winston's health. At Chartwell, the master loved to show guests the golden orfe being fed by his own hand, the swimming pool he had designed himself, the herd of Belted Galloway cattle, the black swans. Christopher would disappear, only to be found with his car, ready to make sure Sir Winston did not attempt to climb back up the hill.

Whenever or wherever the Churchill family gathered, fun and laughter was never far away. During a General Election campaign it was usual to break at midday for a snack lunch at home, in between our local canvassing. On one occasion my wife had prepared a salad with king prawns which had been carefully peeled by hand. Like a young boy, unnoticed by us, Christopher was saving his largest prawn to the last. Suddenly there was a cry of anguish, and we saw Sir Winston's fork transferring this morsel to his mouth, with that famous cherubic smile on his face.

Seeing the three "boys" recently reminded me that when Nicholas was quite young I tried to teach him how to transport young frogs in his pocket without harming them. His mother did not approve, and perhaps as a reprimand, Toby the budgerigar was released from its cage. It made straight for my shoulder, where the little beast attempted to extract hairs from my ear — most amusing to father Soames.

We can testify to the names listed as attendees at the Westminster Abbey Memorial Service, at which we were pleased to see the International Churchill Society represented. These give some indication of the measure of the respect and admiration all held for this man.

And it took me back to when Sir Winston was lying in state at Westminster Hall, the catafalque lit by four huge candles. In their dim light we could see Christopher Soames in black morning coat, standing stock still, a man in abject sadness.

Whatever he did for Queen and Country, and this was a very great deal, Christopher also brought much love to the whole Churchill family. — DONALD L. FORBES

The Rt. Hon. Roy H. Jenkins, PC, has been a Member of Parliament since 1948, serving Labour Governments 1964-81 as Minister of Aviation, Home Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Deputy Leader and President of the European Commission. In 1982 he became a founder member of the Social Democratic Party. An author, journalist and broadcaster, Mr. Jenkins has written several excellent books including biographies of Clement Attlee and Herbert Asquith. His remarks are reprinted by kind permission of The Spectator.

Grace Hamblin, OBE, was from 1932 through 1973 a Chartwell secretary, PPS to Lady Churchill, and administrator of Chartwell; she is an honorary member of ICS.

The Viscount De L'isle, VC, KG, had a distinguished military career and served in the second Churchill government of 1951-55.

The late Sir John Colville, CB, CVO, was PPS to Sir Winston during most of the war and again in 1951-55, after which he became a banker and author.

Peregrine Churchill, Sir Winston's nephew, is an engineer and writer, who now serves as managing director of C-Sight Publications, which administers Sir Winston's literary estate.

Martin Gilbert has been Sir Winston's official biographer since 1968 and is an ICS honorary member.

Donald L. Forbes, CBE, served on the Woodford Conservative Committee and was associated with the Churchill family for 40 years.
YOUR HONOUR, Mr. Justice Steer, Mr. Ivany, Gentlemen. You've been so kind to me that I must say there were some moments when I hardly recognized myself.

You referred to the GCMG*, which stands for "God Calls Me God," and then the GCVO**. I received these very close together, and I then received a rude telegram from a friend, who said, "What! Twice a knight at your age?" [Laughter] It's not strictly true, actually, it's about someone else; but it will do ...

Nothing would have more gratified and indeed moved Winston Churchill than to have known how successful has been this Society which he knew had been founded in his closing years here in Edmonton. And what great personal efforts have been made by successive presidents and executives to make a constructive contribution to its work. Indeed it is now one of three well established Winston Churchill Societies, here, in Calgary, and now the new one in Vancouver.

Societies which bear his name are founded not only to preserve his memory but also to keep alive those themes and ideals which were the mainspring of his life's work and achievement. You do me a great honour in inviting me to address you, and I thank you all, and in particular Mr. and Mrs. Ivany, with all my heart on behalf of my wife and myself, for the kindness and hospitality you have shown us.

I follow in the line of distinguished men who combined their own achievements with the experience of having worked closely with Winston Churchill, of having known him as chief, as colleague or as friend and many of them combining all three of these categories. They all possessed a close personal knowledge and indeed affection of Winston, withal at the same time a degree of detachment and evaluation.

I must confess that the first time I met Winston Churchill, it was with some trepidation — not only because he was who he was, but also because I knew I had taken no mean liberty, in that I had proposed marriage to his youngest daughter, blue eyed in more ways than one, not only not seeking his permission, but without even having met him. And after, indeed, Mary and I had spent but a few handful of hours in each other's company.

I met him, it was arranged, when she had dined alone with her parents and I went round to join them afterwards. Any anxieties that I might have felt, and there were some, were immediately swept away by the warmth of their welcome. They were still in the dining room sitting over coffee and brandy. After some time Mary and her mother

*Grand Cross of the Order of St. Mary and St. George
**Grand Cross of the Victorian Order
withdrew and Winston and I sat on at the dinner table discussing all manner of things.

This was the first of many hundreds of such occasions during the 17 years which lay ahead and it was for me the beginning of the most important relationship with another man of all my life: a relationship which spanned the years which took him from his middle seventies to his middle nineties. And me from the middle twenties to my middle forties. And it is this side of Winston, as a loyal and true friend, and the best of all companions that I would like first to talk to you about this evening. For I must tell you that what lives most in my memory is not just a giant among statesmen, but a giant among men: a man of great humanity.

After our marriage in early 1947, Mary and I lived in the farmhouse that was a stone's throw from his beloved Chartwell. He had recently bought the farm and he had made me his manager. In the five years of opposition, those five years from early '47 to late '51, he spent a great deal of his time there. It was his headquarters for his books on the history of the war, and it was there that he liked to entertain his friends and his colleagues and visitors from abroad. During this period, hardly a day went by without my having the chance to spend some hours in his company. He brought me into and discussed with me more and more facets of his life, and as time went on he gave me to a growing degree his affection and his trust. Imagine, what a joy and delight and what an opportunity this was for me, a man in his 20s, to live so close to this great and extraordinary being. For, apart from anything else, he was so full of life and above all such a man of great humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that others who have been your guests on these occasions have, apart from personal reminiscences of their times with Churchill also had a theme to put before you. I would like to dwell on one single period of Winston Churchill's life's work, the only period of which he never wrote about himself, which I witnessed personally. It was the coda to his career: from shortly after the hour of national victory, which also combined for him personal and political defeat, throughout five years of opposition to the political victory of 1951 which saw the Conservative party once more in power and Winston Churchill Prime Minister again until his resignation in 1955. This was a period which I was privileged to witness, personally and intimately, at first hand.

Now there were, first of all, these five years of opposition at Chartwell. We made frequent trips together abroad. Then when he and his party won the 1951 election, he made me his parliamentary private secretary — at first unofficially because he was somewhat frightened of the charge of nepotism. (I think I set myself up as one of the founders of the son-in-law club. Indeed when Peter Jay was sent by Prime Minister Callahan to Washington, I sent him a telegram saying "Welcome to the son-in-law club.") But of much greater importance to me, he admitted me to his small and close personal circle of men with whom virtually everything was discussed. And this gave me the opportunity to observe him closely and constantly for a long period of time.

It has now become fashionable with some people and in
Clementine and Winston Churchill at the Epping Committee Rooms after WSC was returned to power in 1951. As usual, the PM had a quip: A lady in the Balkans, after the 1945 election, said to a British officer, "Poor Mr. Churchill, I suppose now he will be shot." Churchill promptly added, "My friend was able to reassure her by saying that the sentence might be mitigated by various forms of hard labour..."

some quarters to, as it were, write off this last decade of public life and service. There have been revelations about his medical history; and accounts of his personal foibles and the irritation at times caused to his colleagues, by the manner in which he conducted business, or did not conduct it. The fact it that there were in those last years of office whole areas of political administration or activity which he delegated entirely to others, in which a younger prime minister would have taken more of a hand. There was restiveness in political circles, not only within his own party but also within his own government and cabinet.

All these factors have contributed to what I believe is a distorted picture in the minds and expressions of some: of a feeble old man, sustained first as Leader of the Opposition and then as Prime Minister only by the memory of past glories and achievements and by the loyalty and forbearance of his colleagues. Recently, I hear, some colour has been lent to this version, for those who wish to see it thus, by the revelation of Clementine Churchill's own views in her biography, just published by my wife Mary (there's a good plug).

Clementine Churchill was a perfectionist in all aspects of her life, and by no means least in her ambitions and heart's wishes for her husband. She could not bear to contemplate a tarnishing of his bright armour, nor for any to perceive decline in his performance. In our private circle she made no secret of this view, so much so that in 1945 she thought, and I quote from my wife's book, "Winston should, at the victorious conclusion of the war, resign from office and not seek reelection at all. Having led a coalition government and a united nation, she felt very strongly that he should retire rather than become the leader of one half of the nation against the other. To this view Winston was wont to retort that he was not ready to be put upon a pedestal." (Copyright permission sought, graciously granted, and the fee was waived.)

Although, as was her lifelong wont, Clementine having voiced her view fell in loyally with his decision to battle on through thick and thin, she never changed her view on this subject. But I think it important to remember that her feelings in this were undoubtedly influenced by the fact that she was, like many others, feeling the heat and burden of the war's long day. I remember well her saying to me, "Winston may not want to retire, but I do."

I must tell you that deeply though I loved and admired my mother-in-law, neither I nor my wife agreed with her view on this particular point. And I want to avail myself, if you will allow me, of the opportunity given to me by the invitation to address your Society, to put a juster proportion to this picture.

I would like to recall some of the services he rendered in those last years from 1945 to 1955, to his country and indeed the world which, we should recognise and be thankful for. This is not to deny or to conceal the fact that when Winston Churchill embarked on his last lap of public life he was older, not only by years, but by the heavy toll exacted by the toil and the burden of the war years. His extraordinary constitution became impaired and undermined as years went on — by time, by the burden of stress, and by strokes. But his stamina and his strength were still amazing, and a constant wonder even to those who knew him best. His mind-speed was still powerful and clear even if less capable of pyrotechnic effects, and less able to deal with the detailed intricacies of problems.

There was, of course, the reluctance on his part to lay aside the fascinating possibility of the exercise of power again; the endless adventure of governing men. He had no illusions about "next time." There would be no next time. Once he went, that would be it. The long story of his splendid and varied life would be over. And the prospect of brooding over its cooling embers did not appeal to him. But with this reluctance of an old man to retire was combined a simple and sincere conviction that there remained services he could still render his country and world. That he still had a gift to bring. I firmly believe that he was right in this, and that events proved it so. His accumulated wisdom, his immense prestige, and the unique — I use the word advisedly — the unique position he held internationally, put him in a position of influence which can seldom if ever be attributed to any other statesmen down the course of history.

It was natural from the moment Churchill, then 78 years
old, took office once more as Prime Minister in the Autumn of 1951, that there should exist — sometimes openly expressed but more often as a background factor — the question: "How long can he last?" How long, they wondered, would his health stand up to the heavy burdens of leadership and government; how long could he command the loyalty and cohesion of his colleagues and the party? On health, of course, no one knew the answer. He sustained a major stroke in the summer of 1953, and yet he faced the confounded family, colleagues and critics alike by delivering a major oration, in which he made a moving but simple personal declaration. I quote: "If I stay on for the time being, bearing the burden at my age, it is not because of love for power or office. I have had an ample share of both. If I stay it is because I have a feeling that I may, through things that have happened, have an influence about what I care about above all else, the building of a sure and lasting peace."

He was quite well aware that his various illnesses had left their mark. To his wife he wrote in May 1954, referring to an important speech he had to make, and I quote again, "This is a toil which lies ahead of me, and I do not conceal from you that original composition is a greater burden than it used to be, while I still have a horror of having my speeches made for me by others as much as ever I did."

Politically, Churchill felt himself to be secure. He headed a government which included distinguished, brilliant and experienced men as well as young stars, among them Anthony Eden, just rising on the political firmament. His colleagues were mostly loyal, many were old comrades. But they suffered bouts of frustration and irritation, particularly in the last year before Churchill resigned in April of '55, when he himself showed indecision and procrastination in relation to his tenure of office. There were rumblings and grumblings. Churchill remained unmoved. He knew he commanded not only the loyalty of the Tory party, but that his prestige transcended party political barriers and that the country as a whole would not look approvingly upon any form of palace revolt by frustrated or impatient colleagues.

I remember one day about that time when I was travelling in the car with him for the annual luncheon given by the Parliamentary Conservative party for him as leader. I said to him, "I know you're not going, you don't want to go; okay, that's your decision and that's for you to make and no one else. But you must at least show to them that you are aware of these rumblings and grumblings." "All right," he said, "I will."

He made a charming speech, a delightful speech, captivating them. Then, as he was drawing toward the end of his speech, he said, "Christopher tells me [that was a great help!] that some of you think I ought to go. Well, let me tell you. I don't intend to go until either things get a lot better, or I get a lot worse."

Now gentlemen, if he decided in 1945 to remain leader of the Conservative Party, and in 1951 to take over again the burdens of premiership, it was because he had the deep desire to see accomplished, or at least set in motion, some major purposes, each one of which would contribute to his main objective: building a sure and lasting peace. He was among the few, you will remember, who saw clearly from the immediate postwar days the need for a united Europe, if only to prevent a third world war originating in western Europe. He pointed the way with a clear voice which was listened to as none other would have been. Many were astonished when as early as 1946, while the Nuremberg trials were still in progress, Churchill was preaching the necessity for the early return of Germany to a place in the family of nations, and in particular a Franco-German reconciliation. What foresight — and how right he proved to be. At the same time he constantly sought, both in opposition and later in government, to maintain the close relationship between himself and the President of the United States — a link which had played a vital part in the war years and which he still saw as the foundation of the English-speaking peoples — as leading to more hopeful times in those immediate postwar years of uneasy and fragile peace.

Another example of his clear-sightedness is a speech at Fulton, Missouri in March, 1946, when he used the phrase which has now passed into the bleak phraseology of our time. He referred to the "Iron Curtain" which had descended, from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic behind which now lay all the capitals of central and eastern Europe. You may remember that at the time, this factual warning was highly criticised in many quarters on both sides of the Atlantic. Stalin accused him of adopting the position of warmonger. Yet by 1953, when Stalin died, the words "cold war" and "iron curtain" had become commonplace in the vocabulary and accepted, alas, as political facts.

By that time in 1953, Churchill was again Prime Minister. And what I'm going to recall to you now is I think, an excellent example of how immediately flexible he still was in his political thinking and how ready he was to grasp an opportunity.

The Korean War was drawing to its end and Churchill's
belief and instinct was that Stalin's successor, Malenkov, far from being in the same mold as his sinister predecessor, was at heart a man of peace. So he was convinced that this was the time and opportunity to seek to open up and unfreeze western relations with Russia. This, remember, was in 1953, when the United States' nuclear superiority was overwhelming. The word "detente" came into current use more than 20 years later at a time of nuclear parity, and indeed with a threat of Russian nuclear superiority less than a decade away. But it had its genesis in Churchill's mind 20 years earlier, when the relative military strengths were of quite a different order. He did his best to carry with him in his thinking General Eisenhower, who was soon to become President of the United States. But although personally full of warmth, Eisenhower reflected the opposition of his Secretary of State John Foster Dulles — and I must add that Churchill also ran into opposition from his own Secretary of State, Anthony Eden.

Yet he still continued through his own channels to try to get through to Malenkov. Whether Churchill was right or wrong in this we will never know, for in the event Malenkov was soon removed from power and replaced by the redoubtable Khruschev — who was, where international affairs at least were concerned, in the old political mold. But had things gone smoother and more quickly, who knows whether Churchill's instincts might not have proved right and if so, to what extent the course of history would have been altered.

In another area Winston Churchill succeeded in these last years of activity and power to appreciate and to grasp the enormity of the military and geopolitical significance of nuclear power, with all its terrifying, doom-laden implications for humanity. By 1952, Great Britain had become the third power after the United States and Russia to include the atomic bomb in its armoury, and work on the hydrogen bomb had started in Britain at that time. It was due very largely to Churchill's realistic appraisal of the nuclear situation, and his own initiative, that the chief of staff were set out and to think through a new policy for defence. The resulting global strategy paper came to be regarded as a classic among military documents, and had a marked influence also on American thought and policy. When in February, 1954, details of the American tests of the hydrogen bomb began to be publicly known, Churchill immediately grasped the difference in the intensity of destructive power between the two nuclear weapons, and the sinister implications for the world.

A few months later, he again visited President Eisenhower specifically to discuss these new developments, and their talks had a major bearing on world affairs. That meeting with the President in June, 1954 was to be his last as Prime Minister. By early 1955, Winston knew that he must take a final and definite decision to retire. Parliament was now in its fourth year and he knew he couldn't fight another election as Prime Minister. On the first of March 1955 he made his last important Parliamentary pronouncement when he delivered, what could only be called a majesterial speech, on the hydrogen bomb to the House of Commons. He resigned as Prime Minister a month later.

Mr. Chairman, Winston was a great fan of Harry Lauder, who was a homespun popular Scottish comedian, not only in his native Scotland but throughout Britain for many years. Winston knew many of his songs and he became a friend of his. My wife well remembers during the war an occasion when Harry Lauder and her father sat long over luncheon. As he used to say, "Let us command the moment to remain." They sang together many of Winston's favourite songs. But the one that he loved the best seems to epitomize the ragged, dogged resolution of Churchill's public life and particularly of those last ten years from 1945 to 1955:

Keep right on to the end of the road,
Keep right on to the end,
Though the way be long
Let your heart be strong,
Keep right on round the bend.
Though you're tired and weary, still journey on
Till you come to your blessed abode,
Where all you love and you're dreaming of
Will be there, at the end of the road.

It was not granted, Mr. Chairman, to Winston Churchill to keep right on to the very end of his road. Life was to hold on to him for nigh onto another decade. But he kept on as long as the strength lay in him, and I think that future generations will recognize and be grateful for the services he still sought to render — and indeed in great measure did — for his country and the world. Because his heart was strong, and tired and weary as he was, he battled on.
ICS 1987 AGM: Triumph At Dallas
Wendy Reves Puts Companion Volumes "Over the Top"
Fine Speeches and a Musical Tribute at the Adolphus
First Center For Churchill Studies Launched

Wendy Reves, whose support makes our dream possible years ahead of time, with Congressman Jim Courter.

Grace Hamblin spoke on Friday, October 30th to a packed house on her 40 years of Churchill/Chartwell memories.

"THE Churchhill Society's 1987 Annual General Meeting, at the Adolphus Hotel in Dallas October 30-31st last, was more than a tribute to the life and work of Sir Winston. Through the generosity of Wendy Russell Reves, ICS has completely funded the editorial costs of the ten final Companion (Document) Volumes of the official biography, and planned a new Center for Churchill Studies under ICS auspices.

Thanks to Mrs. Reves, over 10% of the necessary funds are already in hand. ICS board chairman Wallace Johnson met in London in February with the principals, and the first new Companion, covering September 1939 to May 1940, will be underway soon.

Hosted by David and Karen Sampson and Naomi and Michael Gottlieb, Dallas was the largest and most successful AGM to date. Guest speakers at the two black tie dinners were Hon. Member Grace Hamblin, OBE; and Congressman Jim Courter of New Jersey, a prolific writer on defense affairs.

Miss Hamblin's October 30th speech, "Chartwell Memories," was a warmly personal account of Winston and Clementine Churchill from 1932, when she arrived as a secretary, through her years as National Trust Administrator (1965-73). Her talk ranged from Sir Winston's love of animals to the deadly war years when he dictated his famous speeches.

Asked why she has not joined the legion of former associates and retainers who have written about the boss, the erudite Miss Hamblin replies, "Oh, he would not want that! He would look up at me sometimes and say rather wistfully, 'You're not writing a book about me, are you, Miss? All the rest of them are — but they dare not tell me'."

Congressman Courter's theme was "War in Peacetime." Echoing Churchill's warnings of the 1930s, he observed that "Democracies are such open, polite societies, they find it hard to imagine that Dictatorships can be preparing ceaselessly for war. You could say that as the West arms the Soviets arm, and when we stop arming the Soviets arm," Courter contrasted the euphoria of the Gorbachev visit to America with the almost simultaneous bracketing of Hawaii by Soviet missiles in simulation exercises.

Wendy Reves presented the Society's
first Emery Reves Award, a Nemon bust of Sir Winston, to Rep. Courter for his book, Defending Democracy. The Reves Award is established for authors who demonstrate the relevance of Churchill’s thought to current affairs.

The two dinners were accompanied by musical tributes to Sir Winston: the organ finale of N.H. Rutherlyn’s Churchill Symphony on the 30th; a recital by the Arlington Choral Society the 31st. The chorus followed toasts to the President, HM The Queen, Canada, Australia and New Zealand with the appropriate National Anthem, along with two Churchill favorites, “Battle Hymn of the Republic” and “Jerusalem.”

Wendy Reves personally hosted members at the Wendy & Emery Reves Collection at the Dallas Museum of Art; a business meeting was held and the film "Young Winston" was shown. The Hon. Paul H. Robinson, Jr., former US Ambassador to Canada and chairman of the English-Speaking Union of the US, introduced Mr. Courter; Richard M. Langworth introduced Miss Hamblin.

Guests also saw — and many received — the first new book by Churchill in 13 years, The Dream (see articles in our last two issues), which is presented to any donor of US$100, $65 or $135 Canadian or Australian.

* * *

A native of Texas, Wendy Reves was a top New York fashion model when she met noted international publisher Emery Reves in the late 1940s; Mr. Reves represented the literary interests of Winston Churchill. In 1953 they purchased Coco Chanel’s Villa La Pausa in Roquebrune, France, where they assembled the extensive fine arts collection which is now housed in a recreation of part of La Pausa at the Dallas Museum of Art.

“Just as Johnson had his Boswell, Sir Winston has his Emery Reves,” said Richard Langworth, commenting on Reves’ extraordinary worldwide publishing program on behalf of Churchill after the war.

Mrs. Reves replied: “I strongly believe in the Churchill Society and in its young, vigorous leaders. In addition to the biography project I am spearheading the creation of a Center for Churchill Studies in connection with a local university, which will house many vital Reves-Churchill papers and all of Sir Winston’s literary works, and serve to promote further studies of this aspect of his career.”
Dallas '87: Another View

1. Churchill Envy
Winstoned! America's Churchill Addiction

"In many ways, you can find in the Churchill writings almost everything, as you can in the Scripture." — Caspar Weinberger, address to the International Churchill Society, Boston, Massachusetts, November 2, 1985.

My first gaffe at the Fifth Annual International Churchill convention in Dallas was mentioning Churchill. "Winston," I soon learned, was how hard-core Churchillophiles referred to the Master, although it could be shortened to "Winnie," or even "WSC," for that extra special intimacy. On special occasions it could even be extended to include all the dynastic details. At the beginning of the second black-tie banquet of the weekend convention, there was a solemn "Invocation." The tuxedo- or uniform-clad guests in the ballroom suddenly hushed. An intense expression came over the cherubic face of the lay pastor who presided. Heads temporarily bowed, we called upon "Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill" to "make us worthy of his example" in the fight for freedom around the world.

Just when you thought it was safe to go back into Poland, Churchill, it seems, is coming back. The International Churchill Society is now five years old, and heading for over 1,200 members worldwide. About a thousand are Americans. Along with a Churchill Literary Foundation, there are plans for a Center for Churchill Studies and a computerized Bible-style concordance to everything Churchill either wrote or said. There are even hopes for a Churchill Oratory Prize. Recently, however, it ran into difficulties. Richard Langworth, chairman of the board of the International Churchill Society, explained: "I suggested we give it to Jesse Jackson, but I was hooted down."

But Churchillism extends beyond the ranks of the amateur Anglophiles. In its deadliest political manifestations, it amounts to a neurosis of the great and not-so-good. Call it Churchill-envy, the mysteriously endemic desire to smoke big cigars, wage wars against Nazis, and dictate to your secretary in the nude. Gary Hart, with his customarily unerring sense for the sublime, came out as a Churchillian a few years ago at a conference at Churchill's former war-time base in Ditchley, England. He was found in a bath at the end of the day, smoking a cigar and drinking brandy.

But just a coincidence? He's not the only one. The Sultan of Brunei has constructed a private museum of Churchill artifacts just in case the Luftwaffe makes a surprise return swoop. One of the first actions of the Reagan administration was to hang a picture of Churchill at the center of the White House Situation Room. Caspar Weinberger, America's greatest Churchill freak, has one of the most extensive Churchill libraries in the world. William Sessions, new head of the FBI, sees Churchill as his mentor. The Nobel Prize-winning president of Costa Rica, Oscar Arias, counts Churchill as one of his supreme heroes.

Unfortunately, none of them made it to Dallas. The convention began on Friday afternoon with high tea. It was followed by a banquet, crammed with a weird mix of World War II veterans, earnest young military types in uniform, and a bevy of women in bouffant hairdos and large sequined dresses. There was the diminutive pastor who whipped out a ten-inch cigar during the speeches; Bill and Sue Truax who run the Iowa chapter and specialize in making English trifle; and an Ollie North look-alike with a big, gold tiepin the shape of Winston's profile. I sat next to a man from Kentucky called Bob who talked endlessly about his faculty club and the wonders of Mrs. T., and a Canadian veteran who now sold post-natal products in Toronto. The organizer apologized for the large number of Americans in the quiet tones of someone diagnosing a disease: "We're all a little, well, you know, Anglophile, I suppose. We can't help it."

According to the society's records, among current members of the International Churchill Society are Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; John Lehman, former secretary of the Navy, and Senator Robert Packwood. Not that membership exhausts the avenues for Churchill-envy. Oliver North quoted Churchill in the Iran-contra hearings (in wartime, truth has to be protected by a "bodyguard of lies") and Ronald Reagan hopelessly misquoted him at his mother-in-law's funeral ("meeting her was like opening a bottle of champagne"). According to a computer scan of recent national journalism, William Safire has a Churchill-reference rate of one every four columns. Fortune magazine recently surveyed the libraries of the nation's chief executive officers and found Churchill to be among the most popular authors.
Amplified List of Section A Editions from the Woods Bibliography (continued)

Note: This work was first issued in individual parts, and later in bound volumes. Because it contains numerous contributions of authors besides Churchill, it may later be reclassified as a "B" item.

A142 THE UNWRITTEN ALLIANCE
Note: Only one [British] Edition exists and in only one impression limited to 5000 copies, 1961.

"A142/1" FRONTIERS AND WARS
A142/1 (a) The First Edition (1962)
A142/1(a1) — (a.2): at least two impressions
A142/1(b) The American Edition
Note: Mentioned by Woods under A1, but an abridgement in fact of A1. A2, A4, and A5, and as worthy of individual listings as, e.g., A136.

A143 YOUNG WINSTON'S WARS
A143(a) The First Edition (1972)
A143(a.1) — (a.2): two impressions, 1972
A143(b) The American Edition
A143(c) The Sphere Paperback Edition
A143(d) The Reader's Union Edition (1975)

WORKS PUBLISHED SINCE THE LAST ENTRIES IN WOODS

"A144" IF I LIVED MY LIFE AGAIN (1974)
Note: A compilation by Jack Fishman, poorly annotated, but all material checked thus far is by Churchill, probably constituting an "A" item.

CHURCHILL COLLECTORS HANDBOOK, SECTION IV, PART 3

"A145" WINSTON S. CHURCHILL: THE COMPLETE SPEECHES
A145(a) The First Edition (Chelsea House/Bowker, 1974)

"A146" ROOSEVELT AND CHURCHILL/ THEIR SECRET WARTIME CORRESPONDENCE
Note: Edited by Lowenheim. Not all Churchill and therefore a possible "B" item; to be determined.

"A147" COLLECTED ESSAYS OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL
Note: Published by Library of Imperial History in 1976 in vellum and cloth bindings: remainder sheets bound in quarter- and full morocco and vellum to original design by Churchill-books, 1987.

"A148" CHURCHILL AND ROOSEVELT/THE COMPLETE CORRESPONDENCE
Note: Edited by Kimball. Published in three volumes, Princeton University Press, 1984. Unlike "A146," this work is said to contain the complete texts.

"A149" THE DREAM (1987)

Addenda and Corrigenda to Earlier Pages for Woods A1-A138

A2 THE RIVER WAR
A2(e): The date should be 1960 and there was a second impression in 1964.

A3 SAVROLA
A3(b): There were in fact four impressions, not three — a fact generally known.
A3(bc): This should correctly be A3(bb).

A31 THE WORLD CRISIS
A31(a): Mr. Cohen wishes to add that he personally has not yet examined the Thornton Butterworth records. We did not mean to imply that no one has examined them. Obviously someone has.

A40 MARLBOROUGH
A40(a): The note under this entry is garbled. It should read as follows: "Woods does not distinguish between the limited presentation edition and the trade edition."
A40(aa): We are not certain that all 155 copies of the limited presentation edition were actually numbered. Woods says 155 were printed and 150 published; the odd five may have been given to the author. Also, the binder was Leighton Straker, not Sangorski and Sutcliffe as stated by Woods. The note about two binding formats for Volumes I and IV applies to the trade edition.
A40(ba): This entry should not be in bold face since it is not reported anywhere in Woods.
A40(e): This edition was reprinted at least once, in 1969.

A66 BLOOD SWEAT AND TEARS
A66(b): This entry should probably be broken down into A66(ba), the trade edition, and A66(bb), the Book-of-the-Month Club.

A66(c): It is worthy of note that the speeches in this Canadian issue are those of the British, not the American edition.

A138 A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES
A138(ab): Typographical error; this should be A138(e).
A138(ca): Typographical error; this should be A138(c).
A138(c): This entry should be bold face since it is reported in Woods. Consistency would normally suggest that this be designated A138(ca), since the American edition is A138(cb); however, we set out not to change any number reported in Woods, whether accurate or not.

FURTHER NOTES
The above entries do not exhaust the ranks of Woods Section A works by Churchill which might conceivably be termed "books." For example, the Overbrook Press limited editions, A84(c) and A93(b), were bound in boards and therefore constitute "books," at least in the technical sense. However, a collection including one each of the abovelisted works would be held to be a "complete collection of Churchill's books" in the minds of most experts.

Examination of genuine "Section A" items which are not listed in Woods, but should be, is beyond the purview of this handbook supplement. Such items have often been cited in Finest Hour, however, and will all be considered by Mr. Cohen in the process of constructing his new Churchill Bibliography (which presently numbers close to 200 "A" entries versus 143 in Woods). Among possible candidates for inclusion are Ten Chapters (Woods D68), Churchills Visit to Norway (Woods D67), and the Grabhorn Press Addresses Delivered... in 1940 (Woods D5), which are all first appearances of this material in volume form.
The Dream: published 1987 by ICS/Churchill Literary Foundation

The Dream is Sir Winston Churchill's 44th single title and 64th individual volume. In the expanded Woods list it carries the designation A149. It is the second all-new Churchill book published posthumously, the first being Young Winston's Wars, a compilation of his early war despatches, published by Leo Cooper in London and Viking in New York in 1972 (Woods A143). Twenty copies were bound with handmade French marbled endpapers for presentation to heads of state and certain ICS honorary members; 480 copies were published with red moire cloth endpapers. The binding was in padded bonded burgundy leather, with satin page marker and gilt page edges. The Churchill Arms were debossed on the cover, along with the author's signature and a decorative border in gilt. Printing was by letterpress on 300-year archival paper. All these characteristics were symbolic: burgundy for the color of several of Churchill's early works; the border design from Harrap, one of his leading publishers; the cover signature from the abridged one-volume edition of The World Crisis, Woods A31(b). The centerspread painting is an original oil especially commissioned for the Society, by a New Jersey, USA artist, Mr. Sal Asaro, depicting the strange scene of Churchill in 1947, aged 73, confronting his 37-year-old father.

Copies Assigned, 1987

PRESENTATION COPIES:
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Most first editions, both British and American, are identified by consulting the verso of the title page. Herein the typical Churchill work either states FIRST EDITION (USA war speech volumes by Little, Brown, for example) or "First published... 19XX" (with no subsequent impressions listed). My remarks will therefore be confined to the exceptions.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LONDON & NEW YORK
Longmans produced Churchill’s first five books (Woods Al through A5) in both British and American editions, and provided plates or sheets for certain Canadian issues (ICS A3bb, A4bb, A5cb), as well as the Colonial issues of the Malakand and Savrola (see illustration). In all cases, the title pages of first editions are devoid of any notice of a subsequent impression. The words "NEW IMPRESSION" on a Longmans title page denote later, non-first impressions.

MACMBLLAN AND CO., LONDON & NEW YORK
The publishers of Lord Randolph Churchill released only one impression each of the British and American editions of the original two-volume work, which are similar, but not identical. The British

Part 3: Identifying Churchill First Editions
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Colonial First Editions of Woods Al and A3.
The hard- and soft-bound editions of India, Woods A38.

Two binding variations, both first editions.

(true first) edition is bound in smooth cloth; “London” is set in Old English type above the company name on the title page, and the spine bottom reads “Macmillan & Co.” The American edition uses a faintly ribbed cloth, with “New York” above the company on the title page; the spine bottom reads “The Macmillan Company,” and the top page edges are gilt.

The Times Book Club edition (ICS A8ac) apparently used first edition sheets trimmed to a smaller size. The binding carries the TBC logo, but rebound copies of Lord Randolph smaller than 8 5/8 x 5 7/8 may have been made up from this cheap edition.

HODDER & STOUGHTON, LONDON & NEW YORK

The publishers of My African Journey, Liberalism and the Social Problem and The People’s Rights (A12, A15, A16) identified later versions of Liberalism with the line “SECOND EDITION” on the title page. There was only one edition of People’s Rights in 1910, though two states and several varieties of wrappers (see under A16ab on page 4.06). But all these versions are first editions. There was only one impression of My African Journey. Hodder & Stoughton or George Doran imprints may be found on the American editions of My African Journey. Both this work and the American first of Liberalism may be identified by the line “NEW YORK AND LONDON” on the bottom of the title page; the British editions do not mention New York.

THORNTON BUTTERWORTH LTD., LONDON

The most prolific ‘tween-wars Churchill publishers, Thornton Butterworth invariably used the legend “First published . . . 193X” on the versos of title pages. Large press runs often involved more than one bindery, however, creating binding variations. For instance, India, Woods A38, is found hardbound with two different spine letterings while My Early Life, Woods A37a, is found with three- and five-line covers (see illustrations). Nevertheless, if the title page verso lacks any indication of a later impression, all these works are first editions.

CHARLES SCRIBNERS SONS, NEW YORK

Scribners published the American River War (1933 1-volume edition) World Crisis, My Early Life, Amid These Storms and Marlborough (respectively ICS A2db, A31aa, A37b, A39b and A40b). First edition identification is easy, if inconsistent. The World Crisis: Volumes I and II must bear the date “1923” on the title page and no indication of a later impression on the title page verso. Volume III (both parts, confusingly labeled “Volume I” and “Volume II” on the spines) must bear the title page date 1927. Volume IV (The Aftermath) must bear the title page date 1929. Volume V(The Unknown War) must have a 1031 title page date and the code letter “A” on the t.p. verso.

Scribners began using the verso code “A” around 1930, and the American first edition of A Roving Commission has it. But the practice was spotty: no copy of the Scribners Amid These Storms has ever been encountered by me with the verso code “A”; we must conclude that it was omitted. The Scribners River War, using sheets sent over from London, also lacks the “A.”

HOUGHTON MIFFLES COMPANY, BOSTON

Traditionally, Houghton firsts are the only impressions with dates on their title page and no indication of subsequent printings on the title page verso. But this is not clear evidence of a first edition Second World War, since the Book-of-the-Month Club first printing was identical. The true H-M first edition must also carry the brick red trade binding, yellow stained top page edges and red and yellow cloth headbands at the top and bottom of the spine gatherings. (The BOMC version is bound in a pinkish cloth, with unstained page edges, no headbands, and the BOMC “dot” on the lower right corner of the rear board. This is the Churchill work most often mistaken for a first.)

Cover type variations on My Early Life, Woods A37(a).

Step By Step first British, American and Odhams.

CCH4.12
Wilderness Years ethic, and a recurring equation of the Jefferson to Churchill. . . but I think the similarity probably from New Jersey aren't going to let it pass them by. Courter kissed Leonid Brezhnev. Congressmen like Jim Courter major crack at being Churchill since Jimmy Carter wet-the administration have given conservatives their first Soviet-American relationship with the battle against Nazi power now," he warned. Courter has not become the before World War II, and it is conservatives who are in than five feet six inches tall.

I cannot help but be struck by the similarities\(^{21}\) in the careers of Winston Churchill and Caspar Weinberger. Both served with distinction in the army . . . both wrote articles and book reviews for the press. . . . In government, both strove hard for economy: Mr. Churchill as . . . chancellor of the Exchequer; Mr. Weinberger as California director of finance, and later as director of the Officer of Management and Budget. And I understand that the secretary is still economizing today.\(^{21}\)

Well, not quite. But he's in favor of Star Wars, the key totem of the neo-Churchillians' political agenda. In a recent edition of Finest Hour, the International Churchill Society's quarterly bulletin,\(^{22}\) Courter has an article on "Sir Winston's Wisdom and SDI." It draws an explicit link between Churchill's support of radar against bomber raids and Reagan's support of Star Wars. To read the article you'd think that nuclear weapons hadn't been invented. Bracing himself to his duty, Courter blithely links 1930s fatalistic opposition to defense against conventional bombs with "our contemporary doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction."

The role Star Wars plays in all this is relatively simple: it makes the world safe for conventional war. It's at this point that Churchill-envy turns into something a little more contrived. At bottom, it's also Hitler-envy: the powerful psychological desire to have a simple enemy and a simple means with which to oppose him. Of course, this is never stated explicitly. In President Reagan's eulogy at Weinberger's send-off, the analogy is deliberately vague: 'I've occasionally called Cap 'My Disraeli.' But as I think of him and the service he's given the nation in the cause of freedom and peace, more than anyone else it's Churchill who comes to mind." He quotes Churchill on the call of "great causes . . . beyond space and time, which, whether we like it or not, spells duty." The "great causes" remain unspecified. Does Reagan really mean the fight against Hitler? Or the maintenance of British rule over India?\(^{23}\)

But for the neo-Churchillians history is more an object of desire than analysis. For those stricken with Hitler-envy, no one will ever quite replace the thrill of 1938. Other considerations, such as the obscure fact that today's more complex world has avoided the simple slaughters of the first half of the century,\(^{24}\) don't figure. Take a recent editorial in National Review, which draws a direct parallel between containing Hitler and negotiating the maelstrom of the Iran-Iraq war: "These Democrats are in a fairy-castle world where defense spending is wasteful and foreign policy an indulgence. . . . Winston Churchill watched Britain sink into that delusion in the 1930s: 'I have watched this famous island descending continuously, fecklessly, the stairway which leads to a dark gulf. Protect the Persian Gulf or descend into Churchill's gulf. The former is painful, the latter is worse.' As Bob from Kentucky put it to me over the beef Wellington: "You see, things were simple back then, during the war: there was good and evil, black and white. You knew where you were."

Even if the thesis worked perfectly as a historical parallel, it would still rest on a reading of only part of Churchill's record: the 1930s. Churchill's strategic view, once nuclear
weapons had been invented, sits uncomfortably with the SDI pushers. He was a clear supporter — indeed, one of the intellectual founders — of Mutual Assured Destruction, precisely the doctrine the neo-Churchillians wish to abolish. "I have sometimes the odd thought," Churchill said in 1961, "that the annihilating character of these dread agencies may bring an utterly unforeseeable security to mankind." Nine years earlier he had remarked, "Moralists may find it a melancholy thought that peace can find no nobler foundations than mutual terror. But for my part, I shall be content if these foundations are solid."

Still, the Churchillization of SDI goes on. At Weinberger's farewell, an aide gave him a framed version of Churchill's dictum: "Never give in, never, never, never, never — in nothing great or small, large or petty." The reference to SDI was clear: a link that doesn't please everyone. "I don't think it's good to draw parallels between Reagan and Baldwin," says fellow Churchill-freak Frank Gregorsky, editor of The House Republican, "It will only split the party, but the radar thing is credible as a historical parallel, and as a marketing tool for SDI, it's brilliant."

His enthusiasm is understandable. For hard-core neo-Churchillians, the coming Wilderness Years of detente and Democratic ascendence in Washington are the greatest boon since Hitler marched into the Sudetenland. They can hardly wait. They will fight in New Jersey, they will fight on the boards of Commentary and Policy Review, they will fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the media, they will defend their continent, whatever the cost may be. They will never surrender. In the battle of Churchill-envy, you get the creeping suspicion that this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. It is merely, perhaps, the end of the beginning.

ANDREW SULLIVAN

2. Churchill Spite

SuUivaned! Andrew's Churchill Neurosis

To The Editor, The New Republic:

The Churchill subject does seem to bring out fanatics. Last year, when the International Churchill Society happened to sample a right-wing mailing list, we got back everything from accusations that Churchill consorted with the Yalta Commies to a length of 2x4 and a box of screws — all anonymous and paid for with our business reply permit. This year, when one of our eight speakers turns out to be a pro-SDI congressman, we get Andrew Sullivan's "Churchill Envy" in the December 7th NEW REPUBLIC. Pearl Harbor Day for us!

I spent a good deal of my time trying to acquaint young Sullivan with our non-profit, NON-PARTISAN, educational organization concerned with the examination of Churchill's thought and the preservation of his vanishing writings. But expatriate Brits (so I judge from his accent) are

NOTE THE READER

Reprinted by permission of The New Republic, copyright 1987, The New Republic, Inc., issue of 7 December. This is a verbatim reprint, including misstatements of fact, which are indicated through the following footnotes.

1. Ordained minister; degrees in Theology and Political Science, halfway to a Ph.D. in Theology.
2. We called upon God, not Churchill.
3. Twenty.
4. Over 1,300 worldwide.
5. About 700 are Americans.
6. A Concordance bears no relation to a Bible.
7. executive director.
8. Ditchley was a home, not a "base."
10. public not private.
11. The Adolphus serves high tea every day; ICS functions began with the Friday night banquet.
12. One bouffant hairdo counted by us.
13. Two large sequined dresses by our count!
14. five feet, 11 inches.
15. seven-inch.
17. Much as the majority was Canadian at Vancouver '86 and the majority British at London last September.
18. Mr. Lehman has never been a member of ICS.
19. Chairman is 6', executive director 6'2", Rev. Sampson 5'11"; however, Mrs. Sampson, who is 5'2", recalls that author Sullivan was shorter than she.
20. similarities are factual.
21. At the time the Secretary had just completed a well-publicized crackdown on overcharging contractors.
22. magazine.
23. Reagan obviously spoke in broader terms. Churchill's quarrel, as Martin Gilbert said, "was with tyranny."
24. Mr. Sullivan writes as if the boat people, Gulag, Afghanistan and the Cultural Revolution are non-existent "in today's more complex world."
rarely capable of laid-back contemplation of Sir Winston. To Canadians and Americans, he was a statesman-philosopher; to many Britons he was a party politician, with all the frailties and absurdities of that species.

John Kenneth Galbraith, in an article in our journal, says Churchill's talent depended on "a truly fearsome certainty that he was completely right. Nothing else, I've often thought, is so important for winning battles in Washington. The men who wanted to bomb North Vietnam were absolutely certain that it would end the war. Those who were opposed only doubted it." Sullivan is also fearsomely certain that he is right. But Churchill, when he laced into somebody, cited facts, not malarkey.

The men who wanted to bomb North Vietnam were ab-solutely certain that it would end the war. Those who were opposed only doubted it." Sullivan is also fearsomely certain that he is right. But Churchill, when he laced into somebody, cited facts, not malarkey.

At Rep. Courter's Dallas press conference, Andrew Sullivan asked the first dumb question — which I see he is still on to: "How can you say Churchill's 1930s advocacy of a radar net has any bearing on SDI and nuclear misses?" Nonplussed, Courter gave a dusky answer.

It wasn't simply radar that Churchill advocated in the '30s — it was comprehensive defense against the then-apocalyptic threat of bomber aircraft, thought to be as invincible and deadly as the ICBM is thought to be today. Churchill said it was not. It took a bloody war to prove him right.

When Courter wrote a cogent piece about the similarities between Churchill's 1930s defense argument and the SDI debate, we published it — under the heading "OPINION" — because we found it thought-provoking. What Sullivan misses is the fact that we would publish the counter-argument too — because the study of Churchill's thought is our business.

Since Sullivan doesn't bother to provide any counter-arguments, allow me: Churchill's 1930s "SDI" was a response to instability (the rearmament of Germany); today's SDI would destabilize a relatively stable situation (the ICBM stand-off). Why didn't Sullivan take that approach, instead of silly vacuities like guess-your-height observations about "Churchill freaks"? (If my fellow freaks and I average only 5'6" we must have shrunken an average of 6"; and Galbraith towers over us. Come to think of it, Mr. Sullivan was the shortest person there; is this significant?)

I will not bore you with the two dozen inaccuracies in Mr. Sullivan's account. You may hear from those with whom he broke bread in Dallas, never revealing his mission, nor how he planned to twist and exaggerate their offhand remarks. But I must note that our "diminutive pastor" holds degrees in Theology and Poli-Sci, and is halfway to a Ph.D. — not bad for a "lay preacher"; that Americans number only half our Society's membership; that Canada, not the USA, has our largest proportional representation.

We Churchill freaks have, by the way, raised $250,000 to sponsor publication of the remaining Churchill papers in the Official Biography. The result will be, as Simon Schama wrote in THE NEW REPUBLIC, "history as total recall . . . for us to sift and sort, retain or dismiss as we see fit." Our Churchill Concordance, which Sullivan ridicules, will insure that any writer or politician who quotes Churchill does so accurately. I should think this would please those who decry the inaccurate Churchillisms of Ronald Reagan.

What disappoints me is the article's smallmindedness. THE NEW REPUBLIC is a journal of clear-cut opinion and argument by formidable thinkers, Kondracke, Kinsley, Krauthammer — not a playpen for petty sophists. Like all "clubs," the Churchill Society has its eccentrics and extremists. But give us a little credit for good works, which both Churchillophiles and Churchillophobes will welcome.

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

3. Memo to: The Weird Mix

The New Republic Will Get You If You Don't Watch Out!

AS GARY HART might say, any publicity is good publicity. Mr. Sullivan's performance has since led to a BBC World Service interview with Wallace Johnson and myself; a solid and fair news report by the Manchester Guardian; and the Society's placement on the Harper's Index, with Harper's interviewing Richard Haslam-Hopwood in the UK as well as this writer. The BBC's Christabel King contacted us because she thought the Sullivan article "frivolous," and was sure there was more substance to ICS than The New Republic represented. Past doubt.

We considered carefully before reprinting the Sullivan article here. As longtime readers of everything about Churchill, we have a certain antipathy to longwinded lash-ups by people who let their personal politics color what they write; or who get their material by subterfuge, not telling those they talk to that their remarks will be quoted. We decided to

"These gentlemen of the Press were listening to every word you said — all eagerly anxious for a tiny morsel of cheese which they could publish.

And you go and give them a whole ruddy Stilton!"

WSC TO A GENERAL WHO TALKED TOO MUCH, 1941

run it for two reasons: (a) It is highly entertaining and all about WSC, thus meets our criteria for content; and (b) it is an object lesson to all of us in how to deal with the press.

The warning bells should have started ringing at the Dallas press conference, when Sullivan asked Rep. Courter how he could compare today's nuclear missiles with Churchill's plan for radar stations. That question, and the tone it
was delivered in, were plain indications that Sullivan was not aware of the comprehensive nature of Churchill's 1930s air defense proposals, and had already drawn his conclusions about both Courter and the Society, whatever happened later. That was the first lesson: listen to the questions such people ask, and mark well the tone in which they ask them.

A handful of letters by those Sullivan misquoted were sent to *The New Republic* along with mine above. As you might expect if you know that journal, none have been printed. That's lesson number two: once you have given such people their material, it is this material and no later reply that will be seen by most readers. The more serious journals will publish rebuttals, but by their very nature they appear in small print long after the article that caused them has come and gone.

Everybody whom Sullivan quoted, out of context and unaware that their remarks were being carefully remembered, wrote us to say, "had I only known that little fellow was planning to write an article I would have been more careful." Well, that's lesson number three: as the Churchill Society continues to grow in numbers and prominence, its functions will continue to attract journalists (I use that word in the broadest possible sense) who don't particularly like Churchill, whose political orientation is the diametric opposite of WSC's, who don't understand that give-and-take is essential to civilized debate, and who lack manners.

Each of us would be well advised to establish the purpose of the person at our table asking all those questions, before replying offhandedly or in a humorous way to a question the questioner thinks is deadly serious. I was as guilty as anyone in ignoring these essentials when I spoke for 45 minutes on the phone to Mr. Sullivan, who was by then finishing his lampoon. It is amazing how the most innocent remark, which just the slightest out-of-context twist or small misquote, can be bent out of all proportion.

Even Michael White of the *Guardian*, whose 7 January piece, "True Brit," was mostly accurate and balanced, managed to put me on the spot. "Mr. Langworth notes merely that, as with Churchill, foreigners only see the positive side of Mrs. Thatcher the politician," he wrote. "[Langworth] suspects that Churchill, who had no women in his Cabinet, might have seen the Iron Lady much as he saw Lady Astor MP, 'And he hated Lady Astor'."

Now I did say that Canadians, Australians and Americans "probably" see WSC and Margaret Thatcher in their best, statesmanlike light. And I did say that WSC hated the presence of Lady Astor in the House of Commons. But I hope I did not say Churchill hated Lady Astor; as far as I know, WSC hated only one person, Adolf Hitler, and that, as Churchill said, "was professional."

Ms. King of the BBC was fascinated by the possibility of somebody forming a "Thatcher Club" or a "Reagan Club." You have to be very careful, when the media asks for comment on such questions, not to mix your personal opinions of politicians with your reply. I told the BBC that no other politician of this century has Churchill's stature and the breadth of literary, political, artistic and oratorical achievement, to encourage people to form a club in his or her honor; such Societies would not, therefore, be warranted.

I did not say that personally I think Margaret Thatcher is the best thing since sliced bread — or that, as a Canadian friend remarked at Dallas, "I wish we over here had a political leader with half her spunk." But expressing such opinions to the media is an open invitation for them to represent the International Churchill Society as a Tory political action committee, and that is not why we exist.

As Sue Truax from Iowa — uh, I mean Ohio! — said, we probably should be complimented that the fish-fryers of *The New Republic* deem us a threat to their ordered view of the universe. No doubt others of their ilk will take similar lines in future. The simplistic exposition of much of today's media is, obviously, able to misrepresent our function. Whenever I talk to them henceforth, I hereby resolve to repeat at least three times: "The purpose of the Churchill Society is to honor the memory, to maintain the ideals, and to preserve the literary heritage of Winston Spencer Churchill." That is the urgent, ever-present message which all of us must seek to convey at every opportunity. — RML

This nut-rejoinder is still useful. (*World Press News*, 26.IV.45)
WINTER 1887-1888 • AGE 13
With his parents on a tour of Russia, Winston spent Christmas at Connaught Place with Jack and Mrs. Everest. The Duchess of Marlborough invited him to Blenheim and was "much aggrieved" when he showed a reluctance to go. When Mrs. Everest came down with diphtheria the boys were taken to Dr. Roose's house.

After they moved to the Duchess' London home in January, their grandmother wrote their parents, "I keep Winston in good order as I know you like it. He is a clever Boy and really not naughty but he wants a firm hand."

On 23 January he returned to his last term at Brighton. His grandmother looked forward to his eventual entrance to Harrow, "for I fancy he was too clever and too much the Boss at that Brighton school."

During February Winston claimed to be working hard for his forthcoming entrance exam for Harrow. On 15 March he took the examination. His own dramatic account of the event is found in My Early Life (Woods A37). He claimed that he was accepted only because the headmaster, Dr. Welldon, was a man "capable of looking beneath the surface of things: a man not dependent upon paper manifestations."

And so he left the school of the Misses Thomson. His own reminiscences of these years were quite favourable: "At this school I was allowed to learn things which interested me: French, History, lots of Poetry by heart, and above all Riding and Swimming. The impression of those years makes a pleasant picture in my mind, in strong contrast to my earlier schoolday memories."

WINTER 1912-1913 • AGE 38
The year ended with a bitter storm in Parliament over Churchill's behaviour in forcing the resignation of Sir Francis Bridgeman as First Sea Lord. On 20 December an acrimonious debate occurred in the House of Commons. The criticism was led by Andrew Bonar Law and Lord Charles Beresford. Although Churchill vigorously defended his actions, it was generally believed that he had not behaved well and that Bridgeman had been a victim. Criticism of the First Lord within the Navy was considerable.

Ultimately, Churchill required the assistance of the King to quieten the episode. Immediately after his audience with the monarch, Bridgeman withdrew his request for publication of all correspondence.

In January, Churchill accompanied the Prime Minister on a tour of naval facilities in the north of Scotland. Speaking at his home constituency of Dundee, he claimed that the Navy was strong and the Army was efficient, and that that strength would be used "to preserve peace, to bring disputing parties together, to smooth away difficulties and to compact an abiding settlement. . . . based upon justice and equality." On 30 January he boarded the Admiralty yacht Enchantress and headed south. Four days later he was at Portsmouth and Spithead where he was joined on board by King George V.

He loved working on Enchantress. Between 1911 and 1914 he would spend a total of eight months aboard it. A critic in the Commons charged that it was not necessary for the First Lord to go to sea at all, and that, because naval stations were dotted round the coast on land, they would be visited more quickly and cheaply by rail. Churchill responded that in the event of war the personnel of the yacht would be transferred to fighting ships and the vessel itself would be used as an auxiliary hospital ship.

While Winston was afloat, Clementine visited the Asquiths at their country home even though she strongly disapproved of the Prime Minister's open appreciation of feminine pulchritude.

Ulster continued to be a serious problem for Britain. In a speech before a Home Rule Council Luncheon, WSC called for moderation in language and accused the Tory leader of preparing himself for Prime Minister by recklessly adopting the extreme language of the rabid partisans in his party.

WINTER 1937-1938 • AGE 63
Motivated by a real fear of war based on his own WW1 experiences, a knowledge that Britain was militarily weaker than Germany, and a belief that Germany understood "realpolitik," Prime Minister Chamberlain pursued his policy of appeasement. Winston Churchill had the same dread of war and awareness of Britain's weakness — but there his concurrence with Chamberlain ended. He believed that the totalitarian tigers had voracious appetites, which would only increase after each feeding.

Excluded from councils within both the Government and the Conservative Party, Churchill used numerous opportunities to extend his contacts. His "Focus on Freedom and Peace" luncheons brought together Tories, Liberals and Socialists who agreed with his objective of gathering support from all Parties, especially those of the "left," for British rearmament, for the association of France and Britain, and "for the maintenance of peace through British strength."

Early in January he left for a month's vacation in the south of France. While there working on Volume IV of Marlborough (Woods A40), he heard that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was requesting a total reduction of £12 million in Service estimates.

Chamberlain's desire to develop a rapprochement with Mussolini led to the resignation of Anthony Eden from the Government. Although Churchill vigorously supported the Exchequer he was not accepted as their leader. Senior to most, his own inner core of close followers was still marginal.

On 12 March Austria was incorporated into the German Reich, an event Churchill called a dastardly outrage. "Finally," he noted, "the scales of illusion have fallen from many eyes, especially in high quarters." He called on Britain and France to rally the second rank powers of Europe to collective defence. He predicted that the next state to be threatened by Germany would be Czechoslovakia.

WINTER 1962-1963 • AGE 88
During this winter season, Sir Winston recuperated quietly in his home at Hyde Park Gate.
Churchill in Stamps
BY RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

PAGES 85-90: RED MENACE & MIDDLE EAST

While actual Churchill issues showing WSC in this period remain scarce, stamps of the independent non-Russian republics and Israel successfully depict his efforts to resolve Mid-East conflicts and support the Zionist cause. All examples shown are on the ICS list of Churchill-related (CR) stamps, available from ICS Stores. Numbers are Scott (#) and Gibbons (sg). A slashmark (/) means a set from which any stamp may be used.

85. One actual Churchill commemorative that is almost always useful is Upper Volta #350 (sg?), showing him with his back to the photographer (taken post-1945, but never mind). Azerbaijan #1/10 (sg 1/10), Georgia #12/17, #26/30 (sg 10/18, 28/32), and Batum #13/20 (sg 13/20) represent the independent Azerbaijani and Georgian republics and the British-occupied oil port.

86. Denikin, Kolchak and W range I all ultimately failed, as did the several independent states which were set up. These include South Russia (top left) #1/4 (sg 1/4), Transcaucasia (top right) #1/6 (sg 1/5), Siberia #1/10 (sg 1/10), the Far Eastern Republic #1/70 (sg?) and the Ukraine #62/6.

87. Churchill was presented with a set of Occupied Iraq issues like these (Mesopotamia #N1/26, sg?) as a memento of his years as Colonial Secretary, when he was faced with a huge slice of former Ottoman territory and the need to establish responsible governments therein. These are overprints of some of the best Turkish stamps ever designed, and make a handsome collection.

88. The late Dalton Newfield did the research which produced this page of CR stamps relating to Churchill's Middle East Department, set up despite the disapproval of Lord Curzon, depicted on British Antarctic Territory #78 (sg 95.) WSC's Cairo Conference saw Faisal ascend the throne of Iraq (#14/23, sg 78, 80, 88), Abdullah in Trans-Jordan (#145/57, #199/06, sg 159/66, 230/38). Faisal II (Iraq #139/41, sg 342/44), Faisal's son, was deposed in the revolution of 1958; Abdullah's descendant is King Hussein. After Cairo, Churchill toured Egypt on a camel, visiting sites shown on Egypt #50/59, #61/67 (sg 73/110). The Yemen overprint (sg 68) is much later, but an appropriate design.

89. Israel #44, 48/50 and 380 (sg 54, 58/60, 487) represent the building of the country by Jewish immigrants. Israel #183 (sg 194) depicts Theodore Herzl, founder of the Zionist movement, against a Palestine background. Israel #70/71 (sg 73/74) shows Chaim Weizmann, who led the movement when Churchill was Colonial Secretary and was devoted to WSC. Recently I was told that most Israelis are "indifferent" to Churchill: astonishing news to me, as it would also be to Weizmann.

90. The 1917 Balfour Declaration committed Britain to a Jewish homeland. Israel #354 (sg 373) depicts Arthur Balfour; #90 (sg 100) shows Lord Rothschild, who received Balfour's promise. Palestine #1/14 (sg 1/15) and #15/25 (sg 21/33) represent the British occupation and subsequent mandate. Israel #354 (sg 373) shows WeizmannIsrael #267 (sg 286) represents immigration.

A continuing series
On 15 February 1921, Churchill changed hats again, leaving the War Office for the Colonial Office (though he retained the Air Ministry until 1 April). His number one task was to bring order to the Middle East. He enlisted the help of Lawrence of Arabia.

Mesopotamia, later Iraq, had with other provinces of the Ottoman Empire been wrested from the Turks. Vast tribal divisions existed over vast and trackless wastes mandated to Britain by the League of Nations.

A STEP TOWARD ISRAEL

Churchill was convinced by Jewish leader Chaim Weizmann and others, that a "Jewish National Home" should be established in the Middle East. As Colonial Secretary he visited Palestine and was impressed by the progress Jewish immigrants had made there already. He continued to encourage Jewish emigration there.

A set of Occupied Iraq issues like this was presented as a memento to WSC in the mid-Twenties.

THE MIDDLE EAST DEPARTMENT

Despite clashes with Lord Curzon, the Foreign Secretary, over jurisdiction and responsibility, Churchill set up a Department of the Colonial Office to handle the Middle East problems, visited Cairo personally with Lawrence and others.

Lord Curzon and a Yemeni stamp overprinted in memory of Churchill.

Cairo saw the Emir Faisal put on the throne of Iraq, his brother Abdullah enthroned by WSC in Jordan. The latter kingdom remains to this day, while Faisal's successor fell in 1958.

After the Cairo conference, WSC toured Egypt on a camel.

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

The Jewish claim to Palestine stemmed from a 1917 letter from then-foreign-secretary Arthur Balfour to Lord Rothschild, the prominent Jewish MP, pledging Britain to a Jewish homeland after the war. This put English Jews behind the war effort squarely.

Churchill had long been friends (if political enemies) with Arthur Balfour and was also a friend of Rothschild.

Palestine subsequently became a British mandate like Iraq and Jordan.

Churchill encouraged Weizmann to continue with plans for Israel, but did not commit the British government to an independent state.
Opinion: A Plea For Peace
The True Meaning of the "Iron Curtain" Speech
BY PAMELA C. HARRIMAN

This speech was delivered on 19 May 1986 to the Friends of the Memorial, New York City Branch, and two lines have been updated by the editor in the light of the INF agreement. This is the first time the complete text has been published, outside of the Congressional Record. — Editor.

Today we honor the anniversary of an event, which, like so many in Winston Churchill's life was accounted as an historic moment, and yet the man himself was out of power. He was unique among the leaders of 20th century democracy in that his influence did not disappear with his office. Perhaps his only rival in this respect was General DeGaulle, who pales by comparison with Churchill's capacity to stand astride the world stage, even while relegated to the backstage of opposition in his own country.

This role had not come easily or early to Churchill. In his long political exile of the 1930s, he was a lonely voice, "crying in the wilderness," and few turned to hear him or to see the approaching storm. Yet he never tired, for he always knew that history, too, had its claims. Perhaps he understood that because he wrote history as much as he made it. He was an author as well as an orator. He was not only a Prime Minister; he was also a prophet of things to come.

It was this unique ability that he took with him to Fulton, Missouri, 40 years ago last March. Winston Churchill made his mistakes; but he was more often right than wrong on more matters of consequence than any other statesman of this century.

He was not only an early, isolated critic of appeasement. He was also one of the first — perhaps the first non-scientist — to comprehend and describe the dawning wonders and terrors of modern invention. In a 1932 essay — more than a decade before the Manhattan project — he speculated "that new sources of energy, vastly more important than any we yet know, will surely be discovered. . . . Nuclear energy is incomparably greater than the molecular energy we use today. . . . There is no question that this gigantic source of energy exists. What is lacking is the match to set the bonfire alight, or it may be the detonator to cause the dynamite to explode."

He wrote of "wireless telephones and television" — and of genetic engineering. He looked to a time, "50 years hence," when "explosive machinery will be available upon a scale which can annihilate whole nations." In 1925 he wrote of "guided missiles" and of "electrical rays which could claw down aeroplanes from the sky."

Churchill was different from most political leaders in that he thought beyond the next election to the next generation. It was this sense of perspective which enabled him to persevere despite recurring disappointments in his public life. His moment of triumph did not come until he was 66, past the normal retirement age, and long after he had been written off. In its greatest trial, Britain found its greatest modern
leader. Yet five years later, with the war won, he was defeated for reelection. He had the world's honor and respect, but not his country's vote.

So it was that a year after that, President Truman invited Churchill — as prophet and not Prime Minister — to speak in Truman's home state, at Westminster College — "a name," as Churchill said, "somewhat familiar to prophet and not Prime Minister — to not his country's vote. He had the world's honor and respect, but won, he was defeated for reelection. He was leader. Yet five years later, with the war won, he was defeated for reelection. He had the world's honor and respect, but not his country's vote.

Second, he traced the roots of the dawning conflict to Soviet territorial ambitions. As he put it, "What they desire are the fruits of war, and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines."

Power and doctrine — Winston Churchill had read history and he knew that ideology was not simply or partly commentaries on the text for our time.

When he spoke of the "Iron Curtain" that had descended from "Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic," Winston Churchill was acknowledging and announcing a truth which so many in the West were so unwilling to admit — the onset of the Cold War. So powerful was the phrase, it cut like a thunderbolt through the public dialogue; so pronounced was the turning point marked by this speech, so wise does it seem at least in retrospect, that leaders since then return to it and quote it repeatedly to validate their own policies.

Half of the lectures delivered since 1946 in the Westminster series, in which Churchill spoke, have been primarily or partly commentaries on his speech. Presidents, Vice-Presidents, Cabinet officials, Senators, Ambassadors, and one other British Prime Minister have followed in his footsteps.

All this, I suspect, would evoke from Churchill a reaction something like Lincoln's description of the man tarred and feathered and ridden out of town on a rail: "If it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I'd rather walk." Winston Churchill sought to be memorable, but I am certain that he would rather be remembered for what he actually said and believed, and not have his remarks misused as an all-purpose proof text for the prevailing policies of the hour. He spoke so often and so well over so many years that by taking selected words out of the context of their times, virtually anyone who is clever enough can quote Churchill to suit his own purposes.

So what did he really say at Fulton, Missouri? What did he mean, and how does it apply today?

First, as one of the architects of the Grand Alliance he, in effect, recognized the tragic reality of its dissolution. No one else of similar authority had said what he did so plainly or so publicly before. And this, too, he had foreseen. At the Cairo Conference in 1943, he told Harold Macmillan of his fears about the rise of Soviet power, and the failure of the West to observe and respond to the danger.
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had stated it before, shortly after the outbreak of the war in 1939. In another famous phrase which is also usually only half-quoted, he said: "Russia ... is a riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma; but perhaps there is a key. That key is Russian national interest."

The part about national interest is the part of the quote that is often left out. But in 1946, at Fulton, Churchill identified precisely what that interest was: The Soviets might want expansion, but they did not want war. The inevitable truth of that principle, in the atomic age, still eludes foolish and dangerous people on both sides of the Iron Curtain, who assume that on the other side, a first strike is being planned, a nuclear exchange is being actively considered, and therefore, arms control is an impossible dream or an undesirable snare. To them, Churchill replied, 40 years in advance: "What we have to consider ... is the permanent prevention of war." This, he believed, was in the Russian interest as surely as our own.

Third, Winston Churchill was convinced that the West should actively pursue what he called "a good understanding with the Russians ... There is the solution which I would offer to you."

He was to expand on this theme again and again. At the Conservative Party Conference in North Wales in 1949, during the most frigid days of the Cold War, he called on the West to take the initiative in opening talks with the Soviets. This time, it was the hawks who assailed him. They and their ideological descendants prefer to edit Fulton, to forget the Party Conference, and to neglect the sweeping proposal of Churchill's second Prime Ministership in 1953.

After Stalin's death in March of that year, the new Soviet regime appeared to Churchill to be signaling, in various ways — for example, in the Austrian treaty negotiations — a new readiness to reduce tensions. He believed there was a least a glimmer of light, a possibility of progress. He told President Eisenhower in a letter: "A new hope has been created in the unhappy, bewildered world." And he suggested that the West make a new approach to Moscow. He wrote in a top secret message: "If we fail to ... seize this moment's precious chances, the judgment of future ages would be harsh and just."*

The moment, unfortunately, remained unseized. John Foster Dulles and some in his own Foreign Office accused Winston Churchill of starting down the road of appeasement. As the recently published diary of his private secretary, Sir John Colville, recounts, it was one of the bitter moments of Churchill's life when Eisenhower rejected the policy of negotiation.

The issue is not whether the policy surely would have worked; many of his friends conceded that at that time it might very well have failed. But Winston Churchill was steadfast in believing that it should be tried. As he said in 1955, in one of his last, great speeches to Parliament, "I have hoped for a long time for a top-level conference where these matters can be put plainly and bluntly" — and he was talking then specifically about the issue of nuclear weapons.

This is the complete Churchill, not the hardliners' conveniently quotable half. He was, I believe, right about the Soviet danger — and the nuclear danger. He was right to warn against appeasement — and equally right to warn against a rigid, all or nothing approach to the Russians. Today his insights, in their full form, still have the

*See also Lord Soames' remarks on this subject to ICS, London, 1985, Finest Hour #50, page 17, and in this issue.
freshness of morning, the crispness which has not willed through the years. But we cannot have his counsel about the Soviets without his counsel about ourselves: the two parts are of a single piece, shaped by a single, subtle mind, the product of a complex and realistic world view.

Across four decades, Winston Churchill's voice and his advice still speak to us and they come to this: yes, you can deal with the Russians — but only if you have both strength and suppleness, a willingness to stand your essential ground, and yet to see a great common interest which transcends inevitable rivalries, regional conflicts, and petty quarrels.

Now the question is, how have we applied this prescription in the long passage of time since the Fulton speech? Sometimes not at all, sometimes with great uncertainty, and always with great inconsistency.

In his brief years in office, President Kennedy, who took a special pleasure in conferring honorary American citizenship on Winston Churchill, became the post-war American leader who seemed to understand best the Churchill formula of toughness and negotiation. One October, he prevailed in the Cuban missile crisis — a victory which he then used as an opportunity to seek a Test Ban Treaty. By the next July, he had sent Averell Harriman to Moscow to conclude the agreement.

He was in many ways a fitting negotiator, not least in terms of our topic today. Just after the Fulton speech, Churchill and Harriman had met in Washington for a long private talk. Harriman shared Churchill's conclusion, as he reported it in his notes — that he was "very gloomy about coming to any accommodation with Russia unless and until it became clear to the Russians that they would be met by force if they continued their expansion.

Seventeen years later, after the Soviet installation of missiles in Cuba had been met and repulsed, it was Averell Harriman who initiated, for the United States, the first great accommodation of the postwar era.

Most of the time, however, we appear to have followed only half the lesson of this history — to stand fast — and not the other half — that the stand should not be a stopping place but a departure point toward making the world safer for human survival. Each tough stand, once taken, should be another step in the long journey toward peace.

A number of observers had believed — or hoped — that in his second term, Ronald Reagan could and would move in the direction now being followed. He certainly does have the same kind of freedom of action Richard Nixon had when he reopened the door to China; no one can rightly accuse him of being soft. He has a far more receptive Senate than Jimmy Carter found when he submitted an arms agreement in 1979.

Just as a certain measure of strength is a precondition for negotiating a treaty with the Soviets, so perhaps a certain measure of perceived toughness is a precondition for securing its approval here at home. Ronald Reagan undoubtedly meets that test. Over and over again, from the beginning of his Administration, he has attacked the Soviets as the "focus of evil in the world" and he has constantly urged larger and larger defense budgets to meet the Soviet threat.

Yet the President and his Secretary of Defense, so intent on demonstrating their resolve, so fond of quoting Churchill, still seem reluctant to take the full measure of Churchill's advice. The Administration talks of arms control; under public pressure, the President speaks of the unwinnability of nuclear war. But our negotiations in Geneva so far resist any compromise on the Star Wars concept, even in return for the most comprehensive strategic arms agreement. However, the Russians have conceded ground on the question of intermediate range missiles in Europe, and agreed to a treaty in this area regardless of what happens on SDI.

Winston Churchill had a purpose in his strategy of deploying strength in dealing with the Soviets. He was, as Sir John Colville has said, a leader who adopted a "flexibility" which "may have a certain relevance in the 1980s." His aim, as he expressed it in the Fulton speech, never wavered. He said, "What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become." To Churchill, military strength, divisions, missiles were not an end in themselves; he armed in order to parley.

Over 40 years since the Fulton speech it is fitting to ask: What is the aim of the Reagan policy? Did they expect by military intimidation or economic exhaustion, to bring the Soviet system down — something that Churchill, one of the original anti-Bolsheviks, considered foolhardy in the atomic age? If so, did they expect the Soviets to go gently into the twilight of their diminishing power, or abjectly accept an internal collapse?

These are not realistic hopes, but danger fantasies, and we should pray that no one in office really has such irrational views. Perhaps the Administration's stubbornness is a bargaining strategy. But the strategy can be justified only if, at the end of the negotiating process, there is a negotiated agreement.

I would be more encouraged if the President would read the entire Fulton speech and Winston Churchill's other postwar writings. He would discover that the spirit of Winston Churchill was one of both resolution and conciliation: of magnanimity based on strength— and that is the spirit the world urgently needs today.

In short, we should recall that Churchill entitled his Fulton speech "The Sinews of Peace" — not of war. And I would like to close with some words he was composing at nearly the same time he was drafting the speech. He wrote:

"Those who are prone by temperament and character to seek sharp and clear-cut solutions of difficult and obscure problems, who are ready to fight whenever some challenge comes from a foreign power, have not always been right. On the other hand, those whose inclinations is to bow their heads, to seek patiently and faithfully for peaceful compromise, are not always wrong. On the contrary, in the majority of instances they may be right, not only morally but from a practical standpoint. How many wars have been averted by patience and persisting good will . . . How many wars have been precipitated by firebrands! How many misunderstandings which led to war could have been removed by temporizing! How often have countries fought cruel wars and then after a few years found themselves not only friends but allies!"

These words are from the first volume of Winston Churchill's World War II memoirs, in preparation even as he traveled to Missouri. He called the volume "The Gathering Storm." We would be well advised today to heed his warning, to hear the real Churchill voice and views. For now we must deal with the potentially even more cataclysmic storm gathering in our own time.
Britain had three areas of interest: foremost, the Commonwealth; next the "English-speaking world" (presumably Churchillese for America); and, only then, a "United Europe" (with not much detail of what this precisely meant).

Anthony Eden actively opposed the actions of the "pro-Europeans." When Macmillan sought a cabinet confrontation with Eden in 1952, he discovered that Churchill no longer seemed concerned with European unity. Even Churchill's son-in-law, Duncan Sandys, had little hope of influencing the Prime Minister.

Discouraged by his defeat in cabinet, Macmillan withheld his resignation only out of affection for and loyalty to Churchill. While Anthony Eden and the Foreign Office had been the main obstacles to pro-European schemes, the proponents of those plans had certainly misjudged the meaning of Winston Churchill's statements calling for closer contacts with the nations on the European continent.


The 1950s unmasked traditional Europe's diminished role in world affairs. No nation grieved for this loss more than Great Britain. Her diplomatic clout had been eclipsed by the onrush of events that were largely beyond her control; power devolved away from London to the capitals of two relatively new superpowers.

Both Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden were mesmerized by unwarranted assumptions concerning British power that no longer existed, and both were compromised by illness as they struggled to forge pathways toward international influence that were increasingly closed to them. Neither, in the end, appreciated the degree to which their poor health contributed to this distasteful circumstance.

Historians have traditionally viewed the second Churchill government as almost an afterthought in evaluating WSC's extraordinary career. Some have called his last four years in office an exercise in opportunities lost. Until Selden's Churchill's Indian Summer, little of consequence seems to have caught the historians' eyes. True, Churchill would remain to the end an articulate visionary of events as they came to pass — perhaps as much ahead of his time in calling for detente with Russia in the mid-Fifties as he had been in 1946 with his vision of the Iron Curtain. Yet his singular preoccupation with mollifying Cold War realities solely by agreements arranged face-to-face with other leaders remained an intensely personalized perception of things as he thought they should be, and of his rightful place among them.

Viewed in perspective, Churchill's final attempts to move to center stage in consultation with the power-brokers of the world represented little more than a nostalgic appeal to recapitulate his previous genuine contributions to the end of World War II. He endured the final five years to carve his own epitaph for a career that would span the contrasting poles of great leadership.

Labour's defeat at the hands of Churchill in 1951 was due as much as anything to the exhaustion and illness that wracked its party leadership at the critical juncture of election eve. A similar fatigue characterized the Conservative party thereafter — personified most strikingly by the Prime Minister himself. Only those issues that interested him captured Churchill's executive attention. Economic matters were simply not among them.

On the international front, the United States and the Soviet Union considered Churchill's efforts politely, in deference to the man, but did not take them seriously. Churchill merely represented a symbol of the leadership of a very recent but bygone era.

Preserving the appearance of this symbol assumed an extraordinary amount of the Prime Minister's attention. Beginning with his first cerebrovascular accident, or stroke, in 1949, Churchill became obsessed with making a good show in public appearances. If he could continue long enough to maintain an image of resiliency, then he might be granted that last opportunity to assume the mantle of Peacemaker.

In the interim, however, he suffered two further strokes and numerous transient ischemic attacks. In concert with life-long endogenous depression, Churchill was victimized during his final
Churchill Trivia

TEST your skill and knowledge! Virtually all questions can be answered in back issues of FINEST HOUR (but it's not really cricket to check). Twenty-four questions will appear in each issue, the answers in the following issue.

Questions fall into six categories, which will enable us to develop a deck of cards for "Trivial Pursuit" game boards: Contemporaries (C), Literary (L), Miscellaneous (M), Personal (P), Statesmanship (S), and War (W).

1. Who was "F.E."? (C)
2. Which of his books did Churchill's alma mater, Sandhurst, adopt as a textbook? (L)
3. How many Winston Churchills are there in British political history? (M)
4. How old was Churchill when he was hit by a car in New York City? (P)
5. "I have watched this famous Island descending the staircase" ... (to what)? (S)
6. When did Churchill first meet Stalin? (W)
7. Who was "The Prof.? (C)
8. In what year did WSC first broadcast to the USA? (L)
9. What happened to the Graham Sutherland portrait of Churchill given him by Parliament on his 80th birthday? (M)
10. What pony did he love to ride as a boy at Blenheim? (P)
11. How old was WSC when Edward VII appointed him a Privy Councillor? (S)
12. Where in WW2 did WSC resign himself to dying? (W)
13. Who was "the boneless wonder"? (C)
14. WSC wished but failed to write a biography of what historical figure? (L)
15. What is the Churchill family motto? (M)
16. What childhood toys of Churchill's are displayed at Blenheim? (P)
17. How many Governments did Churchill form? (S)
18. What was the only naval battle lost when Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty? (W)
19. To whom did WSC reply, when accused of being drunk, "And you are very ugly, but tomorrow I'll be sober"? (C)
20. What book text did Churchill complete first? (L)
21. What country issued the first postage stamp depicting WSC? (M)
22. What Noel Coward song did WSC listen to aboard HMS Prince of Wales enroute to meet with FDR? (P)
23. What were Churchill and the young Tory malcontents called in 1901? (S)
24. What was owed by so many to so few? (W).

three years in office by a cerebrovascular induced dementia that compromised his best intentions, if not his leadership skills. The stroke in 1949 had affected the sensation of his right arm and leg and was compatible with a hypertensive lacunar infarction deep in the brain on the left side. In both 1950 and 1951 he suffered transient symptoms of atherosclerotically induced vascular insufficiency involving the two largest arteries supplying the posterior aspect of the brain. In 1952 a fleeting but ominous speech disturbance occurred, suggesting partial occlusion or spasm of the left middle cerebral artery supplying the speech centre of the cerebral cortex. Finally, a second hypertension-related lacunar stroke occurred in 1953, which profoundly weakened his left arm and leg. The widespread involvement of both sides of the brain by the effects of atherosclerosis and hypertension effected changes in Churchill's behaviour that were characteristic of an organic brain syndrome.

All of these cerebrovascular events, except the last, were carefully hidden from the British public.

Alas, the superpowers never called for Churchill's encore on centre stage, and the last two years of waiting induced him to rely upon drugs in the form of central nervous system stimulants to enhance the image he was increasingly struggling to project. Nor were his people as critically aware of his true condition as they should have been, given the air of secrecy that shrouded his medical problems from view.

Note: For a different view, see "Lord Soames on Sir Winston" earlier in this issue. — Ed.
THE DREAM

Thank you for so kindly presenting me with one of the 20 copies of The Dream bound in handmade French marbelised endpapers, which I very much appreciated receiving, and which I will place into the Blenheim Library.  

- THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH, BLENHEIM

I hasten to thank you most sincerely for this charming gift, which will go into the library at Cottachy along with some other books of historical interest.  

- LORD ABLIE, ST. JAMES’S PALACE

I deeply appreciate your most thoughtful gift about which I have only been reading recently, and which I am delighted to own, particularly in such a handsome edition with your very generous note.  

- CASPER W. WEINBERGER, WASHINGTON

I am delighted to possess this beautifully produced copy of Churchill’s strange and fascinating short story. It is clear how much thought and care has gone into every detail of the production. It gives a fine lead to the publication of the remaining Companion Volumes.  

- SIR JOHN MARTIN, OXFORD, UK

This very special memento will be treasured. I am only sorry that it will be my descendants rather than myself who will be around in 2250 to check on the longevity of the paper!

It has been most rewarding to have established personal contact with the International Churchill Society and I am sure the very welcome association between the House of Pol Roger and ICS will continue from strength to strength.  

- BILL GUNN, DENT & REUSS, HEREFORD, UK

On behalf of the Library Committee I wish to thank you for donating The Dream to the Club Library. It is a most beautifully produced book and your kindness is much appreciated.  

- DR. PETER URBACH, REFORM CLUB, LONDON

We are absolutely delighted to have the beautiful copy, which will greatly embellish our library.  

- CORRELLI BARNETT, ARCHIVIST, CHURCHILL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

I write with gratitude for the splendid copy and with all sincerity I congratulate you on the production, which is brilliant unto every detail and truly worthy of the thesis. It is something to be treasured by my family for all times.  

It is tragic to look around here and see the havoc caused during that one night in October when the hurricane uprooted so many of the great old oak and beech trees which brought fame to the Hascombe hills and, one may assume, pleasure to WSC. [See also "International Datelines." — Ed.]

In the garden the large yew which WSC climbed when playing gorilla with the children is standing unharmed, but I fear the little summer house has had it.  

My regards and may good health and happiness be with you in the New Year.  

- ARTHUR SIMON, HOE FARM, SURREY, UK

I feel very honoured to have the precious book in my library. The outside matches beautifully the inside. Thank you for such a generous gift.

You may like to know that Sir Ewen Ferguson, the new British Ambassador in Paris, has just reinstalled a gigantic bronze bust of Sir Winston in the main entrance. It is very impressive to see the large silhouette of the PM dominating the place.  

- CHRISTIAN POL-ROGER, EPERNAY, FRANCE

What a really beautiful book The Dream is! And that comes from an old printer and binder. Thanks so much for your great efforts on behalf of Sir Winston. You have accomplished much in 20 years and the best is yet to come.

- W.M. KIDD, PASS CHRISTIAN, MS, USA

Thank you so much for the lovely present of the Number 1 proof copy of The Dream. I think it is most beautifully executed and I am, of course, deeply touched by the inscription which I greatly appreciated.

FROM THE COLVILLE FAMILY

I write to acknowledge your letter to my father accompanying the beautiful limited edition of The Dream. I know he would have been honoured and touched by this handsome gift. Alas, that he never had the chance to see it. I have given the copy to my mother. She became very close to Sir Winston in the latter years of his life, and I know this book will mean a great deal to her.  

My father derived a great deal of pleasure from his association with Churchill College and the various Churchill organisations worldwide; the International Churchill Society undoubtedly being one of the most notable. He often said how fortunate he was to have been so closely associated with one of the few truly great men of the past decades and I think he felt that he owed it to the Society to repay this good fortune in any way he could — hence his genuine and unflagging devotion to all matters relating to Sir Winston.

We all miss him terribly, but he would not wish us to complain. As he said to me only this May, 'I've had my allotted threescore years and ten — anything extra is a bonus.'

- SANDY COLVILLE, BROUGHTON, HANTS., UK

I would like to thank you for the kind letter of condolence and very much appreciate the kind things you say about his literary achievements. His death has left a great gap in our lives and I and my family will miss him very much.  

- LADY MARGARET COLVILLE, BROUGHTON

New Members

AUSTRALIA  
NSW: KILLARNEY HTS/John Meyers; MONTEREY/R.E. Haydon; ULTIMO/S. Laurie  
W.A.: S. YUNDERUP/J.E. Arscott

CANADA  
ALB: CALGARY/Peter Burgener, J.R. Collins, Tim Finniss, John Harty, G. McA. McKinnon, Wm. Taylor, Stanley Waters; ED-MONTON/A.F. Collins, R. Harlbuf


NB: FRDRKTNS/Laurence Wall; RIVERVIEW/Louis Quigley; SACKVILLE/Dr. & Mrs. Alward

ONT: AJAX/Philip Wynne; BARRIE/Neil Craig; BRAMTNT/Jos. Fullan; DON MILLS/Dr. W.N. Clark; PETERBOROUGH/Sheila Craig, John Stewart; RENFREW/Cary Paul; SCARBOROUGH/S.J. Glaister, WSC Coll. Inst., Megan Gazley; TORONTO/Derek Brown, Bruce Headlam, E.J. Little

SASK: REGINA/M. Alward, M. Shumati-

chir

UNITED KINGDOM  
CHESHIRE: NANTWICH/John Pearson  
DORSET: WIMBORNE/Nancy Ward  
HANTS: HAYLING IS/Wm. Eyles  
KENT: FANHAM/Wm. Charnley  
LONDON: Mark Weber

OXON: HENLEY/Robert Hardy

W. MILDS: HALESOVEN/Mrs. O.W. Lawley

SOMERSET: TAUNTON/L.J. Blackwell

SURREY: LIMPSFIELD/Judge M. Cook
His Finest Hours On Radio.

Historical speeches by Winston Churchill as broadcast during the war years.

Hear Winston Churchill, and the voices of other important history makers from WWII on audio cassettes, featuring:

- Churchill's & FDR's declarations of War on Japan
- Churchill's address to the US Congress
- Casablanca War Conference
- Many short-wave broadcasts via the BBC
- Famous Newscasters direct from War Zones
- FDR's Fireside Chats
- Popular "Home Front" programs
- Special Churchill tributes, and much more

Enjoy these historic radio programs on high quality 60-minute audio cassettes from as little as $3.50 per hour, with a money-back guarantee. For your FREE Historical Radio Catalogue, send name and address to: OUTER EDGE Radio Cassettes, Dept. C, 10 Magnolia Ave., Larkspur, CA 94939.

YES! Please rush my FREE Historical Radio Catalogue to:

Name:
Address:
City __________________________ State __________________________ Zip ___________

Return to: OUTER EDGE Radio Cassettes, Dept. C, 10 Magnolia Avenue, Larkspur, CA 94939
IMMORTAL WORDS

TO THE PEOPLE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Today is the second anniversary of the Munich Agreement, a date which the world will always remember for the tragic sacrifice made by the Czechoslovak people in the interest of European peace.

The hopes which this agreement stirred in the heart of civilised mankind have been frustrated.

Within six months the solemn pledges given by unscrupulous men who control the destiny of Germany were broken, and the agreement destroyed with a ruthlessness which unmasked the true nature of their reckless ambitions to the whole world.

In this hour of your martyrdom I send you this message: The battle which we in Britain are fighting today is not only our battle. It is also your battle, and, indeed, the battle of all nations who prefer liberty to soulless serfdom.

It is the struggle of civilised nations for the right to live their own life in the manner of their own choosing. It represents man’s instinctive defiance of tyranny and of an impersonal universe.

Throughout history no European nation has shown a greater will to survive than yours, and today again your people have given countless proofs of their courage in adversity.

Here in Britain we have welcomed with pride and gratitude your soldiers and airmen who have come by daring escape to take part with ever-increasing success in that battle for Britain which is also the battle for Czechoslovakia.

It is because we both are fighting for the fundamental decencies of human life that we are determined that neither our struggle nor your struggle shall be in vain.

It is for this reason that we have refused to recognise any of the brutal conquests of Germany in Central Europe and elsewhere, that we have welcomed a Czechoslovak Provisional Government in this country, and that we have made the restoration of Czechoslovak liberties one of our principal war aims.

With firmness and resolution, two qualities which our nations share in equal measure, these aims will be achieved.

Be of good cheer. The hour of your deliverance will come. The soul of freedom is deathless. It cannot and will not perish.

BROADCAST, LONDON, 11TH SEPTEMBER 1940