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GOOD NEWS ON CONNOISSEUR’S GUIDE AND PEACEMAKER

The prices of the two new books produced in association with The Churchill Center are reduced dramatically.

A Connoisseur’s Guide to the Books of Sir Winston Churchill (described in FH98, page 5) is reduced from $48 to only $30. It sells for £40 in Britain, but only £39.95 in the USA; the member price is based on the USA price and applies wherever you live, including Britain. Churchill As Peacemaker, edited by James Muller, is reduced from $50 to $45. (Bookshop price is $59.95.) See Finest Hour 97, page 28 for a review of this fine work.

Both books may now be ordered directly from the CC New Book Service, PO Box 385, Contoocook NH 03229. Make checks out to “Churchill Center.” Add for shipping: $5 for first book, $1 for each additional book. British members will get faster delivery of the Connoisseur’s Guide from ICS/UK (add address on page 2), which charges £21.50 inclusive of post. A portion of this goes to ICS/UK, the rest to the Center.

The Churchill Center made both these books possible by purchasing a quantity of the Guide while underwriting much of the Symposium that produced Peacemaker. Between these two books, eleven authors have now been published in what are as much Churchill Center publications as Finest Hour or the Churchill Proceedings.

WORKING ON A CHURCHILL BOOK?

One of The Churchill Center’s primary goals is to help implement publication of worthwhile Churchill Studies without getting into the act of publishing itself. These new books have furnished us with models and experience for future projects. We are laying plans for more books based on our symposia, and working with people who have approached us with other book projects. We will announce these titles as soon as arrangements are locked up. (See the report opposite for more details.)

The Center has adopted publishing guidelines which outline how we approach these projects. The first step is for the author to circulate his or her book proposal to publishers. If the book is accepted without our involvement, we cheer; if not, we consider ways by which we might help get a desirable book into print. We like to see commercial or academic publication, because either produces books with large scale distribution that is beyond our own resources. If you are an author with a Churchill book project, I will be happy to send you the CC’s guidelines and samples of book proposals to publishers.

BARRY GOLDWATER

For the frontispiece of his photography book, People and Places, Barry Goldwater chose a photo he’d taken of President Kennedy, whom he had expected to run against in 1964. (They’d even discussed making joint debate appearances, using the same airplane.) The inscription read: “To Barry Goldwater, whom I urge to follow the career for which he has shown much talent—photography! From his friend - John Kennedy.” Their friendship despite deep political differences was a Churchillian characteristic of each.

In 1964 I cast my first Presidential vote for Goldwater, knowing it was in vain, sick at heart over the smears of that campaign, and the way he had handled them. But I will never forget his earlier, electric words, “Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice,” which I classified with those of John Kennedy: “Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.” Now we deplore the absence of figures like them, the one so graceful, the other so genuine; but in so doing we forget that the world has changed. And that we, too, have changed.

We all know what John Kennedy said about Winston Churchill, when declaring him an honorary American citizen. On this subject Barry Goldwater profoundly agreed. “Winston Churchill is one of the people on my list of the truly great,” Goldwater wrote to me eight years ago. "And I can assure you, that's a damn short list."

Rest in peace, Senator.

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH, EDITOR
This summer we thought it appropriate to send a small lapel pin to the Churchill Center Associates listed below, who have brought us to where we are today. An accompanying letter read as follows:

"As a Churchill Center Associate you should be among the first to know that our endowment has now exceeded one million dollars. Given our small numbers, this is an impressive achievement which will encourage other members to become Associates and provide powerful evidence to the major financial backers we will be approaching this autumn, as to what we have already accomplished on our own. The present amount is not insignificant: by the end of 2000 it will total over $600,000 cash and over $400,000 in further pledges or bequests. Pursuant to our goals, this principal will never be touched, but carefully invested to produce income that will guarantee the continuance of our work forever.

"The Endowment is separate from our operating funds, and our operating expenses have never been met solely by annual subscriptions. Accordingly, our Annual Report will also be accompanied by the traditional Heritage Fund appeal, for donations that help underwrite our day-to-day expenses. Also included in the package will be Churchill Proceedings 1994-1995, a book containing all the addresses delivered at ICS and Churchill Center functions during those years. A later edition will cover the same material for 1996-1997.

"The gratitude of our Governors, Trustees and members to you for your powerful aid can never be properly expressed; but we hope these exiguous tokens of thanks will represent their appreciation to you as co-creator of a unique institution."

While thanking our Associates, we must also thank our over 600 founding members in America, Canada, Britain and many other countries, who thought enough of our plans to get the Center off the ground three years ago; and our 3000 members worldwide, whose regular renewals and many contributions sustain all these efforts. We could not do it without you. All of you. In any organization depending heavily on volunteers and donations, inevitably some can do more than others, but the work of the few could not be sustained without the support of the many. Thank-you.

MOVING RIGHT ALONG
Eighteen months ago, The Churchill Center was so extended with seminars, symposia and book projects already authorized that its Board instructed its Governors to avoid encouraging the many people with book projects, scholarship needs or other worthy Churchill Studies projects in the hope of our assistance. We stalled, worried that anything as ambitious as this major new enterprise might be beyond our capacity.

Our position has since improved considerably. The initial success of our endowment campaign has greatly encouraged us. We have started in a modest way to offer scholarships, for two students enrolled in the Centre for Second World War Studies, University of Edinburgh. We have organized the first Churchill Lecture, by Ambassador Raymond Seitz, in Williamsburg, Virginia on November 6th. We have commissioned editorial work on three new books: papers from our two 1996 symposia ("Churchill and the Postwar Years" and the Fulton Speech 50th Anniversary) and a new edition of The River War incorporating both the original 1899 and revised 1902 texts, exhaustively annotated to indicate which parts were 1899 and which were revisions. James Mullers editorial work on the latter is nearly complete and publishing concepts have been approved by the Churchill literary interests; it remains only to find a publisher. A fourth book began with our May 1996 symposium in England: "Churchill's Life of Marlborough," about which more overleaf continued >"
GESTATION OF THE CONNOISSEUR’S GUIDE

Six years ago the Directors of the International Churchill Society, USA asked Richard Langworth to produce a guide to Churchill’s books similar to previous ICS booklets, such as Douglas Russell’s Orders and Decorations of Sir Winston Churchill, John Woods’s The Boer Conspiracy and the Churchill Conover Correspondence. With the press of other business the project was repeatedly postponed—fortunately, as it turned out. In 1996, the author secured the interest of Brassey’s (UK) Ltd. in publishing the work as a book, provided that The Churchill Center would assist by buying a quantity of books hot off the press. Instead of producing a smaller booklet, at considerable expense, which would circulate mainly to members, we ended up with a much better deal: the Center recoups most of its investment through sales of the book to members, who benefit through a special 25% discount off the regular price, and the book is simultaneously available to the public through the retail book trade.

The formula by which the Guide was produced provides a pattern for future, desirable book projects which might otherwise be of marginal interest to publishers. The cost to the Center of a hardbound book turned out to be much less than an ICS booklet; by mid-August the Center had already recouped a third of its investment in copies; and commercial publication gave the book a circulation we couldn’t have achieved on our own.

This success would not have been possible without the response of members who advance-ordered over 150 copies, even when the price appeared to be much higher. We are very grateful to all who bought (and are buying) copies, and hope you will be as pleased by the product as you will be with the lower price.

WINSTON CHURCHILL’S LIFE OF MARLBOROUGH

The most comprehensive symposium ever undertaken by The Churchill Center brought fifteen renowned authorities from Britain, Canada and the United States to the Spencer-Churchill Conference Room, Blenheim Palace, to discuss, dissect, debate, criticize, praise and ponder Marlborough: His Life and Times, the biography Leo Strauss called “the greatest historical work written in our century, an inexhaustible mine of political wisdom and understanding.” About fifty members and friends of the Churchill Center and Societies attended all or some phase of the events, including a finale dinner on May 16th with the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, Lady Soames and Celia Sandys, where our good friends Pol Roger Champagne kindly donated the libation. Our after-dinner speaker was Sir Martin Gilbert, who stepped back for a broad retrospective of the subject on which he has spent much of his adult life. Programmes, which contain abstracts of the papers and descriptions and photos of the symposiasts, are available free from the editor upon request.

Our able symposiarch, Piers Brendon, Keeper of the Archives at Churchill College Cambridge, kept discussions moving and rescued diem on die few occasions where diey lagged. Although he did not write a paper himself, Dr. Brendon obviously had read diem all in advance, and was ready with penetrating insights, keen critiques and humorous asides which animated the symposiasts and kept the audience riveted. Here are some excerpts from the abstracts:

William Speck, Professor of Modern History, Leeds University: “To make die Duke recognizable to twentieth century readers, Churchill strove to present the historical context in modern terms. For example, he persistently called the Spanish Netherlands ‘Belgium.’ He presented Louis XT/ as a threat to the liberties in Europe in much the same way that the Kaiser had been and as Hider was becoming. The result was that Churchill identified himself more and more with his hero.”

Kirk Emmert, Professor of Political Science, Kenyon College, Ohio: “The dominant dieme is the centrality and supremacy of politics. The theme is vital to Churchill’s measured defence of Marlborough and is the major lesson his work teaches to his politically uneducated and disengaged countrymen. Churchill demonstrates Marlborough’s awareness of the intrinsic superiority of political purposes and virtues deriving from their connection to individual and national well-being.”

Barry M. Gough, Professor of History, Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario: “British maritime ascendancy secured Gibraltar and Minorca during die War of Spanish Succession and established a British presence in the Mediterranean diat lasted three centuries. Queen Anne’s war at sea dius demonstrates die crystallization of a policy that served Britain well into the twentieth century and even into die Cold War.”

Geoffrey Treasure, History Master (retired), Harrow School: “As biography Marlborough is grand, compelling and irreplaceable. As a history of die times, inevitably, it is flawed. Especially this is true of Churchill’s treatment of France....My paper suggests ways in which the balance can be restored. To do Louis and his ministers justice is in no way to reduce the stature of Churchill’s hero. Rather, it enhances the significance of his achievement.”

John H. Mather, M.D., Assistant Inspector General, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs: “Marlborough lived when medical knowledge was based on strong beliefs about the origin and cure for disease and injury. He was exposed to maladies, common in large armies, but avoided all the serious infectious diseases. His avoidance of personal trauma and his support for the reparative
needs of his troops are a comment on his own good fortune and his serious commitment to the welfare of his armies.

James W. Muller, Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Political Science, University of Alaska, Anchorage: "Churchill's biographical masterpiece is a tragic story which shows the extent and the limits of human power. We see in Churchill's portrait the power of a great commander to shape the course of human history. Yet Marlborough was unable to prevent his own fall, nor did he contemplate his limits with the same philosophic interest that Churchill shows as a biographer."

David A. T. Stafford, Visiting Fellow, Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh: "Churchill's use of secret service while he was prime minister is now legendary, but he had long experience of all forms of intelligence long before 1940. This is apparent in his biography of Marlborough, where he is the first biographer to highlight this particular dimension of his hero's strategy; it contains many references to secret service, secret agents, and deception. None of them is very full, but his account stands up well to what specialists have later learned about intelligence and its use by armies of the eighteenth century."

Paul K Alkon, Leo S. Bing Professor of English, University of Southern California, Los Angeles: "The book's literary merits can be reassessed by considering the narrative methods Churchill adopts to achieve his announced intention to recall this great shade from the past. Churchill warns against the distortions inherent in retrospective narration; his combination of Boswellian and Richardsonian narrative techniques partly succeeds in bringing Marlborough forward as a living and intimate presence. But the book endures by its success in bringing us even closer to its narrator."

Paul A. Rahe, Jay P. Walker Professor and Chairman, Dept. of History, University of Tulsa: "That Winston Churchill was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature might, with some justice, be attributed to his statesmanship. But it would be an error to deny that he had earned such recognition as a writer. The life he wrote concerning his renowned ancestor bears comparison with the histories of Thucydides, Hume, Gibbon and Macauley. The understanding that Churchill formed while writing this biography sustained him through the travails of the late 1930s and 1940s."

Stephen Saunders Webb, Professor of History, Syracuse University, New York: "The life of Marlborough is Whig history. It mistakes Parliament for politics and Europe for the world. America is absent from the life, although evidence of the importance of the Empire to the builder of Blenheim filled the Palace archives. Because Churchill did relatively little research, compilation of conceptualization for the life, it did little to give life to the American empire that owed so much to Marlborough."

Robert Eden, Professor of History and Politics, Hillsdale College, Michigan: "Today, Churchill's natural audience must learn about Churchill and World War II from historians, most of whom cannot find or make the time to read Marlborough. The book stands in a certain tension with that context. Even well-informed scholars and statesmen, who are persuaded of the book's relevance for understanding Churchill's wartime statesmanship, find themselves embarrassed and perplexed by Churchill's biography."

James R Jones, Emeritus Professor of History, University of East Anglia: "The problems which Marlborough had to overcome in persuading his allies to adopt a defensive strategy, in coordinating their campaigns, and in maintaining allied unity in the later states of a victorious war when they were no longer afraid of the enemy, have intrinsic similarities to those which Churchill himself was to encounter. Churchill learned from Marlborough the vital importance of establishing mutual confidence with allied leaders in order to maintain the unity of purpose necessary to win the war."

Seth Cropsey, Chairman, Dept. of Democratic Decision Making, George C. Marshall Center College of Strategic Studies: "The obstacles that members of the Grand Alliance offered to its collective success, and the leadership that Marlborough displayed in overcoming them, are a better model for thinking about alliances today than the Anglo-American alliance of World War II, in which the major partners were in large agreement; or NATO, which did not fight to win the Cold War; or the Desert Storm coalition, which was political rather than military."

Melissa S. Lane, University Assistant Lecturer in the Faculty of History, University of Cambridge: "This paper explores the forms of reasoning about peacemaking in the period 1708-10 as described by Churchill in Volume IV of Marlborough. It is in part a philosophical exploration of some notions on which Churchill's historiography draws: for example, Marlborough's willingness to accept a reward is analyzed in order to explore the difference between reward and bribe from the standpoint of an agent."

Morton J. Frisch, Professor of Political Science, Northern Illinois University: "Churchill's biography is as close as he ever comes to writing a manual for statesmen. By pointing to what he sees as Marlborough's cautioniness in the peace negotiations of 1709, Churchill draws our attention to the core of his own political thought. Churchill rejects caution, which he believes considerably lowers the status of statesmanship."

The Marlborough Symposium owes its success to many people besides Piers Brendon and the symposiasts quoted above: the Duke of Marlborough, who attended one of the sessions and with the Duchess the concluding dinner; Bill Gunn and Pol Roger UK for the fine Champagne; academic chairman James Muller for the recruitment of symposiasts, organization of papers and editing of programme; Parker Lee for preliminary arrangements; and general manager John Plumpton, who worked tirelessly to pull together complicated travel and transportation requirements, to produce the outstanding catering at Wroxton College and Blenheim, and to assure that everything went off in timely fashion. On the surface it might be supposed that John was treated to a wonderful junket to England. Those who were present know there wasn't a moment from dawn to dark that he wasn't working full-time for the success of the operation.

To make them more widely available to teachers and students, papers delivered at this Symposium are later be published as a book. Now indeed the real work begins for our symposiasts: refining their papers for that book, based on the points that were made around the table. We are sure that we will be pleased and proud with the book that eventually results.

FINEST HOUR 99/7
QUOTE OF THE SEASON
"I have noticed...a tendency...to hush everything up, to make everything look as fair as possible, to tell what is called the official truth, to present a version of the truth which contains about 75% of the actual article...all the ugly facts are smoothed and varnished over, rotten reputations are propped up, and officers known as incapable are allowed to hang on and linger in their commands in the hope that at the end...they may be shunted into private life without a scandal."
WSC, House of Commons, 12 March 1901

HOMONYMS...
...are words that sound alike but spelled (spelt) differently. What do you call words which sound different but are spelled alike? Let us know, because in 1999 we have two events in Bath: one in Bath, Maine (launch of USS Winston S. Churchill, 17 April); and Bath, England (16th International Churchill Conference, 22-25 July). More below...

VIVE LA GREECE!
NEW YORK JUNE 15TH—Winston Churchill has passed Kemal Ataturk in the "leaders and statesmen" category in the ongoing Time magazine Internet poll for people of the century. Apparently, Ataturk's surge (FH 97 pp 8-9) was prompted by Turkish newspaper urgings; the Greeks got wind of this, and voted en masse for Winston Churchill. If Onassis were still around he could have just bought Time.

OMDURMAN COVER
SUDAN, TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 2ND—Churchill Center commemorative cover #51, marking the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Omdurman and Churchill's charge with the 21st Lancers, was issued here today: another gem by covers manager Dave Marcus to follow his "Malakand" cover, posted from Pakistan in March. On this one, the "Sudan" postmark is applied to the U.S. 1965 Churchill commemorative and 1948 " Rough Riders" commemorative. The latter is ideal, since it says nothing about Teddy Roosevelt and depicts a mounted cavalrman. The cachet design is based on Bud Bradshaw's Omdurman print on the cover of FH 77.

Commemorative covers are free but you must ask to be put on the mailing list. If you are not on the list, you may obtain cover #51 for $3 or £2 postpaid airmail from Dave Marcus, 3048 Van Buskirk Circle, Las Vegas NV 89121. To be added to the list, include your current FH mailing label. Congratulations to Dave, who has been turning out these fascinating covers since 1970.

TURNOVER
LONDON, MAY 21ST—The talk around town is that the year-old Labour Government wishes to do away with hereditary peers in the House of Lords. (Churchill, with Lloyd George an early advocate of curbing the Lords, referred to the Upper House in 1911 as "one-sided, hereditary, unpurged, unrepresentative, irresponsible, absentee.") But there is greater turnover in the House of Lords (from superannuation) than there is in the United States House of Representatives (where 99% of the incumbents who ran for office were returned in the last election). Makes us wonder who the hereditary peers are.

ICS/UK FORGES CLOSER
LINKS WITH MEMORIAL TRUST
LONDON MAY 14TH—Discussions with Sir Henry Beverley, Director General of the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust, have produced closer ties between the International Churchill Society of the U.K. and the Trust. The two organisations have identifiable common threads. The Trust uses the words, "to follow his [WSCs] inspiration," whilst the Society uses the words, "to inspire and educate future generations through the works and example of Sir Winston Churchill."

The principal difference is that the Trust specialises in awarding Fellowships for overseas projects covering a wide variety of subjects; whereas the Society is more narrowly defined with two main complementary strands, educational and historical.

The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust is a living tribute to Sir Winston, whose life and example are the inspiration. He died in 1965 and many thousands of people, in respect for his inspired leadership, gave generously to a public subscription to fund Travelling Fellowships. These enable men and women from all walks of life and every corner of the UK to acquire knowledge and experience abroad. In the process, they gain a better understanding of the lives and different cultures of people overseas and, on their return, their effectiveness at work, as well as their contribution to the community, are enhanced greatly. All British citizens are eligible for the 100 or so annual awards; Churchill Fellows can be of any age, and any occupation. Everyone has an equal chance; a lack of qualifications is not a bar to an award as every application is judged on the worth of the individual and the relative merit of the project.

The 1999 categories include fellowships for projects in animal welfare, small business, teaching and education, community health, science and technology, adventure and exploration, urban design, rural planning and development, projects requiring travel to a European Union country, problems of ageing and—most significantly to us—"A project in the Field of History."

ICS/UK members, or anyone known to members, who would like to apply for a Churchill Fellowship in "A project in the Field of History" would receive consideration with all other applicants. They are advised to apply for a fellowship in a history project specifically related to a historical aspect of Churchill's life. 23 October 1998 is the closing date for application forms. For a brochure and an application form, send a self-addressed envelope (22cm x 11cm) to: The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust, 15 Queen's Gate Terrace, London SW7 5PR, telephone (0170) 584 9315, fax (0171) 581 041, E-mail office@wcmt.org.uk. Or visit the Trust's website at http://www.wcmt.org.uk.

-Nigel Knocker
THE CHURCHILL CALENDAR

Local event organizers are welcome to send entries for this calendar; owing to our quarterly schedule, however, we need copy at least three months in advance.

1998
5-8 November: Fifteenth International Churchill Conference, Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia

1999
2 April: Annual General Meeting, ICS/UK, Cabinet War Rooms, London
17 April: Launch of USS Winston S. Churchill, DDG81, Bath Iron Works, Bath, Maine
22-25 July: Sixteenth International Churchill Conference, Bath, Somerset
26 July-10 August: "Churchill's South Africa" Tour, Capetown to Pretoria
24-26 September: Thirteenth Conference, "Churchill & Eisenhower at Gettysburg," Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

2000
14-17 September: Seventeenth International Churchill Conference, Anchorage, Alaska

2001
14 February: Centenary of Churchill's Entry into Parliament
Autumn: Eighteenth International Churchill Conference

2003
Twentieth International Churchill Conference and 50th Anniversary of the Bermuda Conference, Hamilton, Bermuda

IT'S OFFICIAL: THE NAME IS
USS WINSTON S. CHURCHILL
BATH, MAINE, JUNE 20H—Bath Iron Works President Allan Cameron and Vice President for AEGIS Programs John Mason advised today that the middle initial "S." has officially been added to the name of DDG81, the guided missile destroyer to be launched here in April 1999. The lack of the "S." which Sir Winston always used, was brought to our attention by a member of ICS/UK, Armido I. Valori of Norwich, England, and endorsed by Ambassador Paul Robinson. Family approval was secured by Secretary of the Navy John Dalton.

We are grateful to Messrs. Cameron and Mason for kindly welcoming our editor and his family to the historic shipyard, where DDG81 is already taking shape. A member wrote us saying WSC's name should have been used on a larger U.S. Navy vessel. The only larger ones still being built are aircraft carriers, and not many of those. At 509 feet overall, this is a vessel to which enemies will give a wide berth.

Winston S. Churchill will break new ground for her class by her long-range 5-inch gun (more range and accuracy than any battleship), upgraded display consoles, and a few other cutting-edge enhancements. She will certainly be the "best of the best" when she sets to sea. We believe Sir Winston would be more than pleased with his namesake's technical wizardry and, if taken along on trials, would undoubtedly insist on popping off a few practice rounds.

ERRATUM, FH'98
Page 25: John David Marshall informs us that apparently the famous exchange ("Winston, if I were your wife I'd put poison in your coffee"/"Nancy, if I were your husband I'd drink it") is not something that occurred between Astor and F. E. Smith, as we stated. See The Glitter and the Gold by Consuelo Vanderbilt Balsan (1953, p. 62), who says the exchange occurred at Blenheim Palace when her son was host. Christopher Sykes, said to have made the correction crediting F.E. Smith, confirms Balsan's version in his Nancy: The Life of Lady Astor (Harper & Row, 1972, p. 27): "It sounds like an invention but is well authenticated. [Churchill] and the Astors were staying with Churchill's cousin, the Duke of Marlborough, at Blenheim Palace," where WSC and Nancy had "argued ferociously all weekend."

We have issued a complimentary membership to Churchill's designated captain, Cdr. M. T. Franken, who informs us that DDG81 will be ported in Norfolk, Virginia, "good news for the thousands of crew members who will one day call the ship home." Visits to Britain will occur "whenever feasible ...for years to come."

Cdr. Franken has also settled on a motto for the ship's crest: "In War: Resolution; In Peace: Good Will."

The launch date is tentatively Saturday 17 April 1999, with Lady Soames present. Members are invited, so hold the date! Note, however, that there is some agitation for 24 April, the 50th Anniversary of NATO. In that case the launch will probably be attended by very senior officials indeed, but there's a hitch. Tides in Bath, ten miles up the Kennebec, are critical, and vessels this large have to be launched at peak-high lest they end up stuck on a mudbank! So nature, not officialdom, may play the governing hand. Our man in Bath, Fred Koch, USN (Ret.), will keep us informed of developments. -RML

CONTINUED OVERLEAF >>
LIBRARY GIFTS
BLENHEIM PALACE, MAY 16TH— The Churchill Center is most grateful to Mr. Gordon Bloor of Bath, Somerset, who very kindly donated a first edition of Winston Churchill's first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force, to benefit The Churchill Center. Many other members have donated books to The Churchill Center library, including former ICS, Canada chairman Celwyn Ball and Edwin Russell of New York, a brother-in-law of The Duke of Marlborough. The Center library will comprise all editions of all Churchill books in all languages, including fine archival copies and reading copies for loan or reference.

Donated books are professionally appraised and we can furnish appraisals to donors for tax purposes. We do not guarantee that all donated books will be retained; inevitably there will be duplicates and these must be sold to allow acquisition of books we don't have, or given to other worthy libraries. All book donors will be acknowledged in these pages, and their names will one day appear on a plaque on the library wall.

McMENAMIN TO "A.T.D."
"INSIDE THE JOURNALS" REVIVES
TORONTO, JULY 31ST— Senior Editor John Plumpton, who replaced Dal Newfield as author of "Action This Day" in Finest Hour 37 after Dal's death in 1982, publishes his last column in Finest Hour 100. He will be replaced by Michael McMennamin, a skilled writer and organizer of the member meetings in Cleveland, Ohio. John Plumpton will now revive "Inside the Journals," our important but lately absent column of abstracts of Churchill articles in periodicals. He will be assisted by a second contributor, Tom Reinehr. Readers who spot Churchill articles in periodicals should send copies either to John (address on page 2) or to Tom at 12415 W. Monte Vista Rd Avondale, AZ 85323 (e-mail tomreinehr@uswest.net).

Our deepest thanks to John for his seventy-four successive columns. He is one of those writers editors dream about, sending us exactly the right number of words, beautifully expressed, virtually camera-ready, well before deadline, every single time. -RML

FRENCH RESISTANCE
PARIS, MAY 12TH— Brian Reeve, a businessman who started campaigning for the first Churchill statue in France after the British honoured de Gaulle with a £300,000 bronze in central London, says he has raised only £35,000 of the £200,000 anticipated cost of the sculptor Jean Cardot's 11 ft. bronze and was expecting in May to borrow from banks to pay the second of three installments due. "If the worst comes to the worst, I shall just have to stand in front of the statue with a hat," Reeve says. The statue is to be unveiled on the Avenue Winston Churchill near the Champs-Elysees on Armistice Day, 11 November. Reeve has received hundreds of enthusiastic and moving letters from French veterans and a substantial donation from Champagne Pol Roger, although he admits to receiving "a few nasty notes" from Frenchmen who still bear a grudge over Dunkirk (why? British ships rescued thousands of poilus, at great risk) and over the Royal Navy's attack on the French fleet at Mers el-Kebir when Churchill feared French ships would fall into German hands. Reeve says these controversies are beside the point: "If it hadn't been for Churchill at Yalta, France would have been put under an allied government after the war. It wouldn't be France at all. I'm convinced that the French feel great gratitude....It's just a question of working away at the fund-raising."

DOWN THE RIVER
LONDON, 15 JULY— Sotheby's "Political Sale" offered the greatest selection of Churchilliana ever assembled in a single salesroom. Among the highlights: two paintings, "Blue Grass, La Capponcina" (Coombs 471) and "Garden Scene at Breceles" (Coombs 54), £84,000 and £45,500 respectively; a gold cigar case presented by Onassis, £44,300; "the Victory Watch," an inscribed gold watch presented to Churchill in 1945, £26,450; one of Churchill's black top hats, £25,300; Churchill's own Proclamation of his honorary U.S. Citizenship £18,400; his despatch box when he was Minister of Munitions, £13,800; his silver cigar ashtray, hallmarked 1903, £10,350; his copy of the abridged one-volume Second World War (Woods A123c) bound in red morocco, £9,200; a pair of blue velvet slippers monogrammed "WSC," £6,325; a "Don Joaquin" cigar box given to bodyguard Eddie Murray, £2530. Two maquettes by Oscar Nemon, a 24-inch-high bronze of the House of Commons Statue and a 22-inch-high resin bronze of the Westerham Green statue, brought £28,750 and £10,925 respectively. I didn't buy anything but noted with satisfaction a useful hike in the value of a number of items in my collection. -DJH

SIR DAVID HUNT
LONDON, 31 JULY— Attlee's and Churchill's private secretary, who addressed the 1992 Churchill Conference in England, has died aged 84. David Wathen Stather Hunt was born in 1913 and was educated at St Lawrence College, Ramsgate and Oxford. In 1938 he enlisted in the Welch Regiment and served in the Middle East, Balkans, North Africa and Italy, being mentioned in despatches three times and receiving the OBE and the
U.S. Bronze Star. Emerging from the war a colonel, he joined the Commonwealth Relations Office and later became assistant private secretary to the Prime Minister in 1950. From 1954 he served in numerous high positions abroad, culminating as Ambassador to Brazil from 1969 to 1973. He achieved celebrity by winning the BBC television Mastermind title in 1977 and the Champion of Champions title in 1982.

When Labour lost the 1951 general election David Hunt automatically became a private secretary to Winston Churchill. (Downing Street secretaries had never been political appointees and proudly served Prime Ministers of any party with impartiality.) Sir David always looked back on that period of his career with affection and pride. He was not afraid to stand up to Churchill and recalled that whilst the latter would often be indignant at being opposed, he would usually give way when he realised he might be wrong. He particularly enjoyed helping Churchill to prepare his speeches, partly because he was required to intervene if the speech seemed to stray from the brief, but mostly because Churchill liked to have an audience and David Hunt delighted in being it.

Sir David was a droll speaker with wonderful memories of the two Prime Ministers, telling us in 1992 that it was difficult to get close to Churchill, whom he served under principal private secretary David Pitblado. One evening Hunt thought he’d cracked it. When he mentioned that he had just attended his own birthday dinner party, the PM congratulated him warmly and said, “We must have a drink together.” Then, summoning a messenger, he said, “Get Mr. Pitblado a whisky and soda.” -DJH

JAMES W. WIMMER, JR.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, JUNE 22ND—For twenty-five years, at the close of the annual “Other Other Club” dinner in Madison, club founder Jim Wimmer would rise to deliver the eulogy for Sir Winston Churchill, who co-founded “The Other Club” in London when an established club gave him the order of the boot. Each eulogy was the same, except for a few minor alterations Jim would make to be sure fellow members were still listening after a long night of wine, cigars and frozen vodkas. Long and boisterous applause would follow, not for the speech but for the man who gave it.

Born in Portage and raised in Wisconsin Dells, Jim was a lobbyist and a Democrat who, like Churchill, understood the need for cordiality with the opposition. Recently he became an ally of and advisor to Republican Governor Tommy Thompson, as he had been earlier to Democrat Governor Gaylord Nelson. He died aged only 62, from complications of a fall he suffered at his home while cleaning up after an auction for one of his many charities. He fell backwards down a flight of stairs and never regained consciousness.

Jim Wimmer was never elected to anything, but his advice was valued by those who were. He understood power but aspired never to abuse it. Mainly he gave it.

...The Other Other Club” in London when an established club gave him the order of the boot. Each eulogy was the same, except for a few minor alterations Jim Wimmer, Jr. would make to be sure fellow members were still listening after a long night of wine, cigars and frozen vodkas. Long and boisterous applause would follow, not for the speech but for the man who gave it. Born in Portage and raised in Wisconsin Dells, Jim was a lobbyist and a Democrat who, like Churchill, understood the need for cordiality with the opposition. Recently he became an ally of and advisor to Republican Governor Tommy Thompson, as he had been earlier to Democrat Governor Gaylord Nelson. He died aged only 62, from complications of a fall he suffered at his home while cleaning up after an auction for one of his many charities. He fell backwards down a flight of stairs and never regained consciousness.

Jim Wimmer was never elected to anything, but his advice was valued by those who were. He understood power but aspired never to abuse it. Mainly he knew what it meant to be a contributing citizen in a free society.

-Thomas W. Still, Wisconsin State Journal
DR. LARRY DAVIDSON
FULTON, MISSOURI, JUNE 21TH—President Emeritus Larry Davidson, 89, died in a tragic automobile accident. "For many people, Larry Davidson was Westminster College," said College President James Traer. "Larry was involved with the College up to the very end. He will be deeply missed by scores of current and past students, faculty and friends." Davidson served as President of Westminster from May 1955 to June 1973, the longest tenure of any Westminster College president. Among Churchillians he will be remembered as the President responsible for the acquisition and transfer of the Church of St. Mary, Aldermanbury, originally located in London, to Fulton. The church was dedicated in May, 1969 and serves as the main building of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library.

Born in Dover, Delaware in 1909, Robert L.D. Davidson received his A.B. degree from Dickinson College in 1931. He later received the M.A. and Ed.D. degrees in history from Temple University in Philadelphia. He served in World War II, attaining the rank of Lieutenant Commander in the U.S. Navy. On 15 June 1971, Dr. Davidson received the OBE from Her Majesty The Queen.

Davidson began his career as a high school teacher and administrator. Following World War n, he began his college teaching career at Temple, where he rose to the rank of dean. He was preceded in death by his wife, Lois, who died in December 1997. He is survived by a daughter, a son and three grandchildren.

-Dan Diedriech,
Asst. Vice President, College Relations
Westminster College

1999 Conference & South Africa Tour

CHURCHILL CONFERENCE XVI
BATH, SOMERSET, 22-25 JULY 1999—ICS United Kingdom, which is hosting the 16th International Churchill Conference on 22-25 July next year, has now completed its recce's of Bath, the Conference site; prepared an outline programme; and confirmed bookings with the very efficient Bath Conference Bureau. The theme will be "The Emergence of a Leader," and the programme will be centred around the turn of the century to tie in with Churchill's adventures in South Africa etc. "It all fits together quite neatly," reports Chairman Nigel Knocker. "Early days yet though." The Conference will precede departure of Churchill's South Africa Tour.

"CHURCHILL'S SOUTH AFRICA"
CAPETOWN, 26 JULY-10 AUGUST 1999—Sir Winston's granddaughter, Celia Sandys, and South African member Nicholas Schofield are hosts of a unique two-week tour of South Africa during the Centenary Year of Churchill's adventures there during the Anglo-Boer War. The tour, to be joined by Lady Soames, was arranged by Celia and South African member Nicholas Schofield. It combines traditional African touring (game parks, animals, Victoria Falls, a luxury overnight steam train, the Mount Nelson Hotel in Capetown) and specialized Churchill events, including visits to all the places made famous in his books, London to Ladysmith Via Pretoria and Ian Hamilton's March.

The tour begins in Capetown on Monday 26 July and costs £5500/E3400 per person based on double occupancy, plus airfare. Noteworthy are a complete tour of the Boer War battlefields including the site of the armoured train ambush, Churchill's prison in Pretoria, and Durban, where he made a speech following his epic escape. The finale is a gala dinner with descendants of the people whom Churchill met in 1899: the engine driver, the mine operator, the Oldham man who hid him, the grandson of Jan Smuts, former private secretary Elizabeth Nel, and many more. An official flight from London (returning to Pretoria) can be booked for £450/$750 per person, or you may join the party in Capetown on other flights. A complete itinerary was mailed with this issue of Finest Hour; for a copy contact ICS/UK (address on page 2). This tour is scheduled to follow the Churchill Conference on 22-25 July.
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Recent Events

NEWARK, DELAWARE
OCTOBER 23RD, 1997—Member Thomas M. Fairchild ably related the story of 1940 to over sixty-five eighth-grade students at the Independence School here today: "I sat them at tables each carrying a placard for a western European country, reading Churchill's words as Europe succumbed. As Hitler moved through Europe (their classroom), I covered each country placard with an 'Occupied by the Nazis' sign. After France fell I switched off the lights and Europe was dark—except for the 'Britain' placard, starkly lighted against the dark by a strategically aimed flashlight. After a pause I asked them to look closely at the dimes I had given each of them as they entered the class.

"A stack of 39 million dimes, each representing one death caused by WW2, would reach 31 miles into the sky, as high as 110 Empire State buildings. I urged them to remember the souls lost, and to remember Winston Churchill. Students were attentive and asked insightful questions. Several days later, as I walked with my own children through the neighborhood for Halloween, a group of teenagers passed me in the dark and I heard them stop and say, 'Hey look, it's that Churchill guy.'

"Perhaps they will remember."

WASHINGTON
APRIL 2ND—Williamson Murray, frequent contributor to Military History Quarterly and a symposiast at The Churchill Center's 1994 Symposium "Churchill as Peacemaker," gave a fascinating talk on the newly published Alanbrooke diaries tonight at the Old Ebbitt Grill. He also answered many questions on the complex relationship between Churchill and "Brookie."

Washington meetings are frequent, varied and always interesting. Contact Ron Helgemo, 12009 Talesin Court, Apt 13, Reston VA 20190, tel. (703) 476-4693.

PHILADELPHIA
APRIL 18TH—Dr. John Mather repeated his Toronto Conference discussion of Churchill's health for area members »
at No. Ten Downing Street Pub in Downingtown, outside Philadelphia.

For future meetings contact Richard Raffauf, 116 Hampshire Road, Reading PA 19608, telephone (610) 777-1653.

BELVOIR CASTLE
LEICESTERSHIRE, MAY 12TH — Winston S. Churchill opened the Omdurman Exhibition at Belvoir Castle to mark the 100th Anniversary of the battle. The exhibit runs through September.

Belvoir (pronounced "bea-ver"), which established the 17th/21st Lancers regimental museum in 1964, is the home of the Duke of Rutland, whose great-great-great-grandfather raised the 21st Dragoons in 1760. That regiment was restyled the 21st Lancers (Empress of India’s) in 1897. It amalgamated with the 17th Lancers (Duke of Cambridge’s) in 1922 to become the Queen’s Royal Lancers. The museum has since added the 16th and 5th Lancers muniments.

Centrepiece of the exhibit is a huge 1899 Adrian Jones oil painting of the charge at Omdurman, whose sheer size, says the Duke of Rutland, “makes you feel you are actually in the charge.” A smaller painting, by G. D. Rowlandson, graphically depicts the climax of the charge. A third painting by Bud Bradshaw (cover, FH 77) portrays Churchill on his grey Arab pony. Churchill Stores has received a new consignment of prints of this painting; contact Gail Greenly (address on page 2.)

Other showcases contain letters and diaries written at the time which give a remarkable insight into the bloody reality of hand-to-hand fighting. There is regimental silver, captured Dervish swords and spears, a tunic and weaponry of the 21st Lancers. Information panels relate firsthand accounts including those of Lt. Winston Churchill. A faded contemporary photo of Churchill, deftly posed hand on hip, shares a showcase with what for me was one of the gems of the collection. Bearing in mind that he was dearly ill-inclined to be verbose in his message to his mother. His telegram, despatched from Nasri at 1835 on 3 September 1898 simply reads: "ALL RIGHT - WINSTON." DJH

BLADON MAY 8TH — The Churchill gravesites have been beautifully restored, and the ground around them protected from their 20,000 visitors per year, by the Churchill Grave Trust, set up last year by Sir Winston’s family and admirers to fund the £350,000 restoration. Family and friends gathered at Bladon Churchyard to rededicate the site. Front row, l-r: The Duchess and Duke of Marlborough, Lady Soames, the Hon. Celia Sandys, Winston S. Churchill, Col. Nigel Knocker, Mrs. Churchill. Photo courtesy Hello magazine. More photos to follow in EH 100.

CLEVELAND SEPTEMBER 22ND — Members held a dinner tonight for Yvonne Kent, who spoke of 1940 in her address, "Every Man to His Station." Mrs. Kent is author of a novel about England during the Blitz entitled, Don’t Say Goodbye. A British war bride, Yvonne experienced those events firsthand in her home town of Salisbury. She moved to Ohio with her husband, a U.S. Air Force sergeant, in 1946. "Young people don’t know about World War II," Mrs. Kent says. "It’s just not taught; or it’s taught in ways that leave out what matters. It’s important for younger Americans to hear from those who experienced the war—everyone can, because there are eight million veterans of WW2 still alive in America today."

The next Cleveland meeting is scheduled for November 3rd. Contact Alexis at the office of Michael McMenamin, 1300 Terminal Tower, Cleveland OH 44113, tel. (216) 781-1212, fax (216) 575-0911.
On the eve of her latest book, *Speaking For Themselves*, a collection of her parents' correspondence, our Patron remembers what her parents were like up close.

by Ray Connolly

One evening Winston Churchill suggested to Mary, his youngest daughter, that if she came to the drawing room before dinner she would see an Arabian prince. What she saw was Lawrence of Arabia, then calling himself Aircraftman Shaw, dressed from head to foot in cream-coloured Arab dress, with a great curved scimitar at his waist. "Now that was something. He would arrive at Chartwell on his motorbike, dressed in his Air Force uniform, when I was about fourteen. My father had great admiration for him.

"I always had to feed my animals and milk my goats before I went to school, and on my way back to have breakfast I would come across him walking on the lawn. We would have some very courtly conversations, although I don't suppose it can have been very interesting for him. He had extraordinary blue eyes. I was very unhappy when he was killed."

To Mary Churchill (who went on to marry Christopher Soames, her father's parliamentary private secretary, and is now Lady Soames, Patron of the Churchill Center and Societies) the walls of Chartwell, the Churchills' country house in Kent, were very largely the boundaries of her childhood world. The youngest of the family (Sarah was eight, Randolph eleven and Diana thirteen when she was born), she was the one who stayed behind, went to a nearby day school and rarely went to London.

In some ways her parents were rather distant; certainly she does not feel that she knew her mother well until they began going on skiing holidays together when she was thirteen. "I didn't have a complex about it. I was a very happy child. I had this wonderful Chartwell childhood. I knew that mama and papa adored me. Actually I think I was the most awful spoilt little brat, very precocious, because I lived almost entirely with grown-ups."

She was born in 1922 on the day her father, against her mother's wishes, bought Chartwell. She was brought up largely by her nanny/governess, a cousin of her mother's, who, she thinks, had the greatest influence on her early life.

Although Winston Churchill had no deep well of capital to fall back on, Chartwell employed at least six indoor servants as well as three or four gardeners. "My mother always said there should have been more gardeners. Now that the National Trust has the house there are five. Eat your heart out, mama."

She was a solitary little girl. Her friends were Doris, the gardener's daughter ("I saw her the other day, actually") and Olive, the parlourmaid. Her sister Sarah was her great heroine. "She was the only one of the children I remember coming into the nursery. I loved her. Later on I would be enamoured of all the wonderful young men she would bring down to play tennis.

"I was in awe of Diana and Randolph, who were away at boarding school. They were beyond my ken. The first vision I have of Diana was of her practising her curtsy, with a dust sheet around her shoulders, in the drawing room of 11 Downing Street before she was presented."

When her parents were at home, talk of politics governed the house and the children were never excluded. "People talked politics all the time. Torrents of it, every day of my life. In my childish view of things there were goodies and baddies. Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain were the baddies." That was later on. As a little girl she remembers more leisured times, her father endlessly working with a retired bricklayer from the village. Churchill loved bricklaying. Mary never helped for long. "Have you ever tried handing bricks to someone building a wall? It's a damn boring way to pass an afternoon."

She would sit and watch him paint, too, but that was equally boring. "He was very unconceited about his paintings. I can't remember more than one or two being hung..."
at Chartwell. When he'd finished a painting he would bring it in to show us and I would think, 'oh, how clever' but I had no idea how clever it really was."

In her earlier book, Winston Churchill, His Life As A Painter, Lady Soames redresses her early lack of appreciation by tracing her father's work as a painter. "I took it all very much for granted, as children do. Now, writing this book, I suddenly realised what an amazing flood tide his life took in the Thirties. Out of office, but politicking, writing, journalism and painting to the full — at the zenith of his powers. But as a child I didn't think it remarkable. I suppose I imagined everybody's fathers did all those things."

The weekdays were ebullient socially at Chartwell when the centre of activity moved to the London home, leaving her to get on with her homework and animals. But at the weekends and in the parliamentary recesses, the house would be constantly filled with guests.

"If there was an extra special lunch we would push two tables together and there would be sixteen or eighteen, but usually it was just eight or ten of us at a round table. There would be my parents, Professor Lindemann [professor of experimental philosophy at Oxford and Churchill's friend for forty years], Eddie Marsh [another old friend], Bob Boothby, perhaps, the Duff Coopers came quite often, Max Beaverbrook, Lord Camrose — oh, all sorts of people, with nearly always a foundation of family." On one occasion Albert Einstein came to stay, but much more memorable was Charlie Chaplin. City Lights was the first film she had ever seen.

School at the Manor House, Limpsfield, was quite difficult at first, as she gravitated naturally towards adults and was something of a goody-goody. "A quaint, tiresome child really. And a prig." On top of that, her father's views were not popular among many of the parents of her schoolfriends. "I found that puzzling."

As the Thirties went on she became more involved in her "father's great campaign," and the books he was writing. "Often, when we were just family for luncheon, my father would bring a chapter of one of his books in proof form and read it to my mother."

Only once does she remember questioning her father's vision, when at the age of about thirteen a Quaker mistress at school, who was a pacifist, suggested she read Vera Brittain's Testament of Youth. It affected her deeply.

As the threat from Hitler grew the ideal of pacifism receded. "Sometimes people would come to Chartwell, Germans, at great risk to themselves, and my mother would say it was not necessary to know their names. I felt out of touch with my contemporaries because they had no comprehension of what was going on in Germany."

"I remember getting very upset at school after Munich, when we said prayers for Mr. Chamberlain. I had a tremendous outburst, saying it would be better if we prayed for the Czech nation that we had betrayed."

Academically, she thinks she was a plodder who flabbergasted the entire family by doing well in her school certificate. She had a week of euphoria. Then, at seventeen, she left school on the day war was declared. She also left Chartwell.

By now her father's public image was changing to that of saviour of the nation. At first she went to live at Admiralty House and did Red Cross work, then worked as a billeting officer in the Women's Voluntary Service. When she heard that her father had been appointed prime minister, she cried. Her first sitting room was in 10 Downing Street, where she would invite schoolfriends to tea. When she was eighteen she joined the Auxiliary Territorial Service.

The change in life could hardly have been more complete. After basic training at Aldermaston, she was posted to a huge camp in Oswestry for anti-aircraft battery training, forty to fifty in a barracks, bunks three tiers deep.

She loved it, was two years in the ranks and rose to the position of sergeant. "My parents were so proud of me. Then I came down in the world to become an officer cadet — the lowest form of life in the British army."

For five years she served with ATS, going with her battery through Belgium and eventually to Hamburg. "It was a tremendous experience. Yes, I was frightened sometimes. I don't like bangs, but I wanted to be a part of things. The only difficult times were when one went to a new unit and people were suspicious. But after a time one found one's friends."

"To be truthful, as a child I had not really been aware of great social differences. Obviously I must have realised some things, I wasn't half-baked, but it didn't impinge upon my life. I didn't see great contrasts. So it was only when I went into the army that I fully realised the differences. But then the army was also a great leveller, particularly because we were all in uniform."

"At one point half of my battery was made up of tremendous toughies from Liverpool. They were wonderful, with appalling language. I took to it. My own language is appalling to this day."

Mary Soames was demobilised in 1945. In 1947 she married Christopher Soames. Now widowed, she has five children and seven grandchildren. "I decided early on that I wasn't going to leave my children as much as my mother left hers. I remember her coming to see us one day when the children were playing in the garden and she said, rather wistfully I thought, 'T see you have great fun with your children. I think I missed that.'

"My whole life has been as a daughter and a mother and a wife. I'm not whingeing about that. Not at all. Actually I'm extraordinarily proud of it."
It would not be far fetched to call Winston Churchill a genius. He not only lived an uncommonly rich life but also left a large intellectual legacy. From his brilliant words and deeds, much may be gleaned about history, statecraft, diplomacy, war prevention, military strategy, peacemaking, social justice, the democratic process, oratory, painting, the range of the English language, and, not least, the making of memorable phrases.

What was the secret of his success? Such a question can never be answered fully, but tentative suggestions are helpful. Clearly, his numerous achievements were the products of a rare accord between nature and nurture. "Nature" refers to the diverse talents he was born with, and "nurture" refers to the circumstances into which he was born: circumstances which turned him into a highly ambitious person compelled to use those very talents.

Without becoming too Freudian, one can say that the remoteness of his parents from the young Winston left a void in his sensitive soul; he had to fill that void with activities which would teach them that he was worthy of attention after all. The distance maintained by his father Lord Randolph, a brilliant but erratic politician, was especially painful: the latter feared his son would become a "social wastrel" and died just as Winston was beginning to relate to him man to man. Churchill spent the rest of his life proving to the ghost of his father that the son was not a prodigal but a prodigy.

As a fledgling politician, he would "lift again the tattered flag [of his father]. . . found lying on a stricken field" of political battle—and carry it much farther than Randolph could ever foresee for his son, or dream of doing himself. In the process, Churchill would justify not only himself but also his father's aborted career. "I have striven," Churchill wrote late in life, "to vindicate his mem-

Churchill's moving short story, "The Dream," is a late record of that complex relationship, as well as, implicitly, a report to his dead father on the theme of "mission accomplished." This driven man could never cease proving himself.

But nature and nurture do not suffice. Success requires that they be joined, and their convergence is due to a third ingredient—luck, i.e., being in the right place at the right time. Clement Attlee said of him, "Winston was supremely lucky, and one of the most charming things about him is that he never ceased saying so."

Churchill's greatness is the result not just of the compulsive application of his massive intellect to sixty years of problem solving, but also of a series of events which projected him into a unique career of having many national problems to solve. "Luck" means, then, the innumerable things that happened to him which initially had little to do with his talents or his striving. In other words, we are awed by the phenomenon called Churchill in part because his life is filled with incidents that, were they narrated in a novel, would beget dismissive remarks about poetic license.

Such a tale is not, up to a point, unprecedented. Most of the giants of history, good and evil, led lives which suggest that they won the lottery for rising above mediocrity and oblivion, and therefore led lives in which one can trace the finger of fate. Subtle thinkers like Dr. Johnson and Gustave Flaubert have, moreover, asserted that there is a novel in every human being; even the humblest life can be dramatized with the proper story-telling approach, skills and style. Life itself, if duly studied, is so rich that, as William Blake put it, one can see a world in a grain of sand. But the Churchill story often reads like an improbable melodrama, even when set beside that of the other historical giants.

Imagine, then, a novel about a fictional character called Winston S. Churchill. It will of course be long: what used to be called a Victorian triple decker. For the first melodramatic or factitious detail that strikes the reader is the longevity and continuity of the career. Churchill is just about the only person to have played a major role in two world wars. Other individuals similarly involved served in one of the two wars in a lesser role (Roosevelt, John
Simon) or a disgraceful role (Pétain).

Nor is that all. The beginning of each war—exactly a quarter century apart—even finds Churchill at the same desk, as the head of the Navy. It is rather like a stage direction in a play: "Act II: same setting, twenty-five years later!" A bit far fetched, wouldn't one say?

Churchill's participation in the two wars results in an unusual repetition of events and situations. Take the defeat of the Lloyd George Government in 1922. One of Churchill's early biographers, "Ephesian" (Bechhofer Roberts) justly remarks (in 1928):

A General Election followed. The Coalition had carried England through a period of unparalleled stress. No single Party and no other political combination could possibly have achieved the same results. Yet this very success of its record unified its opponents against it. Its merits were forgotten, its faults exaggerated. In Churchill's case not merely was dissatisfaction with the Coalition and the general irritation of an exhausted people visited upon his head, but the old fables about his responsibility at Antwerp and the Dardanelles were brought out again.3

Substitute the words "General Strike" for "Antwerp and the Dardanelles" and the entire paragraph could be applied to the defeat of the Churchill Government in 1945.

Or take Churchill's defeat in the race for a seat in Parliament in 1923 and "Ephesian's" comments on it:

But if the issue of the Leicester contest looked unlucky, it was perhaps really lucky. By his defeat he was saved from any part in the petty Liberal intrigues which ended by Mr. Asquith's aiding the Socialist Party.5

This language is remarkably close to that used both by Churchill himself and by historians about the disguised blessing of his being kept out of government in the 1930s, and of his thereby remaining free of the compromises and derelictions of the Baldwin and Chamberlain administrations.

Finally, consider in that biography this passage on Anglo-American cooperation in World War I:

Nothing indeed ever pleased him [Churchill] more than the trust the American Government placed in him after the United States entered the War. Whether or not they recognized his blood-relationship with them, the Americans gave him an unprecedented free hand. Their praise delighted him5

Again, if the words were applied to World War II—at least as Churchill presents it in his memoirs—not a syllable would have to be changed.

Mention of Churchill's war memoirs reminds us that the uniqueness of his active life is matched by his unique feat of writing voluminously about each war. Especially noteworthy—indeed historically rare—is writing comprehensively about the view from a leadership position in the cockpit of power in a major world war. Lloyd George did that as well, but his memoirs gather dust while Churchill's constitute one of the best selling books of all time. And who else so wrote, besides Lloyd George? Not Roosevelt, nor Stalin, Hitler, Napoleon, Louis XIV, Genghis Khan, Tamerlane. World historical figures just don't do that sort of thing.

No less unlikely is the Churchill-Lloyd George connection itself. After beginning his Parliamentary career, and soon finding himself out of place among Conservatives, Churchill switched to the Liberals. Within a few years he became, in conjunction with Lloyd George, a leader and philosopher of the movement known as the New Liberalism and devoted to state intervention on behalf of the less fortunate.

Contemplate for a moment this curious pair—the one a complete insider and the other a complete outsider, the grandson of an English Duke, working in tandem with a Welshman from a poverty-stricken family. Like some "gold-dust twins" in American football—running, kicking, passing—they plan, orate, and legislate for the sake of what John Kenneth Galbraith in another connection called "comforting the afflicted and afflicting the comfortable." Hard was it in those days for members of the aristocracy, the landed gentry, the manufacturing interests, the rich, and the smug to open the daily newspaper without wincing. The reign of terror by the terrible twins lasted only a short while, as history goes, but during that period they were the cynosure of the British political world.

At this point in the story, the novelist injects himself briefly into the narrative with a prolepsis, a glance ahead: Who could tell that this period of youthful efflorescence and rebelliousness was not the climax of their careers—as it would have been for most politicians—but a mere prelude? Who could foresee that two world wars were to enter their lives and that each would take his turn in dynamically leading Britain to a successful conclusion! It is as if each, having done his political apprentice work in domestic matters, was now ready for the big time, for foreign policy, diplomacy, and, above all, for the challenge of war, real war, not the metaphorical war of normal peacetime politics. The two warriors who stood out in their cabinet level fight against

5. Ephesian, pp. 302-03.
poverty and injustice went on to become leaders separately in the fight against German aggression and imperialism. Little did they know, when together immersed in the struggle with the House of Lords, that they would some day individually struggle with the far more titanic threat of the German warlords. First it was the turn of the older man, then of the younger one. After shining jointly, they shone separately, and bold would be of soul who could ascertain how much, in those golden seminal days of 1909-11, they gained from each other insights which were to help them prosper in the greater and solitary struggle.

"Come now," we say to the novelist, "you are pushing things a little. Your tale depends too much on fantasy and coincidence, and not on a curious double plot. Life isn't quite as neat as that."

The novelist impassively looks us in the eye and says that he has up his sleeve another interesting twist in the plot: a roller-coaster career. This aspect is, once more, not peculiar to Churchill. Think of Ronald Reagan, first washed up as an actor and then, narrowly missing out on the Republican presidential nomination in 1976 at the age of 65, apparently washed up as a politician as well.

Think especially of Richard Nixon, who was only a short time a congressman and, by virtue of his role in the Alger Hiss case, quickly became senator and quickly Vice President. His meteoric career was suddenly stopped by the sharp staccato blows of fate: a painful loss by a whisker (and by probable voter fraud in Chicago and Texas) to John Kennedy in the presidential race of 1960 and to Pat Brown in the California gubernatorial election of 1962. "You won't have Nixon to kick around anymore," he said to reporters, with the bluntness that only someone surely retired from politics can muster.

But time passes, things change, and suddenly he is on the rise again. Not only does he win the presidency in 1968, but in 1972 he is reelected by one of the greatest landslides in modern times. Yet a few months later he is politically besieged, and a year after that he is the only president ever to resign in order to avoid impeachment. What a fall there was!

But these examples are child's play compared to Churchill's case. They span only a couple of decades and a few catastrophes and successes. For a real political roller-coaster ride spanning a half century and involving numerous rises and falls, come aboard the Winston Churchill Special!

Before even entering Parliament, Churchill was already a phenomenon. He had hit the ground running. Coming off his frontier war books and his Boer War adventures and dispatches, he was at a mere twenty six a world-renowned war hero and a much sought-after speaker. He proceeded to build on that. Overcoming a defeat in his first run for Parliament, he started in 1901 a long string of legislative and executive successes. Alienation from the Tories in 1904, while awkward for a while, soon worked to his advantage, as he was happily embraced by a Liberal Party with careers open to talent. Joining the Liberals just in time to participate in their long period of domination, he held various government posts, rose in influence and reputation, became co-warrior with Lloyd George, and served as informal advisor and friend to Prime Minister Asquith. All this was capped with what he long afterwards called his "golden age," four years as the civilian chief of Britain's most important military weapon, the Navy. In this prominent post he was able to champion one of the few major strategic initiatives of World War I, the Gallipoli expedition.

Alas that initiative resulted in catastrophe and dismissal. Churchill's world was in ruins; he touched bottom in political disrepute and personal dejection. "I am finished," he lamented, and his wife Clementine "thought that he would die of grief."

Slowly did he pick himself up. After two years in the wilderness, he made his comeback. In five subsequent tumultuous years near the seat of power, he served in important cabinet posts. He grappled with major issues of waging war and making peace. He tried to strangle Bolshevism in the cradle. He negotiated peace treaties and border settlements in Ireland and the Middle East. Like some Napoleonic figure, he invented Arab countries by drawing lines on a map and placing their kings on thrones.

But in the perilous post-World War I whirlpool, he lost his hold. The Liberals fragmented, Labour rose, the Conservatives distrusted him still. Lo, in 1922 he was abruptly "without an office, without a seat, without a party, and without an appendix." He had hit another low point—not as low as in 1915, to be sure, but certainly with contracted horizons. He was, in fact, for the first time in twenty-two years, out of Parliament. This shocked him into speechlessness. "He thought," noted an observer, "his world had come to an end." In attempting a comeback, he was defeated two more times, and naturally his friends likewise "feared that his political career was at an end."

The result was another two years in the wilderness. Then he was on the upswing again. He was back in politics, back in the Parliament, back in the Conservative Party, back in the cabinet, and, most surprising, Chancel-
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lor of the Exchequer in a Tory government. No small comeback, this was indeed another meteoric rise. The post of Chancellor is one of the most important in the cabinet, a way station to the premiership. As the position his father once had held at the pinnacle of his truncated career, it was a source of deep personal satisfaction for the son. Once again Churchill raised his father’s tattered flag of Tory Democracy, i.e., moderate conservatism. For the third time now, Churchill was riding high. Here was yet another five-year stint of advising the Prime Minister and being at the center of decision-making. Churchill could be forgiven if he now harbored ambitious thoughts, just as he might have in the early and late 1910s.

The Tories were, however, defeated in 1929 and Churchill started a long descent which at various times seemed to be permanent. First he was only out of government, and held on to power by means of a seat in the Shadow Cabinet. Then, becoming once more estranged from the Tories, he resigned that seat. He was now in the wilderness for a third time. This was no two-year stint as in 1915-17 or 1922-24 but a dreary, drawn-out phase lasting nearly a decade. Like someone falling from the heights and bouncing painfully on a hard surface, he touched bottom several times. He was alienated from the Conservatives (not to speak of the liberal politicians and intellectuals) over India, over the Abdication, over Germany. He himself spoke in the early 1930s as if his career was probably over. And why not? He could look back on three decades—long as political careers go—filled with high positions and massive accomplishments. He may not have won the first prizes nor the golden rings but the consolation prize of having lived a rich political life would do.

Again the novelist intervenes to remark that little does Churchill know that the best is yet to be; the half-submerged sun on the horizon is not setting, as it seems, but rising. The long hoped for and long postponed climax is at hand. And what a climax it is to be!

During the later 1930s, popular opinion shifted in his direction. With war coming in 1939, Churchill was back in government. Then, amid a terrible political crisis at home and a worse crisis abroad in May 1940—talk of the long reach of novelistic coincidence!—he reached at long last the top of the greasy pole. Then came yet another tumultuous five years of action and energy: his greatest by far.

But in 1945, the magnificence of the achievement was matched by the precipitousness of the fall. The shocking election returns administered yet another crushing setback, emotionally as draining as the one thirty years earlier. In 1915, he had left things in an inconclusive, even perilous state, while in 1945 he could take pride in having won a war with heroic striving. Yet because joy in victory was almost eclipsed by the anxiety over the nascent Cold War, 1945 seemed to him at least as bad as 1915. While rejection and defeat always hurt, apparent ingratitude rubs the salt in, and the blessings, if any, are effectively disguised. "A cloud of black doom" settled on the leader who had "wanted to do the peace too." As a "bitter" man, he lived through the "longest week" of his life.14

Thus came yet a fourth stint in a wilderness of sorts. It was, of course, nowhere near as serious as his earlier exiles from the center of decision-making, for he remained in Parliament, continued as Leader of the Conservative Party, and led the Loyal Opposition. But absence from the now familiar levers of power was for Churchill the equivalent of being in the wilderness. In 1947, worried over Britain’s economic woes, he thought that his anxiety over the Battle of the Atlantic in 1941 was comparatively slight. "Never in his life," says his official biographer, "had he felt such despair."15

Eventually there was yet one more comeback, as he became Prime Minister again. This ministry was but a shadow of the first one, as the circumstances were less dramatic, the workload lighter, his dominance less compelling, and the accomplishments less cosmic. But the novelist has yet one more serious twist in store. Churchill held on to power, despite ill health and a shrinking attention span in order to erase his reputation as a warmonger and to round off his career by preventing World War III and by making the greatest peace of all, one that would end the cold war. "It is the last prize I seek to win."16

It was not to be. Churchill repeatedly attempted to arrange a summit meeting or, at least, a visit to Moscow by him alone, in order to bring about a reconciliation between the USA and the USSR.17 But he was rebuffed by American recalcitrance, Soviet suspiciousness, his own cabinet’s veto, and the ravages of time. After fifty-five years in Parliament, he made a quiet and soft final landing, in frustration rather than triumph.

C
ome now, dear Novelist, has anyone else in modern democratic politics had so long a career at or near the top, so many ups and downs, so many two year periods of isolation and five year periods of achievement at the highest reaches of government, so many and so thorough crashes as the ones in 1915,1922,1945, and 1955? The Reagan or Nixon story is credible, but your tale lacks verisimilitude. One has to go all the way back to Queen Elizabeth I, perhaps, or to Louis XIV; or at least to Gladstone in more recent times. But the very comparison undermines itself. What a stage Churchill played on! How

"As a young man, Churchill put the world on notice...

CHURCHILL IN 1898 • BELVOIR CASTLE EXHIBITION

slight Elizabeth's or Gladstone's problems seem next to Churchill's. When did they ever grapple with wars that spanned the globe and saw the death of some 85,000,000 people? You're overdoing it, Mr. Novelist. The career of this fictional character is just too long, too repetitious, too dramatic to be believable!"

Undeterred by the reader's complaints, the Novelist proposes one more far-fetched theme: the role of predestination in Churchill's career. On this matter, the historical record is uneven. While a goodly number of the makers of history have felt themselves to be elected souls, others have not. As Shakespeare put it, "Some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon 'em."

Martin Luther King Jr., for instance, matured slowly. First he led a successful boycott against segregated seating on buses in one Alabama city. Then it dawned on him that local problems could not be solved without the dissolution, by means of Ghandian non-violence, of the nationwide pattern of segregation in all areas of life. That insight in turn enabled him to see how a connection existed between institutional racism and persistent poverty. Finally he saw those phenomena as part of the larger problem of false national priorities and misdirected energies, and he joined the anti-Vietnam War movement. Whether he was right in these assessments is not the issue here. What is clear is that he came by his prominence one step at a time; he was not born or raised to lead a crusade against poverty and war.

It is likewise difficult to regard Hitler, especially in his years of obscurity, drift, and even homelessness, as imagining or having others imagine about him—a great career ahead of him. Bill Clinton may have dreamed very early of becoming president; Truman and Reagan probably did not. Nor, on a different plane, was Oskar Schindler a likely candidate for heroism. In fact, for such serendipitous individuals, an unclear vision might have been an advantage, for as Cromwell memorably put it, "A man never rises to greater heights than when he does not know where he is going." Those without a clear goal manage to succeed because they have the flexibility and improvisational skills that Machiavelli thought to be crucial, that chess players cannot function without, and that Iago in Shakespeare or the slaves in Latin comedy exemplify.

Quite different is that other class of great men, those who have sensed even in their young years that they were special. In literature, for instance, Dante, Milton, Wordsworth, and Keats—to name a few—have left on record early intimations of literary success. So was it in the political sphere with Churchill. The fallacy here is, of course, that many other individuals have sensed they were destined for greatness but never made it. Their error is not on record precisely because they remained obscure. The law of averages dictates that some of these dreamers succeed. Churchill was one of them. Hence he is the hero of our hypothetical non-realistic novel.

As a young man, Churchill put the world on notice with his memorably declared resolve to be an achiever by either "notability or notoriety." Perhaps because of his ducal blood, his famous ancestor Marlborough, and his prominent father, he was conditioned to think big. At any rate, not only did he harbor the idea that he would someday lead his country, but a lot of other people thought so too. As early as 1898, the journalist G. W. Steevens predicted that only the sky would be the limit for this "youngest man in Europe" who "has the twentieth century in his marrow" and who has already at 22 "gone through so many phases."18 Two years later, in his first lecture tour in America, Churchill was introduced by his enthusiastic manager
"Who could have foreseen the course of events that led the most unlikely combination of people to turn to him?...He entered the seat of power at the age of 65, when most people retire."

as "the future Prime Minister of Great Britain." One expects such hyperbole from an American impresario, but the sentiment was soon echoed by a more levelheaded British Liberal journalist, H. W. Massingham, who in 1901 prophesied that Churchill "will be Prime Minister." Within a few years (1905 to be exact), a biography of him was written. How many individuals have had a biography of themselves at the age of thirty? It is enough to turn anyone's head, especially as the author, A. MacCallum Scott, also predicted a leadership role for him.

That he did not become Prime Minister for a long time was due to ill fortune—i.e., the Gallipoli disaster—and to his abrasive, erratic personality. He was not a party man, not a prisoner of any ideology. His rugged individualism caused him to chart a highly irregular course so that he was one of the few politicians who could sometimes be—or at least seem to be—on the far left (as in the days of the People's Budget), sometimes on the far right (as in the days of the General Strike, the India Bill and the Abdication) and sometimes in the center (as in the later 1920s and the early 1950s). To become prime minister, one is supposed to be consistent, predictable, partisan—everything that he was not.

Yet, despite Gallipoli, he continued to believe he could make it. In a 1915 letter to Clementine from the trenches, where men all around him were dropping like flies, he arrogantly wrote, "the greatest of my work is still to come." At about the same time, a prominent editor, J. L. Garvin, predicted, "His hour of triumph will come," while another journalist, A. G. Gardiner, said, "Keep your eye on Churchill...He will write his name big on our future." Then, as a result of Churchill's large role in settling the Irish troubles—urging negotiations, participating in negotiations, working with Michael Collins, guiding the Treaty through the House—a prominent person declared in 1922: "This exercise of judgment brings him nearer to the leadership of the country than anyone would have supposed possible." When he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1924, an observer prophesied that he would be Prime Minister, and in 1927 some even thought that, coming off a respectable job as Chancellor, he was on the verge of replacing Baldwin. No wonder that a biographer of Churchill noted in 1936 that "for over thirty years he has been marked out as a potential Prime Minister."

By 1929 and the early 1930s, to be sure, when his career seemed finished and he was approaching the age of sixty, he gave signs of wishing to retire from politics; yet he held on because he continued to hope, as a very long shot, to become prime minister: "Only one goal still attracts me, and if that were barred I should quit the dreary field for pastures new." Soon he held on because he was galvanized by new challenges: at first by the India question and then by Germany rearming. The nuisance he thus became made him now truly isolated, anachronistic and deluded. His individualism had left him so bereft of allies and followers that at various times in the 1930s he could not have been elected for the proverbial post of dogcatcher.

Who could have foreseen the course of events that led the most unlikely combination of people to turn to him as a political leader? For, with war looming, he seemed to many the only choice both because he had prophesied war and because "he was an experienced man of war." (Even the harried and dubious Chamberlain confided to his diary in June 1939 that "Churchill's chances [of entering the Government] improve as war becomes more probable."). At long last his early intimations were fulfilled, just when it was virtually too late. He entered the seat of power at the age of 65, when most people retire; he himself remarked that he would have to run hard to keep up with younger men. "I was almost the only antediluvian....I should have to strive my utmost to keep pace with the generation now in power and with fresh young giants who might at any time appear."
"Go back to your word processor, Mr. Novelist...Such a protagonist as you portray could never exist in real life. This Churchill of yours himself intimated that his life was at best fictional..."

What a historical irony that he finally made it as prime minister at perhaps the very worst moment in Britain's long history. If he had not been saddled with Gallipoli and had become Prime Minister in the early 1920s, taking his turn at bat after Lloyd George, or in the later 1920s in the wake of Baldwin; or if there had not been the heroics of World War II but only the ministry of 1951-55, chances are that such peacetime tours of duty by him at the top would not have been remarkable. Competent, steady, mildly progressive, no doubt, but not remarkable. Historical necessity dictated that someone with his melodramatic, histrionic tendencies, his bellicose instincts, his profound military interests, his nostalgic outlook, and his romantic vision of the British Empire should be chosen for the great crisis of 1940, in which none but he was up to the "level of events." For a brief interlude, his idiosyncratic character traits became terribly relevant.

There is, of course, the unending controversy between proponents of the Great Man theory of history and the Great Forces theory of history. It turns on the question of whether prominently placed men are the masters or the victims of historical events. Modern thought tends (somewhat inconsistently) toward the latter, towards the idea of men as puppets in the grip of Great Forces. But if Churchill had been killed in that encounter with a car on Fifth Avenue in 1931, what would have been the fate of Britain in 1940? One would prefer not to think about that.

The rendezvous with destiny, the coming together of man and moment, the assignment to Churchill of a nearly hopeless cause, cannot be surprising to any close student of Churchill's career. From the beginning, Churchill left clear footprints in his long march to wartime splendor. There is an eye-catching sentence in his second book, The River War. If evil days were to come and "the last army which a collapsing Empire could interpose between London and the invader were dissolving in rout and ruin," Churchill hopes that "even in these modern days some men "would not care to accustom themselves to a new order of things and tamely survive the disaster." This, written in 1899 at the age of 25, looks eerily ahead (even including the phrase "new order") to 1940. Could the man who wrote that sentence with conviction have acted any other way when Britain confronted Hitler's juggernaut alone?

Or consider that this man also wrote an essay in the 1930s on "Great Fighters in a Lost Cause." This peculiarly Churchillian topic turns out to have been not just detached speculation but fervent prophesy. MacCallum Scott had declared in 1905, "He will ever be a leader, whether of a forlorn hope or a great party." So had Harold Nicolson in 1931: "He is a man who leads forlorn hopes, and when the hopes of England become forlorn, he will once again be summoned to leadership." A nice adumbration of 1940 is that word "forlorn," recurring here like the tolling of a bell. Writing in 1936, "Ephesian" prophesied that "the day may well come when the Pitt in Churchill will be called in to restore the Empire's affairs after a disaster or in another supreme crisis like that of 1914.

All these observers sensed that he was fitted only for a certain type of role, not for the premiership in any circumstance. The point has often been made but deserves repeating: Only the man with such an idiosyncratic love of fighting, of adverse odds, of patriotism, of Empire, of tradition and principle could qualify for leadership at such a perilous hour. All other politicians—decent, normal, common sensical—would have seen the writing on the wall and most likely have had the good sense to have saved Britain, as they thought, by making a humiliating peace with Hitler.

As happens only in a well-composed novel making its leisurely way to a climax, Churchill had to bide his time for a long while until the history of his nation took a turn so precarious as to require him and him alone. Without that turn he would never have made it, and his temperament became especially relevant only for that brief emergency period. Just as the historical course of events caused the Germans to seek out a leader who gave full vent to their frustrations, revanchism, and anti-Semitism, so did the historical course of events cause Britons to seek out someone they had rejected before as antiquated and unreliable. The hypothetical case of defending an imperiled London, which had been a mere daydream of his in the sheltered days of British predominance in the late Victorian period, had now become a grim reality. Little did he know that the historical forces that kept him, to his deep frustration, from the premiership in the 1920s and from the cabinet in the 1930s were preserving him for a period when no one but he could
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do justice to the challenge. Even Baldwin, who when be-
coming Premier in 1935 deeply chagrined Churchill by not
offering him a post, half wittingly spared Churchill from
contamination by the compromises and vacillations of the
late 1930s and preserved him for a higher purpose: "If there
is going to be war ... we must keep him fresh to be our war
Prime Minister."36 Can one therefore blame Churchill for
feeling some supernatural sponsorship? "I felt as if I were
walking with Destiny, and that all my past life had been
but a preparation for this hour and for this trial....Over me
beat the invisible wings."37

"No, dear Novelist, you'll have to do better than that.
This tale is too neat, too cleverly designed. The symme-
tries and patterns of your fiction are too much like the aes-
thetic principles that also govern painting and music and
architecture; they therefore have little to do with the chaos
that is history. You cannot expect us to believe this fantas-
tic story."

The novelist, ignoring our complaint, has one last card
to play: the tragic card. Many long narratives, beginning
with their archetype, Homer's Iliad, end tragically. So does
this one. The moment of Churchill's supernal success was,
ironically, also the occasion of a national calamity that was
not of his making. Empires decline as surely as bananas
turn brown. After a century in the sun, the fall of the
British Empire—the largest the world had ever known—
was at hand. It was Churchill's painful fate to preside over
part of that decline, notwithstanding his defiant rhetoric
about refusing to do so.

What was worse, his finest hours, his dynamic wartime
actions in resisting Hitler and then forging an alliance to
defeat the Hun, paradoxically hastened that decline. Sur-
vival required dependence on Russia and America, and,
as Machiavelli had predicted long ago, such dependence
resulted inescapably in the allies overshadowing Britain.
Without such an alliance, Britain could not have survived,
either alone or in league with Hitler. Without Churchill's
vision, courage, and personal diplomacy, therefore, there
might well have been no Britain left to decline, only again
as, in Roman times, a remote island province of a contin-
ental martial empire. And the rise of Russia and America
had in any case been foreseen exactly a hundred years ear-
erly by de Tocqueville.

The hero of the 1940 back-to-the-wall stand and of the
1945 victory thus had the misfortune to see the deleterious
side effects of his triumph, for survival and victory came
with expensive price tags. It was Churchill's tragic fate to
save the world from Hitlerism only at the cost of soon los-
ing the Empire, advancing communism beyond Russia's

borders, boosting Americanism, and opening the door to
socialism at home.

Notwithstanding the fantasy of some recent critics, he
had no alternative. Though he did his best, fate (aka his-
torical forces) was against him. In the transition from a
Nazi hegemony in Europe to a nearly worldwide Ameri-
can-Soviet condominium, Britain declined from being a
major player to being a satellite. It could not play a role,
even in Churchill's peacetime ministry, in reconciling the
two sides of the Cold War. Thus, having had the good for-
tune to be at the right place at the right time in 1940,
Churchill remained in power long enough to end up being
in the right place at the wrong time in 1945. What a savage
fate for the man who had groomed himself for the great
day when he would save his country.

Here, in short, is the tale of a man who expected to be—
and was expected by others to be—prime minister; who
had a wild, roller coaster career with numerous triumphs
and disasters; who, because of that uneven career, had to
wait to take his turn as wartime prime minister over
twenty years after his formidable former ally and friend
Lloyd George had done so; who had a unique tempera-
ment that fitted his leadership talent only for the chal-
enges of the early 1940s; who had a lifetime of expectation
of, and preparation for, a back-to-the-wall stand; and who
became prime minister at just the most critical and there-
fore for him the most opportune moment.

That this man would fulfill his promise, succeed be-
yond his wildest dreams, and then preside over the de-
cline of Britain as it was overtaken by Russian, American
and socialist currents is the final twist to this hardly credi-
table novel. A life that sees a personal triumph so inter-
twined with national decline and sees the climax of one
career so involved with communal loss can only be con-
sidered tragic. Here was a fulfillment so often predicted,
so long delayed, so triumphantly accomplished, and so
hopelessly compromised by the consequences.

The destiny that groomed him for high office at a time
of supreme crisis had played a trick on him. He would get
what he wanted, leading Britain out of the abyss, but his
beloved country would pay dearly for that survival. All
those prophecies and all that ambition and striving re-
sulted in an ambiguous dénouement. Like Macbeth, he
discovered that Fate speaks with a forked tongue.

"Go back to your word processor, Mr. Novelist, and
start from scratch. Your novel shows great promise, but
your acrobatics in plotting keep it from being credible,
verisimilar, and relevant. Such a protagonist as you por-
tray could never have existed in life. In fact, this Churchill
of yours himself intimated that his life was at best fic-
tional. In speaking, in his (alleged, of course) autobiogra-
phy (1930), of his career as being great fun and never bor-
ing, he confessed that 'It was an endless moving picture in
which one was the actor.'"38
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38. Winston Churchill, A Roving Commission: My Early Life
No refrain is more typical today than the lament that we lack leaders worthy of the name. But on closer inspection it can be seen that many of the complainers wouldn't recognize a true leader if he walked up and poked them in the nose.

Consider the following indicator: Back in 1949, *Time* magazine named Winston Churchill "Man of the Half-Century," observing that "no man's history can sum up the dreadful, wonderful years, 1900-1950. Churchill's story comes closest." But then last autumn, *Life* magazine, the other flagship of the Time-Life empire, offered its list of the 100 most important people of the 20th century, and Churchill was not on the list. Meanwhile, back at *Time*, a burst of modesty led the editors to give up on their own editorial judgment in the run-up to the inevitable Person (or People) of the Century designation, and so *Time* is taking a poll on its website asking *Time* readers who they think should be included among the top 100 most important people. Churchill is still on their list of suggestions, but so are a quite a few people of decidedly lesser stature, who appear chiefly because they conform more closely to the newer understanding of leadership. (These are the same people, remember, who still had confidence enough back in the late 1980s to name Gorbachev the "Man of the Decade.")

If you thought that this obvious degeneration is another expression of elite media bias or Orwell's Memory Hole at work, you would be mistaken. There is an emerging intellectual theory—"leadership studies"—to justify disregarding the great personalities of our past in favor of the mediocre men and women of our present. Leadership studies is one of the fastest-growing subfields in academia (though whether it belongs in business or political science is unclear, which is the first hint of trouble), as well as a subject of intense interest in the world of executive seminars. Leadership books and their gurus have been rightly dismissed, as do John Micklethwait and Adrian Woolridge in their recent book *The Witch Doctors: Making Sense of the Management Gurus* (Times Books), as little more than faddism, clichés, one-part motivation, one-part obvious common sense, one-hit wonders, and less. G. K. Chesterton remarked that there is but an inch of difference between the cushioned chamber and the padded cell, and the difference between Tony Robbins and Tom Peters often seems slight indeed. You might call it "Total Quality Leadership."

But the problem with leadership studies is a lot more serious than mere hucksterism.

I came face to face with the problem when I set out to write for a general audience a book about Churchill’s executive management practices. Such books are extremely popular these days. Donald Phillips’s *Lincoln on Leadership* has sold several hundred thousand copies. It was a great surprise that no such book had been written about Churchill, who is in many ways a better subject for this kind of treatment than Lincoln, and certainly better than Attila the Hun, who was the subject of one of the first big-selling books in this genre. Though there was no single book on Churchill, I expected to find him appearing frequently in the leadership literature.

But he is almost nowhere to be found. He is scarcely mentioned in James McGregor Burns’s 500-page tome on leadership, which, published way back in 1977, is regarded as among the more serious works in the field. Even more startling was a recent offering from Donald Heifetz, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Harvard University Press), which goes on for several pages about Hitler but mentions Churchill not at all. "When influence alone defines leadership," Heifetz writes, "Hitler qualifies as an authentic and successful leader: he mobilized a nation to follow his vision....Furthermore, by the standard of organizational effectiveness, Hitler exercised formidable leadership. Within hundreds of specific decision-making instances, Hitler succeeded in developing the effectiveness of German organizations."

This passage suggests what has gone wrong. The general disapprobation of the "great man theory of his-
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for the 21st Century (Praeger), is even more explicit that have studied 'leadership' have tended to side with the Churchill as an example of leadership in a "total quality management" course, the instructor huffed that Churchill was an example of obsolete "linear dichotomous absolutism"—whatever that is.

"Understandably," Heifetz writes, "scholars who have studied 'leadership' have tended to side with the value-free connotation of the term because it lends itself more easily to analytic reasoning and empirical examination." The obvious problem of Hitler prompts Heifetz to offer the important qualification: "Rigor in social science does not require that we ignore values; it simply requires being explicit about the values we study. Placing Hitler in the same general category as Gandhi or Lincoln does not render the theory value-free. On the contrary, it simply leaves its central value—influence—implicit."

Another leading author, Joseph Rost, in his Leadership for the 21st Century (Praeger), is even more explicit that the old sources are passé: "The extended discussions of Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, and Weber are beside the point, as none of them wrote about leadership."

Instead of leadership based first and foremost on moral character and clarity of purpose, the most highly prized trait of "leadership" today is the ability to forge "consensus" through "non-coercive models of interaction." In this model, "hierarchy is out, and loosely coupled organic networks are in." (These phrases appear in the several of the, er, leading books on the subject.) One of the most popular definitions of "consensus leadership" is "an influence relationship between leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes." Such definitions make it possible to go on at length about Hitler's leadership abilities. It raises new possibilities for a sequel to my Churchill on Leadership, such as Stalin on Leadership: The Complete Guide for the Command-and-Control Executive.

Now, what would Churchill say about this "mush, slush, and gush"? Early in Their Finest Hour Churchill remarks that "An accepted leader has only to be sure of what is best to do, or at least to have made up his mind about it." There is no reference here to the necessity of followers, of "mutual purpose," or of consensus. In fact, though Churchill, like anyone in the public life of a democracy, had to operate within a structure that required collective deliberation and persuasion, he hated the tendency of drifting toward the lowest common denominator that we today praise as "consensus," and it was precisely this aversion to consensus that accounts for his success. Churchill wrote that most strategic failure owed to "the total absence of one directing mind and commanding willpower." He complained endlessly about the tendency of collective bodies where "everyone claims their margin at every stage, and the sum of the margins is usually 'no.'"

There is a memorandum on this problem which Churchill wrote at the Admiralty in 1912 that could easily be the germ of a Dilbert cartoon: "There is one epicycle of action which is important to avoid, viz—recognition of an evil; resolve to deal with it; appointment of a committee to examine it and discover the remedy; formulation of the remedy; decision to adopt the remedy; consultation with various persons who raise objections; decision to defer to their objections; decision to delay application of the remedy; decision to forget all about the remedy and put up with the evil."

Another person who is conspicuously absent from the leadership literature is Margaret Thatcher. And no wonder. The Iron Lady had nothing but contempt for the central value of modern leadership gurus: consensus. "The Old Testament prophets did not go out and ask for consensus," Thatcher remarked. She described consensus more expansively as "the process of abandoning all beliefs, principles, values and policies in search of something in which no one believes, but to which no one objects; the process of avoiding the very issues that have to be solved, merely because you cannot get agreement on the way ahead. What great cause would have been fought and won under the banner 'I stand for consensus'?"

Thatcher does rate an entire chapter in Howard Gardner's Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership (Basic Books), but despite the recognition of her success in office, she does not come off well—in part because her formative political years occurred during Churchill's wartime premiership (from which she presumably learned stubbornness), rather than during a more normal epoch. "Her self-confidence slid easily into intolerance, inflexibility, and moralism," Gardner laments. He thinks she would have been better off had she "built bridges" to her critics. Finally, he thinks, "We will not know for decades whether she effected a fundamental reorientation in British political life or only a momentary detour." Gardner wrote this in 1995. Tony Blair would likely give a different answer.

The good news is that, as usual, the general public is not yet wholly contaminated by the vacuousness of the intellectual approach to leadership. My modest volume is selling briskly, as is a new offering by Tom Morris promisingly titled If Aristotle Ran General Motors (Henry Holt). Now if we can get Aristotle back in the universities, we just might get a few leaders who think emulating Churchill is not such a bad idea.
Churchill As Coalition War Leader

Ideas may be splendid, but they have to be worked with to be realized. Visions may be dazzling, but they require labor.

by Christopher C. Harmon

On the morning of Winston Churchill's first full day as Prime Minister, he met with subordinate ministers. Among Churchill's chief concerns was whether Sweden could be brought into the war on the Allied side.¹

Sweden never joined the coalition, of course, but the case pointed to a major problem for Britain: given the power of the Axis of Germany, Austria, and Japan, how could London forge an international coalition that could withstand the aggressors? By war's end, there were only nine sovereign states on the globe which had not taken sides, and nearly all aligned against the Fascists. Even the alliance Italy had with Germany had been broken.² Churchill's greatness in this war was in making Britain the defensible rock, and in building outward a great coalition that could not merely survive but win the war.

We will explore Churchill's leadership in creating this international coalition in four ways. First, there are his ideas and vision; second, his hard work; third, his pursuit of the neutrals and smaller powers; fourth, the Grand Alliance with the United States and Soviet Russia. Finally, I'll offer a few closing points.
IDEAS AND VISION

The first stones laid, in this great construction project, were those of ideas. Churchill had to establish the anti-Fascist cause as one with political and moral credibility. That only sounds easy. It sounds easy today because it has been done; fascism has been discredited for half a century. Then, it seemed more like the ideology of the future.

Why?

Some people had come to understand the full evils of Russian communism. Disturbed by it, they frankly hoped the new Nazism would be a continental check on the Bolsheviks. Many Conservative Party members thought so. Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania probably thought so.

Some were slow to respond to Churchillian calls for arms because they remained transfixed by the mass death they had seen in Western Europe in their own time. As Churchill wrote—about pacific, democratic, demoralized France after World War I—every cottage had its empty chair.3

Some opinion makers in Europe in the 1930s understood fascism's viciousness, but whether from fear or optimism, chose to be dishonest about it. The editor of the powerful London Times, Geoffrey Dawson, admitted privately in 1937 that he was so protective of German feelings that "I spend my nights taking out anything which I think will hurt their susceptibilities and in dropping [in] little things which are intended to soothe them."4

Finally, there were some people in Europe who delayed doing anything about ascendant Nazism because, from their positions of civil responsibility, they coolly judged that chances for preserving their national life and sovereignty were better if they remained aloof from any fray with the Fascist powers. Self-preservation was their first, and their only, rule. Strong strands of this approach are evident in the public remarks of Lord Halifax, Neville Chamberlain, and Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies.

One must admit that there was a plausible argument for neutrality, if one judged only by immediate self-interest. But that is just my point. Churchill rarely assessed world political matters solely from self-interest. For him, that was moral and political bankruptcy. Churchill, no less calculating than other leaders, made his calculations on another basis. With Britain behind him he stood up and he stood fast. With time and with Hitler's attacks, more and more states and governments in exile came to stand with him.

There are two different problems with the neutrals' and appeasers' argument to a moral self-interest, and both have to do with how coalitions form—or do not form. First, even cynical self-interest may not serve your self-interest. Consider the factual record of this war. If immediate self-interest were the best ground for foreign relations, then Italy in both world wars proved herself the wisest country of all! And that is clearly false. Italy, Finland, the Soviet Union—all these jumped to and fro during World War II, and none profited much from the effort. Second, the so-called pure realists can be as bankrupt as the purely self-interested. Take one of today's brightest minds of the school of hard-boiled realists, Colin Gray, a major name in geopolitics. Perhaps you have seen his book War, Peace and Victory, which has a chapter on coalition war. Here are some of the principles he says history teaches to states that are considering joining coalitions for war:

"Identify the side which will win..."

"Intervene sufficiently early in a war so as to make a difference valued highly by new allies, but not so early that undue national effort is required."

"When in serious doubt [about who will win], stay neutral."5

This admirable intellect has not one word to say in this chapter about the differences between just war and the other kinds, or about high-toned statesmanship and low politics. His advice on these pages is mere Machiavellianism. His guides for coalition warfare are the obvious, shallow ones of the uncourageous neutrals of 1939 and 1940 and 1941. Gray is a man who really believes in national defense and national power. But there is a principle here: power, shorn of moral force, is a hollow and sometimes even an ugly thing.

That is part of the answer to our question of how Churchill created the great coalition. He gave the world a political and moral vision. The vision was that of the

Christopher C. Harmon presented this talk at Washington Society for Churchill's meeting on 20 October 1994. He has since offered similar addresses to audiences at the Marine Corps' Command and Staff College, Hillsdale College in Michigan and, most recently, the World War II Veterans Committee, meeting in Philadelphia on 3 February 1998.

5. Colin S. Gray, "The Perils and Pleasures of Coalition," in War, Peace, and Victory (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 257. A fuller list of such rules or principles follows the assertion that "rank opportunism can be prudent..."
democracies standing up against better armed tyrannies and prevailing with moral force until such time as they could win with material force.\(^6\)

The best illustrations of just how far he would go to make that vision tangible may be his proposals for unifying Britain with France and with the USA. In the wake of the war, and the victory, these proposals for joint citizenship seem odd. In fact, when France was falling in 1940 and the suggestion was first made that the British and French peoples should be joined in common citizenship, it struck Churchill as odd. De Gaulle agreed to it, although he thought it was odd. Yet the reality is that these two created a formal proposal, and within days Churchill got aboard a train in London for a trip to France to finalize the pact of mutual citizenship. But before the train could leave, word came that France had fallen. The idea expired on the spot.\(^7\)

Less well known is a similar gesture Churchill made to the United States three years later. At Harvard in 1943, speaking on the theme of "Anglo-American Unity," he raised the prospect that our common tongue might one day develop into a "common citizenship."\(^8\) He did this again at Fulton in 1946.

HARD WORK

Ideas may be splendid, but they have to be worked with to be realized. Visions may be dazzling, but they require labor. The second way Churchill built the Grand Alliance was by tremendous personal effort.

Adolf Hitler and the Japanese warlords worked hard but not necessarily at the right things. They did not work with each other. They never met at the uppermost levels, in years of combat and alliance. Is it any wonder that their strategies were uncoordinated? By contrast, Churchill met Roosevelt at ten World War II conferences. They exchanged 1700 letters and cables which they often drafted personally, in addition to the usual flow of government-to-government messages.

Churchill's travels were another form of notable exertion. He covered half a million miles during the war. Many trips were by air, the dangers of which were no abstraction; he had already been in two plane crashes. And he was now in his late sixties. His son Randolph, special envoy to Serbia's leader Tito, was in a wartime crash in Croatia, which he survived. A top British general was killed flying in North Africa, and a prominent purchasing agent sent to America, Arthur Purvis, was killed in a return flight to England in 1941. One part of the British delegation to the Yalta conference in the Crimea was killed when their plane crashed in the Mediterranean. Churchill's closest call personally came in January 1942 on a return flight home from America in a bomber; six British fighters rose up to intercept the unidentified plane, and only pulled away at the last moment.\(^9\)

Another form of Churchill's hard work was in the prodigious use of voice and pen. There were streams of formal letters, official communiqués, and international broadcasts.

Since any Churchill Center audience already knows a great deal about Sir Winston's masterful English, it may be interesting to relate a few anecdotes about his political speeches in his inadequate French. Always the diplomat, always courting a foreign audience, and always up to a challenge, Churchill used his French freely. He made broadcasts in it; he used it on the telephone to speak with Free French forces; he spoke in French to foreign groups who had no English but could use French as an intermediary tongue. He was clumsy with the language, and his accent was poor. Any of us who mangle French (and I do) can enjoy these stories.

Churchill told one French audience: "Be on your guard, because I am going to speak in French...which will put great demands on your friendship with Great Britain." He told a French theater director translating text for him at the BBC before a broadcast: "What I want is to be understood as I am, not as you are, not even as the French language is. Don't make it sound too correct." When he was speaking to some Turkish leaders in French, Anthony Eden cut in, trying to help and WSC snapped: "Will you please stop translating my French into French!" In a speech to a group of Italians, Churchill's first words were: "I'm going to speak to you today in the French tongue. It's bad French...the kind of French you speak yourselves."

\(^6\) According to Williamson Murray, Churchill recognized that British survival in political and cultural and moral terms depended on total defeat of Nazism, "...at the heart of Churchill's opposition to Nazi Germany,...he understood that the German danger was both strategic and moral." From his chapter on Britain in volume three of *Military Effectiveness: The Second World War*, eds. Allan Millett and Williamson Murray (Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1988), 99.

\(^7\) Gilbert, *Finest Hour*, 556-565. Kay Halle claims he did make the offer in France, on June 16 1940, but it was rejected; *The Irrepressible Churchill*, ed. Kay Halle (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1985), 124.

\(^8\) Winston Churchill, speech on Sept. 6, 1943, *Onwards to Victory*, ed. Charles Eade (Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1944), 236-7. Churchill expanded on this theme when speaking at the British Embassy on the same trip: see Halle's *Irrepressible Churchill*, 6-7, including the illustration of "the dollar sterling" which WSC drew for FDR's son James (in 1933 at Chartwell).

THE NEUTRALS AND LESSER POWERS

In forging the coalition, Churchill worked hard for the neutrals and the smaller prizes as surely as he did for great powers like the United States or the Soviet Union.

In political philosophy, as in practical politics, there is a great tension between Empire and Freedom. British policy was to preserve the Empire as surely as it was to fulfill the ideals of liberty and democracy in the Atlantic Charter. From the beginning, Churchill's many appeals abroad had been phrased not just for the English, and not only generally to the world, but for the dominions and possessions of Britain in their many corners of the globe. And all, or nearly all, responded.

Dominions like New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and South Africa had no constitutional duty to put up soldiers unless their own soil had been attacked. But they did put up soldiers. In this conflict, Australia gave nearly 30,000 of its young men's lives, and Canada almost 40,000. India, then moving towards dominion status, yielded 36,000. These figures compare with 271,000 military dead offered up by Great Britain. No luck. Churchill got rough. He cut off the supply of foodstuffs and fertilizers coming in courtesy of Royal Navy convoys. No change of mood occurred in Dublin. Meanwhile the British worried over reports of German machinations among the Irish. Churchill finally appealed directly to the US to send troops to Eire. When Washington did not move, London was reduced to pleading for a port call in Ireland by US warships.

Iceland was a happier story. Although fearing Germany, it was generous to the Anglo-Americans; both moved in before 1941 ended. Iceland thus helped plug the hole southern Ireland left in the North Atlantic defenses.

Spain, another neutral, was a delicate case, especially during and after Torch, the allied invasion of North Africa in 1942. British and American troops passed through the Straits of Gibraltar. Once they were landed, thoughts turned to whether Germany might punch through the Iberian Peninsula from Southern France and take those straits. But Spain's continued neutrality was crippling to Hitler's Mediterranean aspirations.

Turkey lies astride equally critical straits, which join the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, which is to say to the Soviet Union. When it was the Ottoman Empire, it was pursued by both sides in World War I, and erred in choosing the Central Powers. Now in World War II the Turkish Republic took the road of extreme caution and remained neutral almost until the bitter end (March 1945). One night in 1944, after dinner at Chequers, private secretary Jock Colville was surprised to see the PM smoking cigarettes—Turkish cigarettes. Churchill told him they were the only...
thing he ever got out of the Turks. Later, of course, Turkey became one of the best allies NATO had.

Greece was attacked from the north by Italian forces, and both New Zealand and Britain sent troops to her defense. Greece survived until the Germans moved south in force in April 1941. British forces then had to be evacuated. When the Nazis, in turn, were later forced to withdraw, civil war broke out in Greece. Churchill got on another airplane, spending his Christmas holiday of 1944 in Athens attempting to negotiate an end to the fighting. Greece meant a great deal to the British, not all of it mere trade; Greece was the birthplace of democracy: volunteers like the poet Byron served in an earlier Greek war, and troop commitments were made to Greece during World War I. Washington, for its part, saw the intervention as meddlesome and criticized it, making the episode painful for the Prime Minister.

The neutrals sometimes galled Churchill, and he said so publicly when he thought it necessary. In March, 1940 he made a broadcast on the need for armed cooperation, excoriating those waiting on the sidelines. "With Poland's fate staring at them," he growled, "there are still thoughtless dilettanti or purblind worldlings, who sometimes ask us: 'What is it that Britain and France are fighting for?' To this I answer: 'If we left off fighting, you would soon find out.'"

When coaxing and criticism did not work, he was not above escalation or coercion, as the case with convoys to Ireland shows. Consider also Norway, early in the war. British occupation of Norway came after failed diplomatic efforts. Unable to remain idle while German transports carried Swedish iron ore south through Norway's waters, Churchill had those waters mined. And then Britain invaded, but arrived a day or so too late to obstruct a German naval task force's doing the same thing.

Norway raises an interesting point on the moral basis of Churchill's leadership. How could he justify armed action against a neutral? He told the War Cabinet that the moral doctrine of "supreme emergency" justified the action. "Small nations must not tie our hands when we are fighting for their rights and freedom. The letter of the law must not in supreme emergency obstruct those who are charged with its protection and enforcement. It would not be right or rational that the Aggressor Power should gain one set of advantages by tearing up all the laws, and another set by sheltering behind the innate respect for law of their opponents. Humanity, rather than legality, must be our guide."

This is a difficult argument, but an important one, because Churchill knew that for Britain morale was very affected by whether war policy was moral.

THE GRAND ALLIANCE
The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States are in a category all their own with respect to this coalition war. They were, for London, the two great prizes.

Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt worked gradually towards de facto partnership for many months before 7 December 1941. By that day, it was evident just how divisive a seemingly simple concept like neutrality can be. American neutrality bore little resemblance to what it had been under the same President in 1936. There was the Atlantic Charter, the common declaration of principles which Roosevelt and Churchill wrote in August 1941, before the USA was even at war. Churchill wrote later of the Atlantic Charter that it was "astonishing" to see a neutral like the United States make such a common pledge with Britain, then fighting a total war.

He made many arguments to Americans. There were moral appeals, already mentioned. Doubtless he felt FDR had answered him with the "Four Freedoms" speech in January, 1941. Churchill appealed to a mutual sense of danger, as when he argued with Americans that German hegemony could reach well beyond the European continent, whereas survival of the Royal Navy would mean continued safety for America's Atlantic seaboard. He warned that without Britain and her navy, the Germans would begin to act aggressively against South American republics, which would undermine the Monroe Doctrine and threaten American interests to the South. He tugged upon the strings of sentiment as when, in appeals to Americans, he would refer to the heritage of his mother, Jennie Jerome of New York.

Once America was in the war, Churchill argued powerfully for his own strategic schemes but was also a helpful ally. He won strategy debates that preceded operations in North Africa, Sicily and Italy. But as American power grew and U.S. resources outpaced those of the British, Churchill recognized the need to yield more often. Looking back over the Anglo-American wartime record I see tension and argument, but I fail to see rancor and hostility as an enduring characteristic of either side.

The last word on the spirit of this alliance is an incredible Churchill speech we never hear about. It was a speech by one national leader praising the greater military power of another nation, reflecting such magnanimity toward an ally that most coalition partners could never give it without appearing craven. Stalin could never have uttered it; only as great a man as Churchill would think to write it or dare to give it.

18. Gilbert, Road to Victory, 700.
19. Gilbert, Finest Hour, 136-140.
20. Ibid., 106; see also 137,171.
22. Correspondence, 122,103.
23. Correspondence, 92.
The speech was given in the Albert Hall in London before a gigantic picture of Abraham Lincoln on American Thanksgiving Day, 1944. The Prime Minister said, in part: "It is your Day of Thanksgiving, and when we feel the truth of the facts which are before us, that in three or four years the peaceful, peace-loving people of the United States, with all the variety and freedom of their life in such contrast to the iron discipline which has governed many other communities—when we see that in three or four years the United States has in sober fact become the greatest military naval and air power in the world—that, I say to you in this time of war, is itself a subject for profound thanksgiving."24

By contrast the relationship with Russia was cold, as cold as a bear’s nose. It was calculated, like most alliances, but it was limited to calculation. As late as 1940 Churchill would still vilify Soviet communism as the moral equal of Nazism. Even after 1941 and the alliance between Moscow and London, for every smiling reference to "Uncle Joe" we find in the books or newsreels, there is some private expression of continuing reserve, or even contempt.

The Soviet Union did in time acknowledge the Atlantic Charter, but there is little evidence that Churchill believed, as FDR seemed to, that Stalin’s state could be calmed down and coaxed towards reason over time. The feeling Churchill had for the Russian chief of state was mutual. Roosevelt saw this, writing Churchill in 1942: "I think you will not mind me being brutally frank when I tell you that I think I can personally handle Stalin better than either your Foreign Office or my State Department. Stalin hates the guts of all your top people. He thinks he likes me better, and I hope he will continue to do so."25

What Washington and London had no difference over was the need to move material aid into Soviet Russia. If the British obsession before 1941 had been how to get America into war, that same year witnessed the birth of a joint Anglo-American obsession: how to keep Russia in the war. We have heard so much so often about the invincible Russian will in the face of invaders that we forget they had given up, only a generation before, in 1917. All partners in the Grand Alliance knew all about that former surrender to German power, and they feared an encore.26

And so, Britain and America took unending pains. They sent military supplies, clothing and industrial products they could ill afford. Most of it went by sea, with predictable losses, enough that the Admiralty begged the Prime Minister to stop the convoys.27 He would not; coalition strategy required that the losses be accepted.28 Here is a great example of the difference between a purely military view of war and the wider political one; as George Marshall once said of this aid to Russia, it may have had little operational effect, but a very large, significant and long-lasting political effect.29

"And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes,
comes in the light;
In front the sun climbs slow,
how slowly!
But westward look, the land is bright.

Churchill to Roosevelt, Spring 1941, quoting dough’s "Slave of the Lamp"

Strategic bombing is something we often think of in moral terms, or in purely military terms. Yet it too had an important role as a strategy of coalition war. In his first letter to Stalin after Russia had been overrun by the German army in Operation Barbarossa, Churchill promised bomber attacks...not against the invading German army, already out of reach and moving East, but against Germany itself. The explicit purpose was drawing back the German fighter aircraft to defend the homeland, depriving the Nazi advance of its air arm. The British bombers could thus be a kind of decoy, useful for affecting the Eastern Front’s ground campaign and air fighting.29 Obviously, they also had their central role in a strategy for destroying Germany’s war-making capability.

Over and over again, Churchill telegraphed not merely news but precise details of bombing raids to Stalin, or communicated them in person at their summits. This was true at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the war. In Moscow in August 1942, for example, Churchill was unable to answer demands for opening a second front in France, but he could tell of recent bombing raids and of yet greater bombing efforts to come. Stalin observed that "...it was not only German industry that should be bombed, but the population too." Answering, Churchill spoke of German "morale as a military target" and of Al-

24. The Dawn of Liberation, ed. Charles Eade (London: Cassell and Co., 1945), 253. Charles Eade printed the full speech in normal paragraph form. I have taken the liberty of arranging these selected lines of prose in the style Churchill sometimes used for public speeches. I did this by my own lights, having heard the taped speech but never seen the original text.
25. Message of March 18, 1942, in the Correspondence.
26. See for example Grand Alliance, 409.
27. Correspondence, 211,223.
28. Churchill’s judgment was: "If they (the USSR) keep fighting, it is worth it; if they don’t, we don’t have to send it"; message to FDR on Sept. 7, 1941, Correspondence. See also Churchill’s Grand Alliance, 438,456.
29. Churchill suggested as much several times in 1941 and 1942; see Gilbert’s one-volume Churchill: A Life, 668,702-703,719-720.
laid plans to shatter twenty more German cities. Stalin was then seen to smile—apparently for the first time—in that long meeting.\textsuperscript{30} In fact, the longer they talked of bombing the more jovial he became.

What I am suggesting is that, for a long time, bombing was the de facto second front: an aerial front. This was true even though no one called it the second front, or believed it was all they would need. This was true even though Stalin never ceased demanding a second front on the ground. All expected and planned for a front on the ground in the west of Europe; this was a temporary substitute.\textsuperscript{31}

The United States sometimes differed with its British partner about the targets of bombing and other air operations, but not about the utility of bombing for coalition war. Early on a planner named Dwight Eisenhower privately recorded the need for air assaults on Germany almost as if it were a second front: "If we're to keep Russia in...we've got to begin slugging with air at West Europe, to be followed by a land attack as soon as possible." In a subsequent memorandum, Ike argued that "Defeat of the Russian armies would compel a complete reorientation of Allied strategy. It would practically eliminate all opportunities of defeating Germany by direct action..."\textsuperscript{32}

The air plan developed at Yalta in February 1945 identified three purposes for the bomber offensive by the Anglo-Americans: (1) draw off the Luftwaffe; (2) smash the German war economy; (3) ruin German communication routes and troop movements in the East.

That last strategy helped dictate the death sentence of Dresden in February 1945. Dresden was chosen not only because it was one of the last remaining large cities, but because it was a rail and road center lying just behind the German Eastern Front. The Allies apparently believed that German armor had arrived at Dresden from Italy and was passing through on the way to the fighting just to the east.\textsuperscript{33} In this instance, as in countless others, strategic bombing was playing a part in coalition war.

CONCLUSIONS

The Grand Alliance had historical singularity. For example, it was unusual for the U.S. to bind itself so closely to any other power, even Britain. This partnership was among the closest bilateral relationships between independent powers in all of history. It might also serve as a model alliance. It brought together three global powers, each very different from the others. Here was a joining of unlimited efforts for a limited common purpose.

It was, by war's end, an enormous alliance: "Great Amalgam" is perhaps more apt a tag than "Grand Alliance." Wartime coalitions with so many partners cannot be a blissful union. But the whole did survive immense tests; it did last through the war. And then, after victory, it became fractious and discontented. That is very common for alliances.

The final point is that Churchill understood how moral force is a strategic principle and a strategic asset. Many things are necessary in war: logistics, operational skill, sufficient force size... But there's nothing like being in the right and having morale on your side. And for that, there's nothing like a clear-eyed statesman who articulates the principles of justice and war. For democracies, that which is moral is often very good for morale.

It is remarkable to consider how often Churchill's greatness of spirit buoyed up the morale of citizens and soldiers and civil servants during this war. His famous defiance, his occasional anger, his growling invective toward the foe are well known. But what this now obscures is the remarkable optimism he conveyed, helping to draw others into his efforts. Among my favorite illustrations of this is his broadcast in the spring of 1941, when London was being bombed and the Battle of the Atlantic was going badly. Consoling and inspiring his countrymen, in part by anticipating increased help from the United States, he ended the broadcast with this verse:

\texttt{For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,}
\texttt{Seem here no painful inch to gain,}
\texttt{Far back, through creeks and inlets making,}
\texttt{Comes silent, flooding in, the main.}
\texttt{And not by eastern windows only,}
\texttt{When daylight comes, comes in the light;}
\texttt{In front the sun climbs slow, how slowly!}
\texttt{But westward, look, the land is bright.}\textsuperscript{34}

And so it was.

\textsuperscript{30} Gilbert, \textit{Road to Victory}, 179.

\textsuperscript{31} Gilbert, \textit{Churchill: A Life}, 702-3; 719-720, etc.

\textsuperscript{32} The first of Ike's memos was private; the second was to George Marshall and Admiral King; see Steven Metz, \textit{Eisenhower as Strategist: The Coherent Use of Military Power in War and Peace} (Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania: Strategic Studies Institute, February, 1993), 17, 20. In his book \textit{American Strategy in World War Two}, Kent Roberts Greenfield says that in 1944 we wielded "a long-reaching, heavy, and powerful air fist, and a comparatively small though compact ground fist." And he writes, "The Americans had to be satisfied with the combined bomber offensive as the only means available in 1943 for a direct body blow at the Germans." (6,13). So if my formulation of this argument is somewhat unique, it expresses a military understanding of the time by some of the leaders involved.

\textsuperscript{33} There are many thorough treatments of Allied bombing strategy. One brief essay, which includes issues surrounding the burning of Dresden, is the author's monograph for the Naval War College: 'Are We Beasts?': Churchill and the Moral Question of World War II 'Area Bombing', (Newport, R.I.: Center for Naval Warfare Studies, Dec, 1991).

\textsuperscript{34} Arthur Clough, \textit{Slave of the Lamp}, cited in Gilbert, \textit{Finest Hour}, 1022.
Let the Ghosts of Omdurman Sleep
by Tke Rt. Hon. The Lord Deedes, M.C.

One could hardly be in Khartoum, as I was recently, without speculating on how we shall deem it appropriate to mark the centenary of the Battle of Omdurman, which falls on September 2nd. It was, after all, a singular battle. As Winston Churchill observes in My Early Life, nothing like it will ever be seen again.

In the course of a single day, Kitchener's army of some 20,000 British troops defeated the Mahdi's army, which was almost three times as strong. Churchill took part in the 21st Lancers' cavalry charge and was lucky to escape with his life. In a matter of minutes, the Lancers lost five officers and sixty-five men killed or wounded and 120 horses. The regiment was awarded three VCs.

Some years ago when I was in Khartoum, our then ambassador, Sir Allen Ramsay, called for me before dawn and took me round the battlefield. We had to go at dawn, he explained, for that was when the decisive engagement was fought. I have forgotten the details of the battle, but I do remember the memorial we found there: "In memory of the officers, NCOs and men of the 21st Lancers who fell here."

The first name is that of Lt. Robert Grenfell, one of nine sons, five of whom died in the country's service, and cousin of Julian and Billy, who were killed in the First World War. I have speculated since on how far our history might have turned out differently had Churchill's name been on that memorial.

Ah of which explains my interest in the Battle of Omdurman. But I should have known better than to anticipate any sounding of trumpets over the centenary of the battle.

Kitchener of Khartoum, the defeat of the Mahdi, the gallantry of the Lancers in hand-to-hand conflict, the sacrifices of the Grenfell family, all belong to our past. In these times, they are ghosts better not disturbed. So the British Council will mark the centenary by staging a seminar on British relations with the Sudan, past, present and future—and that can hardly cause hard feelings.

There does survive in Khartoum, however, one relic of our glorious past. At the Blue Nile Sailing Club, founded in 1822, there survives on dry land what is said to be Kitchener's gunboat.

Agreed, in temperatures hovering around the 42C mark, such beverages are much better for you, and a short period of abstinence does no harm. Yet, decadent though it seems, around the time the sun went down, I did sorely miss a long whisky and soda.

Travelling round the city and looking at all the mosques, a thought occurred to me about our Millennium Dome. It is a much more appropriate symbol of Islam than of Christianity.
As OTHERS SAW HIM

Neville Chamberlain:

"Winston is a very interesting but a d—d uncomfortable bedfellow. You never get a moment's rest and you never know at what point he'll break out."

Assuming that we [the Conservatives] come back next year with a diminished majority and stay in the full term, most of us will be a good deal older and a good deal the worse for wear. Probably we should then have several years of Opposition and that would give Winston his chance of establishing himself in the party's favour....In opposition, his want of judgement and his furious advocacy of half-baked ideas would not matter, while his wonderful debating and oratorical gifts would have free play....

"One doesn't often come across a real man of genius, or, perhaps, appreciate him when one does. Winston is such a man and he has les défauts de ses qualités. To listen to him on the platform or in the House is sheer delight. The art of the arrangement, the unexpected turn, the master of sparkling humour, and the torrent of picturesque adjectives combine to put his speeches in a class by themselves. Then as you know there is no subject on which he is not prepared to propound some novel theory and to sustain and illustrate his theory with cogent and convincing arguments. So quickly does his mind work in building up a case that it frequently carries him off his own feet.

"I have often watched him in Cabinet begin with a casual comment on what has been said, then as an image or simile comes into his mind proceed with great animation, when presently you see his whole face suffused with pink, his speech becomes more and more rapid and impetuous till in a few minutes he will not hear of the possibility of opposition to an idea which only occurred to him a few minutes ago.

"In the consideration of affairs his decisions are never founded on exact knowledge, nor on careful or prolonged consideration of the pros and cons. He seeks instinctively for the large and preferably the novel idea such as is capable of reinterpretation by the broadest brush. Whether the idea is practicable or impracticable, good or bad, provided he can see himself recommending it plausibly and successfully to an enthusiastic audience, it commends itself to him.

"There is too deep a difference between our natures for me to feel at home with him or to regard him with affection. He is a brilliant wayward child who compels admiration but who wears out his guardians with the constant strain he puts upon them."

-12 August 1928

Chamberlain, then Minister of Health, was writing to Lord Irwin, later Lord Halifax. Ref: Gilbert, the Official Biography, Vol. V, Prophet of Truth (1976), pp295-97.
One hundred years ago:
Summer 1898 • Age 23

"I do not accept the Christian or any other form of religious belief."

Shortly after he arrived back in England from India Churchill, as author of The Story of The Malakand Field Force, was invited to meet "the Great Man, Master of the British world, the unchallenged leader of the Conservative party, a third time Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary at the height of his long career" (as he referred to Lord Salisbury).

Salisbury told him: "I have been keenly interested in your book. I have read it with the greatest pleasure and, if I may say so, with admiration not only for its matter but for its style." He offered to be of any assistance requested by young Churchill. Winston responded immediately with a request to join the expedition to Khartoum.

For whatever reason, a vacancy occurred to which Churchill was appointed. In order to avoid a recall to India, he caught "a filthy tram" out of Marseilles, thus keeping himself out of touch from the authorities in London.

Before leaving for Egypt he made his second political speech (not in Robert Rhodes James's Complete Speeches). He wrote his mother that the 15 July speech at Bradford was a complete success.

During preparations for the expedition up the Nile, he worked on his dispatches for the Morning Post. He could find little time to write letters but he did write his mother that "if I am [killed] you must avail yourself of the consolation of philosophy and reflect on the utter insignificance of all human beings...I do not flinch - though I do not accept the Christian or any other form of religious belief....I shall come back afterwards the wiser and stronger....and then we will think of other and wider spheres of action."

As he prepared for battle, he commented about his Commander-in-Chief and future Cabinet colleague: "Kitchener said he had known I was not going to stay in the army - was only making a convenience of it; that he had disapproved of my coming in place of others." He added that Kitchener "may be a general - but never a gentleman."

Churchill participated in the Battle of Omdurman on 2 September. The best account of this event is his own in The River War. Professor Paul Rahe (FH 85) presents a powerful argument for the book's contemporary relevance: "Churchill's great, neglected work is, like Thucydides' history, a prose epic. His subjects—the Nile and its peoples; the conflict between Islam and modernity; the origins, character, and course of the Mahdist revolt against Egyptian rule with the Sudan; the resistance mounted by General Gordon at Khartoum; the fecklessness of Gladstone's Liberal administration; and the campaign of reconquest ultimately mounted on behalf of Egypt and Britain by Sir Herbert Kitchener—offered him the same sort of canvas available to Thucydides, and he took the endeavor as an occasion for reflection on the moral responsibilities attendant upon a great power and as an opportunity to explore the relationships between civilization and decadence, between barbarism and courage, and between modern science and the changing character of war.

"In an age when the Great Democracies are likely to be called on to respond to ugly little conflicts marked by social, sectarian and tribal rivalries in odd corners of the world...I can think of no other historical work that better deserves our attention."

"All right-Winston." Telegram to his mother after Omdurman. (Photo by Douglas Hall)

Seventy-five years ago:
Summer 1923 • Age 48

Hosey Rigge = Cozy Pig

In May Stanley Baldwin replaced the dying Andrew Bonar Law as Prime Minister. While his family holidayed at Cromer on the North Sea, Churchill spent the summer at Sussex Square working on the second volume of The World Crisis, with periodic excursions to supervise the renovation of Chartwell. While there he lived at a rented house, Hosey Rigge (which he immediately nicknamed “Cozy Pig”), on the Wester-
Clementine suffered a throat infection so she stayed at Hosey Rigge while Churchill rested in the Mediterranean aboard the yacht at Chartwell "but Winston had his heart set on it." She did not wish to leave London and she doubted the family could afford the costs of renovation and maintenance. But Churchill wrote her to Chartwell "but Winston had his heart set on it." She did not wish to leave Chartwell "but Winston had his heart set on it.. .We must endeavour to live there for many years and hand it over to Randolph afterwards." He outlined how he intended to make the necessary money by serving as a consultant with oil companies and writing, primarily the latter. Furthermore, he was confident that "if we go into office we will live in Downing Street!" (Both the Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer reside there. He would eventually hold both offices.)

On 14 August he went to see the Prime Minister. To Clementine he wrote; "I entered Downing Street by the Treasury entrance to avoid comment. This much amused Baldwin. However Max [Lord Beaverbrook] rang up this morning to say he hoped I had had a pleasant interview and that I had greatly heartened the PM about the Ruhr! He is a little ferret."

Fifty years ago:
Summer 1948 • Age 77
Publishing Volume I

Many Poles objected to certain comments made by Churchill in the U.S. edition of his first volume of The Gathering Storm. He deleted the offending passages from the British edition, explaining to Eddie Marsh that "it was written in a feeling of anger against the behaviour of the present Polish Government and the temporary subservience of the Polish people to them."

Rebecca West reviewed the book in The Saturday Review of Literature: "Mr. Churchill's account of the events leading up to the Second World War is a puzzling book. It is clear as crystal about everything except the man who wrote it. He is without match in his generation for his exquisitely feline portraits of his enemies. But Churchill is the leader of the Tory Party, and he is not going to make it lose face altogether, so though he gives Baldwin away entirely, and frankly reveals Neville Chamberlain's incompetence at certain periods, he preserves certain reticences. This leads him at times into slight falsifications of history...."

"This volume indicates that some of Mr. Churchill's difficulties with his colleagues may be due to his phenomenal egotism...England loves him; it distrusts him, it fears him. England has always kept Winston Churchill because behind him they see the towers and parks of the great houses which were the nerve centres of the old order; in him they fear the insolence which was the occupational disease of those who lived in the great houses...We sigh in astonishment at the fools who year in, year out, kept out of power the man to whom we British owe our lives."

"They not only kept him out of power before the war, but they threw him out as soon as possible after. But they could not silence him. While continuing to call for the defeat of the Labour politicians "whose crazy theories and personal incompetence have brought us down," he supported the Government's firm stand against the Russians who had established a blockade of Berlin.

He desired a holiday in France but currency restrictions limited the amount of money he could take out of England. This problem was solved when Time-Life paid for serialization rights for The Second World War in French francs. He ended the summer with a holiday in Aix-en-Provence, but a holiday for Winston Churchill was unlike that of anyone else's, as we will see in the next installment.

Twenty-five years ago:
Summer 1973

Finest Hour announced the Library of Imperial History's Collected Works of Sir Winston Churchill and published a press account of the launch in London: "The dwindling band of British World War II heroes and statesmen stepped unsteadily from the pages of history to honour Sir Winston Churchill, smoke his favourite cigars, and drink his favourite brandy. The occasion was a luncheon in the chandeliered, blue-and-cream rococo ballroom of the Savoy Hotel to launch the first publication of the revered wartime leader's entire literary works in one 34-volume set.

"Up to the high table falteringly stepped aging wartime heroes whose exploits in the air, on land and at sea helped turn the tide against Nazi Germany and its allies as Churchill led Britain through its 'finest hour.' They were joined by a generation of Churchill's, from Sir Winston's 88-year-old widow Lady Clementine, frail but proud, to his grandson Winston, 33, now a Member of Parliament."

The eulogies to Churchill, eight years after his death, flowed as fast as his favourite brand of Champagne (Pol Roger) and cognac (Hine) among the 400 guests. Prime Minister Heath, presenting Lady Churchill with the first volume of the £945 ($2364) leather-bound, gold-embossed set, said, "only Julius Caesar matched Churchill's achievement in writing history and living it."

The affair sought to recapture everything Churchill loved: From his favourite brand of Havana cigars (Romeo y Julieta), passed around after the meal, to the red roses and pink tulips decorating the tables, to "Begin the Beguine" and other old favourites played by the Savoy Blue Room string quintet.

Guests included former Prime Minister Harold Macmillan; the relatives of ten deceased prime ministers besides Churchill, including his controversial predecessor, Neville Chamberlain; and at least twelve retired wartime generals and twenty-five Battle-of-Britain pilots who with now-deceased comrades swept the Luftwaffe from the skies over Britain in 1940, earning Churchill's accolade:

"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."
Riddles, Mysteries, Enigmas

1) I have yet to read a discussion of a Churchill error or a flaw in his character. Yet I know that a lot of historians would find many flaws while still considering him a great man. (on Listserv "Winston")

2) Championing the Dardanelles operation without plenary authority to bring it to a successful conclusion.

3) Misjudging his First Sea Lord, Fisher, who brought about his (temporary) political destruction in 1915.

4) Restoring the Gold Standard without commensurate reforms in employment and wage policies.

5) Not listening to Bernard Baruch before plunging into the Wall Street stock market in the late 1920s.

6) Wasting political capital opposing the India Bill in the early 1930s, which was clearly going through with thumping majorities.

7) Trying to skewer Sam Hoare on an issue of Privilege when Sam's Tory friends could stack the deck to protect him, despite his guilt.

8) Standing up for Mr. David Windsor in the Abdication Crisis, long after that worthy had lost the right to support from anybody.

9) Abject miscalculation during the Norway invasion of April 1940, although some of this was due to Cabinet dithering.

10) Placing faith in the French Army.

11) Confusing Blitzkrieg with the static warfare of WW1.

12) Believing that capital ships were safe from hostile aircraft.

13) Accepting leadership of the Conservative Party in 1940.

14) Believing he could trust Stalin.

15) Comparing poor Clem Attlee and his friends to "a kind of Gestapo" in the 1945 General Election.

16) Staying on too long as Prime Minister in the 1950s.

17) Believing that personal diplomacy would make a difference in Soviet behavior after Stalin's death.

18) Not interceding more forcefully to resolve the Anglo-American split over Suez in 1956.

Not everybody on the Listserv bought this list, but Churchill may have. In The Grand Alliance, over the sinking of Prince of Wales and Repulse, he writes: "The efficiency of the Japanese in air warfare was at this time greatly underestimated both by ourselves and by the Americans" (Ch. 12).

During the Blitzkrieg in France, he writes, "I was shocked by the utter failure to grapple with the German armour, which, with a few thousand vehicles, was encompassing the entire destruction of mighty armies" (Chapter 3). Some respondents held the Dardanelles unwinnable, even had Churchill been in charge (the Turkish forts may have been short of ammunition, but their mobile batteries weren't), and questioned what would have been gained had the fleet got through—would Turkey have surrendered, as Churchill thought? These points are worthy of further discussion and we will welcome articles on them.

The main point I wished to make was that Churchill's faults were, like his virtues, on a fairly grand scale, but that the latter outweigh the former. And, as Professor Paul Addison wrote, "I always feel that, paradoxically, it diminishes Churchill when he's regarded as super-human, and I'm delighted to see the Churchill Center airing these issues." -Ed.
WIT AND WISDOM

On Listserv Winston (see p41)

the question arose over where James Humes's The Wit and Wisdom of Winston Churchill (which sadly omits attributions) sourced WSC's quote of Beaverbrook being Churchill's "foul weather friend." Lord Moran's Churchill: The Struggle for Survival, p199, quotes Churchill as saying on 22 September 1944: "Max is a good friend in foul weather. Then, when things are going well, he will have a bloody row with you over nothing."

A question involved the origin of another Churchill quote in Humes's book: "There is nothing wrong in change, if it is in the right direction. To improve is to change, so to be perfect is to have changed often." It appears to be part of an exchange in the House of Commons with Philip Snowden when Churchill defended his first budget in 1924, cf. Ephesian, Winston Churchill, (1936 edition), p288.

IDEA VS. COINCIDENCE

On one occasion, Sawyers [Churchill's valet] was coping with a Churchill who was in a particularly bad mood. For one thing, the Prime Minister had been losing things all morning.

"Sawyers, where are my glasses?" he demanded petulantly.

"There, sir," said Sawyers, leaning over Churchill's shoulder as he sat, and tapping his pocket. Getting ready for his afternoon nap, the Prime Minister found himself balked by another problem.

"Sawyers, where is my hot water bottle?" he asked.

"You are sitting on it, sir," said the unruffled Sawyers. "Not a very good idea," he added.

"It's not an idea, it's a coincidence," triumphantly replied the reigning master of English, so pleased with his brilliant correction that he forgot all about his other troubles.


UNWELCOME AT RICHMOND

Clarence Martin writes:

"Reading We Happy WASPs by Parke Rouse, Jr. (Dietz Press), a memoir of Richmond, Virginia in the 1930s and 1940s, I came across the following on page 45:

"Senator Byrd was not given to jocularity, but he relished two stories about the Richmond visit of Winston Churchill when Byrd was Governor (1926-1930) and Churchill came to Richmond visiting the battlefields of the Civil War (1929). The Byrds invited Churchill to stay at the Governor's Mansion, and Churchill accepted.

On Churchill's first night the Byrds invited him at a black-tie dinner at the Governor's Mansion. R. Gray Williams, a Winchester Va. attorney, was also a house guest of the Byrds and was in the drawing room when Churchill came downstairs before dinner. Mistaking Williams for the butler, Churchill asked him for a cigar.

"I don't have one, sir," Williams replied, "but I'll get you one." He hot-footed it across Capitol Square to Scher's Confectionary and returned with several splendid stories. He wouldn't accept Churchill's tip.

When Churchill asked for brandy, evidently unaware that Virginia was legally dry, Byrd put in an emergency call to his friend John Stewart Bryan for the loan of a bottle. In those Prohibition times brandy was rare, but Bryan rushed a bottle to the Governor. Churchill consumed so much that Byrd had to open another bottle the next night.

As the Byrds bade Churchill good-bye at the end of the visit, Mrs. Byrd turned to her husband. "Harry," she said, "I don't know much about Mr. Churchill, but I hope you won't invite him to this house again."

Editor's note: Mr. Martin's quote was repeated almost verbatim by retired Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., addressing an ICS meeting in Richmond, Virginia in 1991. Senator Byrd also added another reason for his mother's displeasure: "At the formal dinner the night of his arrival, he asked for English mustard. His hostess sent his request to the kitchen only to be informed that there was none in the house. Mrs. Byrd told Mr. Churchill of her predicament and, trying to pass it off lightly, said she would be glad to send someone to the store if Mr. Churchill would like. He said yes, that was what he would like! So Mrs. Byrd slowed the dinner to a snail's pace, while I was dispatched to the grocery."
"Earn This..."
DICK FEAGLER

In a battlefield cemetery each marble cross marks an individual crucifixion. Someone—someone very young, usually—has died for somebody else’s sins.

The film "Saving Private Ryan" begins and ends in the military cemetery above Omaha Beach. By sundown of D-Day, 40,000 Americans had landed on that beach, and one in nineteen had become a casualty.

The military brass purposely chose troops with no combat experience for the bulk of the assault force. The brass reasoned that an experienced infantryman is a terrified infantryman. The odds of dying in the early waves were so great that an informed soldier might be paralyzed with well-founded despair. But the young and idealistic might move forward into the lottery of death.

Director Steven Spielberg made "Saving Private Ryan" as a tribute to D-Day veterans. He wanted, reviewers say, to strip the glory away from war and show the ’90s generation what it was really like. The reviews have praised the first thirty minutes of the film and the special effects that graphically show the blood and horror of the D-Day landing.

Unfortunately, American movie audiences have become jaded connoisseurs of special effects gore. In the hands of the entertainment industry, violence has become just another pandering trick. But Spielberg isn’t pandering.

Shocked by and wary of his depiction, I bought a copy of Steven Ambrose’s book, D-Day. The story of the Normandy invasion is a story of unimaginable slaughter: worse than I ever knew, and I thought I knew something about it.

Saving Private Ryan,
Steven Spielberg, Director;

The young men who lived through those first waves are old men now. Many have asked themselves, every day for more than fifty years, why they survived. It is an unanswerable question. The air was full of buzzing death. When the ramps opened on many of the landing craft, all the men aboard were riddled with machine gun bullets before they could step into the water.

Beyond this cauldron of cordite and carnage, half a world away, lay an America and Canada united in purpose with their British brethren like no citizen under sixty has ever seen. The war touched everyone. The entire starting lineup of the 1941 New York Yankees were in military uniform. Almost every family could hang a service flag in the window, with a star embroidered on it for each relative in uniform.

In the film, a squad of rangers is sent behind enemy lines to save a man whose three brothers have been killed in battle. Higher headquarters wants him shipped home to spare his mother the agony of having all her sons killed in combat. So eight Rangers risk their lives for one man. And when one of the Rangers is mortally wounded, he asks Pvt. Ryan to bend over so he can whisper to him.

"Earn this," he says.

Mr. Feagler is a columnist for the Cleveland Plain-Dealer. Reprinted by permission, thanks to the author and Marshall Wright, USMC, WW2.

In the early hours of D-Day, with the outcome of the battle still in the balance, the nation prayed. Ambrose tells us that The New York Daily News threw out its lead stories and printed in their place the Lord’s Prayer.

"I fought that war as a child," a historian on television said the other night. I knew what he meant. So did I. We all saved fat and flattened cans and grew victory gardens. But we did not all go to Omaha Beach. Or Saipan. Or Anzio. Only an anointed few did that.

The soldiers of World War II are beginning to leave us now. In my family, six have gone and two are left. We have lost the uncle who was on Okinawa, the cousin who worked his way up the gauntlet of Italy, and the cousin who brought the German helmet back from North Africa.

These men left us with a simple request. You can hear that request in "Saving Private Ryan." I haven’t read a review that has mentioned it, but it is what makes Spielberg’s movie a masterpiece.

FINEST HOUR 99 / 39
Not Really Churchill's Challenge

MICHAEL RICHARDS


Craig Read believes in World Government, and believes that Winston Churchill did, too. But (1) Churchill didn’t; and (2) no one is going to "Challenge the Tribe" anytime soon. This does not prevent Read’s book from being thought-provoking; but it would be more fun to read had he stuck to his theme, instead of masquerading from being thought-provoking; but it soon. This does not prevent Read’s book going to "Challenge the Tribe" anytime

The last section of his book, "Churchill’s Leadership and World Government," occupies only forty pages, but forms the nub of Mr. Read’s argument: "We must begin to employ the term ‘world-society’ instead of international relations... (347). To support this view he brings together every word of regret Churchill uttered over the sad history of the twentieth century, all the mistakes the nations made, as an argument for abolishing the nations. And to be sure he found some good ones. "Think of these people, decent, educated, the story of the past laid out before them," Churchill wrote, in a letter to Stanley Baldwin in 1928, musing over the mistakes of Versailles. Mr. Read fastens on all this Churchillian sorrow and discontent as a launching pad for his world government solution, but he does not realize that Churchill usually accompanied his catalogues of mistakes with his own formulations, by which the nations (sovereign nations) might have avoided them—or might avoid them in the future. Instead he adds his own articles of faith: "...the globe cannot support a massive system of interdependent democracies or semi-democracies, intent on economic growth and desirous of the best lives possible for their citizens, including population growth, lower infant mortality and a gradual cessation of natural deaths. Something will have to collapse" (31).

There are lots of examples of mankind despoiling its nest. So why can’t “interdependent democracies” do something about it? Well, Mr. Read says, "witness the demise of the current governmental structure and political edifice. Such as already occurred in Russia, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Italy and in Canada.” Canada?

Churchill was a believer in great combinations, but he never built his dreams at the expense of national sovereignty, and held that with the help of high minded leaders (like himself, of course) the nations could reach "the broad, sunlit uplands." He pointed to the Chiefs of Staff system of World War II as proof of this—a level of cooperation between two sovereign nations, he said rightly, that the world had never before seen.

Churchill did not live to evaluate the result of a half century without a major war, although there certainly were plenty of minor wars in his last twenty years and since. He was unable to contemplate the effect of having no great impetus toward unity among democratic states, which he espoused; or on the international level, which Mr. Read espouses. There were a lot of unpleasant movements and struggles, and there still are; but they are nothing compared to the movements led by Hitler, or by Stalin and his successors.

Maybe we have gone soft. Perhaps low morals and low morale and low expectations of leaders are the effects of having no Great War to fight, no D-Day troops to pray for, no great calamity, no invader to occupy and enslave us. Maybe the Martians will finally launch a war of the worlds that will bring us together; as in the film "Independence Day." In the meantime we would perhaps do well to observe Churchill's example, developing national leaders with a semblance of the comprehension he focused, on international affairs and the hopes of mankind.
Recent Discussions on Listserv "Winston"

LISTSERVWINSTON:
Subscribe free to our discussion forum. Send the e-mail message SUBSCRIBE WINSTON to LISTSERV@vm.marist.edu—you’ll receive a confirmation and will then be able to send and receive comments on all aspects of Churchill by our online community by e-mailing Win- ston@vm.marist.edu. In case of problems contact our List Manager, Jonah Triebwasser:
JZML@maristB.marist.edu

TOPIC EUROPE

Terrence Leveck, leveck@hotmail.com:
I call the list's attention to the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal, 25 March, "The Case for the Euro," where the author quotes Winston Churchill's views on a united Europe: "If Europe were once united in the sharing of its common inheritance there would be no limit to the happiness, prosperity, and glory which its 300 or 400 million people would enjoy." One wonders if the European Union as it is presently conceived, with its supra-national bureaucracy immune from popular influence and control, was what he had in mind.

As a staunch defender of free enterprise, he would surely be dismayed by a commitment to socialism which has resulted in alarming rates of unemployment and flight of capital. Would he be willing to give France and Italy a say over the value of the British currency?

D. Spencer Hines:
Churchill is still probably the greatest person of the 20th Century, but I know a number of people who would not agree. They dislike/hate him because they blame him for selling out Eastern Europe to the Communists by allowing Stalin to take control. Personally, I have no bias as I don't know what could have been done otherwise.

Rafal Mankoo, kmankoo@Sprint.ca:
It is ahistorical to blame Churchill for the communization of Eastern Europe, which was, indeed, a great tragedy. Only the military power of the United States, on the ground, brought quickly to bear against Stalin, could have prevented that. Such an option was a foolish pipedream. The Americans wanted to bring the boys home.

Editor, mahkand@aol.com:
Ratal's comments remind me of an arresting conversation in Liepaja, Latvia, during our 1995 bicycle tour of the Latvian coast on the 50th anniversary of VE Day. (It was no such thing to the Latvians, who were by then fighting with the Germans in a rearguard action against the oncoming Red Army, equipped with Sherman tanks courtesy Uncle Sam. The defenders didn't surrender until May 8th.) It illustrates a depth of feeling which I think we in the West rarely comprehend.

The British Ambassador to Latvia, Richard Ralph, had kindly arranged for local officials to meet us enroute. In Liepaja on our second morning out we were told that the mayor would come round for coffee. When we mentioned Churchill, he mentioned Yalta. I gamely made the case for Yalta, which ended with certain "guarantees" toward Poland but no hope for the Baltic States, which we maintained was the best Churchill could get out of it, given the position of the Red Army and FDR's reluctance, for the reasons stated, to break with Stalin while there was still some hope. The mayor replied: "But you and the British made a serious mistake. You didn't nuke Moscow. Think of how much trouble you would have saved yourselves-not to mention us."

We swallowed hard and tried to say there was no way the British or American people would have stood for that after what they'd been through, and there were few Baltic-Americans among the voters to influence the political leadership. It didn't do any good. "You should have nuked them," he repeated. He then told us he had strafing scars across his stomach, received as a boy when he dared venture onto the Liepaja beach one night. The beach was strung with barbed wire from the Polish-Lithuanian border to northern Estonia, swept dean every evening after curfew, and patrolled by armed guards with Alsatians. (The barbed wire didn't disappear until 1991.) He and his pals used to walk backward into the water and then forward, over and over again, leaving masses of footprints, to goad the Soviets into thinking there had been a raiding party landing in the night. One night the guards caught them and opened fire. The kids got away—just. Some of them were hit.

I guess how we look at these things all depends on our experience.

>»
A spirited discussion occurred over the summer as to what Churchill thought of the American Civil War and the decision of Robert E. Lee to adhere to Virginia and the Confederacy. Hoping to keep this one going we posted as follows:

Debaters on Lee may wish to read two good papers in the Proceedings of the International Churchill Societies 1990-1991: "Churchill's 'American Civil War' as History," by Col. Joseph B. Mitchell, and "The Noblest and Least Avoidable Conflict... Winston Churchill and the American Civil War" by Dr. James W. Muller. This is available for $10 from Churchill Stores (address on page 2).

A signal moment at the Virginia Churchill conference in 1991 came when a passage by Dr. Muller caused Col. Mitchell to get up and announce that he had never heard Gen. Lee spoken of in such terms, particularly in Richmond of all places, and that he did not intend to listen any more, whereupon he duly left. Dr. Muller, qualifying himself for our croix de guerre, remained unruffled and carried on. Later he was permitted to leave the Confederate capital under a flag of truce. Muller stated:

"...it is disappointing that Churchill does not ask whether this noble soldier made the wrong choice. There is an inescapable contradiction in Lee's position. At West Point, as he became a cadet, he adhered to the motto binding him not only to duty and honor but also to country; and it was on the last point that the Virginian erred. He mistook Virginia for his country, though he had sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States. Since he agreed with Lincoln that secession was unconstitutional, one is forced to conclude that Lee knowingly violated his oath. That he did so on account of his lifelong allegiance to the State of Virginia does not excuse his misdeed, however poignant it makes his quandary. The Confederacy was not only, as the event proved, a lost cause; it was also a bad cause, as Lee knew from the start. His nobility is thus tinged with a tragic flaw. [Col. Mitchell stood up.]

"Yet Churchill breathes not a hint of criticism of the Virginian. He comes to the fair conclusion that 'the great American Civil War' was 'the noblest and least avoidable of all the great mass-conflicts of which till then there was record.' It may seem almost churlish to criticize the greatest captain of that war here in 'world-famous Virginia,' but for all that we admire Lee we must not shrink from defending the Union. Robert E. Lee could not have avoided the war, but he could have avoided fighting on the wrong side of it..." [Col. Mitchell left.]

Readers may like to review Churchill's marvelous might-have-been, "If Lee Had Not Won the Battle of Gettysburg" (Collected Essays, 1974). We hope to reprint it next year for a mini-conference to be held at Gettysburg ("Churchill and Eisenhower at Gettysburg," 24-26 September 1999).

WHAT WOULD HE SAY?

Karl-Georg Schon, IDKGSchon@aol.com: In the background of some debates on "Winston" there lies the question, What would Churchill do, think, say today in this or that situation or on this or that issue? Now this is of course a very intriguing question, especially as no one will ever be proven right or wrong. But perhaps it might be interesting as well to know which Churchill you are talking about.

Is it the one who said, "I believe that working classes all over the world are recognising they have common interests and not divergent interests" (Swansea, 17 August 1908)?

Or is it the Churchill who said, "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" (Mansion House, London, 10 November 1942)?

Or could it be the Churchill who wrote, "We are fighting to reestablish the reign of law and to protect the liberties of small countries" (War Cabinet Paper on Norway, 16 December 1939)?

Or perhaps the Churchill of the percentages deal with Stalin?

I do not write this in a neo-revisionist vein. What I would like to stress is that any statesman (in Lloyd George's definition "a politician with whom you happen to agree") is bound to see problems and situations under different aspects depending on the situation he and his country happen to be in at the moment. This, in fact, is the essence of the art of statesmanship.

"To improve is to change. To be perfect is to change often" (Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the debate on his first budget, April, 1925.)

It would be important to define the experiences you are thinking of when you consider the Churchill who would do or say this or that today. The cavalry charge at Omdurman? The trenches of Flanders? Dunkirk? The Finest Hour? VE-Day? The H-Bomb? The collapse of the Soviet Union? The establishment of the Euro? What would be the position of his country? Victorian Empire? Junior Partner of the USA? Pre-Thatcher Britain? Today's Britain?

To take Churchill's views more or less for granted on some question of present-day politics or policy is not only adventurous; it debases "the most wonderful man" Field-Marshal Lord Alanbrooke had "ever met" (Diary for 27 May 1941).

WSC and FDR vs. STALIN

Prof Brian Villa, bvilla@uottawa.ca: Is there really any good evidence that Churchill was prepared to be more confrontational with the Soviets than were FDR and the American diplomatic establishment? Let me now lay out a few elements that might stimulate discussion.

The view that WSC knew better and was blocked by the Americans was first advanced by Chester Wilmot based on no particular evidence and by Elliot Roosevelt who said his father Franklin was upset at Winston's inclination to be confrontational and who confessed to working to block Churchill. The other major evidence was provided by Churchill's physician, particularly in his recollections of remarks Churchill made in Teheran in 1943. The view that Churchill was not very anti-Soviet and easily caved in to FDR is made by John Charmley in his very controversial works. Where are the good evidence and the good argument? Any takers?

More on this next issue; all comments welcomed, by email or mail.
The Churchilliana industry abated somewhat after the deluge of the centenary year. Some limited edition 1974 issues continued to sell throughout the rest of the 1970s. In some cases the full edition was not sold.

Karin Churchill (no relation) missed the centenary but in 1975 produced a cold-cast bronze limited edition full-length figure of Churchill in Garter robes and in the following year came up with a small limited edition bust. Alva Museum Replicas of New York introduced a copy of Oscar Nemon’s bust in a plastic resin/marble dust composite material they called "Alvastone"—quite a nice reproduction, 9 1/2 inches tall including its polished wooden plinth, which continues to be available from Churchill Stores (address on page 2). In 1976 Grantmere marketed a 10-inch-tall bust, modelled by John Armstrong, in either black basalt or bronze effect. Although not so controversial as the Epstein bust Mr. Armstrong’s rendition was not universally liked and not too many copies were sold, giving it a rarity value in 1990 of £500 in the UK and $2000 in the USA.

The Franklin Mint offered in 1977 a small purple crystal glass paperweight containing a white relief portrait of Churchill. In the same year Ivor Roberts-Jones made available a 32-inch-tall bronze maquette of his Parliament Square statue. On its black granite plinth it was a faithful replica of the full-size effigy, but its smaller scale tended to exaggerate "the considerable allegorical illusion" disliked by Lady Soames. The maquettes were offered with a breathtaking price tag (I forget just how much but one sold in the USA a few years ago at $10,000, albeit with a polished marble plinth) and fewer than half the intended edition of 500 were sold.

A nice ceramic piece was commissioned by the Observer newspaper in 1977 for the Queen’s Silver Jubilee. The mug, more of a tankard really at 4 1/2 inches tall x 4 inches diameter, had sepia portraits on a white background of the Queen and the seven Prime Ministers, who had served during her reign.

In 1983 the National Trust’s "Churchill at Chartwell" plate, designed
by John Holder and made by Oakley Fine China, went on sale at Chartwell. Originally priced at £35, it has since appreciated threefold on the secondary market. An enduring 1983 introduction by Royal Doulton, still on sale in High Street china shops, was Adrian Hughes's "Man-in-the-white-suit," a 10 1/2-inch-tall earthenware figure. Originally offered at £55, it is now ticketed £85, or $180 in the USA.

The highlight of 1984 was the opening to the public of the Cabinet War Rooms, Churchill's underground operational headquarters, opposite St. James's Park. This brought another rich collection of Churchilliana into the public domain plus, in the form of a well-stocked souvenir shop, another source of Churchill memorabilia. The War Rooms shop always stocks a range of Churchillian gifts including audio cassettes, badges, books, busts, figures, fridge magnets, hip flasks, jugs, lighters, medals, mugs, pictures, plates, postcards, posters, plaques, playing cards, 
Punch cartoons, sweets, table mats, tankards, teaspoons, thimbles, tobies and videos—quite enough to start a collection! Don't miss it in London.

In 1985 from Holland came a brass medal commemorating the 40th anniversary of "Operation Manna" (the dropping of food supplies to the liberated Dutch civilian population) which incorporates a portrait of Churchill.

Perhaps the highlight of that year was the 11 1/2-inch-tall figure—designed by Andrew Turner for the History in Porcelain Company—in a limited edition of 375, of Churchill standing on the steps of 10 Downing Street. The figure was endorsed by ICS, Lady Soames and Sir John Colville, and was originally offered for £355 in the UK and $980 in the USA. Not surprisingly the price limited the market and the edition was not sold out until the early 1990s (colour photo on cover of FH 55).

Caverswall China celebrated the 40th anniversary of VE-Day with a bone china plate and a thimble. The plate, not the best thing Caverswall ever did, has the crowd scene in front of Buckingham Palace on 8 May 1945 in the centre with the Royal Family and Churchill in two separate inserts at top and bottom.

Marcus Replicas of Bottesford, in 1986, launched their highly regarded six-inch-tall cold-cast bronze bust of Churchill, together with a 5-inch-diameter pewter effect wall plaque. Both were on sale in the Blenheim Palace and Imperial War Museum gift shops as well as High Street outlets. Later that year Staffordshire Fine Ceramics introduced a "War Heroes" series of miniature character jugs, just 2 1/2 inches tall, which included a nicely modelled and painted representation of Churchill.

In the following year Staffordshire Fine Ceramics produced a toby jug of Churchill, seated and wearing a morning suit, with the front door of 10 Downing Street at his back. This was in a limited edition of 1000 exclusively for the North American market; but, although nothing like the full edition has been sold, SFC seem reluctant to sell one in the UK (to me) and will not even quote a price! Francesca China issued a pair of bone china Churchill thimbles in 1987, one image bare-headed, the other with a black hat; both are beautifully decorated but useless as sewing aids.

In 1988 we saw the first of Peggy Davies's Churchill designs following her retirement from Royal Doulton. It was not memorable, just a fairly ordinary character jug with the "Prestige" backstamp. Later that year, Michael Sutty produced his superb 16-inch-tall porcelain figure of Churchill as a twenty-year-old Second Lieutenant in the 4th Hussars (see back cover). Expertly sculpted and very finely painted, the figure was to have been in a limited edition of 250 selling at £500. An example was on display at the Chartwell gift shop, where orders could be placed. Margaret Thatcher, a devotee of Sutty’s work, purchased one of the first pieces. Unfortunately before the edition could be completed Sutty's business was bankrupted when an American customer defaulted on payment for a large order.

Nineteen eighty-nine saw Peggy Davies’s first commission for Kevin Francis Ceramics: the splendid "Spirit of Britain" toby jug in a choice of three colourways and a limited edition of 5000. Staffordshire Fine Ceramics reissued Shorter's 1939 "Admiralty" character jug, using the original moulds but adding a cigar, while Wood Potters of Burslem brought out a new character jug to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Churchill's return to the Admira-

![KEITH LEE'S 12-INCH-TALL COLD-CAST BRONZE FIGURE, 1981, IN A LIMITED EDITION OF 250, ISSUED TO COINCIDE WITH THE TV SERIES "THE WILDERNESS YEARS" STARRING ROBERT HARDY. (AUTHOR'S COLLECTION) BELOW RIGHT: KARIN CHURCHILL'S COLD-CAST BRONZE LIMITED EDITION FULL-LENGTH FIGURE OF CHURCHILL IN GARTER ROBES. (EDITOR'S COLLECTION)
ON THE CHURCHILL TRAIL

My wife and I and our eleven-year-old son recently returned from a holiday in the UK, including a bit of Churchill's Britain. The Third Winston Churchill Symposium, on Churchill's Life of Marlborough (see also pp6-7) was interesting and most stimulating. The symposiarch, Piers Brendon, Keeper of the Churchill Archives, directed a lively exchange by sympsiasts. It was too bad that there was only a handful in the audience to enjoy it. We thought it was all just as good as the first two symposiums, which we also attended, although the surroundings were considerably more genteel.

During the Friday afternoon break at Blenheim, nearly everyone visited the newly renovated graves of Sir Winston and family in the churchyard of St. Martin at Bladon. Even though a considerable sum was spent repairing the damage done from years of wind, rain and visitors, the effect is unchanged. It is still a simple and peaceful grave (see p13).

We also spent a day in Woodford, Churchill's constituency, with David Thomas, author of Churchill, Member for Woodford. There we visited several sites but there was little evidence of Churchill's years in the area. This disturbs Mr. Thomas very much. At Hawkey Hall we did see a bronze plaque, which Churchill presented upon its opening in 1955. And there was a photo of Sir Winston and Clementine placed on the wall at Bancroft School, where they were both awarded the Freedom of the Borough in 1945. Except for the statue of Churchill at Woodford Green, however, there was nothing that the average citizen might note.

There are quite a number of Churchill statues about the country, and I did not see one that I did not like: Westerham, Chartwell, Woodford; and in London at Bond Street, Westminster and the Guildhall. For beautiful surroundings, though, none are more lovely than those of the Oscar Nemon statue of Churchill in the Pines Garden at St Margaret's Bay near Dover. There in a peaceful and quiet setting (just we three and two gardeners), Churchill looks out over a lake and six-acre garden towards a stunning view of the white cliffs. It was really quite impressive.

While in Dover, we toured the secret wartime tunnels under Dover Castle. It was from here that the evacuation from Dunkirk was directed by Vice-Admiral Ramsay. And it was amazing to learn the extent of other wartime activity that went on in those tunnels. As our guide was leading us through them, I noticed a copy of Arthur Pan's portrait of Churchill hanging on the tunnel wall. The guide said that of the thousands of school children that pass through the tunnels each year, very few are able to identify whose picture it is. My son, who is a budding Churchillian, immediately piped in with the answer.

I could go on about the Cabinet War Rooms, Chartwell and more, but I won't. However, I cannot end this narrative without telling of Jack Darrah at Bletchley Park. Jack is doing a valuable service to enlighten many of those school children about who Winston Churchill was and what he did. Jack rolled out the red carpet for us in opening his display of Churchilliana housed in several large rooms of the mansion at Bletchley Park. The exhibit, arranged in chronological order, takes you from Churchill's youth and early career in one room to his funeral in the last room. While most of the items are inside giant glass display cases, Jack doesn't hesitate to take them out for a closer look. The collection includes both old and new items, though nearly all of them are period pieces. And they run the gamut from old posters, photos and flags to books, clothing and ceramics. There's even a life size cut-out of WSC. In showing us all this, Jack described how he also guides groups of children through it. I am certain that hearing Jack's stories of Churchill while surrounded by his enormous exhibit is a hit with young and old. I salute Jack on the wonderful job he is doing to "keep the memory green." (See also FH 91 pp18-19. -Ed.)

-MIKE SINGH
COORDINATOR OF THE CHURCHILL PROJECT FOR THE COMMONWEALTH CARIBBEAN, GEORGETOWN, GUYANA

-FRED HARDMAN, SPENCER, W.V., USA $
CHURCHILLTRIVIA

BY CURT ZOLLER (Curt@fea.net)

Test your knowledge! Most questions can be answered in back issues of *Finest Hour* or other Churchill Center publications, but it's not really cricket to check. 24 questions appear each issue, answers in the following issue. Questions are in six categories: Contemporaries (C), Literary (L), Miscellaneous (M), Personal (P), Statesmanship (S), War (W).

865. At what occasion was Churchill a guest of Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914? (C)
866. Where can you find a memorial to Churchill's wife, Clementine Hozier married? (P)
867. Where can you find a memorial to Churchill's wife, Clementine Hozier married? (P)
868. How often was Churchill on the cover of *Time* Magazine? (P)
869. What did Churchill call the "most unsordid act in the history of any nation"? (S)
870. What uniform did Churchill wear at his meeting with Roosevelt at Argentia in August 1941? (W)
871. On what occasion did Churchill's nephew John Spencer-Churchill compose a coronation march for him? (C)
872. What was the last major literary work Churchill handled without research assistants? (L)
873. Name the sculptor who created the bronze statues of Roosevelt and Churchill sitting on a bench in New Bond Street, London. (M)
874. What commercial brands of cigars were Churchill's favourites? (P)
875. Who was the British statesman and philosopher in whose practices Churchill viewed political leadership? (S)
876. Who captured Churchill during the Boer War? (W)
877. Who described Churchill as "riding in triumph through Persepolis"? (C)
878. What was Adam Marshall Diston's connection with Churchill? (L)
879. What personal airplanes did Churchill use during 1943-1945? (M)
880. When did Churchill give his maiden speech in the Commons? (P)
881. What is the "Armistice Dream" which Churchill mentioned in *The World Crisis*? (S)
882. On 27 April 1941 Churchill wrote about war: "There is only one thing certain about war...." What was "certain"? (W)
883. Who sponsored Churchill's wife, Baroness Spencer-Churchill, when she entered the House of Lords? (C)
884. Name the title of the British edition of *White England Slept.* (L)
885. Which American Vice-President argued with Churchill against an Anglo-American bloc? (M)
886. When were Winston Churchill and Clementine Hozier married? (P)
887. What did Churchill consider to remain "the sovereign definition of democracy"? (S)
888. On what occasion did Churchill send the following message to General Wilson: "This is a time to think of Clive and Peterborough and of Rooke's men taking Gibraltar." (W)
889. Michael Collins was assassinated 22 August 1922. (S50) Churchill was without an office after his defeat at Dundee in 1922. (S51) The Curzon line was established as the Eastern frontier of Poland. (S52) The Lee-Metford rifles had a range of 2900 yards when outfitted with a dial sight.
890. When did Churchill give his maid's speech in the Commons? (P)
891. What is the "Armistice Dream" which Churchill mentioned in *The World Crisis*? (S)
892. On 27 April 1941 Churchill wrote about war: "There is only one thing certain about war...." What was "certain"? (W)
893. Who sponsored Churchill's wife, Baroness Spencer-Churchill, when she entered the House of Lords? (C)
894. Name the title of the British edition of *White England Slept.* (L)
895. Which American Vice-President argued with Churchill against an Anglo-American bloc? (M)
896. When were Winston Churchill and Clementine Hozier married? (P)
897. What did Churchill consider to remain "the sovereign definition of democracy"? (S)
898. On what occasion did Churchill send the following message to General Wilson: "This is a time to think of Clive and Peterborough and of Rooke's men taking Gibraltar." (W)

Answers to Churchilltrivia *FH* 97:

(841) "In his speeches he revealed a range of thought, an authority of manner and a wealth of knowledge, which neither friends nor foes attempted to dispute" was the way Churchill characterized his father's speeches. (842) Churchill was paid £5 for the Indian frontier articles, although he wanted £10. (843) It took Churchill three tries to get into Sandhurst. (844) Churchill attended a football game in early 1930 when he visited at Columbia University and commented, "Actually it is somewhat like Rugby. But why do you have to have all those committee meetings?" (845) "...prejudices die hard" wrote Churchill to Michael Collins on the Irish problems, 7 July 1922.

(846) Lord Alfred Douglas accused Churchill of issuing false communiqués on the battle of Jutland. (847) The "Profile for Victory" was painted by Alfred Egerton Cooper. (848) "How to Stop War" was printed in the *Evening Standard* of 12 June 1936 and in *Step by Step* 1936-1939, p.37.

(850) Mary Churchill (Lady Induna. (862) Mary Churchill (Lady Soames) was born on 15 September 1922; on the same date, Churchill wrote to Knight, Frank and Rutley offering to buy Chartwell. (863) The 1947 note, "It showed where we stood," referred to the orders Churchill gave to attack the French fleet at Oran. (864) Operation *CATAPULT* was the seizure of French ships in British ports and the action against French ships at Oran in July 1940.
Westham, Kent, June 5th—A new summer coach service to Chartwell has proved very popular and successful, "both in terms of being a 'green' transport initiative and in providing an excellent service to visitors at much less cost than rail and taxi," writes Chartwell administrator Carole Kenwright. (See rail notes in this column, FH 91.) The "Chartwell Explorer" left Charing Cross on weekends through September 6th and added three-weekday service during the summer. Return tickets cost only £3 adult and £1.50 children, or £12/6 respectively including entry to Chartwell (less for National Trust members). This will be published too late to be of value to members this year, but we will announce next year's schedule in our Spring number.

WASHINGTON, September 1st—A new exhibit, "World War II Through Russian Eyes," opened today at the Ronald Reagan Center for International Trade, 1300 14th St., NW. The exhibit opens the eyes of its many visitors, more than 10,000 in the first weekend, to the terrible carnage inflicted on the Russian people. Over 27 million Russians died; German forces burned 1710 cities and towns and 70,000 villages completely or partially. Among the many interesting topics is the controversy concerning the alleged conduct of Russian troops in Berlin after the signing of the cease-fire, who were said to have committed many rapes, murders and robberies of German citizens, while shelling and burning the city, long after the cessation of hostilities. A document on exhibit, from the Russian commander on proposed cease-fire terms, clearly shows his desire to end the misery of the people on both sides and the needless slaughter of the local citizenry. This is a terrific exhibit including some notable references to Churchill in an accompanying film. -Craig Horn

Sydney, July 18th—As we go to press, word arrives of what may be the oldest vessel named for WSC, the yawl Winston Churchill, built in Hobart, Tasmania in 1942. This beautiful, 15.5-metre yacht took part in the August 1998 Southport-to-Queensland Race, mainly for the fun of it, according to her owner, Richard Winning, who has spent A$360,000 to buy and restore her. We are trying to contact Mr. Winning, and to obtain photographs for FH. Our thanks to Alfred James and Clarence Martin.

Recipes From Number Ten by Georgina Landemare

Edited and annotated for the modern kitchen by Barbara F. Langworth
(Email: bjangworth@conknet.com)

Mrs. Landemere's cooking was much appreciated by the Churchills. In a letter to her daughter Mary, Mrs. Churchill wrote from a villa near Carthage: "Last night we had partridge for dinner which... was cooked for an hour and a half. The result was concrete....Mrs. Landemere cooks partridges for only fifteen minutes. Your poor father literally cannot eat the food."
—Clementine Churchill by Mary Soames

Summer Salads

Celery, Beetroot and Apple Salad
(upper right in photo)

2 large dessert (sweet) apples peeled, cored, cut into squares and placed in cold, salted water to keep crisp
1 head of celery cut into small strips (about 1 cup)
1 large cooked beet(root), diced

Dressing: 4 Tb cream, 1/2 oz (1 Tb) sugar, salt and pepper (seasonings), 1 Tb vinegar, 1/2 tsp prepared mustard

Strain off water from apples, mix in with dressing; add beetroot and celery.

Mimosa Salad
-for 4 (photo, upper left)

One small head of lettuce, quartered
Four oranges, peeled and quartered
Dressing: 3/8 cup cream, 1/8 cup lemon juice, salt to taste.
Yolk of hard-boiled egg pressed through a sieve
Chopped parsley

Arrange lettuce and oranges on individual plates. Pour dressing over salad and sprinkle with egg yolk and parsley.

Tomato Salad (photo, front)

Skin and seed one pound of tomatoes.* Cut each tomato into 8 pieces. Put in a dish with a sprinkle of sugar, salt and pepper.
Dressing: 4 Tb oil, 1 Tb tarragon vinegar, 1 Tb chilli [sic] vinegar, 1 tsp prepared mustard, 2 Tb chopped chives and 2 Tb snipped tarragon leaves.
Put the tomatoes into the dressing and leave to stand for 2 hours before serving.

* Dip the tomato into boiling water for about ten seconds, then drain. Remove the core with a sharp knife and peel off the skin. Cut the tomato in half horizontally and gently remove seeds.

FINEST HOUR 98/47
"In one respect a cavalry charge is very like ordinary life. So long as you are all right, firmly in your saddle, your horse in hand, and well armed, lots of enemies will give you a wide berth. But as soon as you have lost a stirrup, have a rein cut, have dropped your weapon, are wounded, or your horse is wounded, then is the moment when from all quarters enemies rush upon you."


Though Churchill was only briefly a full-time regular soldier, he wrote about it as few soldiers ever have. Undoubtedly the best portrayal of him as a soldier is this splendid china figure by Michael Sutty, a foremost military modeller, produced in 1988. It depicts Churchill in 1898, two years before the Charge at Omdurman, in the full dress uniform of a second lieutenant of the Fourth Hussars.

PHOTOGRAPH BY DOUGLAS HALL • SEE "CHURCHILL COMMEMORATIVES," PAGES 43-44.