Remarks by President John F. Kennedy at the White House, Washington, D.C., 9 April 1963

We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting - for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk the stage of human history in the time in which we live.

Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty.

Facing firmly toward the future, he has never forgotten the past.

Serving six monarchs of his native Great Britain, he has served all men's freedom and dignity.

In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone - and most men save Englishmen despaired of England's life - he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.

Given unlimited powers by his citizens, he was ever vigilant to protect their rights.

Indifferent himself to danger, he wept over the sorrows of others.

A child of the House of Commons, he became in time its father.

Accustomed to the hardships of battle, he has no distaste for pleasure.

Now his stately Ship of Life, having weathered the severest storms of a troubled century, is anchored in tranquil waters, proof that courage and faith and the fight for freedom are truly indestructible. The record of his triumphant passage will inspire free hearts all time.

By adding his name to our rolls, we mean to honor him - but his acceptance honors us far more. For no statement or proclamation can enrich his name - the Sir Winston Churchill is already legend.

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL

Mr. President,

I have been informed by Mr. David Brudnitz that you intend to sign a Bill conferring upon me Honorary Citizenship of the United States.

I have received with great satisfaction the Statement of the Senate which you now accord me. I accept it with deep gratitude.

I am also moved to the warm-hearted action of the two Houses of Congress in accorded me the great compliment of their Honorary Citizenship as a recognized friend of the Congress.

It is a remarkable commentary on our affairs that the former Prime Minister of a great sovereign state should thus be received as Honorary Citizen by another. The word, "sovereign" with design and emphasis, for I remember when the British and the Commonwealth would now be relegated to a tame and minor role. The word underscored the fact that I firmly trust and believe will be no less the vibrant and independent future of a people with potentialities and our abiding power for good.

I am, as you know, a Southerner by birth and blood, and the story of my association with that mighty and benevolent nation goes back a quarter of a century to the day of the surrender at Appomattox. In this century of storm and tragedy I can claim with high satisfaction the truth interwoven and upward progress of our people and our brothers in the Free World now stands alone as a partnership any exclusive nature: the Atlantic dream that can well be to the detriment of none and to the enduring benefit and honour of the great democracies.

Mr. President, your action illuminates the theme of unity of the English-speaking peoples, to which I have devoted a large part of my life. I would ask you to accept yourself, and to convey to both Houses of Congress, and through them to the American people, my solemn and heartfelt thanks for this unique distinction, which will always be proudly remembered by my descendants.

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL
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Thoughts on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of ICS

So many anniversaries, so many memories ... 1993 ... 1968 ... 1963 ... all seem to come together on our cover. To my colleagues (page four) who have made it possible, and to every reader of these words, my gratitude for all you have done to sustain this proudly international journal from its humble beginnings twenty-five years ago.

The American President on our cover shared with Sir Winston Churchill a quality of leadership that transcended politics. (Let that description be extended to their wives, the late President’s having honored us by her contribution last issue. Her country owes her what it can never repay, and she will always be the First Lady to me.)

Winston Churchill and John Kennedy, so different in so many ways, were alike in two critical qualities: their bedrock faith in the democratic system of Britain and America ("the worst system," Churchill quipped, "except for all the others"); and their ability eloquently to communicate that faith. A manifestation of those qualities was the fraternity they displayed toward political opponents. I remember Kennedy inscribing a photo for Barry Goldwater, "who should spend more time in the activity for which he is well suited: photography!" I have seen that same amiable trait lately in John Major, praising Neil Kinnock as the Labour leader stepped down (FH #76 p3); I have seen it in the honest debate among certain American members of Congress over a controversial budget. They remembered that despite philosophic differences they shared common loyalties, common principles.

A lot of those principles are questioned today. One current political fashion calls for bipartisan unity on issues over which honorable people differ philosophically. Would Churchill not remind us that the very nature of democracy is argument? "Division," after all, is what Parliament calls a vote. Of course division on the floor works best when accompanied by fraternity off it hence the term Loyal Opposition. But the duty of the opposition is to oppose.

ICS academic advisor Jeff Wallin has rightly said that "questioning our tradition is at the very base of that tradition." But what goes on now in the name of questioning is scarcely a search for truth, as a thinker named Carol Iannone points out: "You used to be able to point to Nazism as indisputably evil. Now, if the question arises, Did World War II have to be fought? a student is as likely to reply, 'Well, I suppose if you were Jewish it had to be fought.'" Readers of "Despatch Box" this issue will know what she means.

I think Churchill and Kennedy would be troubled by such moral relativism. Certain institutions of the English-Speaking Peoples were and are worth fighting for. Where, they might ask, is the appetite for toil, tears and sweat, for asking not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country? After utter triumph over the most virulent enemy of liberty, the Great Democracies seem lost in a collectivist dream, where no human activity is outside the purview of government, and the object of life is to be proclaimed a "victim" in order to be showered by money, guarantees and "rights," even at the expense of national solvency. For the Decade of Greed, I nominate the 1990s.

In the way Churchill confronted the problems of his time lie approaches of value in our own. Is he our hero, as our critics insist? On balance, sure. Was he always right about everything? Demonstrably not. But the average wasn’t too bad.

I believe ICS has prospered these twenty-five years because of its subject, and his contributions to the critical struggle of our time: the quest for freedom and democracy. He was "a man of quality," as Martin Gilbert wrote, "a good guide for our troubled times and for the generations now reaching adulthood." Our responsibility is not only to puncture the moral relativists, insofar as Churchill is concerned, but also to accent the positive, as in this issue’s reviews by James Muller and Christopher Bell. "Fair enough," we may say in reporting a legitimate Churchill critique—"now here is the case for the defense." We are not an historical association, centering on an object or a period in time. We study a man to learn contributions to the critical struggle of our time: the quest for freedom and democracy.

Remember Sir Winston’s last exhortation to his final Cabinet in 1955, "Never Despair." Manifestations of his indomitable spirit occur every day, at every level of life. They suggest that perhaps the unteachable race of man can be taught yet; and that all the hopes of future years, as Roosevelt wrote Churchill quoting Longfellow are still hallowed breathless, on the destiny of their Ships of State.

Hanging,

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH, EDITOR
Quote of the Season
Every new administration, not excluding ourselves, arrives in power with bright and benevolent ideas of using public money to do good. The more frequent the changes of Government, the more numerous are the bright ideas, and the more frequent the elections, the more benevolent they become.

-WSC, HOUSE OF COMMONS, 11 APRIL 1927

Vancouver Society Teaches "The Next Generation"
VANCOUVER, B.C., MARCH 12TH— The Sir Winston Churchill Society of British Columbia is offering three prizes of $1500, $500 and $300 respectively for essays of up to 3000 words on its 1993 "Churchill Communication Challenge," sponsored by the Society as its contribution to the "Teaching the Next Generation" programs of Churchill Societies worldwide. The subject this year is "World Famine: A Churchill Solution": how a leader of our time might approach and solve this vast human problem.

Essays should focus on food production difficulties, particularly those of eastern Africa, due largely to the seemingly endless civil wars in that region. The material should suggest how a strong leader and problem solver such as Sir Winston Churchill might approach the challenge. Entries for the prizes must be received no later than October. Candidates agree to allow the Vancouver Society to determine the winners, and to publish the essay, or extracts therefrom, in Finest Hour.

The essay series, created by Vancouver Society director Daryl Birce, has received the support of SFU and the University of Victoria. The winning 1991 presentation entitled "Project Garbage," was delivered at the Society's annual banquet. The topic in 1992 was, "Our Environment in Crisis."

The long-range purposes of the programme are to attract young people into the Society, provoke research and study into the life of Sir Winston, and to make that information broadly available. "When Churchill is viewed as a brilliant contemporary, rather than a lifeless, historiical figure, students are able to bring him alive," says Mr. Birce. "These contemporary subjects are the alchemy which brings Churchill to life for the students."

ICS strongly supports this initiative and recommends Vancouver's approach to any ICS chapter. Anyone interested in the programme may contact Stanley H. Winfield for information and applications at #1-54 Richmond Street, New Westminster, BCV3L5P2. -SW

Wendy Reves Night 30 September
NEW YORK, MAY 13TH— ICS and the National Arts Club will co-host an evening of tribute at Gramercy Park, Manhattan, for ICS Honorary Member Wendy Reves September 30th, to which area Friends of ICS are invited. The NAC will present Mrs. Reves with its prestigious Citation of Merit for her leadership as an arts patron and cultural benefactor. The speakers include leaders from across the country from Dallas to Florida to New England.

ICS will be represented on the dais by its President, who will recall the spirit of Emery Reves (page 18 this issue) which lives on through Wendy, and describe her great work in financing the ten final document volumes of the Official Biography (pp 16-17). If you have not by now received an invitation, please call Helen Newman at (914) 365-0414.

Expert Advice
LONDON, 7 MAY 1947— I am a Parliamentarian myself, I have always been one. I think that a Minister is entitled to disregard expert advice. What he is not entitled to do is to pretend he is acting upon it, when, in fact, he is acting contrary to it. -WSC

Free Admission to Chartwell
WESTERHAM, KENT, JULY 1st— ICS United States has worked out an arrangement whereby any visitor presenting a current membership card at the supporting ($250) level or higher is admitted to Chartwell without cost, with one guest. ICS/USA reimburses Chartwell for these admissions, and will consider extending the privilege to Sustaining ($100) Friends. This is a small token of thanks for your generous support.

ICS Anniversary on Cover #40
CAMP HILL, PENNA., JUNE 15TH— Dave Marcus, director of the ICS commemorative cover program, has issued the fortieth in this series, marking the 25th anniversary of the founding of the original Churchill Study Unit here in 1968. Printed in black, red and silver with the Elizabeth Baverstock silhouette of WSC, the cover is franked with US Churchill commemoratives and postmarked at Camp Hill on the 15th.

Covers are free to any current Friend of ICS but you must request them. Leftover copies are sold to help cover the costs of the program. To be placed on the mailing list for future covers, contact Dave Marcus, 3048 Van Buskirk Circle, Las Vegas NV 89121. To obtain a copy of cover #40 while they last, please enclose $3.
Praeger of his *Citizen Shakespeare* (available from ICS New Book Service, see page 37). The new book describes how the political currents of his day influenced the actor-poet-playwright and calls Shakespeare and Churchill "the two towering geniuses of the English language."

The comparisons between Churchill and Shakespeare as brought out in this book are fascinating. Both, Humes writes, "were monarchists and romantics who loved the traditions of feudal chivalry, and conservatives who relished being country squires." Interestingly, Humes notes that both chose to be buried in their families' churches and not in Westminster Abbey, to which each was entitled.

**Churchill Day in Britain?**

**LONDON, MAY 30**— Great Britain celebrated the May Day bank holiday again today amid a crescendo of calls to rename it in honor of Churchill. "Sir Winston was a tower of strength to the British people, especially in our finest hour," wrote Mrs. I. Caton of Beckenham, Kent in a typical letter-to-the-editor. Friend of ICS/UK Tom Cawte has laboured long on this project, and would be glad to hear from others interested in moving it forward. He may be contacted at 3 Causeway Court, Queen Street, Arundel, West Sussex BN18 2LE.

**Churchill Barbs Exchanged**

**WASHINGTON, JUNE 9**— Dr. Harry Byrd, testifying on behalf of the President's national health proposals, quoted WSC: "Americans can always be counted on to do the right thing after all other possibilities have been exhausted." Across town, former Nixon-Reagan-Bush aide David Gergen began work for the President as communications director, causing a Republican senator to utter another Churchillism: Told of a postwar MP who was leaving the Labour Party to join the Liberals, Churchill said: "That's the first I've heard of a rat swimming to a sinking ship."

ICS North Texas

**DALLAS, MAY 18TH**— Christina Jones, winner of the Dallas Winston Churchill Oratory Contest, presented her speech "Against All Odds" at a dinner meeting of the Emery Reves Chapter. She will similarly address the 25th Anniversary ICS Conference in Washington, DC on November 6th. Miss Jones has just completed her freshman year at Jarvis Christian College on her oratory scholarship, and is working toward two goals: her own day care center and a career as a pediatrician. Those of us present believe her aims are entirely within her reach. Her speech carries great impact and dignity, emphasizing that we cannot change circumstances, but we can overcome them, if we "never, never give in." -ANNHAZLETT

**Edwina Sandys at Fulton**

**FULTON, MO., USA, MARCH 26TH**— Sir Winston's granddaughter Edwina Sandys delivered the Eleventh Kemper Lecture at the Winston Churchill Memorial today. Entitled "His Art Reflects His Life," her talk showed how qualities present in WSC's paintings reflected his character: "prodigious, bold, irrepressible, inspiring, filled with love of life." The transcript is available from the Churchill Memorial, Fulton, MO 65251.

**Humes on Shakespeare & WSC**

**PHILADELPHIA, JULY 22ND**— Honorary member James C. Humes has become "the only writer with biographies of the two greatest Englishmen, Winston Churchill and William Shakespeare," with publication by
Canada to Host 1994 Conference
ICS Canada and the Sir Winston S. Churchill Society of Calgary, Alberta, will host the International Conference next year on 23-26 September, using the same hotels where Churchill stayed while touring the Rocky Mountains: the Palliser in Calgary and the spectacular Banff Springs Hotel in Banff. Hold those dates!

Bicyclists Please Note:
1994: The editor, as avid a cyclist as his 52 years and great Trek 7900 allow, has been asked by a bicycle tour firm to guide a seven-day summer bicycle tour of Churchill's England: Blenheim to Chartwell, on back roads. Country inns or B&Bs with a van for rain or emergency transport are planned. You may bring your own bike and costs will be modest.

1995: I'd like company on a coastal bike tour of the Baltic States, the "Amber Shore," renowned for its beauty and flat biking. This will follow the Latvian Song Festival in June, 1995. If you like biking, are up to 30-40 miles a day, and don't mind meeting the locals—write the editor please.

Objection Sustained
LONDON, FEBRUARY 9TH, 1927 - "IT WAS the fashion in the Army when a court martial was being held and the prisoner, was brought in that he should be asked if he objected to being tried by the President or any of those officers who composed the court martial. On one occasion a prisoner was so insubordinate as to answer, "I object to the whole bloody lot of you." That is clearly illustrative of the kind of reception which, at this stage, consultation of the trade unions by the Government would be met with." WSC

Q: In your review of "Boothby" (FH #78) you refer on page 37 to Churchill Society commemorative covers #1-31. Will pay top dollar for the full set. Contact Ben Cardozo, Cardozo & Cardozo, 515 Madison Avenue, New York NY 10022 USA, telephone (212) 838-6120.

Pipes and Books for Sale. Handsome carved briar pipes in famous likenesses including Churchill. (1) The Big Three (WSC, FDR, Stalin) plus Eisenhower, half-bent style, nicely carved, the set, fine $400. (2) A Churchill pipe alone, different likeness from above, $100. (3) Facsimile copies of "Mr. Brodrick's Army" and "Tor Free Trade" in standard and collector bindings; write for prices. Eleanor Dalton Newfield, 4629 Sunset Drive, Sacramento CA 95822 USA.

Churchill Gold Medals. Designed by Frank Kovacs for Spink & Son, London, 1965. Obverse shows bust of Churchill with books in background; reverse shows David Low's "defiant soldier" drawing of 1940, facing enemy aircraft over the Channel and inscribed, "Very Well, Alone." Engstrom #30A, the 56mm, gold piece, 916 fine, 135 grams, number 383 of 500 minted, boxed and accompanied by a pamphlet giving pertinent details. Also Engstrom #30B, the 47-gram, 39mm. version, one of 1000 struck in gold. Please make offer or contact Jeri Weed, 5664 Etiwanda Ave #2, Tarzana CA 91356 USA, telephone (818) 342-0683.

Effanbee Churchill Doll. In full morning coat, striped trousers, bow tie, gold watch chain, etc, the 17 1965 creation of the collectible doll-makers. Sold new for $150. Mint condition, no box $95. Derek Brownleader, 1847 Stonewood Dr, Baton Rouge LA 70816 USA.


Elusive of J^H^W^H^A Allow 6-8 shipping in K^^K^H^H1 weeks for USA from $229.95. Shipping in H^W^H^H1 weeks for Canada to Yalta, No More Let Us Falter." True" Collected Poems of Winston Churchill, edited by Martin Gilbert, from a 12 Dec. 1926 letter to Thornton Butterworth, his publishers: "Strait away, without delay, I want the page proofs day by day. On January 4, I leave this shore, nor will you catch me any more!"

Send your riddles to the editor.
ICS: The First Twenty-Five Years

There's a long, long road awinding, between thirteen members with a $180 budget and the Center for Churchill Studies...

BY DAVID FREEMAN

The International Churchill Society was founded in 1968 because Richard M. Langworth did not want to buy phony stamps.

Following the death of Sir Winston Churchill in 1965, a rash of commemorative stamps was produced in his memory. The major issuers were quasi-autonomous Arab sheikdoms like Ajman, Fujiera and Sharjah, whose emissions with their many variants (called "black blots" by philatelists) were produced to bilk collectors rather than to frank envelopes.

Curiously the American Topical Association, the presiding U.S. authority on topical or thematic stamps, seemed indifferent to this obvious charlatanism. Thus it was that one young man attracted to Churchill sought to escape the pressure of having to buy phony issues in order to "complete" his philatelic biography (which still runs regularly as "Churchill in Stamps" in these pages).

After contacting other members of the ATA who had expressed an interest in Churchill, Li r>r<h founded the Winston S. Churchill Study UIUL ui iiie ATA (WSCSU) in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. Its purpose was to identify "black blots," legitimizing their status as bogus issues.

Officers were elected and a bimonthly newsletter was announced. Richard Langworth served as president and "acting" editor. "Actually I would have never done it at all," he recalled, "had I not been pushed into it by our second member, Martin Hoff of Brooklyn. He shamed me into it by saying, when I hesitated, that he guessed I wasn't serious. That spurred me to get it going, whereupon Martin almost immediately lost interest and left!"

EARLY YEARS

In late June 1968, the first issue of Finest Hour was sent to unit members. The title was proclaimed "temporary" until a better suggestion arose. Later Dalton Newfield, Langworth's successor as editor, told him, "that title was a stroke of inspiration." It has never been altered.

A seven-page mimeographed document, issue #1 appears crude by today's standards. It contained a three page checklist of Churchill stamps. Also appearing was a letter from Randolph Churchill, who acknowledged that while he knew "nothing about stamps" he "would try to answer any questions" the group had. Tragically, Randolph died two months later while working on Volume III of his father's official biography.

The second issue of Finest Hour featured a tribute to Randolph who had accepted hon-

Ordinary membership in the Study Unit prior to his death. The Unit sent letters of sympathy to Lady Clementine Churchill and to Randolph's son Winston S. Churchill, who became the third honorary members after his grandmother and father. *Finest Hour*, as it is now, was the life-blood of the group. In the early issues, most of the articles were focused on stamp collecting, with prodigious warnings about those ubiquitous "black blots." Still, there was an early movement to publish more generalized information about Churchill. Stories appeared about trips to Blenheim Palace and a visit to the ultimate Churchill collection at Longleat, home of the Marquess of Bath.

Richard Langworth served as editor for the first thirteen issues over two years of the group's existence. Then, with issue #14 in May of 1970, *Finest Hour* underwent radical change. Dalton Newfield relieved Richard as editor. Dai's effervescent personality bubbled over the pages of the new journal. Reading Dai's *Finest Hour* was, in the words of Sir Winston, "like opening your first bottle of Champagne." Indeed it is difficult to overstate the value of Dai's contributions to the Society. Under his stewardship, first as editor and later as President, the Winston Churchill Study Unit would transform itself into the International Churchill Society. *Finest Hour* would become a lively bulletin with the editor cramming in information up and down the margins. "It wasn't pretty," Dal said later, "but it used a lot of ink."

Unfortunately, the longer newsletter was more expensive to publish and money became an increasing problem for the young society. Dal wanted *FH* to be printed by photo offset, which, he believed, created a more professional-looking journal. In order to meet his budget, Dal agreed to deal with a friend who would print *Finest Hour* when business was slow. As a result, the journal frequently arrived late and at erratic intervals.

TRANSFORMATION

While attempts were made to attract more members, the problem was the understandably limited number of Churchill philatelists. Finally, in January of 1971, Richard Langworth presented "The Case For the Winston Churchill Society." Most Churchill philatelists were actually Churchillophiles first and stamp collectors second. Langworth argued that a generalized society would attract a larger membership and could also organize meetings attracting speakers. The model for this proposal, The Winston S. Churchill Society of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, had already hosted Lord Mountbatten. A general society could also produce a larger journal. It would cost more to print, but the
anticipated increase in membership would result in greater revenue. The only foreseeable disadvantage was an increase in dues.

The board of directors deemed the matter too important to decide by itself and debate was welcomed before all members were asked to vote. An early UK member, Jack Symonds, noted that "expansion along the lines envisaged, with a possible membership running into four figures, is a tremendous undertaking ... Who is going to do the work, presumably in an honorary capacity?"

Dal responded by saying, "I too envisaged a huge four figured, monolithic monster growing out of our comfortable little unit ... and I questioned Langworth as to whether he had considered such things ... but I feel a substantial increase in membership in advisable." Says Langworth now, "it does often seem a monster sometimes, but with a mission, and wonderful people."

In the autumn of 1971, issue #21 of *Finest Hour* was published as the "Bulletin of the International Churchill Society." Appearing on the cover was a photograph of Lord Mountbatten, the Society's newest honorary member, later its first Patron.

As time moved towards the upcoming Churchill Centenary in 1974, there were many bright events. By 1971, membership totaled 154 people in nine different countries including Vietnam and Iran. In late 1971, there was a record meeting of one dozen members in Los Angeles, and the first ICS/UK meeting took place the following year at the Charing Cross Hotel in London. Finally, in 1974, the Centenary arrived, and with it a whole new rash of commemorative stamps.

But despite reorganization and rising membership, the new Society still maintained a precarious existence. By 1972, profit from the journal's Auction (column) mainly financed costs. Even Dai's prodigious nature was strained when he was elected to serve both as President of ICS and as Editor of *Finest Hour*. He declared that he could not continue in this dual role past the 30th of June 1973. By mid-1975 Stephen King was also forced to relinquish his role due to personal pressing matters. After six and a half years, the International Churchill Society was forced to fold due to the critical lack of an editor for its all-important journal.

**RESURRECTION**
ICS would remain dormant for a period equal to its entire previous existence. Then in 1981, with Dai's encouragement, Richard Langworth was persuaded to resurrect the society he had created, and to serve once again as editor. During the interregnum, Dal had banked the So-
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Caspar Weinberger is honorary member ... "One feels certain that WSC has clamored to attend [marriage of Prince Charles and Lady Diana Spencer]." *Spring 1982*: Dalton Newfield, rest in peace ... Lord and Lady Soames, Harold Macmillan, Averell Harriman, Martin Gilbert new honorary members ... "Wilderness Years" TV documentary "viewed. *Summer 1982*: George Lewis appointed treasurer (he still holds the job) ... Tom Thomas heads UK branch ... First "International conference" in Fulton, Mo. draws two Canadians, two Americans. *Autumn 1982*: Sarah Churchill, rest in peace ... Literary Trust proposed to encourage reissue of out-of-print WSC books ... FH
society's assets and the happy result was almost enough money to cover the expense of the first new issue. *Finest Hour* reappeared displaying the modern magazine format.

Sadly, only months after the rebirth of ICS, Dal Newfield suddenly died. Dal had been the "guiding light" of the Society; he had been the "heart and soul" of the organization in its early years and had made possible the resurrection in 1981. A continuing sadness is that he is not around to see his organization today.

**CONFERENCES AND TOURS**

Even as the society lost Dal, it was welcoming prominent newcomers. Harold Macmillan and Lord and Lady Soames graciously accepted honorary membership. From Randolph Churchill to General Colin Powell, ICS has had 29 honorary members. Ultimately in 1986, Lady Soames, as the only surviving child of Winston and Clementine Churchill, agreed to become the "Patron of the Society." It is she who is responsible for defining the missions of ICS and guiding its directors and trustees.

The first international meeting was held in London in 1983. The next two meetings were held in Toronto and Boston respectively, establishing the pattern of rotating the convention between member countries. The 1985 Boston gathering demonstrated that ICS had "arrived" when it hosted as its guest speaker United States Secretary of Defense and honorary ICS member, Caspar Weinberger.

An added feature of the 1983 London conference was the presentation of the society's first Blenheim Award. This honor is awarded to individuals for distinguished service to the memory of Sir Winston or to the International Churchill Society. Appropriately, the award was first given to Lady Soames. Subsequent recipients have included Martin Gilbert, Sir John Colville, and founding member Richard Langworth. In 1991, at a ceremony aboard the *Queen Mary* in Long Beach, California, the Blenheim Award was presented to actress Lee Remick for her performance as Lady Randolph Churchill in *Jennie*. This was the last public appearance for the terminally ill star, but a touching tribute by Gregory Peck helped to insure that on that evening ICS had clearly done the right thing.

Nineteen eighty-three was also the year of the first Society sponsored tour of Churchill's Britain. So successful was the first excursion, that the tours have become a biannual feature of ICS. Each tour is themed and makes visits to places of significance in the life of Sir Winston.
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Above: The indefatigables: Merry Alberigi and Mary Soames. Below: George Temple and John Plumpton of ICS Canada.

Churchill, such as Chartwell, Blenheim Palace and private places opened only for ICS. Itineraries have included Scotland and a cross-channel visit in 1989 to Pol Roger, Churchill's favorite Champagne house. In 1991 ICS went "down under" for a tour of Australia, in conjunction with meetings with ICS Australia and Australian Churchill Fellows from the Memorial Trust.

GROWTH AND PROGRESS

In the autumn of 1983 the Sir Winston S. Churchill Society of Vancouver, British Columbia, joined ICS en masse, doubling total membership to above six hundred. The growing size of ICS necessitated reorganizing the structure of the society. Throughout most of its existence, an elected Board of Directors was responsible for governing the Society's affairs worldwide. In order to take advantage of tax laws covering nonprofit organizations in each country, ICS was ultimately divided into four independent societies in 1989. Each national society is now responsible for its own affairs, while an international council makes decisions affecting ICS as a whole. A group of trustees in each country appoints the directors, and Jonathan Aitken, MP, Britain's Minister of Defence Procurement, graciously serves as chairman of the international council.

Although by 1985 many memorials and trusts existed in Churchill's name, members of ICS were concerned that no serious effort was being made to preserve the spoken and written word. Furthermore, many of Churchill's books were no longer in print. Alarming, the publishers of the official biography had abandoned further publication of the companion or document volumes. For these reasons, ICS decided to create the Churchill Literary Foundation. This new organization would strive to bring back out-of-print books and to sponsor publication of the official biography's final ten companion volumes.

In 1986 the Churchill Societies continued their publishing program with pamphlets which contained speeches given at ICS functions by Caspar Weinberger and Martin Gilbert. This series has continued with periodic compilations of all speeches given at ICS meetings. The Proceedings booklets preserve the unique and remarkable reflections of such luminaries as Lady Soames, Robert Hardy, and Alistair Cooke.

In 1988 the Literary Foundation felt that it had met its established goals, but the publishing program has continued under the sponsorship of ICS. The Orders, Decorations, and Medals of Sir Winston Churchill by Doug Russell; Churchill's Chartwell Bulletins; and most recently The Boer Conspiracy by John Woods have all been published and sent to members at no extra cost. ICS has subsequently influenced the "return to hotel proves to be flophouse ... The Queen, Presidents Reagan and Mitterand, acknowledge their copies of The Dream ... Final biographic volume VIII published ... Pol Roger sponsors new tree planting at storm-devastated Ghtarwell. Fourth Qtr 1988: 20th Anniversary of ICS ... US Congress proclaims "National Sir Winston Churchill Week." First Qtr 1989: Enoch Powell addresses ICS/UK ... ICS devolves into four separate national organizations, Cold T Ball heads international council, John Plumpton

ICS/La Qtr 1987/88: Churchill studies ... Second Qtr 1989: Dr Richard Langworth proposes Center for Churchill Studies ... Bequest Department for books established ... in the name of the late Dalton Newfield. Third Qtr 1987: "Churchilltrivia" column debuts ... Jock Colville, rest in peace ... Andrew Sullivan lampoons ICS in The New Republic; ICS reprints his article, footnoting 24 errors ... Celwyn Ball relieves George Temple at Canada office. Spring 1988: "Australia Number" of FF explores what Aussies thought of Churchill, and vice-versa, the WSC-Menzies relationship, Australia's view of WW2. Summer 1988: Alistair Cooke, John Sununu address ICS conference at historic Bretton Woods, New Hampshire ; 140 attend but...
California chapter of the Society organized a banquet in San Francisco attended by local Bay area students, with the Grand Master of Churchill scholarship, Dr. Martin Gilbert as speaker. Even as the ICS membership approaches 3000 worldwide, the median age of “Friends of the Society” is lowering. And, while the circle of family and friends who personally knew Churchill or went through the Second World War must necessarily diminish, the Churchill Societies will continue to expand as new generations learn about the remarkable achievements and evergreen wisdom of the Twentieth Century’s greatest champion of liberty.

ICS United States, with the support and encouragement of ICS Canada in particular, is now embarked on its most ambitious project ever: a Center for Churchill Studies. Planned in conjunction with the Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University in Washington, DC, the Center aims to facilitate learning by developing a computer index to all twenty million of Churchill’s written and spoken words, to assist students in their work on Churchill-related subjects, to encourage new Churchill-related research, and to impart that research to future generations through teaching and publishing.

From a small group of philatelists worried about phony stamps, the International Churchill Societies have blossomed into large and influential organizations firmly committed to preserving the record of Churchill’s accomplishments, and the great goals to which he devoted his life: freedom, liberty, democracy. £

TEACHING THE NEXT GENERATION

In 1991, as part of the mission to keep the memory fresh, ICS embarked on a project to educate today’s youth about Churchill. The
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Our Greatest Achievement to Date
ICS/UK hosts the launch of "At the Admiralty": Part 1 of Companion Volume VI to the Official Biography Produced through the generosity of Wendy Reves
BY DAVID BOLER AND RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

It is twenty-five years since the death of Randolph Churchill, and we wish he were here: to celebrate "the end of the Beginning" of the Official Biography. For with this new book, the end is really in sight at last.

Biographic Volume VI was no sooner published than ICS learned there were no plans to pursue the remaining document volumes - the underpinning of the main biography - because they were not commercially viable. We had a meeting with Randolph's successor, Martin Gilbert, and determined what was lacking: ten more volumes, seven for the war years, one for the Opposition years, one for the second Premiership, one finale. In 1987 we began an appeal to support this plan as a charitable contribution - to ease the overhead enough to make commercial publication possible. We gathered in London to celebrate the result of that appeal on May 10th, as you see here.

The reason we were able to gather was Wendy Reves - the lady opposite - where this story continues ...

Celebrating at the Royal Automobile Club, London, May 10th: (1) Celia Perkins, Eddie & Beryl Murray, Robert Hardy & Celia's son Dominic; (2) David Boler with W.W. Norton President Donald Lamm; (3) "The Broomes of Chartwell.*

Above: Martin Gilbert, Wyltna Wayne of ICS/London; Lady Soames; and two Winston S. Churchills. Below Bookmen Mark Weber & Michael Wybrow; UK Chmn David Porter, editor & WSC; David & Diane Boler, Robert Hardy.
Wendy Reves: The Lady Who Made It Possible

ICS had raised enough to cover one of the ten final document volumes in 1988 when Wendy learned of our campaign. I will never forget the day she called from France: "Darling, I am very impressed with the Society's idea to publish the remaining document volumes, and I have decided to make it happen." She is supplying the entire wherewithal - it will total a quarter million dollars for compiling the ten final document volumes.

In giving thanks for the publication of At the Admiralty we have therefore first to thank Wendy for the appreciation, vision and generosity that makes this book, and the nine to follow, possible. If it were not for Wendy, ICS would still be plowing through the long, hard slog it would have taken to support this effort bit by bit, volume by volume. Wendy not only solved the immediate problem; far more importantly, she allowed ICS to go on to meet more challenges in the years ahead.

On September 30th ICS and the National Arts Club in New York have organized an evening of thanks to the lady James Humes has called "The Muse of History" (invitations will be sent automatically in the northeast). By participating in this event, ICS aims to say plainly: Thank you, Wendy. You made it happen.

"A Priceless Gift for Future Historians"

Michael Carver in The Times Literary Supplement


This huge book covers nine months between Winston Churchill's appointment as First Lord of the Admiralty and his succession to Neville Chamberlain as Prime Minister on the day Hitler launched his attack on France and the Low Countries. Future volumes, completing 1940, one each for 1941-45, and a trilogy for 1945-65, will be around 800 pages and cost less; still, the War Papers are primarily reference works.

However, to read the book straight through from cover to cover, as this reviewer has done, is an experience to be savoured. It is like watching a long film. The arrangement of documents in strict chronological order mesmerizes the reader, making one feel like a participant in events as they unfold. As with all contact, however remote, with that remarkable personality, one finishes with the question: did Churchill's virtues outweigh his faults? All those who worked with him came to the conclusion that the answer was in the affirmative, although at times they were almost driven to distraction by him.

The majority of the documents consist of notes to the First Sea Lord, Admiral Sir Dudley Pound, whose responsibilities Churchill was not only perpetually interfering in, but was almost constantly assuming. Yet on 20 January 1940 Pound wrote, "I have the greatest admiration for WSC, and his good qualities are such, and his desire to hit the enemy so overwhelming, that I feel we must hesitate in turning down any of his proposals."

Those proposals covered every aspect of naval and military affairs. They varied from grand strategy to tiny details. Churchill had initiated the construction of dummy battleships to deceive German aircraft. On a visit to Scapa, he suddenly stopped and said: "I know what is wrong with those ships. There are no seagulls around them. That would be noticed immediately by enemy planes... Have food thrown from these ships so that seagulls will hover round the dummies."

But the main interest lies not only in a reminder of the great concern about shipping losses by submarine attack and aerial mining, but also in the extraordinarily unrealistic views taken by ministers and their military advisers about almost everything during the "phony" war, and the chaos in the machinery for the higher direction of politico-military affairs, which spelt disaster in Norway. The climax of the book is the famous debate in the House of Commons on 7-8 May 1940, which led to Chamberlain's resignation and, after some dallying, his replacement by Churchill. It is a good example of the British political system at its best.

Churchill's extraordinary versatility and mental energy are vividly related by the documents. Caution must be applied in using them; although some critical material from other sources is included, they represent a one-sided view, and need to be considered in the light of wider and more balanced accounts for this period, such as Francois Kersaudy's Norway 1940. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that this volume and its successors will prove a priceless gift for future historians.
Emery Reves: Retrospect and Prospect

The man who brought *The Second World War* and the *English-speaking Peoples* to the world at large played a crucial role in the Churchill story. Without him, his History would have been incomplete.

"Taken by me on Lake Como on our first trip to Europe, 1949. Wasn't he a handsome man?" - Wendy Reves

INTRODUCTION

After the end of the Second World War, Emery Reves took what one observer called 'the biggest gamble in the publishing business' when he purchased the rights to publish Winston Churchill's war memoirs outside Britain before one word had been set to paper, and set up the business arrangements accordingly. Later, he did likewise with Churchill's History of the English-Speaking Peoples, which had seen its first draft before the war as a one-volume book, but was ultimately published between 1956 and 1958 in a much broader, four-volume format. "Some people," his wife Wendy recalls, "thought Emery was taking a huge chance."

Emery Reves knew he was not gambling. He had known Churchill since well before the war, syndicating his newspaper articles throughout Europe; he appreciated the prodigious journalistic energy that had produced *Marlborough, The World Crisis, My Early Life, Thoughts and Adventures and Great Contemporaries*. He knew Churchill would write the crucial memoir of the late war and, he knew he would bring that memoir to the world. From Brazil and Mexico to Yugoslavia and Israel, *The Second World War* was published in the languages of a score of peoples, most importantly, of course, in the United States (by Houghton Mifflin) and Canada (by Thomas Allen)—all through the efforts of Emery Reves. Again with Churchill's History, it was Emery who made the arrangements with Dodd, Mead in New York and McClelland & Stewart in Toronto, and with many other publishers around the world, which gave Sir Winston's last major work such enormous circulation.

But Emery Reves was much more than the loyal colleague who spread Churchill's word. A powerful thinker in his own right, author of the acclaimed Anatomy of Peace and a champion of liberty, he was one of the few people in whose company Sir Winston was always comfortable, whether they were in conversational mood or simply lost in silent contemplation. They shared an almost sublime relationship, thought many who observed them together: not the least Wendy herself, who knew Emery best, and Sir Winston in his declining years as his devoted hostess. There is no better opportunity than the twenty-fifth anniversary of ICS to tell the story in Finest Hour.

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH
On the first of April 1933, a day of infamy in Berlin, the day of the boycott of all Jewish shops and offices, Nazi storm troopers entered an office to seize its contents and its owner. The office was a centre for the distribution of newspaper articles upholding democracy. It was wrecked. Its owner was Emery Reves. "I had to flee from Germany in the clothes I stood in," he later wrote, "just saving my life." Reves was then twenty-nine years old.

Reopening his office in Paris, the young man circulated to an ever-widening public throughout Europe the views of the leading anti-Nazis, and the leading democratic statesmen, including Paul Reynaud, Leon Blum, Anthony Eden and Clement Attlee (later Britain's second Labour Prime Minister). In 1937 he met Winston Churchill.

Reves quickly became one of the giants in Churchill's life. Small of stature but large of mind, he made it possible for Churchill's writings, and most importantly his opinions, to become far more widely known than even Churchill expected. The spread of Churchill's influence, his ideas about the world and its destiny, gained enormously from the work that Reves did across three decades. "I can speak from personal experience of his altogether exceptional abilities and connections," Churchill wrote to Lord Reith, the British Minister of Information in February 1940. To Cecil King, one of the press barons of the time, Churchill described Reves as "a most brilliant writer" who "holds our views very strongly."

Four months later, when Churchill was Prime Minister, and only two weeks after the fall of France, when Britain was being portrayed in the world as beaten, he wrote to the new Minister of Information, Alfred Duff Cooper: "I have long thought very highly of Mr. Reves' abilities in all that concerns propaganda and the handling of the neutral press."

As a result of Churchill's letter to Duff Cooper, Reves was asked by the British Government, on 9 July 1940, to go to New York and help build up the British propaganda organisation in both North and South America. It was a task of great delicacy and importance.

His aim, Reves wrote to Churchill shortly before his departure, would be to persuade those in the New World "that Hitler is directly menacing the American nations, and he will conquer them one by one, just as he conquered Europe." To this end he would seek to persuade the people of the United States "that principles like 'neutrality,' 'isolation,' 'non-intervention,' 'defence of the national territory but no war' - principles which also Great Britain has followed until she was plunged into war, and which also have been the principles of some twenty European nations until they were conquered one by one - are principles of a lost world, which lead every nation to the abyss."

Churchill knew that Reves would be an effective instrument of the democratic message, with its call to a recognition of the need for vigilance and cooperation ('Cooperation' was the name of Reves' bureau in Paris before the war). The clarion calls for a unified defence policy which Churchill published every two weeks in England in the Evening Standard (until they disapproved of his anti-appeasement stance and said his views were no longer required, whereupon he was taken up by the Daily Telegraph), were given extraordinarily wide circulation in Europe solely as a result of Reves' efforts at syndicating them.

Among the newspapers that published Churchill's articles in 1938 and 1939, thanks to Reves, were those in Brussels, Copenhagen, Riga, Stockholm, Helsinki, Oslo, Warsaw, Cracow, Kaunas (in both the Lithuanian- and Yiddish-language newspapers) and Tallinn (Estonia).

Beyond Europe, Reves placed these same articles in cities as far afield as Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Cape Town, Perth, Sydney, Colombo, Singapore, Hong Kong, Nairobi, Cairo and Jerusalem. In all, an average of thirty newspapers reprinted the articles every two weeks, an annual total of 750 different outlets. This was a formidable achievement by Reves and a remarkable gain for Churchill.

The key to understanding Churchill, wrote his Principal Private Secretary in 1940, Eric Seal, was "Liberty": a devotion to, and determination to defend the concept of freedom of the individual, and the efforts of the State to uphold that individual's place of honour. Reves shared this ideal and, from the moment they met in 1937, recognized Churchill's power to give effect to it both in his writings and in his political activities. For this reason, every one of Churchill's articles which Reves placed before the war in a European newspaper, or beyond Europe, was a powerful plea for the maintenance and supremacy of the rights of the individual, and for the energetic defence of the democratic process, then under such massive attack.

On the eve of the Munich conference in September 1938, as Britain was preparing to allow Hitler to annex the German-speaking Sudeten regions of Czechoslovakia, Reves encouraged Churchill to make a special journey to France, to show the French political leaders that there was another voice in England beside that of fear and appeasement. At the time of the German occupation of Prague in March 1939, Reves took down with him to Chartwell one of the leaders of Czech democracy, and came away with an article by Churchill that was a clarion call for the unity of the threatened nations of Europe, before it was too late.

When, in the summer of 1939, Reves wrote to Churchill to explain that several countries no longer wanted the articles, Churchill wrote to him: "I am indeed sorry to hear that the net is closing round our activities, through fear of Germany. Luckily, you have already called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old."

Churchill knew that Reves was a full and committed democrat. "I am 100% individualist," Reves wrote to Churchill in October 1939, "and hate with my whole heart any form of collective regime, under which I could not exist. I think my whole life
and career is indisputable proof of that."

I first met Reves when, shortly after Churchill’s death, he came to see Randolph Churchill, for whom I was then working. Within only a few minutes of meeting him, I remember how struck I was by the depth of his thought, and by his devotion, not to Churchill's literary sales or receipts (which he had so greatly enhanced), but to Churchill's philosophy, and to the need even in 1965 (and how right Reves was) to make that philosophy as widely known as possible.

I later had the chance of several long talks with Emery Reves: at Randolph’s funeral three years after our first meeting, at his home in the South of France, and at Montreux in Switzerland, very shortly before his death in 1981. He was a man whose devotion to Churchill and Churchill’s ideals was total. He kept no disagreeable diary and told no prurient stories about the man he admired and helped, and saw so much of.

Because of the importance of Reves in Churchill's story, I have been preparing, for several years now, at the request of Wendy Reves, a comprehensive collection of the Reves-Churchill correspondence. I have woven into the documentation a note of every time the two men met. Although this note of their meetings has taken a long time to compile, it is I think a unique exercise in writing about the relationship of two people.

We are told so often that X or Y or Z knew Churchill well and saw a lot of him, only to find that the two hardly met, if at all. But in the case of Emery Reves, he was a frequent visitor to Chartwell, to Morpeth Mansions before the war, and to Hyde Park Gate after it, quite apart from the long periods of time that the two men spent together between 1956 and 1960 at the Villa la Pausa, overlooking the Mediterranean Sea.

The new Churchill document volume, At the Admiralty, opens with a dedication "to the memory of Emery Reves, who helped carry the books of Sir Winston Churchill to the world. This is a simple statement, but a true one, strengthened by its simplicity. Not only was Reves active in the negotiations for the publication of Churchill's books, he was equally active, and influential, in advertising on the structure of the books, and made certain that they went into languages and countries that would not have translated them but for Reves' efforts.

Churchill knew how much Reves' life had been scarred by the slaughter of almost all the members of his close family by the Nazis. One of the research assistants at Chartwell, Denis Kelly, once recalled to me the grim look on Churchill's face as he passed on what Reves had told him of their terrible fate: civilians murdered by an insatiable tyranny. No wonder that Reves saw Churchill as a saviour: had Britain not taken up arms against Nazi rule in 1939, and persevered despite great odds throughout 1940 and 1941, and then led the coalition against Hitler until the Nazi system was totally destroyed, how many more millions might not have perished is a question, not for doubt, but for arithmetic.

In May 1945 there were two million Jews left alive in Europe who, like Reves' murdered relatives, would certainly have been killed had Nazism not been destroyed. Three million Polish civilians had already been murdered: how many more might have been shot, had Nazi rule continued, is again a matter, not of speculation but certainty. The gypsies, many of whom lived in Reves' native Hungary, were likewise already victims, and marked out for further killing.

Reves, knowing all this from his inner soul, recognised (as one or two recent writers seem to ignore) how great was Churchill's contribution, not only to the survival of Britain, but also to the survival of liberty and democracy in Europe and beyond.

The fall of the Iron Curtain in our time is another tribute to Churchill's tenacity of belief. "Captive peoples need never despair," he said in 1949, recognizing what he called the "spark of hope" that could never be extinguished in the human spirit.

Reves understood and supported Churchill's vision from his vantage point of experience, suffering and effort. His most outstanding achievement was in making as widely known as possible the two great post-war pillars of Churchill's thought, the six-volume Second World War and the four-volume History of the English-speaking Peoples. This achievement was recognised by Churchill at the time and by his official biographer; it will be recognised in the final (1955-65) Churchill document volume; and it will be shown in all its glory in the Reves-Churchill correspondence. I am proud to be associated with each of these efforts.

Camera study by Editta Sherman
Cartoon Critic Sidney Low

Except when he was indispensable during wartime, Churchill was almost always pilloried by the brilliant Low as a warmongering tool of capitalist oppressors. It was a tribute to the gentlemanly magnanimity of both that each spoke of the other with undisguised affection.

BY MICHAEL RICHARDS

"Yah - Untouchable!" (1933)

"LOW is the greatest of our modern cartoonists," wrote Churchill in his delightful essay on that subject in Thoughts and Adventures, "because of the vividness of his political conceptions, and because he possesses what few cartoonists have - a grand technique of draughtsmanship. Low is a master of black and white; he is the Charlie Chaplin of caricature, and tragedy and comedy are the same to him."

Sidney Low was, of course, most often cast as Churchill's critic. "He is a little pre-War Australian radical," wrote WSC. "When he was growing to years of discretion, the best way of getting a laugh was to gibe at the British Empire... There he is, with his little tyke and his Joan Bull and her baby, deriding regularly everything that is of importance to our self-preservation." A Low cartoon, Churchill went on, was a masterpiece of invective. "There is not a figure in it that is not instinct with maliciously-perceived truth."

Low gave Churchill as good as he got. "An upholder of Democracy," he described Churchill - "yes, when he was leading it. Impatient with it when he was not. His definition of democracy, I felt, would be something like 'gov-ernment of the people, for the people, by benevolent and paternal ruling-class chaps like me.'"

"Remembering him as one of the most energetic mis-educators of public opinion in the early 1920s, when his dislike of political onrushes took him within hail of fascism, when the rabbits of the Trades Union Council were held up as Russian bears and the idea of a Labour Government was alleged to mean the enthronement of bolshevism at Westminster, I could never accept him as a democrat in the Lincolnian sense."

Thus it went on until the war came and Churchill plunged in as Prime Minister, when suddenly Low's cartoon critiques were replaced by rampant boosterism. Here was the opportunity for all the characteristics Low admired in Churchill to come to the fore.

"Winston's characteristics were confidence in himself and love of his country... At the time of our first meeting I wrote, 'Churchill is one of the few men I have met who ... give me the impression of genius. Shaw is another. It is amusing to know that each thinks the other is much overrated!'"


Overleaf: An ICS 25th Anniversary Commemorative: A "Low" suitable for framing

Sidney Low's greatest cartoon of Churchill was created for Illustrated in 1954, to mark Sir Winston's 80th Birthday. It speaks for itself. It is simply marvelous. On our 25th Anniversary, Finest Hour has created a limited edition of 100 prints, unfolded and suitable for framing, shipped in sturdy rolls. A donation of US $15 or more (or the equivalent in sterling, Canadian or Australian dollars, which goes to the appropriate Churchill Societies) will secure yours. Make payable to ICS Stores, 9807 Willow Brook Circle, Louisville KY 40223 USA.
Fifty years ago at Harvard, Winston Churchill delivered his great clarion call for Anglo-American brotherhood. How remarkable it is, with all the dragons slain, that his words remain as noble a guide half a century on.

"The Price of Greatness is Responsibility"

BY WINSTON S. CHURCHILL
INTRODUCTION

After the Quebec conference in 1943, Churchill relates in Closing the Ring, "the President was very anxious for me to keep a longstanding appointment and receive an honorary degree at Harvard. It was to be an occasion for a public declaration to the world of Anglo-American unity and amity." It was to be more than that: "Law, language, literature - these are considerable factors," Churchill told his audience ... "Blood and history — I, a child of both worlds, am conscious of these." He explained how well the combined chiefs of staff system worked — should continue to work - and how much Harvard and Cambridge had done for the abbreviated language called "Basic English" - a similar simplified vocabulary is still used by British and American broadcasts abroad (if not as often as it should be among immigrants wishing to be citizens). He reminded us that if we, the English-Speaking Peoples are together, nothing is impossible - as Desert Shield and Desert Storm reminded us again only recently. He supported the concept of an effective international organization, but implored us not to pass along the defense of our lives and liberties "until we are quite sure [it] will give us an equally solid guarantee." On the Churchill Societies’ Twenty-fifth Anniversary we confidently republish the Harvard Address on its Fiftieth Anniversary, knowing that his words provide a sheet anchor to the future, if only we will heed them.

The last time I attended a ceremony of this character was in the spring of 1941, when, as Chancellor of Bristol University, I conferred a degree upon the United States Ambassador, Mr. Winant, and in absentia upon President Conant, our President, who is here today and presiding over this ceremony. The blitz was running hard at that time, and the night before, the raid on Bristol had been heavy. Several hundreds had been killed and wounded. Many houses were destroyed. Buildings next to the University were still burning, and many of the University authorities who conducted the ceremony had pulled on their robes over uniforms begrimed and drenched; but all was presented with faultless ritual and appropriate decorum, and I sustained a very strong and invigorating impression of the superiority of man over the forces that can destroy him.

Here now, today, I am once again in academic groves - groves is, I believe, the right word - where knowledge is garnered, where learning is stimulated, where virtues are inculcated and thought encouraged. Here, in the broad United States, with a respectable ocean on either side of us, we can look out upon the world in all its wonder and in all its woe. But what is this that I discern as I pass through your streets, as I look round this great company?

I see uniforms on every side. I understand that nearly the whole energies of the University have been drawn into the preparation of American youth for the battlefield. For this purpose all classes and courses have been transformed, and even the most sacred vacations have been swept away in a round-the-year and almost round-the-clock drive to make warriors and technicians for the fighting fronts.

Twice in my lifetime the long arm of destiny has reached across the oceans and involved the entire life and manhood of the United States in a deadly struggle.

There was no use in saying "We don't want it; we won't have it; our forebears left Europe to avoid these quarrels; we have founded a new world which has no contact with the old." There was no use in that. The long arm reaches out remorselessly, and every one's existence, environment, and outlook undergo a swift and irresistible change. What is the explanation, Mr. President, of these strange facts, and what are the deep laws to which they respond? I will offer you one explanation - there are others, but one will suffice.

The price of greatness is responsibility. If the people of the United States had continued in a mediocre station, struggling with the wilderness, absorbed in their own affairs, and a factor of no consequence in the movement of the world, they might have remained forgotten and undisturbed beyond their protecting oceans; but one cannot rise to be in many ways the leading community in the civilised world without being involved in its problems, without being convulsed by its agonies and inspired by its causes.
If this has been proved in the past, as it has been, it will become indisputable in the future. The people of the United States cannot escape world responsibility. Although we live in a period so tumultuous that little can be predicted, we may be quite sure that this process will be intensified with every forward step the United States make in wealth and in power. Not only are the responsibilities of this great Republic growing, but the world over which they range is itself contracting in relation to our powers of locomotion at a positively alarming rate.

We have learned to fly. What prodigious changes are involved in that new accomplishment! Man has parted company with his trusty friend the horse and has sailed into the azure with the eagles, eagles being represented by the infernal (loud laughter) - I mean internal - combustion engine. Where, then, are those broad oceans, those vast staring deserts? They are shrinking beneath our very eyes. Even elderly Parliamentarians like myself are forced to acquire a high degree of mobility.

But to the youth of America, as to the youth of all the Britains, I say "You cannot stop." There is no halting-place at this point. We have now reached a stage in the journey where there can be no pause. We must go on. It must be world anarchy or world order.

Throughout all this ordeal and struggle which is characteristic of our age, you will find in the British Commonwealth and Empire good comrades to whom you are united by other ties besides those of State policy and public need. To a large extent, they are the ties of blood and history. Naturally I, a child of both worlds, am conscious of these.

Law, language, literature - these are considerable factors. Common conceptions of what is right and decent, a marked regard for fair play, especially to the weak and poor, a stern sentiment of impartial justice, and above all the love of personal freedom, or as Kipling put it: "Leave to live by no man's leave underneath the law" - these are common conceptions on both-sides of the ocean among the English-speaking peoples. We hold to these conceptions as strongly as you do.

We do not war primarily with races as such. Tyranny is our foe, whatever trappings or disguise it wears, whatever language it speaks, be it external or internal, we must forever be on our guard, ever mobilised, ever vigilant, always ready to spring at its throat. In all this, we march together. Not only do we march and strive shoulder to shoulder at this moment under the fire of the enemy on the fields of war or in the air, but also in those realms of thought which are consecrated to the rights and the dignity of man.

At the present time we have in continual vigorous action the British and United States Combined Chiefs of Staff Committee, which works immediately under the President and myself as representative of the British War Cabinet. This committee, with its elaborate organisation of Staff officers of every grade, disposes of all our resources and, in practice, uses British and American troops, ships, aircraft, and munitions just as if they were the resources of a single State or nation.

Harvard: Fifty Years Ago ...

I was Monday 6 September 1943. I was a 22-year-old First Lieutenant lucky enough to be selected as one of 400 young officers to attend a four month concentrated course at the Harvard Graduate School of Business in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The conflicts in Europe and the Pacific were raging. Big events lay ahead. All I knew was that the work at Harvard was very tough; that we had a rigid schedule from 8 a.m. until 10 p.m. five days each week, and there was study hall on the weekends. I also knew that most of us would graduate in late October. What I didn't know was that I would be reassigned to a new unit and shipped to England for further training and staging for the big invasion the following June. From Utah Beach it was Cherbourg, across to Liege, Belgium; Galeen, Holland and finally Niederbreisig on the Rhine when the war ended. So much for an introduction.

On 3 September, three days prior, we had been informed that the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, would be at Harvard to receive an honorary Doctor of Laws degree, thus returning the compliment paid to President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Oxford Convention ceremonies (also held at Harvard due to the war) in June 1941. The announcement included the fact that we would take a break from classes that afternoon and march from the Graduate School, across the bridge over the Charles River to the Tercentenary Quadrangle,
I would not say there are never divergences of view among these high professional authorities. It would be unnatural if there were not. That is why it is necessary to have a plenary meeting of principals every two or three months. All these men now know each other. They trust each other. They like each other, and most of them have been at work together for a long time. When they meet they thrash things out with great candour and plain, blunt speech, but after a few days the President and I find ourselves furnished with sincere and united advice. This is a wonderful system. There was nothing like it in the last war. There never has been anything like it between two allies. It is reproduced in an even more tightly-knit form at General Eisenhower’s headquarters in the Mediterranean, where everything is completely intermingled and soldiers are ordered into battle by the Supreme Commander or his deputy, General Alexander, without the slightest regard to whether they are British, American, or Canadian, but simply in accordance with the fighting need.

Now in my opinion it would be a most foolish and improvident act on the part of our two Governments, or either of them, to break up this smooth-running and immensely powerful machinery the moment the war is over. For our own safety, as well as for the security of the rest of the world, we are bound to keep it working and in running order after the war — probably for a good many years, not only until we have set up some world arrangement to keep the peace, but until we know that it is an arrangement which will really give us that protection we have already had to seek across two vast world wars.

The great Bismarck — for there were once great men in Germany — is said to have observed towards the close of his life that the most potent factor in human society at the end of the nineteenth century was the fact that the British and American peoples spoke the same language.

That was a pregnant saying. Certainly it has enabled us to wage war together with an intimacy and harmony never before achieved among allies.

This gift of a common tongue is a priceless inheritance, and it may well some day become the foundation of a common citizenship. I like to think of British and Americans moving about freely over each other’s wide estates with hardly a sense of being foreigners to one another. But I do not see why we should not try to spread our common language even more widely throughout the globe and, without seeking selfish advantage over any, possess ourselves of this invaluable amenity and birthright.

Some months ago I persuaded the British
Cabinet to set up a committee of Ministers to study and report upon Basic English. Here you have a plan. There are others, but here you have a very carefully wrought plan for an international language capable of a very wide transaction of practical business and interchange of ideas. The whole of it is comprised in about 650 nouns and 200 verbs or other parts of speech - no more indeed than can be written on one side of a single sheet of paper.

What was my delight when, the other evening, quite unexpectedly, I heard the President of the United States suddenly speak of the merits of Basic English, and is it not a coincidence that, with all this in mind, I should arrive at Harvard, in fulfilment of the long-dated invitations to receive this degree, with which President Conant has honoured me? For Harvard has done more than any other American university to promote the extension of Basic English. The first work on Basic English was written by two Englishmen, Ivor Richards, now of Harvard, and C.K. Ogden, of Cambridge University, England, working in association.

The Harvard Commission on English Language Studies is distinguished both for its research and its practical work, particularly in introducing the use of Basic English in Latin America; and this Commission, your Commission, is now, I am told, working with secondary schools in Boston on the use of Basic English in teaching the main language to American children and in teaching it to foreigners preparing for citizenship.

He spoke of the combined Chiefs of Staff Committee which worked "in complete harmony under the President and myself" using troops, ships, aircraft, ammunition, "just as if they were the resources of a single state or nation. We trust each other. We like each other. This is a wonderful system. There never has been anything like it between two allies."

His speech clearly stressed unity. It was so full of optimism for victory that he dwelled upon the kind of world we all wanted after the war. He closed by saying, "Let us rise to the full level of our duty and of our opportunity and let us thank God for the spiritual rewards He has granted for all forms of valiant and faithful service."

The Commencement Hymn was sung in Latin and the Very Reverend Henry Bradford Washburn pronounced the benediction.

Upon the adjournment of the meeting, many of those in the Academic Procession and the audience walked to the Yard to watch Mr. Churchill speak to the assembled throng of some 10,000 from the steps of the South Portico of the Memorial Church. Ruffles and Flourishes accompanied his arrival and the Coast Guard Band played "God Save The King." Harvard President James B. Conant introduced him to the outdoor audience, which gave him a great ovation. He spoke for about five minutes, punctuating many points with the tapping of his cane and, again, this was followed by another enthusiastic demonstration whereupon Churchill responded with his famous V-for-Victory sign.

With appearances concluded, the official party then proceeded to the Fogg Museum where an informal luncheon was served and (yes) several Champagne toasts were presented. Churchill and his party returned to Washington, D.C. by rail that same evening. Thus ended a day that will always be remembered as unique in Harvard history and in the minds of those who attended albeit far fewer in number today, fifty years later.

So I count myself as a very lucky person. Not only did I see and hear Churchill that day, but I also was in the front line of servicemen not more than twenty feet from him. It was a moment truly to be remembered and cherished these past many years.

JOHN T. HAY
also be an advantage to many races, and an aid to the building-up of our new structure for preserving peace?

All these are great possibilities, and I say: "Let us go into this together. Let us have another Boston Tea Party about it."

Let us go forward as with other matters and other measures similar in aim and effect - let us go forward in malice to none and good will to all. Such plans offer far better prizes than taking away other people's provinces or lands or grinding them down in exploitation. The empires of the future are the empires of the mind.

It would, of course, Mr. President, be lamentable if those who are charged with the duty of leading great nations forward in this grievous and obstinate war were to allow their minds and energies to be diverted from making the plans to achieve our righteous purposes without needless prolongation of slaughter and destruction.

Nevertheless, we are also bound, so far as life and strength allow, and without prejudice to our dominating military tasks, to look ahead to those days which will surely come when we shall have finally beaten down Satan under our feet and find ourselves with other great allies at once the masters and the servants of the future. Various schemes of achieving world security while yet preserving national rights, traditions and customs are being studied and probed.

We have all the fine work that was done a quarter of a century ago by those who devised and tried to make effective the League of Nations after the last war. It is said that the League of Nations failed. If so, that is largely because it was abandoned, and later on betrayed: because those who were its best friends were till a very late period infected with a futile pacifism: because the United States, the originating impulse, fell out of line: because, while France had been bled white and England was supine and bewildered, a monstrous growth of aggression sprang up in Germany, in Italy and Japan.

We have learned from hard experience that stronger, more efficient, more rigorous world institutions must be created to preserve peace and to forestall the causes of future wars. In this task the strongest victorious nations must be combined, and also those who have borne the burden and heat of the day and suffered under the flail of adversity; and, in this task, this creative task, there are some who say: "Let us have a world council and under it regional or continental councils," and there are others who prefer a somewhat different organisation.

All these matters weigh with us now in spite of the war, which none can say has reached its climax, which is perhaps entering for us, British and Americans, upon its most severe and costly phase. But I am here to tell you that, whatever form your system of world security may take, however the nations are grouped and ranged, whatever derogations are made from national sovereignty for the sake of the larger synthesis, nothing will work soundly or for long without the united effort of the British and American peoples.

If we are together nothing is impossible. If we are divided all will fail.

I therefore preach continually the doctrine of the fraternal association of our two peoples, not for any purpose of gaining invidious material advantages for either of them, not for territorial aggrandisement or the vain pomp of earthly domination, but for the sake of service to mankind and for the honour that comes to those who faithfully serve great causes.

Here let me say how proud we ought to be, young and old alike, to live in this tremendous, thrilling, formative epoch in the human story, and how fortunate it was for the world that when these great trials came upon it there was a generation that terror could not conquer and brutal violence could not enslave. Let all who are here remember, as the words of the hymn we have just sung suggest, let all of us who are here remember that we are on the stage of history, and that whatever our station may be, and whatever part we have to play, great or small, our conduct is liable to be scrutinised not only by history but by our own descendants.

Let us rise to the full level of our duty and of our opportunity, and let us thank God for the spiritual rewards He has granted for all forms of valiant and faithful service.
The Ideals of Democracy:
"His Truth is Marching On"

The Recollections of a Friend of Presidents
to the Pilgrims of the United States Annual Meeting
The Waldorf Astoria, New York, 27 January 1993

BY THE HON. JAMES C. HUMES

The Pilgrims of the United States, and their counter-parts the Pilgrims of Great Britain, are distinguished organizations numbering many Friends of the International Churchill Societies. Their founding object was "the promotion of the sentiment of brotherhood among the nations, and especially the cultivation of good fellowship between citizens of the United States and its dependencies and subjects in the British Empire." Churchill addressed the Pilgrims on several occasions.

During the 1993 Annual Meeting in New York, a message was received approximately ten minutes before the call to order that the guest speaker, the American Ambassador to the United Nations, had suddenly been taken ill and could not appear. President Hugh Bullock asked three prominent Pilgrims if they would be willing to substitute and, for various understandable reasons, they declined. Mr. Bullock at this point noticed the chairman of another pro-British institution older than the Pilgrims, namely The Ends of the Earth " (and an honorary member of ICS United States). "Welcome Jamie, you have just been unanimously elected and you have accepted and you will go on stage, replacing the previously announced speaker," Mr. Bullock announced. "You are an authority on Winston Churchill throughout the United States, as well as William Shakespeare. May I with very great pleasure present to you the Honorable James Calhoun Humes."

Those who know Jamie will scarcely be surprised to learn that he was fully up to this impromptu invitation; but few might expect that the words he chose would be so entirely appropriate on the 25th Anniversary of the International Churchill Societies. They are reproduced by kind permission of the Pilgrims and their President, Hugh Bullock, GBE, and the speaker.

Mr. Humes will discuss "Churchill and Lincoln" at the 1993 ICS international conference closing ceremonies, the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, November 8th. His book on WSC's wit and wisdom will be published soon by Harper-Collins; his Shakespeare biography is published by Praeger.

RESIDENT Hugh: I speak by his request, but under protest. But I speak because I have such great respect for the man who introduced me, who is the living embodiment of the Pilgrims. (Applause)

I speak because I share his devotion and your devotion, to the ideals the Pilgrims champion. I suppose the seeds of my love and respect for those ideals began forty years ago when Sinclair Armstrong's organization, the English-Speaking Union, sent me to school on an English-Speaking Union scholarship, and I found myself at the Commonwealth Banquet. I pushed myself into the reception line, and the Duke of Edinburgh said to Churchill, "Prime Minister, here is a young man who wants to go into government." Churchill was eighty, I was eighteen. He had a very tiny pink hand. He put his hand on mine and he said, "Young man, study history, in history lie all the secrets of statecraft."

I did study history. I think I am the only person who can say he has written biographies of both Winston Churchill and William Shakespeare, the two greatest Englishmen who ever lived. (Applause)

I am pleased to speak today about those shared ideals. Angier Biddle Duke just came back from Morocco where they celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the historic conference. Ambassador Duke met with Winston Churchill MP, Philippe DeGaulle and descendants of those other great principals. That was the first World War II conference where those ideals were hammered into policy.

This September we mark the fiftieth anniversary of Churchill's speech to Harvard where he received an honorary degree. In his address he proposed a common passport for Britain and the United States. That was fitting testament, said Churchill, to the ideals we shared.

This year, I have a new book that's coming out. It is entitled, "The Wit and Wisdom of Churchill."
This will be my third book on Churchill. And I ransacked all the quotations, that’s all of his speeches from 1897 to 1963 in addition to all the books he had written — more words then any author this century. These will include over a thousand of his observations on liberty, life and just about every other topic.

But one quotation that we should all know about here, is particularly applicable to our society. Churchill said, "The central fact for the nineteenth century, is that Britain and America spoke the same language. Let it be our resolve that they speak the same ideals." We do speak the same ideals!

Two or three years ago I was in a country churchyard in Oxford, and with me was an elderly woman with white hair, Grace Hamblin, and we put flowers, three years ago this week, on the grave of Churchill in that little Anglican churchyard, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death.

Afterwards, Miss Hamblin invited me to her house right near Chartwell. And I said to her, "You heard his dictation when the Prime Minister drafted that historic speech on the occasion of Dunkirk. What was it like?"

She said, "Oh, Mr. Humes, I remember it was a Sunday afternoon and the Prime Minister was in the Foreign Office where they were trying to persuade him to negotiate a surrender with the Nazis. He came into No. 10 about five o'clock and went up to the Cabinet Room where he always liked to dictate. I would sit at one end of the table and he would pace around the table. When it got to midnight, he was fatigued, tired - he didn't know whether there would be an army left on the morrow to defend the island as this miraculous deliverance of Dunkirk was going on."

"She continued, "He came to the most climactic peroration of his address, 'We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields, and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills.' Then, she said, "He grabbed a chair at the opposite end of the table and his body shook and sobbed for his stricken countrymen. Then, after a two-minute pause he roared, 'We shall never surrender!'" (Applause)

Hold those ideals, yes, but hold those ideals fast! This is what the Pilgrims is about.

Ronald Reagan spoke to Oxford not long ago, and he enumerated some of those ideals, perhaps you say it on C-Span - representative government; the rule of law, which our two Attorney Generals here today, Herbert Brownell and Elliot Richardson would attest to; a free and independent judiciary. Then he went on to add free assembly, free press, free churches, free unions, and free markets.

Free markets reminds me of another time I saw Churchill. Churchill, as you know, was in Parliament from 1900 to 1964. And the last campaign in which he stood for the House of Commons was in 1959. I was in England. And my friends told me, "Do not bother to go see him, he will just make an appearance, he is a feeble shell of what he once was. Maybe they will introduce him and he will just wave a V-sign, that's all it will be."

I took the train out and went to Woodford, the bedroom constituency of London that Churchill represented. The campaign meeting was in a girls' school. Churchill was seated at the platform, his legs covered by a blanket, his face flaccid after almost nine decades of infirmities. And it was a sad sight to see the wasted frame of this giant figure. The local chairman of the constituency, Captain Morrison, said, "Ladies and gentlemen, the Right Honourable Member for Woodford, Sir Winston Churchill. Hip hip hooray, hip hip hooray, hip hip hooray!"

This old man - giving the speech for the Conservative Party, stood up with the help of his cane and he said, "On this last appearance in my parliamentary career, let me take this opportunity to give testament to free enterprise. The academic often thinks of private enterprise," and he takes his cane and points as a rifle, "as a tiger, a predatory animal to be shot." Then he crouches and puts his hands in a pumping motion. "The bureaucrat often sees private enterprise as an old cow to be milked. But," he said, "the decent people of England know that private enterprise is the sturdy horse that pulls along the car of democracy." And then he waved with his V-sign. After that speech, Conservatives went on to a landslide victory.

Now I'd like to tell you another time - and I am sure that Ambassador Max Rabb, who was then Cabinet Secretary in the Eisenhower White House (actually my wife worked for him) will remember in 1959 when Churchill came over to visit America for the last time. And on his last day Churchill went to Walter Reed Hospital to say goodbye to George Marshall, who had a stroke and couldn't speak, and then to cancer-ridden John Foster Dulles, who was a couple of months away from death: a final farewell to two statesmen.

I positioned myself in front of Walter Reed. I was going to law school. All I wanted to see was Churchill in the Rolls-Royce with his cigar, waving the V-sign. Alas the Secret Service - you know how they do this — changed the routing and I missed it. But I had ten dollars in my pocket and I took a cab to Andrews Air Force Base.

It was a rainy, cold day, but there were people like Walter Lippman and Joe Alsop who might not walk across Pennsylvania Avenue to see the President of the United States. There were about thirty of us there in front of this screen mesh fence. Suddenly, we see this hunched figure make his way
across the concrete apron. He negotiates his way up the steps haltingly - one at a time. He gets to the top of the steps and the rain ceases, and a crimson glow lights up the Washington skyline at this twilight time.

He looks down on all of us and he says, "Farewell to the land [pause] of my mother. God bless you all. Good night." There wasn't a dry eye left in that audience. I'm no hero, but I would have charged the trenches on those words.

Then, if you will indulge me, let me go back to when I was a White House speechwriter for Nixon and I was asked to work on the eulogy for General Eisenhower in March 1969. (I'm sure Dr. Grayson Kirk, Herbert Brownell and Max Rabb, who knew him so well, would have done a better job.)

I was with John Eisenhower at Walter Reed Hospital - only days before as his family waited in his final illness. John knew that my hero was Churchill. (By the way, we have Churchill's great-grandson with us today at the head table, Mark Dixon.)

And John Eisenhower said, "Jamie, did you ever hear about the last time dad saw Winston?" It was 1964 and General Eisenhower had come over for the twentieth anniversary of D-Day. Remember how Ronald Reagan went over for the fortieth anniversary of D-Day and the liberation of Paris. Eisenhower stopped at the Normandy Beaches. Then he made a speech in Paris, then he came back to England. He asked Lady Churchill if Winston would be up for a visit. Churchill was in George V Hospital.

Now, these two may seem incongruously paired in history. Churchill, the grandson of the ninth Duke of Marlborough, Eisenhower the grandson of Pennsylvania Mennonite preacher. But both had gone to a military academy; both had a child taken away from them in 1922; Marigold for Churchill and Dwight Doud for Eisenhower. Both were in the wilderness in the Thirties, Churchill in Chartwell and Eisenhower in the Philippines. Both had come back to help in the war and then in the Fifties to preside over their countries concurrently.

Churchill was propped up against the bed. Suddenly, he recognized his old friend at the door. Churchill takes his tiny pink hand, puts it to the bedside table to his right and clasps Eisenhower's. Four minutes pass, no words spoken, two old men holding hands - two old men sharing the ideals that they mutually cherished and championed. Eight minutes pass, no words spoken - two old men holding hands.

I've written nineteen books, but I will tell you no one ever, save Churchill himself, could write words more poignant, more eloquent than that mute hand-clasping between two nations, two leaders, two friends.

Fourteen minutes pass, no words spoken - two old men holding hands. Then Churchill gently waved his hand in a V-sign.

General Eisenhower withdrew from the room to his son John waiting on the outside. He said, "John, I've just said goodbye to Winston. But you know, Johnny, you never say farewell to courage!"

I saw General Eisenhower with his son John in 1965 at Gettysburg. He had just come back from the funeral. He said, "You know, I wasn't sent to represent the United States - Earl Warren and Hubert Humphrey were - but the Churchill family and the Queen invited me. And they put me in with the heads of state, President DeGaulle of France, King Olaf of Norway, King Baudoin of Belgium, Queen Juliana of the Netherlands."

I said, "What was the most interesting thing about the service? Was it the RAF pilots who flew in their Spitfires and Hurricanes, the same pilots who had flown in those planes twenty years before, flying in a V-formation over St. Paul's Cathedral? Or was it the union dock workers who, without any plan or coordination, dipped the cranes of their gantries in final reverence salute as the barge carrying his body went up the Thames for the final resting place in Bladon churchyard?"

He said, "No, the most interesting thing was the hymn. You know the magnificent cathedral - Christopher Wren designed it, our Capitol is modeled after it. After I read in the Anglican service we had an anthem to sing, 'The Battle Hymn of the Republic' I remember his saying that he was stipulating in his will that this favorite of his be sung at his final service."

He said, "You know what the first verse is, 'Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.' "But," Eisenhower went on, "Do you know what the fourth verse is?" Because there I was seated with these heads of foreign countries - General DeGaulle, Queen Juliana, King Olaf, King Baudoin, the heads of nations whose freedom had been redeemed by the valor of that warrior who lay in state in front of us.

Eisenhower said, "I could feel my eyes mist with memory and gratitude. Just like the other heads of state as all of us sang that fourth verse together, 'He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat.'"

All of us have the duty to sound that trumpet. Britain and America have sounded that it - not only in two World Wars but in Desert Storm. For all of us here, every time we speak we must sound the trumpet of those ideals that combine our countries and the other great countries of English-speaking nations, the Commonwealth, the liberal democracies. We must sound those trumpets, sound those ideals to preserve the world.
Churchill's Political Philosophy

JAMES W. MULLER


THE AUTHOR of this study, who is Guterman Professor of English at Yeshiva University, observes in his preface that "there is no end to the writing of books about Sir Winston Churchill" (9) - to which we might add, by Manfred Weidhorn. For A Harmony of Interests, as he ruefully owns in his dedication (5), is Weidhorn's fourth book on Churchill's writings. So we are not surprised to find in his preface a justification for this book, which he distinguishes from those that came before. But Weidhorn's books do not explore the same territory over and over; they take up different parts of the subject.

The first member of his eventual tetralogy was Sword and Pen: A Survey of the Writings of Sir Winston Churchill (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974), which treats each of Churchill's books in turn and groups them into six historical phases. Next came Sir Winston Churchill (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979), a general account of Churchill's literary achievement for Twayne's English Authors Series which sets forth his basic ideas synoptically. Third was Churchill's Rhetoric and Political Discourse (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1987), which as part of a series issued by the White Burkett Miller Center of Public Affairs at the University of Virginia acquired a startlingly ungracious preface by the director; in that book Weidhorn examines Churchill's use of language, in his speeches and writings.

Despite his Nobel Prize for Literature and the durable popular success of his books, Churchill's writings have been eclipsed by his political achievements; and in particular they have been undervalued by scholars. In a field still suffering from academic neglect, Weidhorn's contribution bulks large.

On many questions his works afford the best, and in some cases the only sustained examination available. This fourth book makes him undeniably the dean of this branch of Churchill studies. In it he aims to study what he calls Churchill's "sensibility" - his "ineffable mental processes at the border of thought and feeling" (9). If anyone is puzzled by this description, a more effable name for Weidhorn's subject would be "Churchill's political philosophy." A Harmony of Interests is a collection of six essays, four of them previously published in scholarly journals, which investigate the issues that Weidhorn calls central to Churchill's personality (11). Thoughtful and urbane, the essays fit together smoothly without quite escaping their separate origins; some repetition and inconsistency of form may be found in Weidhorn's chapters.

As the author of several books on English literature, Weidhorn is well equipped to assess Churchill's creed from the viewpoint of his literary contemporaries. After describing the intellectual milieu in which Churchill lived, Weidhorn's first essay explores his relationship with a host of writers - particularly John Galsworthy, H.G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw. Galsworthy's "problem plays" (Strife and Justice) convinced Churchill to undertake prison reforms as home secretary. Likewise Churchill made common cause with Wells, giving him credit for imagining the tank; but they parted company on Wells's support for the Bolshevik Revolution. While Churchill, who delighted in Wells's books, taxed him for a doctrinaire hostility to the institutions that had allowed him to flourish, Wells reproached Churchill for his antique love of empire, his self-absorption, and his romantic militarism. Their long-running war of words ended only with Wells's death at the end of the Second World War. Churchill admired even more the plays of Shaw, counting himself among his world-wide audience and paying tribute to Major Barbara as "the very acme of modernity" (33); but he rued the irresponsibility of Shaw's politics. Shaw paid a notorious visit to Stalin's Moscow with Lady Astor in 1931, which Churchill derided in Great Contemporaries. For his part Shaw, who had called Churchill "a bumptious and jolly Junker" in 1914 and then predicted his political eclipse in the interwar years, put down his appeal during World War II to "his long cigars and the genial romantic oratory in which he glorified the war" (31, 35-36). Nonetheless Churchill considered Shaw the "greatest living master of letters in the English-speaking world" (33). In this essay Weidhorn also considers portraits of Churchill by English novelist Arnold Bennett, who made him his model for the irrepressible Tom Hogarth in Lord Raingo (1926), a novel based on Lord Beaverbrook's recollections of cabinet struggles during World War I.

Churchill's criticisms of left-wing intellectuals as unrealistic and doctrinaire point to the theme of Weidhorn's second essay, which considers his con-
servatism. Of course Churchill irritated party men on both sides of the aisle: Weidhorn avers that "he may, like Milton in religion, be said to have finally formed [in the 1930s] his own party with a membership of one" (45). While he was unbending on the maintenance of the British Empire (and therefore opposed self-government for India), he showed flexibility in his dealings with Soviet Russia. If Churchill was unsympathetic to socialism in his mature years, he was a leading liberal reformer in his first decade in Parliament; and his views on social policy remained consistent over the years while party positions changed around him. Here (48, to which cf. 71, 108, 166) Weidhorn echoes the idea he propounded earlier - in Sword and Pen (1974) and especially in Sir Winston Churchill (1979) - that Churchill is a Machiavellian. (Some such meaning seems to attach to the title of the book, the "harmony of interests," in Churchill's phrase, corresponding to Machiavelli's advice to harmonize self-interest with the needs of the state.) Though the evidence Weidhorn gives for this link in those earlier books is suggestive, it is far from conclusive. Weidhorn might better have looked to the ancient writers than to Machiavelli as the locus classicus of Churchill's political outlook. When he resists needless innovation, but also when he favors the good over the ancestral, Churchill has borrowed a lesson from Aristotle's Politics.

In a third essay Weidhorn takes up Churchill's attitude toward war. He begins with the charge that Churchill was a warhorse or a warmonger, remarking that he had indeed a "taste for war" that is "out of fashion in our century" (61). On the eve of the Great War WSC confessed that the prospect excited him greatly. Yet Weidhorn nicely marshals the evidence that Churchill was "neither a warmonger nor a sadist" (67). He shows that Churchill saw the reverse of the medal: though war could sometimes be glorious, in modern times the heroic role of the commander had disappeared and war had become a process of mutual extermination. Churchill enjoyed making military plans and rushing to a front to observe the battle. He was keen to bring the war to the enemy with all possible vigor, but he brought the same energy to making peace in its season. As Weidhorn remarks, "Most politicians are proficient either at seeking peaceful resolutions through negotiations or at cold-bloodedly making war. Churchill was one of those rare persons adept at both" (68).

Weidhorn claims that Churchill's conclusion that peace can only be achieved through military might "ignored the possibility that such a hawkish attitude may be applied where the nation's vital interests are not at stake and thereby lead to fruitless wars" (74). But if Churchill's conclusion is correct, then the only alternative to trusting yourself with enough force for your own defense is to trust someone else, who is also only human. A self-respecting nation will embrace the responsibility itself if it can, and if human nature does not always prevent fruitless wars, no doubt it does sometimes avoid them. Now perhaps it is not the whole truth about war to remark, as Weidhorn does, that if it "is inevitable, it is because of an ugly streak in human nature ... which showed itself all too visibly in Churchill." It is unfashionable to see anything noble in war, but one who did might demur from Weidhorn's grudging conclusion that "part of the tragedy of our times is that someone essentially archaic like Churchill ... may still be indispensable at certain junctures" (76). One serious question about Churchill's attraction to the military art needs more exploration: whether or not he understood that art to be strictly subordinate to the art of the statesman. Certainly there is evidence to suggest that Churchill's spiritedness was sometimes more than a match for his prudence.

In his fourth essay Weidhorn takes up "eerie parallels" (11) between the career of Winston Churchill and that of his great ancestor Marlborough, as the latter Churchill limned it in his magisterial biography - the eerier because Churchill wrote the life of Marlborough before the peak of his own political achievement in the Second World War. To have had Marlborough for an ancestor, Weidhorn says, "invited a rich fantasy life" (77) - but the irony is that in many respects Churchill's fantasy came true. Just as his father would have been surprised to have been surpassed in his political career by what he took to be an unpromising son, so we are now bound to call Marlborough, for all his dazzling accomplishments, only the greatest Churchill before Sir Winston. Of course, as Weidhorn points out, there were differences between Sir Winston and John Churchill: where Marlborough was patient and taciturn, his descendant was impatient and voluble. More precisely, Marlborough was better than his descendant at masking his impatience, though chafing inwardly; but even Winston Churchill's open impatience, which Weidhorn says made him "a potential tyrant" (104), did not actually make him one.

Weidhorn, following A.L. Rowse on some points, indicates the parallels in the careers of the two Churches: both stood somewhat apart from parties and preferred a national government, both endured years in the wilderness in the middle of their careers before attaining the highest office, both led a Britain allied with other nations in a glorious victory over a Continental tyrant, and both were suddenly spurned. But is he right to call Winston Churchill a "dreamer" because of his fascination with Marlborough? Certainly Churchill dreamt of following in the footsteps of his father, and eventually of leading Britain, like Marlborough, in a titanic struggle against tyranny. But, as WSC concludes the first volume of The Second World War, "facts are better than dreams"; and Churchill's achievement is a fact, not a dream. Weidhorn is right to observe what he calls proleptic parallels in Churchill's Marlborough, and also to wonder how far his account of the intentions of his ancestor is influenced by Churchill's own concerns and aspirations. But he might have given more thought to Rowse's pregnant remark in The Later Churchills (452) that Churchill's contemplation of Marlborough's career "afforded a providential training for the comparable destiny awaiting Marlbor-
ough's descendant. The experience may be taken to have matured him as a statesman."

Weidhorn's fifth essay describes Churchill "the semi-American," tracing his lifelong solicitude for the fortunes of the Great Republic, as he called it, to his American mother. Churchill admired the energy of the United States, and particularly its economic might, though he criticized Americans for their political idealism, which gave rise to Wilson's self-righteousness in foreign policy and the misbegotten experiment of Prohibition. Weidhorn holds that Churchill's devotion to Anglo-American friendship, or even reunification, was unique only in that he clung to it long after it had ceased to be fashionable. For a man devoted to his country's greatness, Britain's decline as a world power was easier to bear if he could think that her traditions and purpose had passed intact to her progeny over the sea, now grown to full vigor and discretion. Yet such a view, as Weidhorn argues, gives short shrift to the American Revolution, to the novelty of American political institutions, and to ideas and immigrants who contributed to forming the American nation but came from the Continent - or elsewhere. There is probably some truth in Weidhorn's suggestion that the English language mattered so much to Churchill as to obscure in his mind the political differences between America and Britain. Yet the men who made the American Revolution and led the nation through its first, formative century were preponderantly of British extraction. What is more, they justified their work by ideas they had learned from British philosophers like Locke; and where they departed from the British constitution they took their bearings from Montesquieu, the leading French Anglophile of his generation. As for the immigrants from other lands who enriched the American melting pot, they learned English and added their heritage to the national experience within a framework of law and liberty largely borrowed from Britain. In short, even if Churchill overstated the bonds between America and Britain, with a view to strengthening them, those bonds were real and substantial.

In his final essay, Weidhorn inquires into Churchill's philosophy of history. Do great men make and mar the course of history, or are we all enthralled to forces beyond our control? In an age whose historians deprecate human intentions and explain events by impersonal forces, Churchill's emphasis on responsible human action and his preference for political and military history over social, cultural, and economic history stamp him as a man out of season. Yet Weidhorn points out that the fine figure cut by Churchill in his own account of the Second World War, which seems to imply that great people make a difference, should not lead us to overlook his doubts about human power. Those doubts, expressed and elaborated in all of his books, are implicit even in his memoirs of World War II, which recount tragedy as well as triumph. Though Weidhorn dismisses the idea (152), perhaps Churchill was right to adopt Tocqueville's view that impersonal forces explain more in a democratic age, while human choice has more weight in an aristocracy. Where Churchill rues the displacement of genius and heroism in war by cleverness and the destructive power brought to bear by modern science, Weidhorn objects that "a general wiping out a city by pushing a button may be craven and stupid," yet he still may be considered a great man because he influences the course of history (153). Churchill's point, however, is that a general is only a little man without nobility - a view that can be traced as at least as far back as Savrola.

Manfred Weidhorn brings to these essays the rare virtues of his earlier books: an intimate knowledge of Churchill's writings and a wide reading both in the secondary sources and in the literature of Churchill's English contemporaries. Moreover, he puts good questions to his reader and does not shrink from making serious arguments. Even if we demur from some of his conclusions, Weidhorn's fourth book about Churchill has much to teach us. In fact, we are already looking forward to the sequel.

A Somewhat New Assessment

CHRISTOPHER BELL


This collection of twenty nine essays is the product of a Conference held at the University of Texas at Austin in March 1991. With the completion of Martin Gilbert's official biography the time has come, the editors declare, "to take full measure of that extraordinary man who is perhaps the greatest figure in twentieth-century history." Their goal is ambitious: to de-mythologise the subject while still providing a fair and judicious assessment of his life and career. That reassessment is needed can hardly be doubted. Despite the proliferation of literature on Churchill in recent years, and to a large degree because of it, the mythical status of Winston Churchill has become more firmly entrenched in the public mind. Admirers and detractors alike have shown a tendency to distort the record to such an extent that Churchill and his accomplishments have only become further obscured by the wealth of attention. Old myths
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threaten to acquire the status of accepted fact, while new ones appear daily to be emerging. The time for a thorough reappraisal is clearly overdue.

A brief glance at the contributors assembled in this volume reveals that they are well qualified for the task. Several have previously made notable contributions to the literature on Churchill (Robert Rhodes James, Henry Pelling, Paul Addison); the remainder are prominent experts in their respective fields. They are, on the whole, a particularly distinguished group, but as is almost invariably the case in any such collection, the quality of the essays varies considerably.

One chapter can be classified as an outright disaster. David Cannadine's essay, "Churchill and the Pitfalls of Family Piety" seems oddly out of place in an otherwise scholarly and relevant volume. Cannadine makes the valid observation that part of the reason Churchill was so widely distrusted in political circles was his "genealogically precarious reputation." But he uses this observation merely to justify digging up every hint of dirt or scandal which ever touched any of Churchill's relations. Cannadine casts his net wide, including not only Churchill's parents, his children and the Dukes of Marlborough, but also his wife's family, and her stepfather's. No relation is too obscure or distant for inclusion. Do we really need to know details, for example, of the disreputable dealings of Winston's stepfather's sister's husband?

The remaining essays are of a higher quality, although the merits of many are mixed. Roy Jenkins' piece on the Government of 1951-55 displays an undue concern for whether Churchill was really fit for office, rather than attempting a balanced evaluation of what was accomplished while he was there. Ronald Hyam's essay "Churchill and the British Empire," is really a very narrow examination of Churchill as an administrator during his two terms at the Colonial Office. Readers would be better advised to turn to Kirk Emmert's "Churchill and Empire" for an examination of this topic. In his essay, "Churchill, Japan, and British Security in the Pacific 1904-42," Robert O'Neill neglects the broader strategic issues implied in the title and displays a preoccupation with Churchill's relationship with Australia.

Too many of essays in fact add little to our understanding of Churchill. Perhaps the worst offender in this respect is John Grigg's chapter on "Churchill and Lloyd George," which fails to probe the dynamics of this important relationship and concludes with a pointless attempt to determine which of the two was the greater war leader.

That a book like this can produce rewarding results is demonstrated by the high quality of several of the other contributions. Paul Addison provides an excellent essay on the topic of "Churchill and Social Reform." How justified is Churchill's rank among the founders of the welfare state? Was his participation in the Liberal welfare reforms of 1908-11 merely opportunism, as his critics have charged? Or was his genuine interest in social reform cut short by his electoral defeat in 1945? Addison argues convincingly that Churchill, though possessing the paternalistic attitude of an "old benevolent Tory squire," was genuinely sympathetic towards social reform. His record as a radical in his early career was based on conviction rather than opportunism. The lack of interest he displayed in later years can largely be attributed to the fact that he considered these early reforms had reached the limits of what was feasible or necessary in terms of state intervention. The Beveridge Scheme and postwar Labour reforms were later accepted by Churchill, but he clearly approached them with misgivings. "The welfare state of 1911 had been his," Addison concludes, "but the welfare state of 1951 was thrust upon him."

Peter Clarke provides an insightful essay on another frequently neglected area. Examining Churchill's economic ideas during the years between 1900 and 1930, Clarke concludes that from his early experiences as a free trader until the great depression Churchill was an enthusiastic champion of orthodox economic theory. Clarke upholds the widespread claim that in deciding to return to the gold standard in 1926, Churchill was the victim of bad advice from the high officials at the Treasury and Bank of England. But he also demonstrates that while Churchill often had misgivings over their council, he lacked the knowledge to counter their arguments, and was, on the whole, entirely in sympathy with them.

Other highlights in this volume include William Roger Louis' fine essay, based on detailed archival research, chronicling Churchill's change of heart over Egypt, 1946-56; Sarvepalli Gopal's sympathetic treatment of Churchill and India; Sir Robert Rhodes James's chapter on Churchill as a parliamentarian and orator; and Sir Harry Hinsley on "Churchill and the Use of Special intelligence."

Warren Kimball offers a challenging reevaluation of war at the top in his essay "Wheel Within a Wheel: Churchill, Roosevelt, and the Special Relationship." Kimball turns on its head the popular perception, which Churchill himself fostered, of Churchill as the realistic leader who clearly foresaw Soviet expansion in contrast the idealistic and naive Roosevelt. He also challenges the Churchillian depiction of Anglo-American wartime relations as entirely open and harmonious, particularly on the question of postwar politics. Finally, Kimball asks how events might have developed if Britain and the U.S. had had different leadership during the Second World War. His answer is that things probably would have been pretty much the same. Not everyone will agree with his assessment. It could be argued that at certain key turning points events might have taken a radically different turn: if, for example, Halifax had made peace with Germany in June 1940; or if a different president had followed public opinion after Pearl Harbor and concentrated on the war against Japan. Kimball's argument is sound, though, and deserves serious consideration.

The most determined attack on the Churchill myth comes from D.C. Watt in his chapter on "Churchill and Appeasement." Watt, who has writ-
ten extensively on European relations in the 1930s, attacks the common depiction of appeasement as a battle between the perceptive but ignorant Churchill and the "all-powerful but pig ignorant Neville Chamberlain." The Churchillian critique of appeasement, as described by Watt, rests on the proposition that Hitler could have been deterred from aggression at an early stage by a) more determined British rearmament b) a more aggressive British diplomatic style or c) the formation of a grand coalition including the Soviet Union. And if these actions had not deterred Hitler then they would probably have led his generals to overthrow him.

Watt questions what would have happened if Churchill's advice during the 1930s had actually been followed. In the first place, he contends that more rapid rearmament would not have deterred Hitler because Churchill, like Chamberlain, would have concentrated on building up the RAF. As the Germans did not share the British concern over the dangers of aerial bombardment Hitler would not have been influenced by this course. [But the RAF's main role early in the war was defense, not offense. -Ed.] Similarly, he notes that the Germans were particularly dismissive of Soviet military strength so that the conclusion of a Franco-British-Soviet alliance would have exercised little restraint. Finally, Watt argues that opposition to Hitler within Germany and the likelihood of his overthrow in a military coup has been greatly overestimated. Thus the course of action advocated by Churchill would probably not have been any more effective than that undertaken by Chamberlain.

Professor Watt's argument should not be dismissed lightly. The perpetual search for the villains of appeasement seems to be based on a pervasive assumption that there simply must have been something that Britain could have done differently for everything to have turned out right. But in view of Britain's military weaknesses and Hitler's determination to undertake aggression it may well be that nothing which Britain alone could have done would have averted war with Nazi Germany. Yet if indeed war was unavoidable, wouldn't Britain have been better prepared under Churchill's policies than Chamberlain's?

This volume does not entirely fulfill its promise of providing a major new assessment of Churchill's life and career. Certainly some of the contributors manage to cover new ground or challenge outdated conclusions; but too many chapters merely provide a reiteration of standard arguments based on widely available sources, or revisionist theories that don't hold up under close scrutiny. The essays are of a high standard, however, and this drawback should not obscure the fact that most of the contributions are solid scholarly works. As a summary of the state of research on Churchill the book is invaluable. Moreover, it has the merit of being a work which can be appreciated by the general reader and academic alike. Much research undoubtedly remains to be undertaken, but this book is an effort in the right direction.
100 YEARS AGO

Success and Failure at School
Third Quarter 1893 • Age 18

Winston was jubilant that, after three attempts, he had passed into the Royal Military College at Sandhurst. Although he had achieved a standard which admitted him to the cavalry and not to his father's desired infantry regiment, he wrote what his own son later called "a somewhat insouciant letter" to Lord Randolph. He received "one of the most formidable rebukes of Lord Randolph that survive." He was told that his failure to meet infantry standards "demonstrated beyond refutation your slovenly happy-go-lucky harum scarum style of work for which you have always been distinguished." His father predicted that if Winston could not prevent himself "from leading the idle useless unprofitable life you had during your schooldays and later months, you will become a mere social wastrel, one of the hundreds of the public school failures, and you will degenerate into a shabby unhappy and futile existence." He told his son not to reply because "I no longer attach the slightest weight to anything you say about your own acquirements and exploits."

A crushed Winston replied, "I am very sorry indeed that you are displeased with me" and promised he would "try to modify your opinion of me."

75 YEARS AGO

Toward Final Victory
Third Quarter 1918 • Age 43

On 4 July Churchill spoke to the Anglo-Saxon Fellowship at Westminster about the war. "I am persuaded that the finest and worthiest moment in the history of Britain was reached on that August night, now nearly four years ago, when she declared war on Germany." He saw the war as "an open conflict between Christian civilisation and scientific barbarism" and declared that not only must Germany be beaten but "she must feel that she is beaten" in order to "deter others from emulating her crime."

Labour problems plagued the production objectives of the Minister of Munitions. In some cases he blamed management. The Government assumed control of the Alliance Aeroplane Works because Churchill disapproved of their labour relations practices. In another case, he argued for conscripting the workers whose strike impeded tank production.

On 8 August the British offensive in France began and Churchill insisted on being present in order to observe the effectiveness of tanks in the battles. East of Amiens he came within a few thousand yards of the front. What he saw convinced him that, despite the apparent inferiority of some British equipment, the tide had turned and victory was inevitable. He returned to Paris where he lived comfortably at the Ritz and met with allied leaders regarding munitions problems. He also visited French Premier Georges Clemenceau, who complained about British manpower shortages. Churchill, for his part, argued against the transfer of manpower from munitions production to the fighting forces. He wanted priority given to tank production. He also wanted to increase the production of airplanes for bombing. "This is the moment to attack the enemy, to carry the war into his own country, to make him feel in his own towns and in his own person something of the havoc he has wrought in France and Belgium. This is the moment to affect his morale, and to harry his hungry and dispirited cities without pause or stay."

On their tenth wedding anniversary Churchill wrote to his wife that "I am very happy to be married to you my darling one, and as the years pass I feel more and more dependent on you and all you give me." He acknowledged the fear she felt about his flying but could not give it up because "it gives me a feeling of tremendous conquest over space."

Throughout the frenetic pace of his work, the poet in Churchill was seldom far below the surface. After quoting some anti-war poetry by Siegfried Sassoon, he expressed the desire to make amends to the novelist and poet for how he had been treated because of his anti-war views. When advised to be careful Churchill replied: "I am not a bit afraid of Siegfried Sassoon. That man can think. I am afraid only of people who cannot think." He later met Sassoon who made the following remarks in his book, Siegfried's Journey: "...To my surprise he seemed interested to hear my point of view ... he evidently wanted me to have it out with him ... for him war was the finest activity on earth. Nevertheless he was making me feel that I should like to have him as my company commander in the front line."

50 YEARS AGO

Quebec and Hyde Park
Third Quarter 1943 • Age 68

As the Allies bombed targets in Sicily in preparation for invasion, Churchill pressed for another meeting with FDR. Churchill knew that this was a propitious moment. In a communication with Roosevelt and Eisenhower, he quoted Shakespeare's Julius Caesar: "There is a tide in the affairs of men Which taken at the flood leads on to fortune ... And we must take
the current when it serves or lose our ventures." The present venture was to get onto the Italian mainland as quickly as possible, with Rome as "the bull’s-eye." Even if the Americans hesitated he was prepared to use British troops, and perhaps Polish troops stationed in Persia, to achieve his objectives in "the soft underbelly." When he learned that General Marshall agreed he responded, "I am with you heart and soul" and he told Smuts that "we all go the same way home."

Notwithstanding their troubles in Italy and the fact that the Allies had won the Battle of the Atlantic, the Germans opened an offensive on the Eastern Front; but it was stopped by mid-July after the great tank battle at Kursk. Churchill's attention was also on the Balkans and the "hardy and hunted guerrillas" of Tito as he prepared to leave for Quebec and a meeting with the American President.

Traveling under the code-name Colonel Warden, Churchill boarded RMS Queen Mary on the Clyde. Despite the attempt at secrecy, large crowds met them at Halifax and at every train stop on the way to Quebec. Churchill's V-sign was extremely popular. The Churchills were accommodated in the Citadel, the residence of the Governor-General of Canada. The remainder of the 200 people in the British party stayed at the Chateau Frontenac Hotel. The conference was not to begin for a few days so Roosevelt invited Churchill to his home in Hyde Park, New York. Leaving his wife in Quebec, Churchill and his daughter visited the Roosevelt home, where they swam and picnicked on hot dogs and hamburgers.

Churchill wanted Brooke and Roosevelt wanted Marshall to command the invasion of Europe. Roosevelt insisted that the position go to an American but eventually he could not bear to be without Marshall in Washington. They agreed that Mountbatten should receive the South-East Asia Command. They also agreed that the atomic bomb would be manufactured in the United States and that they would invite Stalin to meet them, probably in Alaska.

The Quebec conference, code-named Quadrant, began on August 17th. For a break, Churchill, Roosevelt, Hopkins and Harriman visited the Canadian Governor-General's country retreat where they fished and discussed global strategy in a log cabin in the woods. The conference ended on 24 August and a weary Churchill took his family to a fishing camp in the Laurentian mountains for a few days' rest. Anthony Eden noted that the Prime Minister "did not look well and was a bad colour. He said to me that he felt the need for a longer change. I urged him to take it." The mountain air, fishing and shooting the rapids of the Montmorency River revived him.

On his return to Quebec he spoke to the people of Canada where "in mighty lands which have never known the totalitarian tyrannies of Hitler and Mussolini, the spirit of freedom has found a safe and abiding home." Clementine and Mary Churchill also made radio broadcasts from Quebec.

After Quebec, Churchill went to Washington to discuss a tripartite meeting with Stalin. From there he proceeded to Boston where he received an honorary degree from Harvard. John Martin noted that the academic gowned Churchill "looked like a genial Henry VIII." Elizabeth Layton said that Churchill had his Harvard audience "in the palm of his hand. It was one of his very best deliveries." The New York Times said that "he has opened up a vast and hopeful field of discussion. Down the grim corridors of war light begins to show."

The Churchills returned to Washington and then to Hyde Park where they celebrated their thirty-fifth wedding anniversary. Then on to Halifax where they boarded HMS Renown. To the strains of "O Canada" and "Will ye no come back again?" they headed for home. On the Atlantic crossing Mary Churchill celebrated her 21st birthday. She had been received as enthusiastically as had her father by both their Canadian and American friends.

### 25 YEARS AGO

#### The Soames to Paris

**Third Quarter 1968**

Christopher Soames had lost his parliamentary seat in 1966 and was looking for a new constituency when Prime Minister Harold Wilson offered him the position of Ambassador to France.

Although concerned about care for Clementine, in September Mary waved goodbye to her mother and her sister Sarah at Victoria Station and accompanied her husband to his new post in the British Embassy in Paris.

During the next few years Clementine would enjoy many visits to her daughter and Paris, a city she loved.
PROFESSOR CHARMLEY'S REBUTTAL

Your letter (FH #79, p.34) was little more than one expected, and its tenor leads to the conclusion that you are unlikely to afford my corrections equal space with your misrepresentations ("John Charmley's Tabloid Churchill," FH 78). But again, that was expected. Here, complete with reference to your page numbers, is a list of your more egregious mistakes.

1. Page 10: After the elaborate but clumsy sarcasm about "the Great Satan" and, "in case you missed it," you commit the schoolboy howler of mistaking "it" yourself - I refer to Russia and Germany, not, as you imagine, Russia and the US.

2. Page 10: There is no "campaign" and I am certainly not "waging" it from the Memorial. The Chair that I occupy was endowed in memory of the founder of Westminster College.

3. Page 10: Nowhere do I say that Churchill was the "destroyer of Britain's greatness," his misjudgements merely contributed to this process. Nor, despite Alan Clarke's [sic] article, do I state that Churchill should have made "peace" with Hitler. As a friend of mine commented in a letter from Norway recently, "such allegations seem redolent of the worst excesses of tabloid journalism" - quite so.

4. Page 10: "Witnesses" - I did not talk to contemporaries because I have already spoken to many of these for my previous books and have found that far from being "primary" sources, as you seem to imagine, their memories at this distance are irrevocably altered by the post-war Churchill worship. Look at Sir Robert Menzies' memoirs and what he was saying in 1941 if you want a real explanation of why I distrust contemporary reminiscences.

5. Page 10: I fear I must again pick you up on your tabloid antics when you seem to claim that I call myself a Thatcherite Historian. I cannot imagine what one of these is? Could you, pray, enlighten me as it is a phrase you seem to have invented.

6. Page 11: Russo-German War. There are real arguments here, but you don't use them. It is dubious in the extreme to imply that the Allied campaign in Africa made the difference between victory and defeat for the Soviet Union - try reading some real history such as John Erickson's books on the Russian Front. We provided supplies, but the contribution which we made in the western desert did not make all the difference between Russia's success and her failure in the period before Stalingrad (the only time Russia was likely to be defeated). Indeed, one of the origins of the Cold War lies in Stalin's belief that the Western Allies had deliberately avoided opening a proper Second Front until 1944.

7. Page 11: Empire. You don't seem to have a clear argument here beyond a vague liberal belief that "imperialism was doomed" (tell that to the Soviets in 1945). You quote Churchill to the effect that the Empire was a good thing, then say that the British people weren't interested in it - this is not an argument. Baldwin and Chamberlain were not giving away the Empire (another Churchillian canard you swallow whole), they were providing for what was, in effect, a renegotiation of the terms upon which the British held India - as they had done in Egypt. (See Jack Gallagher's important book on the decline, rise and fall of the British Empire, or Carl Bridge on British policy in India in the 1930s). My book, which you had to have read when you wrote your article, makes this clear. It is facile to say that the Empire was already lost. Churchill regarded this sort of talk as weak-minded liberalism, and I am disposed to agree with him.

8. Page 11: Churchill and Labour. It was Churchill's action in taking power with Labour support that allowed Labour to get a toehold on power. It was his action in allowing Labour to run the home front after Chamberlain's death which allowed Labour to consolidate that power. It was Churchill's insistence upon fighting a total war to the bitter end which helped create conditions in which socialism became an "article of faith" - enough said.

9. Pages 11-12: I don't see your point here - no-one argues that Churchill was a reactionary Tory. Was this another attempt by you to erect a straw man?

10. Page 12: Quite enough was known about Stalin to make it clear to all but the willfully deaf that he was as evil as Hitler. Only people like Henry A. Wallace believed otherwise, and I am surprised to see you in that camp. I commend to you Sir Owen O'Malley's comments to Churchill about his Polish policy in January 1944 - of course you'll have to do some work to find them, but it will be good for you.

11. Page 12: "Anti-Americanism." I am amused that like the liberal Leslie Gelb, you fall back on this charge when intellectual argument fails. I am unsure how an academic book can be "anti-American." Can you actually sustain this argument with some references?

12. Pages 12-13: Nazi hegemony. No-one argues that would have been a good thing. What I argue is that the war would have gone much as it did, there was nothing to stop Britain and America from sending supplies to Stalin whether or not they were in the war. Such a course would not only have made Nazi hegemony unlikely, it might have averted the Soviet hegemony which we helped to create.

13. Page 13: It is all very well for you to go on about "fighting and dying," but leaders have an obligation to consider what results might follow from others doing just this (leaders, of course, usually neither fight nor die in the wars they advocate). Chamberlain, the Foreign Office and the Treasury in the 1930s did just that and concluded that Britain could not, in any meaningful sense of the word, "win" another world war. Churchill, with his old fashioned imperialism and his narrow world-view, did not begin this process of thinking ahead until 1945, when, as he told Eden in April (in a passage published in my book) that if America left Europe, Britain would be worse
off than she had been in 1939. Pretty weighty testimony for the view that the war was not, from the British point of view, worth the candle.

Churchill, of course, possessed a greater historical sense than many of his self-proclaimed latter-day admirers. He asked Macmillan in 1943 whether he thought Cromwell was a great man, and when Macmillan replied "yes," Churchill wondered whether historians might not say that in concentrating so much on Britain's ancient enemy, Spain, he had missed the rise of Britain's new foe, France. The analogy is clear to me. Churchill realised that the war had created the conditions in which Communism might come to dominate the world — and he was horrified that America seemed to be content to pull back into isolation. This, of course, was why he came to Fulton.

Your offer of a debate is another example of your addiction to the tabloid style. But since Professor Mahoney is both a scholar and a gentleman, I can at least rest assured that he will have been courteous enough to read a book which even Martin Gilbert admitted "has considerable merit (including the merit of readability)." Perhaps you can learn from these two scholars how gentlemen conduct arguments, and thus apply it to your own, rather blowzy, polemicism.

I do hope that your review, when it appears, is more accurate that your first shot. The main reason for persevering with the attempt to get over my real arguments to you is that I am saddened that one who considers himself a conservative, fails to see how much the war contributed to the fulfillment of FDR's plans to internationalise the New Deal. Most of the things which you deplore about modern society have their origins in the boost given by the war to the "century of the common man," with its unreflective liberalism and politically-correct cant. FDR and many Democrats knew that the war would give a boost to Presidential power, would commit the Congress "infinitely to large state spending programmes, and some Democrats even hoped that the result of American intervention would be to spread their state control and "big government" ideas throughout the world. Real American conservatives like Senator Taft saw what would follow from Roosevelt's policies - and if you care to study his arguments rather than those of a turn-coat liberal like Churchill, you may yet see the light. It is not enough to advocate conservative values, you need a social, political and economic system which is capable of protecting and advancing them. The grave men of my charge against Churchill is that he ended up letting the Democratic agenda prevail.

- JOHN CHARMLEY
FULTON, MO. USA

MR. LANGWORTH
REPLIES

Although the opinions of Leslie Gelb and Alan Clark are no concern of mine, I faithfully publish (again) Mr. Charmley's every word. Considering that we hosted him at our conference, have devoted pages to his words, sell and will review his book, and offered a debate (which I see elicits no enthusiasm), it is bewildering to hear that our actions are "little more than one would expect." Only a little?

The decision to comment on those of his arguments which raised a furor in England (Finest Hour #78), in advance of reviewing his book, was a collective decision by ICS on the grounds of reader interest. Perhaps his outrage that I based my impressions mainly on his lecture stems from his having prepared for same rather more haphazardly than for his book, and encountered objections more substantial than the ones he gets from the "common man" he so abhors. Mr. Charmley says I "desire to tarnish" Westminster College, calls me a "blowy, weak-minded polemicist," and (elsewhere) a purveyor of "expensive tours of Churchill's England." Then he suggests that it is I who must learn "how gentlemen conduct arguments." Well, "the Rt. Hon. gentleman should not generate more indignation than he can contain."

1. I referred to the outcome of the war, not Charmley's alternative scenario, which would imply the Third Reich's survival. (When another journal ran a conjectural piece on Hitler's survival, Charmley wrote in to call it - I kid you not - "a bit of fun.")

2. Professor Charmley writes on Westminster College letterhead. He held interviews from his Fulton office where, to one reporter, he announced that his presence there allowed him to research his sequel at the Eisenhower and Truman libraries — "if Americans are shocked by the Churchill book, he says, 'just wait until they see this next one.'" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 27 January 1993).

3. I am responsible neither for Mr. Alan Clark's interpretations, nor his opinions.

4. Does the lack of "witnesses" in this book then mean Mr. Charmley's earlier books were flawed? Surely he knows that what Menzies said in 1941 or 1948* is as much a "primary source" as a latterday interview. Is it not the duty of historians to quote and evaluate primary sources? (In one evaluation of Churchill his book states, "others believe ..." I looked up the footnote to see who the "others" are, and found ... David Irving. Some witness!) Speaking of which, why is it that an author who pronounces so assuredly on German intent doesn't provide more German sources? I commend him to Herrs Goebbels and Goering, who voiced these same arguments in 1945.


6. I did not say the African campaign alone made the difference. Bolsheviks have long said they won the war singlehanded - couldn't lose after Stalingrad. I don't believe it. (See Djilas, Tolstoy, et. al.) I believe that without UK/US resistance, Hitler's...
Reich would - later than we then thought, yet inevitably - have become the first nuclear power. Speaking of alternative scenarios, imagine that one.

7. Okay, "British Imperialism was dead." I stand by my definition of the Empire as kaput by 1940. "Renegotiating the terms under which Britain held India" is a nice way of explaining what happened to British India in 1947.

8. Had Churchill died in 1939, Labour was still destined to remake Britain in a collectivist image.

9. Churchillophiles sometimes viewWSC as a reactionary Tory. That remark was directed at readers, not Professor Charmley.

10. Repeat: through 1939 Stalin's tyranny was confined to his borders. It is a valid irony that Britain went to war over Poland, which was promptly lost in 1945; but even after 1945 Stalin's foreign policy was comparatively non-aggressive.

11. I wrote of "implied anti-Americanism," which seems clear enough. One of Mr. Charmley's chief accusations is that Churchill made Britain dependent on the USA. There are worse things than that, as Churchill said: "If we stopped fighting, you would soon find out."

12. To say the Allies could have supplied Stalin without warring with Hitler, given what the U-boats were doing to shipping bound for Russia, seems insupportable. It was the U-boat campaign that caused American entry into World War I, for example.

13. Those who served in the forces understand something of this subject. Churchill aged 66 was ready to go down "choking in his own blood"; so were his countrymen, at least those I've talked to. I commend Mr. Charmley to The Second World War - he won't even have to do some work to find it.

I read with sympathy Mr. Charmley's paens to Senator Taft: dear Bob Taft, who was always good for 20% of the vote. The universal franchise - that is the trouble! 0 for the eighteenth century, when landed males reigned supreme and electors were 5% of the populace. I wonder if, with my usual luck, I would have been born into the 5% like Squire Charmley.

It is fair to mention that these issues involve fewer than fifty pages of "Churchill: The End of Glory," which is a critical biography covering 1874-1945. I find the book itself (reviewed by Professors Schoenfeld and Arnn next issue) interesting, and its said arguments unconvincing. Those remind me of the self-flagellating Newthink in which the West has wallowed for thirty years, in headlong flight from bedrock morals, principles and responsibility - which Churchill, whose libertarian impulse transcended political expediency, would deplore. But this is another world. In the name of equality we discriminate. In the name of the environment we squander resources. In the name of education we miseducate. In the name of free speech we broadcast enemy propaganda in wartime. Under the circumstances, it is scarcely surprising to find someone defending the appeasement of Nazis in the name of conservatism.

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

* "Years afterwards, in 1948, I made a remark to Winston ... 'You realize,' I said, 'that five years after your death ... clever young men will be writing books explaining that you were never right about anything!' 'Oh,' he said in a friendly grumble, 'you think so, do you?' I retorted that, as he himself was an historian who had felt called upon to restore the reputation of the great Marlborough, he knew that such things could and would happen. 'But!' I added, 'not many years later, the clever young men will have been forgotten, and your name will be seen clearly at the pinnacle.'"

SIR ROBERT MENZIES

NEXT NEXT GENERATION

After writing a report on Sir Winston Churchill I really admire him. I am twelve years old. I would like to receive a free brochure.

KARAN JAIN, PHILADELPHIA, PA. USA

We sent Mr. Jain a copy of Marsh's 'Young Winston Churchill" along with many ICS publications and a special application marked only five dollars. Our regular student rate is $15/£10, but at this age we like to offer a bonus; we are pleased to say he is not our only twelve-year-old.

NO "THE" IN MAGNA CHARTA

I have enjoyed perusing the first Finest Hour I have ever seen (Second Quarter 1993, No. 79). I winced, however, to see "Magna Carta" preceded by "the" (p. 14).

While studying in England, I learned immediately that monarchs were never coronated, only crowned; that "lifestyle" and "comedic" were "nasty bits of jargon"; and that one never, ever wrote "the Magna Carta," but simply "Magna Carta." The student who broke such rules invited scathing evaluations of his or her essay. Aloud. One does not forget.

Thank you for creating an interesting and inviting magazine.

MANDY MARVIN, VIENNA, VA., USA

We looked up Magna Carta in the English-Speaking Peoples, and sure enough, Churchill never preceded it with the article. We tend to wonder if this isn't a Britishism, because it would seem perfectly proper to say "the Great Charter." Britons often shun articles, as in "going to hospital." Which is where I shall go if I'm ever coronated ... Ed.

THE BULL & THE DURBAN SPEECH

No doubt on some occasion I saw the bull's head at Chartwell (FH #79, p29) but somehow it failed to register. What a pleasure to have an ICS member with a camera, memory and intelligence! It's a rare combination. Please thank Douglas Cairns. I've typed the two speeches made by WSC on his arrival at Durban and photocopied the page from The Natal Mercury of Monday 25 December 1899. Certainly use it in FH should you wish. (We will. -Ed.)

L.L. THOMAS, EMSWORTH, HANTS., UK
INTERNATIONAL CHURCHILL SOCIETIES 25TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE
MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON DC, NOVEMBER 5th-8th, 1993
"Statecraft, Leadership and the Churchill Model"
Honorary Chairwoman: Senator Barbara Boxer • Honorary Chairman: The Hon. Jack F. Kemp

FRIDAY 5 NOVEMBER
8:30AM-6PM: Registration-coffee-exhibits, Cabinet Room
9AM-3:30PM: Hillwood Mansion Tour (2 groups AM-PM)
1:30-4:30: "Churchill as Commander in Chief," Papers:
•Prof. Ray Callahan: Churchill & the British Army
•Prof. Eliot Cohen: Churchill and His Generals in WW2
•Prof. Warren Kimball: Churchill and the Americans

SATURDAY 6 NOVEMBER
8:30AM-5PM: Registration and exhibits
9-10:30AM: General ICS Membership Meeting
10:45-11:45AM: Student Presentations, State Room
1:30-2:30PM: National Cathedral & Churchill Porch tour
3:00-5:15PM: "Churchill as Political Strategist" Papers:
•Prof. Keith Alldritt: Churchill the Easterner in WW1
•Prof. Kirk Emmert: Churchill, Chamberlain & Munich
•Prof. Manfred Weidhorn: Misjudging History
6:30-7:30PM: Dinner Reception, Cabinet & Chinese Rooms
7:30-10:30PM: Dinner and Keynote Speech, Grand Ballroom: Winston S. Churchill, MP

SUNDAY 7 NOVEMBER
9AM-4:30PM: Exhibits continue, Cabinet Room
10:45-4:30PM: General ICS Membership Meeting
10:45AM-Noon: Navy Chapel reenacts services aboard HMS Prince of Wales with Roosevelt and Churchill, Argentia Bay, August 1941. ("I chose the hymns myself...It was a great hour to live. Nearly half those who sang were soon to die." -WSC)
2:00-4PM: Churchill Pursuits. Dr. Cyril Mazansky: Great Contemporaries, A Cigarette Card Panorama
Dr. Frederick Woods: Bibliographic Workshop
6PM-7PM: Dinner Reception, Chinese and Cabinet Rooms
7:30-10:30PM: Dinner and Addresses, Grand Ballroom: The Hon. Jack Kemp, and Others

MONDAY 8 NOVEMBER
8:30AM-10:30AM: ICS Breakfast, East Room
11:30AM-2:15PM: Tour of US Holocaust Memorial Museum
2:30-4:30PM: Lecture at the Museum by Martin Gilbert: "Churchill and the Holocaust: A New Perspective"
7:00-9:00PM: Capital City Tour
9:00-10:00PM: Lincoln Memorial closing ceremonies: "Churchill and Lincoln" by James C. Humes; the Gettysburg Address recited by Robert Hardy, CBE; Second Inaugural Address recited by James W. Muller: "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" sung by Amb. Alan Keyes

REGISTER NOW IF YOU HAVEN'T ALREADY!
Registrations were posted prior to this issue and should be in your hands. If not, you may register over the telephone with, or write to: James Johnson, 24595 Sequoia San Jose Rd, Los Gatos CA 95030 USA, telephone (408) 353-2103

REGISTERED (To Date):

GRATEFUL THANKS TO OUR DONORS (To Date):
Benefactors: Jefferson & Shirley Graves, Ambassador John Loeb, Jr.
Patrons: Michael W. Michelson
Supporters: Gerald M. Kirke, William C. Robinson, Saul P. Steinberg
Friends: Ronald D. Abramson, Mr. & Mrs. Walker B. Comegys, William C. Ives, The Hon. & Mrs. Proctor Jones, Richard & Ruth Lavine, Earl & Charlotte Nicholson
Sponsors: Dr. James S. Benedict, James P. Bennett, Mr. & Mrs. William N. Boyce, Drs. Ruth & Martin Cousineau, Clark W. Fetridge, Edward R. Flenz, Mollie Frank-Jones, Harry J. Hart, James H. Heineman, Jon & Sharon Holtzman, Ronald & Margaret Lebowitz, Terrence Leveck, J. Wm. Lovelace, Michael McMenamin, Marvin & DeEtta Nicely, Amb. Paul H. Robinson, Hon. George P. Schultz, Jonah & Ellen Triebwasser, Dr. William G. Underhill, Kathleen & John Utz, Edward C. Wilson, Jr., Dr. H. William Winstanley, John D. Woods, Sr.