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Dr. Youv Tenenbaum

BOOKS, ARTS & CURIOSITIES:
35 Paul Addison calls The Personal Letters of The
Churchills “an inside story of a marriage that was also a
great political partnership,” while its editor, Lady
Soames, selects her favourite letters....Alfred James has
indexed all Churchill entries in Hansard....A biography
of Sir Edward Spears is noted by Philip Aspden....Till
Kenziel finds a bio of an “Exemplarische Gegenspieler”
....Richard Langworth calls Payne’s The Great Man “A
Real Payne”....Churchill Online offers the “Rules of
Listserv Winston” and why WSC did not sink RMS
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helping of Churchilltrivia.
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Our covers this issue are a Heraldic Feast...
Cover: The Coat of Arms of Sir Winston Leonard
Spencer Churchill, drawn by Charles Lusted, late
of the College of Arms, London. (Collection Max
Kleinman.) We are all generally familiar with this
device, but what is it saying to us? Paul
Courtenay, a member of the Heraldry Society and
Hon. Secretary of ICS UK, explains on page 22.

Back Cover: The Coat of Arms of USS Winston
S. Churchill (DDG 81), the new guided missile
destroyer, launched at Bath, Maine on 17 April
before a crowd of 8000. Story on page 10.
TR, WSC AND ARL

I read *Finest Hour* 100 and encountered on page 46 the piece about Theodore Roosevelt’s view of Churchill. I once asked Alice Roosevelt Longworth why her father disliked Winston Churchill so much. She replied, “Because they were so much alike.”

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER JR., NEW YORK CITY

BALDWIN: “A RESPECTFUL SALUTE”

With the greatest respect to you and Sir Martin Gilbert I was dismayed that you wrote, “in the end [Churchill] did not grant forgiveness” to Baldwin (FH 101, “How Churchill Saw Others”). This view was based on a letter quoted by Sir Martin (In Search of Churchill, p. 106) in which Churchill wrote to an unnamed recipient, “I wish Stanley Baldwin no ill, but it would have been much better had he never lived.” This was surely a private letter intended only for its recipient, and not for publication.

I will cite opposing evidence, from H. Montgomery Hyde’s biography of Baldwin (Hart-Davis MacGibbon 1973) to show that this letter was not truly representative. Their meeting at Downing Street, which you mention, lasted three hours and “happily put an end to their previously strained relations” (Hyde, pp. 553-54). After Baldwin’s death in 1947, when a public appeal for a memorial near his home was undersubscribed, Churchill generously made up the difference (Hyde, p. 564). At the ceremony when he handed the memorial deeds to the trustees, he said, “As the years roll by and the perspective of history lengthens and reduces so many of our disputes to their due proportion, there will be many who will not pass this place without giving their respectful salute.”

DEPREK LUKIN JOHNSTON, VANCOUVER, B.C.

Editor’s Response: Baldwin’s biographer could not have known what Churchill wrote privately of Baldwin. Churchill’s generosity toward Baldwin’s memorial and his public remarks are very typical of him; I suppose what we conclude about Churchill’s true feeling depends on whether we credit what he said in public more than what he said in private.

CHURCHILL MEMORIAL

We just completed a full weekend of Churchill Fellows/Kemper Lecture activities with gatherings in St. Louis, Fulton, and Kansas City featuring P.M.H. Bell (Senior Research Fellow from Liverpool University) who spoke about Winston Churchill’s policy toward France and Charles de Gaulle during World War II and Lady Soames, who spoke about the development of her latest book, *Winston and Clementine: The Personal Letters of the Churchills*. We very much enjoyed having Jim Muller join us on Sunday 21 March here in Fulton, and speaking at the luncheon in order to bring us up to date on Churchill Center activities. I enjoyed meeting you at Williamsburg and hope we can work together to mutual benefit and interest.

GORDON DAVIS, DIRECTOR
CHURCHILL MEMORIAL & LIBRARY, FULTON, MO.

CHURCHILL’S SOUTH AFRICA

I am pleased to hear of Celia Sandys’s tour of South Africa. I remember touring some of the preserved battlefields of the Boer War, including the outline of the trenches, etc., when I was in my early 20s. Some of them were in remote areas and I took with me a memorable book about the Boer War, *Good Bye Dolly Gray*. In those days (1971) I was able to travel alone and wander round these historic sites, most of which were off the beaten track.

ROBIN LINKE, ICS AUSTRALIA, WEMBLEY, WA.

YOU CAN PLEASE SOME OF THE PEOPLE SOME OF THE TIME....

I am sure that you and Barbara have been inundated with congratulations on the 100th edition of *Finest Hour*. It gives me pleasure to add my thanks and congratulations. The concept and layout did full justice to a uniquely challenging occasion, a landmark in the history of The Churchill Center and Societies. I found the concept utterly compelling: a scrupulous and exciting retracking of growth from small beginnings expertly blended with a fascinating and convincing display of Churchill’s many-sided genius. In the years ahead *FH* 100 will help confound ill-informed critics and inspire every believer serving the cause. Another advantage is that newcomers, given the opportunity to study it, will readily realize the lasting importance of carrying the flag boldly forward. I am greatly indebted to you for your constant encouragement and generous reference to my efforts.

RON CYNHEWUFB. ROBBINS, VICTORIA, B.C.

...BUT NOT ALL THE PEOPLE (ETC.)

It dismays me to hear some of the stuff being pumped out about Churchill in certain British schools and colleges nowadays, but that young fellow from Texas ("The First Time I WSC'd....", *FH* 101), who is I fear far from alone in his obtuseness, is planting some equally offbeat, albeit opposite, notions. Churchill’s proper place in history will not be secured if these bigoted so-called experts go around attracting ridicule through promoting him as some kind of deity. *FH* should have no truck with them. Such absurd notions do more harm to the cause than the “Thoughts of Chairman Charmley.” There are and always will be Churchill critics. Counter them by all means by wheeling out all the enlightened Churchill apologists you can continued on page 6.
DATELINES

QUOTE OF THE SEASON

"Nations who are bound by the Covenant can never, however powerful they may be, menace the peace and independence of any other state. That is the essence of the conditions which bring them together. To form a war combination against a single state would be a crime. To form a combination for mutual defence against a probable aggressor is not only no crime, but the highest moral duty and virtue."

WSC, FREE TRADE HALL, MANCHESTER, 9 MAY 1938

HEAR, HEAR...
WASHINGTON, MAY 3RD—Winston S. Churchill sparrowed over NATO operations in Yugoslavia with highly decorated retired Army Colonel David Hackworth on Chris Matthews's "Hardball" on CNBC. Our honorary member said, "there can be no substitute for victory; NATO cannot afford to fail." He called the present policy of air strikes without planning for a follow-up ground force "catastrophic." Said Churchill: "...if the United States, the largest superpower today, and her 18 NATO allies can't deal with a two-bit dictator in the Balkans and take over a country the size of greater Los Angeles, we might as well pack up the NATO alliance." Unfortunately Hackworth saw fit to swat at Churchill's grandfather at the end saying Kosovo had been screwed up "the same way your grandfather screwed up the Dardanelles." Chris Matthews cut him off: "Churchill is the greatest man this century. I won't stand for any cheap shots against him." Well said, Chris. You receive Finest Hour's Oscar for "keeping the memory green and the record accurate." Very few of these are awarded.

NOMINATIONS TIME
NEW YORK, MAY 10TH—Time magazine is actively soliciting nominations for "the remarkable person who, for better or worse, has had the most profound impact on the events of the past 100 years." We have been working with Time on Churchill nominations. The first, published in the May 10th issue, was by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu (see page 51).

While we have little interest in popularity polls, the attendant publicity should

"He launched the lifeboats":
The cover of Time, 2 January 1950

our candidate receive this accolade will benefit all projects Churchill. We therefore strongly urge our readers to formulate their own letters.

There is a word limit on letters Time will publish. They prefer no more than 180 words in three to five sentences. Anything longer will not be accepted or may be edited out of recognition. We offer you our services in suggesting edits or condensations that will put your letter in contention. Feel free to communicate, preferably by email: malandra@conknet.com.

Nomination letters should be sent to Person of the Century, Time Magazine Letters, Time & Life Building, Rockefeller Center, New York NY 10020 or emailed to letters@time.com.

STRATEGY: One good argument with

Time was suggested by Ronald Cohen in a recent letter to Finest Hour. In 1950, Ron reminded us, Time named Churchill its "Man of the Half-Century"—ahead of Einstein, the other main contender, saying Churchill "launched the lifeboats."

Presuming that Time should not reצל visit their decision for 1900-1950, Ron continued, the question becomes who, if anyone, surpassed Churchill's achievement during 1950-2000. Well...by 1950, both Roosevelts had completed their contributions, while WSC still had another Administration and his History of the English-Speaking Peoples to deliver, not to mention his efforts for peace at the summit and his prediction of the demise of the Soviet Union.

A related angle: William Rusher, speaking to our 1996 Conference, mentioned the sheer breadth of Churchill's prominence—over fifty years. For most statesmen, indeed anyone, twenty years is a stellar achievement. Consider that FDR had only thirteen years at the summit.

Finally, lest anyone believe that Churchill altered only the fortunes of Europeans and North Americans, consider what would have happened had Japan continued to possess much of China, Southeast Asia and the Pacific as part of the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. While Churchill had a limited role in the Pacific War, that war was brought to a successful conclusion because the Allies adopted the correct policy of settling the Hitler war first. This could not have been prosecuted as quickly as it was had Britain surrendered or reached an accommodation with Hitler in 1940.

continued on page 7...
muster. Let there be vigorous, informed and healthy debate. But Churchill deifiers are simply bad news with which you should not put. Pragmatic Brits will treat them with the contempt they deserve, and by giving them any kind of encouragement FH probably damages its own credibility.

DOUGLAS HALL, GRANTHAM, LINCS., UK

IGNORANT FAN CLUB
I am glad to see you’ve been giving “Churchilliana” a period of “benign neglect” lately. Nothing leaves us more open to charges of derision of a very human being, or serving as an ignorant fan club, than page after page of kewpie dolls and toby jugs in the image (most of them pretty dreadful) of the Great Man. Give it a rest!

JAMES WARREN, NEW YORK CITY

GANGING UP
I find your glorification of Churchill quite disgusting. It is typical British/American arrogance to ignore the outcome of WW2 for the peoples of Eastern Europe, not to speak of the Germans. Churchill knew from the beginning about the terrible fate of the Russians and many other East European peoples under Bolshevik dictatorship. He obviously didn’t care. He was obsessed with anti-German hatred. Knowing the fact that he bombed German cities, killing thousands of civilians long before the Germans were retaliating, makes him in my opinion even worse than Hitler. Why at all did he go into alliance with Stalin against the Germans? That is his crime and the recognition of it will come.

HELMUT WILD <comite6@ips.net>

Reader response (via Internet): Seems like we need to check our WW2 timeline: Who occupied the Rhineland in violation of Versailles in March 1936? What was the March 1938 Anschluss about? What about March 1939 and the absorption of all those German-speaking Bohemians, Moravians and Slovaks into the Reich? Last I looked it was Berlin, not London, which initially sided with Moscow; August 1939 comes to mind. As for unprovoked bombing, places like Guernica, Warsaw, Rotterdam and East London were all hit before the RAF had dropped a single bomb on the peace-loving Reich. Indeed, a man who has been singularly demeaned as an agent of peace in a time of war, Neville Chamberlain, would only go so far in 1939 as to drop pamphlets out of airplanes over Germany. When someone in the House of Commons asked why only paper was being dropped on Germany, a government spokesman answered, “Don’t be absurd, that would be destruction of private property.” Apparently Goering had no such reservations on this matter. General William Sherman said “war is hell” in 1864, and nothing has changed. If you start a World War, you’d better be able to finish it, or sooner or later expect quite a few bombs over your own skies.

-Bob Caputi

Editor’s response: It is a legitimate criticism that Churchill ignored Stalin in his obsession with Hitler, and arguments to that end are not coming out, they’ve been out—for up to thirty years. But the notions that he (1) hated Germans in general and (2) was obsessed with Hitler are mutually exclusive. If he hated all Germans, excluding in 1946 that the only way to salvage Europe was through rapprochement between France and Germany was an odd way to express it. If you are seriously interested in understanding, consider several articles we have published. These express differing views, which is what we are about: “Churchill and the Baltic” (FH 53, 54); a review of Christopher Harman’s book, Are We Beasts? Churchill and the Moral Question of World War II Area Bombing, (FH 76); and two articles in Churchill Proceedings 1994-1995: “Churchill, Roosevelt and Eastern Europe,” by Warren Kimball and “The Best He Could Do in the Situation That Prevailed,” by Larry Arnn.

SCOTTISH DEVOLUTION
“Churchill Online” (FH 101) discussed “banter” that occurred over this matter. I was one of those engaged and I believe my opinion has been misrepresented. I did not state, or mean to infer, that Churchill opposed the potential establishment of regional parliaments or even a Scottish parliament, in theory. A break-up of the UK is another matter entirely; which, I believe, would appall him. Whether or not such a potential break-up can be laid at the door of Margaret Thatcher, as Professor Addison asserts, is a more debatable point. Academics tend to blame Mrs. Thatcher and her American counterpart, Ronald Reagan, for just about every calamity under the sun.

Churchill’s comments on regional parliaments were made when he was a Liberal MP for Dundee in Scotland and hoping to keep Ireland in the union. He does not appear to have shown much interest in this matter later. But quoting Churchill on anything is like quoting the Bible in terms of variety and depth and does not necessarily make the point. This is due to his nearly six decades in public service, including numerous cabinet positions, prolific pen and tongue, two world wars, a cold war, and two changes in party affiliation! I remain unconvinced that Churchill’s support of regional parliaments within the United Kingdom was ever anything more than theoretical.

WILLIAM J. SHEPHERD, CROFTON, M.D., USA

I agree that there is a clear distinction between the creation of a federal system and the break-up of the Union. Churchill’s thinking in the early part of this century—and again I agree it was just thinking—seems to have revolved around the possibility of an Imperial Parliament at Westminster with subsidiary regional parliaments in Ireland, Scotland, Wales and possibly even parts of England. He was clearly influenced by the need to solve the Irish question, and also possibly by the fact that he was a Scottish MP. He was also clearly aware of the flaws and dangers inherent in his own plan.

In general, I am sure it is correct to assert that Churchill would have been opposed to full Scottish independence. He would have seen it in the same light as the loss of Empire, as a further weakening of Britain in the modern world. But that is not to say that he did not toy with Scottish nationalism when it suited his own political agenda. At Edinburgh in 1950 he announced that no-one would be able to blame Scotland for breaking away from England if the latter became an “absolute socialist state.”

ALLEN PACKWOOD, CHURCHILL ARCHIVES CENTRE
CHURCHILL COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

William Shepherd is quite right to stress that it’s always difficult to define Churchill’s position on some issues, since he took different positions in different phases of his career. He and Allen Packwood also underline the key distinction between federal devolution within the UK, which Churchill in principle supported in the period just before the First World War as a means of binding the UK together and removing the Irish question from party politics; and the break-up of the UK, which he would surely have regarded as a disaster.

As we mustn’t have too much agreement, I stick to the point that the Blair government’s view of the Scottish question is very much in line with Churchill’s view of the Irish question, namely that Home Rule is the best antidote to separatism. We’ll never know whether Churchill was right about Ireland, but we’ll find out eventually whether Blair is right about Scotland.

PROF. PAUL ADDISON, UNIV. OF EDINBURGH #
THE CHURCHILL CALENDAR

All postages welcome; owing to our quarterly schedule, we need copy at least three months in advance.

1999

26 July-8 August: "Churchill's South Africa" Tour, Cape Town to Pretoria (sold out)
3 September: "Churchill and the Second World War" panel/dinner,

American Political Science Association Convention, Atlanta, Ga.

24-26 September: Theme Conference, "Churchill & Eisenhower at Gettysburg,"

26-28th: Churchill Center Board of Governors Meeting, Gettysburg, Penna.

18 October: Publication of Churchill War Papers 3: "The Ever-Widening War, 1941"

2000

14-17 September: Seventeenth Intl. Churchill Conference, Anchorage, Alaska

2001

14 February: Centenary of Winston Churchill's Entry into Parliament
Spring: Theme Conference: "Churchill and Intelligence"

Autumn: Eighteenth International Churchill Conference, Ottawa, Ontario

2002

Spring: Nineteenth International Churchill Conference, London

Spring: Ninth International Churchill Tour, England

2003

Spring: Student Seminar, Quebec City

Autumn: Twentieth International Churchill Conference, Hamilton, Bermuda

4-8 December: 50th Anniversary of the Bermuda Conference

WELSH MEMORIES

DALLAS—CC member Nathan Hughes has published Reminiscences of Wales 1924-1941, a spiral bound work describing his Welsh youth. There are several mentions of Winston Churchill in his chapters describing life during the Second World War in a small village in Wales. Nathan offers copies to members at $28.50 postpaid from him at PO Box 830427, Richardson TX 75083-0427.

DAVID NOSS

HOMENY, OKLAHOMA, MARCH 16TH—Longtime member and supporter David Noss died today aged 65. A native of Oklahoma, David was an attorney and rancher. Carol, his wife of 27 years, tells us he still had many books he wanted to read by and about Churchill. She requested donations in lieu of flowers to two charities, of which the Churchill Center was one. We thank her for her thoughts at this grievous time and join her in mourning for our friend David.

EMPTY MONTY

LONDON—Recently released documents reveal that British commanders, including Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery,
LOCAL & NATIONAL

Edinburgh

Members may be interested in a new and exciting programme of cultural holidays in Edinburgh this summer with a Churchill theme, introduced by the University of Edinburgh in association with its Centre for Second World War Studies. For a week, you can sign up for a course entitled "Churchills at War," a unique and stimulating look at the Churchill family during the Second World War that explores how the dynamics of its family life interacted with the strains and stresses of war, giving an unusual human dimension to the Churchill wartime story.

The course leader will be Dr. Paul Addison, a distinguished academic adviser to The Churchill Center, author of the Farrow Award-winning Churchill on the Home Front, and Director of the Centre for Second World War Studies.

Morning lectures and discussion will be followed in afternoons and evenings by a programme of tours and cultural visits to such places as Lochnadow and St. Andrews. Accommodation will be in Salisbury Green, a baronial residence in the shadow of Arthur's Seat, and all meals are provided. This course runs for the week of 1-7 August, and will be repeated for 8-14 August, immediately prior to the opening of the Edinburgh International Festival.

Two other courses will run simultaneously, also in association with the Centre for Second World War Studies. "Behind Enemy Lines" will explore the heroes and heroines of the shadow war in occupied countries, and will be given by Dr. David Stafford, author of Churchill and Secret Service and other books on wartime intelligence. Like Dr. Addison, Dr. Stafford is a member of ICS UK and has spoken at International Churchill Conferences. "Remembering the Home Front," the third course, will be given by Dr. Diana Henderson, a military historian who served for over thirty years in the Territorial Army and is Research Director of the Scots at War Trust. As Scotland enters a new era with the creation of a Scottish Parliament, it will provide a timely insight into life in Scotland during the Second World War. ICS United Kingdom is pleased that two of its most prominent scholars are helping produce the course.

For further information and a booking form please apply direct to Claire Collins, Classic Cultural Breaks, The University of Edinburgh, St. Leonard's Hall, Pollack Halls of Residence, 18 Holyrood Park Road, Edinburgh EH16 5AY, Scotland, UK. Telephone: (44) 131-651-2189 Fax: (44) 131-667-7271. Email: Claire.Collins@ed.ac.uk

ERRATUM, FH 101
Churchill did not say of Admiral Jellicoe, "He was the only man who could lose the war in an afternoon," rather he said, "He was the only man who could have lost the war in an afternoon," which of course he did not. The former implies a defeat, while the latter statement refers to the great job by Admiral Jellicoe to keep the German fleet bottled up. (See his son's talk at Kirkwall, Orkney, Churchill Proceedings 1994-1995 page 10). - Curt Zoller

Dallas

FEBRUARY 11TH—Churchill Center members and the Dallas Branch of the English-Speaking Union held a joint meeting tonight at Northwood Country Club. The speaker was Dr. James Hopkins, Professor of History at Southern Methodist University, who introduced his newly published book Into the Fire: The British in the Spanish Civil War (Stanford University Press, 1998).

Dr. Hopkins described his research of archives in Britain, Russia and Spain, which allowed the voices of British Volunteers to be added to his book, and gave a fascinating interpretation of Churchill's loss to Attlee in 1945. While admitting that many factors contributed to Attlee's triumph, he noted that Attlee, along with Labour's International Solidarity Fund and the Dependent's Aid Committee, had supported the British volunteers in the International Brigade. By contrast, Churchill had argued against intervention on the side of the Republic since he felt that its victory would imperil British economic interests and threaten the Empire. Many Labour members remembered Churchill's support of Mussolini in a speech in Rome in 1927. Hopkins cited A. J. P. Taylor, the British historian who said, "At the time of the Spanish Civil War, Churchill failed to become the champion of democracy against Fascism as many British people wanted."

AROUND AND ABOUT

Noted American columnist David Broder in The Washington Post for May 9th: "The nation and the world are learning what it means for the United States to conduct a war with a weak-kneed Congress and a wobbly president...If Kosovo ends as badly as it might, historians will remember [Arizona Senator John] McCain's Churchillian warning: 'If we cannot keep our word to prevail over this inferior power that threatens our interests and our most cherished ideals, then it is unlikely that we will long know a real peace.' But this is not a Churchillian moment—at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue".....Lord Jenkins, who addressed us in 1994 on "Churchill from across the Aisle" (see 1994-1995 Proceedings), is proposing to add Churchill to his celebrated line of biographies, which includes Gladstone, Attlee, Asquith and Baldwin....Churchill despaired atom bomb scientist Nils Bohr, recently released secret papers reveal; WSC thought Bohr's views of atomic catastrophe alarmist, and simply didn't like the man....R.I.P.; Wing Cdr Ronald Kellett, who commanded Polish airmen of 303 Squadron (highest scoring fighter squadron in Battle of Britain with 113 "kills") died aged 89; Captain John Mott, IVO, sub-lieutenant aboard the cruiser Exeter in historic 1939 battle with the Graf Spee, has died aged 81....12,000 acre Langholm Moor, one of Churchill's favourite grouse moors, is to be shut down owing to shortage of grouse caused by protected birds of prey—not good news for rural John Bulls....
Churchill's attitude later changed, as the book goes on to elaborate.

An interesting question and answer period followed with Nathan Hughes presenting the speaker with a complimentary membership in The Churchill Center.

CHANDOR EXHIBIT

WETHERFORD, TEXAS, APRIL 24TH—Commencing today and through June 27th, an exhibit entitled "Chandor's Art and Gardens" will be open to the public at Chandor Gardens here and several of Chandor's portraits of Winston Churchill will be on display. (Chandor's art was the subject of a feature in Finest Hour '74, along with proofs for his incomplete "Big Three at Yalta" painting and his famous painting of Churchill in RAF uniform, which now hangs at the National Portrait Gallery in Washington.)

New England

BOSTON, MAY 6TH—At the invitation of CC and Athenaenaeum member Dick Leahy, Richard Langworth, editor of Finest Hour, spoke tonight before a capacity audience of 250 at the Boston Athenaenaeum on "Winston Churchill: The Art of the Statesman-Writer." Accompanied by slide illustrations, Langworth outlined Churchill's literary career and how he went about writing. He then discussed three Churchill books: The River War, The World Crisis and My Early Life, Churchill's article "If Lee Had Not Won the Battle of Gettysburg"; and WSC's short story, The Dream, reading brief excerpts from his favorite passages. A lively Q&A session followed in which the Editor in chief failed to muffle a question, which Dick Leahy said made the evening. The talk was repeated May 27th at the Hopkinton (NH) Town Library. Both were delightful experiences for the Editor. The text (minus the "Lee" story, which runs in full in our next issue) is published as an article in this issue. -Michael Richards

Tennessee

MACKENZIE, TENN., APRIL 15TH—John David Marshall of Murfreesboro, longtime member and bibliophile, delivered the 1999 Holmes Lecture at Bethel College's Dickey Fine Arts Building. His subject was "The Wit and Wisdom of Sir Winston Churchill." University Bibliographer and Professor Emeritus at Middle Ten-nessee State University, J.D. was elected a Churchill Fellow of Westminster College in 1982. He is the author or editor of eighteen books on history and literature.

Speakers' Bureau

FT. LAUDERDALE, MARCH 5TH—Douglas Russell reported to the CC Board of Governors that arrangements are complete to start a Churchill Speakers' Bureau and details will be in place shortly.

Established speakers will be available to address CC or ICS meetings for expenses only, their schedules permitting. Speakers include but are not limited to:

- Dr. John H. Mather: "Physical and Health Factors in Churchill's History," including Marlborough, Lord Randolph, WSC.

For details, or to offer your services, contact Mr. Russell, Treasurer, Churchill Center (see page 2).

Coming up: Atlanta, Ga.

SEPTEMBER 3RD NEXT—The Churchill Center will sponsor a panel, "Churchill and the Second World War," at the American Political Science Association meeting in Atlanta, which is on September 3, 1999 at the Atlanta Marriott Marquis and the Atlanta Hilton. Papers will be presented by Professors Robert Eden of Hillsdale College, John Ramsden of Queen Mary and Westminster College, and James W. Muller of the University of Alaska Anchorage. The discussant will be Dean Raymond A. Callahan of the University of Delaware, returning for this event to scholarship from the rigor of academic administration.

The panel will be held from 1:30 to 3:15 PM. It will be accompanied by a Churchill Center dinner, with Professor John Ramsden speaking on "Churchill and the English-Speaking Peoples." The dinner will be at the Commonwealth Club, 34 Broad St., NW. The time is 8:00 PM. Cost is $60 including wine (The panel discussion is free.) For reservations, telephone The Churchill Center at (888) WSC-1874 after August 1st.
OLD VICTORY’S PRIDE
USS WINSTON S. CHURCHILL DDG 81

“On behalf of the United Kingdom, and in memory of my father,
I wish you fair winds and following seas.” -DAME MARY, THE LADY SOAMES

Bath, Maine, April 17th—The christening and launch of the U.S. Navy guided missile destroyer Winston S. Churchill (DDG 81), before 8000 onlookers at Bath Iron Works, had everything its namesake unabashedly enjoyed: military bands playing British and American airs, a platform full of notables quoting his words, intermingled uniforms of U.S. and Royal Navy officers. Many of them, including the Churchill’s Commanding Officer, were wearing little pins with a crossed Stars and Stripes and White Ensign. It seemed as much a joint celebration as anything since 1941 in Argentia Bay, where sailors of these same two navies joined for divine services on HMS Prince of Wales. In the words of Churchill, writing about that time, “it was a great hour to live.”

Mistaking our mood, a non-participant suggested, “It was clear you were highly excited about the event.” “Highly exhausted” would be more accurate. Preparing for our little role in events involved months of communications, plans and counter-plans between the shipyard, two navies and two capitals, which in the end was so very rewarding. We provided photographs and a 1200-word Churchill biography for the programme, a special first day cover to mark the event (thanks, Dave Marcus), new Churchill Center windshirts to wear on the day (now selling fast; order yours from Churchill Stores). We headed off a rival Champagne company and made sure the bubbly broken on the hull was Sir Winston’s favorite, Pol Roger. On behalf of the Churchill Center and Societies and the Easton Press, we presented leatherbound editions of The World Crisis and The Second World War for the ship’s library. And John Plumptre is working to establish links between our website and the USS Winston S. Churchill.

We are grateful to CC member Fred Koch of Maine, for keeping us informed through every stage of the ship’s construction; and to ICS UK member Armindo Valori, who a year ago urged us to add Sir Winston’s middle initial to the ship’s name—which proved more complicated than buying an extra letter for the stern! We passed Mr. Valori’s letter to Amb. Robinson, who passed it to the Secretary of the Navy, who asked Lady Soames, who endorsed it. After the launch she wrote: “Thanks so much for the very important ‘S,’ which I wouldn’t have thought of, but which is absolutely right.”

Churchill Center Associates Fred and Martha Hardman were among the sizeable delegation of CC and ICS members. “We decided to take along our 11-year-old son, even though he would miss two days of school,” Fred writes. “But that was the smart thing to do. He has learned much from our Churchill travels over the years and he will therefore have an advantage that few other young people will have. The ceremony started on time with an introduction by Alan Cameron, President of Bath Iron Works. The ship was magnificent and bigger than I expected: about 500 feet long.”

Speakers at the flag-bedecked dais included U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen, who iced the cake by announcing, in a spur-of-the-moment decision, that a Royal Navy officer will be permanently assigned to the Churchill, raising the officer complement to twenty-four; we have since learned that this officer will serve as Navigator. Cohen was joined by British Secretary of Defence the Rt. Hon. George Robertson, MP; U.S. Secretary of
the Navy Richard Danzig; the First Sea Lord, Admiral Sir Michael Boyce; and U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jay Johnson. Robertson, a droll speaker, complimented his fellow Scot, Alan Cameron, over the precision with which everything had come off: "The Scots are much better running things in other people's countries than their own!"

The most excited participant seemed to be Janet Langhart Cohen, wife of the U.S. Secretary and the ship's official sponsor. Nicholas Soames, alarmed lest an inadvertent "oh gawd" (or worse) be uttered over live miles if a christening bottle didn't break on first try, deftly warned of the danger. But Lady Soames, honorary sponsor for the United Kingdom, directed the operation: "Just give it a good whack, Janet!" Two Pol Roger bottles exploded simultaneously with a cascade of foam, streamers shot through the air, and DDG 81 slid into the sea as the band played "Anchors Aweigh."

USS Winston S. Churchill is the thirty-first Arleigh Burke class destroyer delivered to the Fleet and the eighteenth to be built by Bath Iron Works. Construction of this state-of-the-art warship began in the spring of 1997, with DDG 81 scheduled to join the Fleet in 2000. As a multi-mission ship, she is equipped with the Navy's Aegis combat weapons system, which combines space-age communications, radar and weapons technologies in a single platform for maximum flexibility.

Arleigh Burke class destroyers are replacing older, less capable ships that are being taken out of service as the Navy reduces spending while maintaining quality. These versatile ships are designed to operate independently as a multi-threat offensive platform or in support of aircraft carrier and amphibious operations.

Cmdr. Michael T. Franken, a native of Sioux Center, Iowa, will command Winston S. Churchill. With a crew of 348, DDG 81 will be homeported in Norfolk, Virginia. The ship is 505 feet long, has a beam of 66 feet and displaces 9000 tons fully loaded. Four gas-turbine engines power her to speeds in excess of 30 knots. We asked Cmdr. Franken how he plans to keep up with the galloping technology of the next century: "I have a rule. No new system comes aboard unless an old one goes." Makes sense to us!

continued...
The Churchill is the fourth American warship to be named in honor of a Briton. The armed merchantman Alfred went into commission in December 1775 as the first ship of the Continental Navy, named after Alfred the Great, the English king who has been called "Father of the Royal Navy." During the Revolutionary War, the frigate Raleigh was named in honor of Sir Walter Raleigh, while another frigate was named Effingham in honor of the Earl of Effingham, who resigned his commission rather than fight against the American colonists.

Official events concluded with a reception for Mrs. Cohen and Lady Soames at Brunswick Naval Air Station, where the latter presented the ship with an oil replica of her father's painting of the Shippond at Chartwell and Winston Churchill presented a wonderful enlarged photograph of intermingled U.S. and British sailors at one of his grandfather's wartime conferences.

Later at Tenants Harbor, a few miles to the north, the Churchill Center Board of Governors held a dinner for Cmdr. and Mrs. Franken; Lady Soames; Mr. & Mrs. Churchill; Winston's children, Jack, Marina, and Jennie; Jennie's husband James Repard; and Trustees Caspar Weinberger and Paul Robinson and their families and friends. We toasted the ship by reminding our guests of all the other parties.

Mike and Jordan Franken could have attended that night! We were so very honored that they chose ours. The C.O. talked about a possible sail around Britain after commissioning, and mused that he might even allow Churchillians to accompany the ship on trials in the Caribbean, leading Winston Churchill to wonder if he was going to organise "Franken Tours Ltd." But we were all very tired....

There were no speeches at the end of this memorable day, but we could not help suggesting to our guests (with prior agreement from the copyright holder) that this was an event of which Sir Winston would have exclaimed: "Let us command the moment to remain."
CHURCHILL is dead, gone from the world he saved. And the world he saved, distracted still by the flow and eddy of modern events, has not yet reckoned its debt to him. Perhaps that sum cannot be reckoned up, so great it is. Our very troubles of this time derive from that more nearly mortal evil which Churchill fought and ended.

Are the emerging nations irritated and frustrated at what they take to be survivals of Colonialism? Had it not been for Churchill, they would have been spared their hurt feelings, for they would never have emerged at all.

Does France grow restive at the failure of the nations to see her glory? The question would not have arisen without Churchill to fight for a France that had been given up for lost.

Are Americans troubled with the problems of a superpower? They'd have been spared their troubles had not Churchill stood when all else fell.

Is it hard and endless to achieve European Union? There was a European unity of slavery and depravity designed to last a thousand years. Because of Churchill it is no more.

The Russians themselves may count their debt to that great man. Had England made its peace with evil, the Russian state would have dropped into the dark of history or have become, in the extension of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the complete political expression of the worst shadows in Stalin's mind.

But Churchill did not fail. He lived and spoke and fought, and so all of us live as we do. In an age of progressive thought, he seemed an odd hero. He liked cigars and brandy and high cuisine. He believed deeply in the virtue of royalty. He believed in the British Empire, in gallantry, in chivalry. He believed in language and in the golden deeds of England's past. In an age that wrote history in terms of social movements and philosophical evolution, Churchill read history as a glorious record of brave people and the things they did for their country.

He was old-fashioned and out of date. He made mistakes, sometimes big ones, as every human does. But when the hour struck it was his alone. For the evil that rose in Germany was a timeless evil. To meet it required a cast of mind that Churchill had, a dedicated innocence, a belief in battles and in courage. The German war-gods came up from under mountains and brandished again their hammers and axes. Their shadow of death spread through the heart of Europe, north to the polar ice, south to the Sahara, over all of France, and paused for a moment at the little strip of water before England.

In that moment Churchill spoke and his voice was like Roland's horn at Roncesvalles. He broke the spell of the evil magician and roused the world to fight for its freedom. Against the Wehrmacht's mechanical might, he had, for a while, only the gallantry, the courage, the spirit of his people. These old-fashioned virtues held the battle.

He saved the world and his world at home replied by turning him out of office, for a new time had come. He said that he would not preside over the dissolution of the British Empire, but it is dissolved and it had to be dissolved. Yet whatever hope of freedom and dignity all people have today, they owe in part to the last glorious fight of that Empire, and to its ability to bring forth, as its last gift, that man.
Churchill and the Art of the Statesman-Writer
An Address at the Boston Athenaeum, May 6th
BY RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

Churchill at the stand-up desk in his Chartwell Study. "I write a book," he said, "the way they built the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Fifty years and five weeks ago tonight, Winston Churchill addressed a distinguished Boston symposium a few blocks away at M.I.T., where they had convened to consider the science and technology of the second half of the century. "I frankly confess that I feel somewhat overwhelmed in addressing this vast scientific and learned audience," Churchill said. "I have no technical and no university education, and have just had to pick up a few things as I went along."¹

Without attempting any comparison, I rather feel as Churchill did, being invited to the distinguished Athenaeum to talk about books. But he went on unabashedly to lecture his learned audience on everything he thought they should know about technology. So I will follow his example and lecture you on everything you should know about his writings.

From the time Winston Churchill was a boy he wrote spontaneously, with a versatility fellow writers envy. He was always ready to spin off a book he was writing into an article or a speech. (He once said, "I'm going to give a long speech tonight; I haven't had time to prepare a short one.")² He wrote forty-two books in over sixty volumes, five thousand speeches and articles—in all roughly thirty million words. He never had writer's block. When he went to work, usually late at night, he shut himself up in his study, banned loud noises, hired teams of stenographers, and arranged his papers at a stand-up desk. And there, padding up and down in his slippers, he reeled off prose in the small hours. "I write a book the way they built the Canadian Pacific Railway," he said. "First I lay the track from coast to coast, and then I put in all the stations."³ "Nearly 3000 words in the last two days!" he wrote his wife in 1928..."I do not conceal from you that it is a task. But it is not more than I can do."⁴

Today Churchill is the leading candidate in Time magazine's sweepstakes for Person of the Century—he was
nominated in their May 10th issue by none other than Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Yet his fame rests unduly on his leadership in World War II. Relatively few realize that he was elected to Parliament in 1900 and, except for two years when he was thrown out, dominated the political scene until he retired as Prime Minister in 1955—and continued to serve another nine years after that. When we consider that twenty years is a good run for any politician—that Franklin Roosevelt had only thirteen years at the summit of affairs—that eight Presidents and nine other Prime Ministers had completed their service when Time named Churchill “Man of the Half Century” in 1950—only to see him serve again as Premier and publish seven more volumes of history after that—his record is all the more astonishing.

Yet Churchill’s career as a writer straddles even his six decades as a statesman. He began writing as a schoolboy and published The Island Race, his last book—well, the last in his lifetime—a few months before he died. For many of those years he was the highest paid journalist in the world, earning up to five dollars a word from the best publishers. In 1953 he won the Nobel Prize for Literature—not, as many suppose, for his war memoirs, but for the totality of his output: history, biography, autobiography, political theory, memoirs, speeches, newspaper reports and articles, even a book about oil painting and an African travelogue.

He wrote about the most essential things—for throughout his life his quarrel was with tyranny—but also about everyday things: cartoons and cartoonists, daylight savings time, Moses, the Boy Scouts. He was extolling the role of “Women in War” as early as 1938. He wondered, “Are There Men on the Moon?” or what he might do “If I Lived My Life Again.” He traveled to America and wrote about “The Land of Corn and Lobsters” and the Civil War. And his work goes on, with continuous posthumous publication—notably his Complete Speeches (eight volumes, 9000 pages); his Collected Works (38 volumes, 19,000 pages), and most recently 700 pages of letters to and from his wife, expertly compiled by their daughter, Lady Soames. Perhaps uniquely, he was a statesman-writer: not only the sole person to hold high office in the two greatest cataclysms this century, but the only one to write about the experience—with a certain understandable personal bias.

Writing and statesmanship went hand in hand, for Churchill lived politics, and writing furthered his political aims. The soaring oratory he made famous in World War II occurred because Britain was led by a professional writer. “This is not history,” he said of his war memoirs, “this is my case.” But he knew how influential his words would be: “…it will be found much better by all Parties to leave the past to history,” he said in 1948—“especially as I propose to write that history myself.”

His writing had a financial side too—the salaries of British politicians were and are low. To this day Members of Parliament share cramped, drafty offices, and the words “aide” or “intern” are unknown to them. Though born to an American society beauty and the son of a duke, Churchill inherited no family wealth. He would later claim, “I kept my family by my pen… and I lived from mouth to hand.” His pen was kept busy because he had rarefied tastes. The manager of The Plaza in New York once telephoned his room to ask if he required anything special. Churchill, posing as his valet, replied: “Mr. Churchill’s tastes are quite simple; he is always prepared to put up with the best of everything.”

The best included silk underwear (“I have a very sensitive cuticle,” he told his bill-shocked wife), a cigar bill running up to $200 a week in today’s money, and—though his drinking was vastly exaggerated, mostly by himself—vintage Champagne and brandy. Chartwell, his beloved home in Kent, was a money pit, with a farm almost always in the red. He once told his colleague Lloyd George, “I’m going to make it pay, whatever it costs.”

He was what the pros call a natural writer, a stylist. In his autobiography, My Early Life, he claimed to have developed his talent for English because he was too stupid to learn anything else. In fact he was near the top of his class in many subjects. Not even the son of Lord Randolph Churchill could have made it out of Harrow without mastering Latin, so we should not take My Early Life too literally. And it is true that Churchill emerged from school a craftsman writer. A Harrow historian found a piece he wrote in 1889 aged 15, about an imagined invasion of Russia—a remarkably accurate forecast of what actually happened twenty-five years later. Young Winston

continued overleaf.
even set the date: 1914, the year World War I broke out in Europe.\textsuperscript{12}

I propose to tell you about some but not all of his writing—that would take a semester. All are in books still readily available, all through the Athenaeum—or from me if you want to buy a copy. What I say is derived from my book, A Connoisseur's Guide to the Books of Sir Winston Churchill,\textsuperscript{13} which I wrote in self-defense to answer the questions I am always asked about the content, value and desirability of the different editions. I wrote it in eight months, but it is the result of fifteen years as a Churchill specialist bookseller and many conversations with Sir Winston's family and colleagues through my work with The Churchill Center.

The Churchill Center is the international focus of interest in Winston Churchill, sponsoring conferences, tours, symposia, books, a website, and a quarterly journal, Finest Hour. We are in the midst of a major endowment campaign to enable the Center permanently to operate its symposia, seminars, student scholarships, visiting professorships—that whole range of activity we call Churchill Studies. We welcome members, and I have brought plenty of applications for anyone who may wish to join.

THE RIVER WAR

With the help of his mother, Lady Randolph, and other influential friends, young Winston won early assignments as a war reporter. He had written five books by age 25, and four of them were based on his experience in India, the Sudan and South Africa. (The fifth was his only novel, Savrola, which he steadfastly urged his friends not to read. When it was republished over half a century later he wrote in a new foreword, "The intervening fifty-five years have somewhat dulled but certainly not changed my sentiments on this point.").\textsuperscript{14}

The aim of his early books was to catapult him into fame and Parliament. In 1906, after his sensational escape from a South African prison camp during the Anglo-Boer war, they did just that. But his grandest early work, which scholars have compared to that of Thucydides,\textsuperscript{15} is The River War, published one hundred years ago this year—a brilliant history of British involvement in the Sudan. Though a century old, it remains insightful to our own time. Combined with Churchill's personal adventures, there are passages of deep reflection about how civilized governments should deal with more primitive ones.

Far from accepting uncritically the superiority of British civilization, Churchill shows his appreciation for the longing for liberty among the indigenous Sudanese; but he finds their native regime defective in its inadequate protection for the liberty of its subjects.

In 1885 the Sudan had been overrun by Dervish tribesmen under their religious leader, the Mahdi, culminating in the assassination of the British envoy, General Gordon, at the capital of Khartoum. Fourteen years later, London sent Lord Kitchener at the head of a combined British-Egyptian force (including Churchill) to reestablish Anglo-Egyptian sovereignty. Notwithstanding the superiority of British weapons and tactics, the obstacles presented by the Nile, the desert, the climate, cholera and a brave, fanatical Dervish army were formidable.

Churchill excitingly describes the British victory, but he doesn't hesitate to criticize the actions of Kitchener, whose treatment of the dead Mahdi was barbaric and whose disdain for the fallen foe after the climactic Battle of Omdurman was shameful.

In 1902 for an abridged edition, Churchill excised one-fourth of his narrative, including his criticism of Kitchener. By then he had entered Parliament, and was wary of burning bridges. He also added material, so there are two texts: the original, and the one in print since 1902. James W. Muller of The Churchill Center has prepared a new and complete edition, containing both the original and 1902 texts. We hope to see this classic work back in print by the end of 2000.

My favorite passage from The River War, sadly excised in 1902, concerns Churchill's visit to the field of Omdurman three days after British artillery had done its deadly work. And consider as you listen to this how strange it must have sounded, coming from an ardent promoter of the British Empire at the height of its power.
If you want to know what war can be, even today with precision guided missiles, you have only to read this description:

The sight was appalling. The smell redoubled the horror...I have tried to gild war, and to solace myself for the loss of dear and gallant friends, with the thought that a soldier's death for a cause that he believes in will count for much, whatever may be beyond this world.... But there was nothing dulce et decorum about the Dervish dead; nothing of the dignity of unconquerable manhood; all was filthy corruption. Yet these were as brave men as ever walked the earth. The conviction was borne in on me that their claim beyond the grave in respect of a valiant death was not less good than that which any of our countrymen could make.... Three days before I had seen them rise—eager, confident, resolved. The roar of their shouting had swelled like the surf on a rocky shore. They were confident in their strength, in the justice of their cause, in the support of their religion. Now only the heaps of corruption in the plain, and the fugitives dispersed and scattered in the wilderness, remained... Their end, however, only anticipates that of the victors; for Time, which laughs at science, as science laughs at valour, will in due course contemptuously brush both combatants away.

And, because Churchill was mainly an optimist, he concludes with a vision of

some distant age, when a mighty system of irrigation has changed the desolate plain of Omdurman into a fertile garden, and the mud hovels of the town have given place to the houses, the schools, and the theatres of a great metropolis, [when] the husbandman, turning up a skull amid the luxuriant crop, will sapiently remark, 'There was aforetime a battle here.' Thus the event will be remembered.16

That was Winston Churchill writing at age 25.

THE WORLD CRISIS

In 1905 Churchill hired a man who was to become his chief literary assistant for thirty years—Edward Marsh, a classical scholar, a civil servant and an accomplished litterateur. From that time, Churchill stopped writing his books and speeches in longhand and began dictating to teams of secretaries, with Eddie Marsh to vet his drafts for Churchill's final approval. They made a marvelous team and have left us with some captivating exchanges:

"Eddie: You are very free with your commas. I always reduce them to a minimum: and use 'and' or 'or' as a substitute not as an addition. Let us argue it out. W."

Marsh replies: "I look on myself as a bitter enemy of superfluous commas, and I think I could make a good case for any I have put in—but I won't do it any more!"

"Eddie: No, do continue. I am adopting provisionally. But I want to argue with you. W."17

Once Marsh entered Churchill's sanctum with a sore throat, unable to spar with him. "What's this?" asked Churchill. "Is that resonant organ altogether extinct?"18 This marked the beginning of another long debate about hyphens. But I don't mean to trivialize. Marsh appears more frequently than anyone else in the Chartwell Visitor's Book. When he died in 1953 Churchill, who seemed to outlive everybody, wrote, "He was a master of literature and scholarship and a deeply instructed champion of the arts. All his long life was serene, and he left this world, I trust, without a pang, and I am sure without a fear."19

Marsh helped Churchill write The World Crisis, his memoir of World War I, which Churchill began as First Lord of the Admiralty. He fell disastrously from power, commanded a battalion in Flanders, returned as Minister of Munitions, and attended the Versailles peace conference. Whenever I'm asked to recommend a "big book" by

continued overleaf...
Churchill, I always name *The World Crisis*. Like all of his war books it is highly personal. One of his friends called this work “Winston's brilliant autobiography, disguised as a history of the Universe.” And one of his enemies said, “Winston has written an enormous book all about himself and calls it *The World Crisis.*”20

Even if you don't read war books you will be entranced by Churchill's account of the awful, unfolding scene of World War I: the great power rivalries that caused the war; his failed effort to break the deadlock in Europe by forcing the Dardanelles, knocking Turkey out of the war and aiding the Russians; the carnage on the Western Front; how Germany almost won and then lost the war in 1918. One of his critics, Sir Robert Rhodes James, regards *The World Crisis* as Churchill's masterpiece, though noting rightly that “one can never quite separate Churchill the orator from Churchill the writer.”21

One of his volumes, *The Aftermath*, chronicles the ten years after victory, including the Versailles settlement, the Irish Treaty, and the Cairo Conference of 1921—the year Churchill lost his mother, a 2-1/2-year-old daughter and his brother-in-law, yet still managed to go to Cairo and draw up the boundaries of the modern Middle East. Incidentally, Churchill pushed hard at Cairo for a Kurdish homeland, “to protect the Kurds against some future bully in Iraq.” But London overruled him, saying that of course Iraq would never be a problem to the West.22

Two brief excerpts from *The World Crisis*. The first is the favorite of Gen. Colin Powell, who asked us for the attribution. It summarizes what we now call the Powell Doctrine, which is not to go to war unless your interests are directly involved and you have overwhelming superiority—very relevant at the moment.

In 1911, the Germans sent a gunboat to Agadir, Morocco, and almost went to war with France over it. Churchill is writing of the exchange of diplomatic telegrams that flew between Berlin, Paris and London as the Agadir Crisis deepened...

They sound so very cautious and correct, these deadly words. Soft, quiet voices purring, courteous, grave, exactly measured phrases in large peaceful rooms. But with less warning cannons had opened fire and nations had been struck down by this same Germany. So now the Admiralty wireless whispers through the ether to the tall masts of ships, and captains pace their decks absorbed in thought. It is nothing. It is less than nothing. It is too foolish, too fantastic to be thought of in the twentieth century...No one would do such things. Civilization has climbed above such perils. The interdependence of nations in trade and traffic, the sense of public law, the Hague Convention, Liberal principles, the Labour Party, high finance, Christian charity, common sense have rendered such nightmares impossible. Are you quite sure? It would be a pity to be wrong. Such a mistake could only be made once—once for all.23

Of course the mistakes were made, and the world plunged finally into war three years later, with Churchill running the Navy. In fact, his resolution over Agadir had convinced Prime Minister Asquith to place him at the head of the Admiralty. In August 1914 Churchill did a prescient thing. Britain's Grand Fleet had assembled for a Naval Review just as the famous Austrian note to Serbia, which precipitated World War I, was sent. On his own authority Churchill ordered the Fleet not to disperse but to sail in darkness through the English Channel to its war station at Scapa Flow in the Orkneys. This is Churchill's description of the passage of the armada:

We may now picture this great Fleet, with its flotillas and cruisers, steaming slowly out of Portland Harbour, squadron by squadron, scores of gigantic castles of steel wending their way across the misty, shining sea, like giants bowed in anxious thought. We may picture them again as darkness fell, eighteen miles of warships running at high speed and in absolute blackness through the narrow Straits, bearing with them into the broad waters of the North the safeguard of considerable affairs...If war should come no one would know where to look for the British Fleet. Somewhere in that enormous waste of waters to the north of our islands, cruising now this way, now that, shrouded in storms and mists, dwelt this mighty organization. Yet from the Admiralty building we could speak to them at any moment if need arose. The king's ships were at sea.24
MY EARLY LIFE

Enough of war books—let us turn now to our author’s most charming and captivating work, his autobiography, My Early Life: the book I always suggest people read first, especially young people.

It is now soundly established that Winston Churchill took liberties in My Early Life, which covers the years from his birth in 1874 to his early years in Parliament. For example, he was not nearly so ignored and abandoned by his parents as he implies. His nephew, Peregrine Churchill, showed me Lady Randolph Churchill’s diaries, which prove that she spent much time with Winston and his brother Jack before they left for school. Peregrine concluded: “Winston was a very naughty boy and his parents were much concerned about him.”

None of this affects the wonderful treat provided by this most approachable of Churchill’s books, which one reviewer likened to “a beaker of Champagne.” If you were drawn to Churchill by The Second World War, his autobiography will be a revelation. The war memoirs chronicle a public struggle against national extinction; the autobiography charts a young man’s private struggle to be heard. But the same style and pace is there, the same sense of adventure, the piquant humour, the ability to let the reader peer over our author’s shoulder as events unfold. As William Manchester writes in his excellent introduction to a recent edition of My Early Life:

...One must realize that [Churchill’s] youth was virtually incomprehensible to most people then alive. He had been born into the English aristocracy at a time when British noblemen were considered (and certainly considered themselves) little less than god-like....The class into which he had been born [was master] of the greatest empire the globe has ever known, comprising one-fourth of the earth’s surface and population, twice the size of the Roman Empire at full flush. [It] also controlled Great Britain herself, to an extent that would be inconceivable in any civilized nation today. One percent of the country’s population—some 33,000 people—owned two-thirds of its wealth, and that wealth, before two world wars devoured it, was breathtaking.

Nevertheless, Churchill had little handed to him, once family influence had placed him where he wanted to be. He could not have embarked on those thrilling war junkets to Cuba, India and Africa without the influence of his mother and other notables; but once there, he was on his own, and he acquitted himself well. His autobiography records these adventures in words which will live as long as any twentieth century author is read.

Two excerpts demonstrate. The first is Churchill’s recollection of his examination in mathematics. It’s my personal favorite, because I had a similar experience...

We were arrived in an ‘Alice-in-Wonderland’ world, at the portals of which stood ‘A Quadratic Equation.’ This with a strange grimace pointed the way to the Theory of Indices, which again handed on the intruder to the full rigours of the Binomial Theorem. Further dim chambers lighted by sullen, sulphurous fires were reputed to contain a dragon called the ‘Differential Calculus.’ But this monster was beyond the bounds appointed by the Civil Service Commissioners, who regulated this stage of Pilgrim’s heavy journey. We turned aside, not indeed to the uplands of the Delectable Mountains, but into a strange corridor of things like anagrams and acrostics called Sines, Cosines and Tangents. Apparently they were very important, especially when multiplied by each other, or by themselves....There was a question in my third and last Examination about these Cosines and Tangents in a highly square-rooted condition which must have been decisive upon the whole of my after life....luckily I had seen its ugly face only a few days before and recognised it at first sight. I have never met any of these creatures since...

My second excerpt occurs as Churchill passes out of the Royal Military Academy and into the world, which “opened for me,” as he wrote, “like Aladdin’s Cave.” You may find this as good an exhortation for youth as any other, now nearly seventy years since he penned it:

Come on now all you young people, all over the world. You are needed more than ever now....You have not an hour to lose. You must take your places in life’s fighting line. Twenty to twenty-five! These are the years! Don’t be content with things as they are....Enter upon your inheritance, accept your responsibilities....Don’t take No for an answer. Never submit to failure. Do not be fobbed off with mere personal success or acceptance. You will make all kinds of mistakes; but as long as you are generous and true, and also fierce, you cannot hurt the world or even seriously distress her. She was made to be wooed and won by youth. She has lived and thrives only by repeated subjugations.”

ABUNDANT WILDERNESS

The 1930s are often called Churchill’s “Wilderness Years.” Out of office, he was soon isolated by insisting that Britain rearm in the face of Hitler. Churchill was not a politician who takes the public pulse daily and engages

continued overleaf...
in a non-stop popularity contest. He never hesitated to tell people things they didn't want to hear and—until his warnings were proved all too real—he was alienated from his party. Yet this period was anything but a Wilderness for Churchill the author.

"I lived mainly at Chartwell," he recalled, "where I had much to amuse me." 30 Indeed he did, because as always, Chartwell was a drain, requiring him to work feverishly. The lights burned late as Churchill labored on hundreds of articles, and some of his most compelling books: his eclectic set of essays, Thoughts and Adventures; his character studies of the great personages of his age, Great Contemporaries; his History of the English-Speaking Peoples; and his finest biography, the life of his ancestor, John first Duke of Marlborough. No less a scholar than Leo Strauss called Marlborough "the greatest historical work written in our century, an inexhaustible mine of political wisdom and understanding, which should be required reading for every student of political science."

Maurice Ashley, Churchill's leading assistant on Marlborough, wrote that his boss held Courage and Honour as the chief virtues—which could at times eclipse all other considerations. "He could be obstinate, and though he might yield to persuasion, he was hard to persuade," Ashley wrote. "That...is Churchill's main weakness as a historical writer...History had at first been a pleasant method of making money and in the end it was a means of self-justification. He never had either the time or inclination to absorb himself in it completely, or to revise his work in detail."

"But," Ashley continues, "there is no doubt whatever that Churchill possessed a powerful sense of history...And as Isaiah Berlin has written, Churchill's central, organizing principle was 'an historical imagination so strong, so comprehensive, as to encase the whole of the future in a framework of a rich and multi-coloured past.'" 32

CONCLUSION

In the last few years of his life Churchill gave in to the pessimism he had always dodged before (for despite reports he was never much bothered by depression, which he referred to as his "Black Dog."). In the late Fifties he told his private secretary, Anthony Montague Browne, "Yes, I have worked very hard and accomplished a great many things—only to accomplish nothing in the end." Mr. Montague Browne told me he thought Churchill was referring to his failure to cement the "special relationship" with America, which wavered after Suez and never developed as he hoped; and to reach what he called "a final settlement" with the Soviet Union—although in 1949 he had predicted that Communism would one day expire in the blink of an eye. 33

His biographer, Sir Martin Gilbert, who has written eight million words about Churchill, was asked if he could summarize his subject in one sentence. He thought for a moment and then said: "He was a great humanitarian who was himself distressed that the accidents of history gave him his greatest power at a time when everything had to be focused on defending the country from destruction, rather than achieving his goals of a fairer society."

That's hard to improve on—except perhaps to add that it was Churchill's last regret that his father never lived to see what he had accomplished. And that leads to one final story:

THE DREAM

At dinner one evening in 1946, his daughter Sarah pointed to an empty chair: "If you had the power to put someone in that chair, whom would you choose?" She expected him to say Caesar, Napoleon, Marlborough—but he took only a moment to consider. "Oh," he said, "my father of course."

Churchill then went on to write what he called a "private article," never published in his lifetime, about a winter night in his studio, where he is attempting to copy a portrait of his father. He suddenly feels an odd sensation, and there, sitting in his red leather armchair, is Lord Randolph Churchill, with his jaunty waxed moustache and his cigarette poised to light—just as Winston remembered him in his prime. 34

"What are you doing, Winston?" his father says. Winston explains he is trying to copy the portrait. "I only do it as a hobby." "Yes, I'm sure you could never earn your living that way," his father observes. "How do you get your living?" Winston replies, "I write books and articles for the press."

Unimpressed, Lord Randolph asks what year it is. "1947," Winston says. "So more than fifty years have passed. A lot must have happened. Tell me about it."

So Winston, aged 73, recites to his 40-year-old father everything that has happened since his father died in 1895, without ever revealing—and this is the supreme irony of the piece—the role Winston himself played.

He shocks his father by informing him that women have the vote, the Socialists are in power, and India is in-
dependent. His father groans...

"What about Ireland? Did they get Home Rule?"

"The South got it, but Ulster stayed with us."

"Are the South a republic?"

"No one knows what they are. They are neither in nor out of the Empire."

Winston mentions that there have been wars. Lord Randolph looks up with a start. "War do you say?" "Yes indeed, Papa. We have had nothing else but wars since democracy took charge." "Did we win?" "Yes, we won all our wars. All our enemies were beaten down."

"But wars like these must have cost a million lives."

"Papa, in each of them about thirty million men were killed in battle. In the last one, seven million were murdered in cold blood, mainly by the Germans. They made human slaughter pens like the Chicago stockyards. Europe is a ruin. Ten capitals in Eastern Europe are in Russian hands. They are Communists now, you know— Karl Marx and all that. It may well be that an even worse war is drawing near...Far gone are the days of Queen Victoria and a settled world order."

Lord Randolph is stunned. "Winston," he says, "you have told me a terrible tale. I would never have believed that such things could happen. I am glad I did not live to see them. As I listened to you unfolding these fearful facts you seemed to know a great deal about them. I never expected that you would develop so far and so fully. Of course you are too old now to think about such things, but when I hear you talk I really wonder you didn't go into politics. You might have done a lot to help. You might even have made a name for yourself."

His father strikes a match to light his cigarette. There is a tiny flash and he vanishes. The chair is empty. Winston writes: "I rubbed my brush again in my paint, and turned to finish the moustache. But so vivid had my fancy been that I felt too tired to go on. Also my cigar had gone out, and the ash had fallen among all the paints."


2Tom McCarthy to the author: "With his capacious memory, WSC may have 'borrowed' the idea from Blaise Pascal who, several hundred years earlier, wrote in a 1656 letter to a friend: 'I have only made this letter rather long because I have not had time to make it shorter.'"

3Celia Sandys, "The Young Churchill," speech to the Churchill Society, Calgary, Alberta, 23Sep94.


5Time, Person of the Century opinions, 10 May 1999.


7Denis Kelly, conversation with the author, 1986.


10Reliably attributed but not documented to date.


13Published at $39.95 by Brasseyes, 1998. Available from Churchill Center New Book Service for $28 + shipping, PO Box 385, Contoocook NH 03229.


18Hassall, ibid., pp. 541-42.

19Hassall, ibid., p. 680.

20The speakers respectively were Arthur Balfour and Sir Samuel Hoare, see for example John Charmley, Churchill: End of Glory. London: Hodder & Stoughton 1993, p. 191 (who confuses the attribution).


28My Early Life, op. cit., p. 40.

29Ibid., p. 74.

30The Gathering Storm, op. cit., p. 79.


Cover Story:
The Armorial Bearings of Sir Winston Churchill

BY PAUL COURTENAY

The splendid painting by Charles Lusted on the front cover of this issue ought to be familiar enough to members. But how many understand what it is saying to us? In trying to answer this question, I cannot avoid giving an elementary Heraldry lesson; I should therefore apologise to those readers who already know a fair amount about the subject. Some of the terminology used is a little arcane so, rather than break up the narrative with frequent explanations, I have defined unfamiliar terms in a glossary at the end. By referring to this, and to the accompanying illustrations, it should be easy enough to follow the thread.

Heraldry as we know it today began to evolve in the second quarter of the twelfth century. The systematic use of devices, centred on the shield, became essentially hereditary in nature and allowed an individual—whose face might have been concealed by an armoured helmet—to be easily recognised. It was therefore important for each achievement of arms to be different from all others—at least in every generation. Thus a person’s arms are very much a personal possession which should not be used by anyone else during his lifetime. The kinship of relations to the head of a family can often be read from a shield, though it has to be admitted that the strict regulation of such matters is much more rigorously applied in Scotland than elsewhere in the United Kingdom. Marriage to women without surviving brothers (or the latter’s descendants) can allow further arms to be permanently added to those already in use. It has truthfully been said that Heraldry is the shorthand of history.

Component Parts of Armorial Bearings

The component parts of Sir Winston’s arms are:

Shield: The focal point of the armorial bearings (and the true coat-of-arms, although this term is often used today to refer to the whole achievement).

Helm: In this case there are two, and their configuration denotes the rank of the bearer. In this instance the visors are open and the helms are affronty (i.e. facing the observer); the helms are therefore those of a knight. Helms of royal persons, of peers and of others, including corporate bodies, are each denoted differently.

Wreath: Just visible above the dexter helm, it is six twists of material in two tinctures, the purpose of which was to act as a setting from which the crest issued forth; it also allowed the mantling to be secured to the helm. In this case the wreath is Argent and Sable.

Crest: Again, in this case there are two (a Lion and a Griffin). A common error is to refer to the shield or to the whole achievement as a crest; this is quite wrong. Just as a crest of a hill or the crest of a wave is at the summit, so in Heraldry the crest is the device at the very top of the armorial bearings, and nothing else.

Mantling: This originated as a piece of material, hanging from the back of the helm and secured by the wreath, to protect the back of the neck from the sun’s heat. Today it survives as decorative strips framing the shield. Charles Lusted’s painting shows this as Sable and Argent, although—to be strictly accurate—it should be in this case be shown thus on the dexter side only, and Gules and Argent on the sinister side. The jagged edges of the mantling are held by some authorities to depict the cuts and rents which would have been received in battle, but this is perhaps a little dubious.

Garter: This borne only by Knights (and Ladies) of the Order of the Garter, to which Sir Winston was appointed in 1953, giving him a title for the first time. Its possession by Sir Winston provides a good example of how an achievement of arms can change from one generation to another; as neither his father nor his son was a Knight of the Order of the Garter, their arms—otherwise identical, apart from the position of the helms (neither being a knight)—would not have been able to feature this item. The famous motto of the Order—Honi Soit Qui Mal Y Pense—means Shame on Him Who Thinks Evil of It.

Motto: This is traditional, although not a formal part of the armorial bearings (except in Scotland).

Mr. Courtenay is Hon. Secretary of ICS (UK); he is also a member of the (British) Heraldry Society.
The Churchill Arms

The original arms of the first Sir Winston Churchill (1620-1688), father of the First Duke of Marlborough, were extremely simple, and were certainly in use by his own father in 1619. The shield was Sable a Lion rampant Argent debruised by a Bendlet Gules (Figure 1). In recognition of the first Sir Winston's services to King Charles I as Captain of the Horse, and his loyalty to King Charles II as a Member of Parliament, he was awarded an augmentation of honour to his arms in 1661/1662. This rare mark of royal favour took the form of a canton of St. George. A canton is a square in the dexter chief, occupying less than a quarter (probably about one-eighth) of the shield, and in this case Argent a Cross Gules. At the same time, he was authorised to add the Bendlet, which had served the purpose of distinguishing this branch of the Churchill family from others which bore an undifferenced Lion. The addition of the Canton rendered this further distinguishing mark unnecessary.

This revised shield, complete with augmentation of honour, was inherited by his son John Churchill, First Duke of Marlborough (1650-1722), whose arms are shown in Figure 2. Note that the helm is in profile and has a closed grill; it therefore belongs to a peer. Extra features in these armorial bearings are:

Supporters: Peers, Knights of the Orders of the Garter and the Thistle and Knights Grand Cross of the other orders of chivalry are entitled to these figures, placed on either side of the shield to support it; they may be human, animal or mythical. In this case they were the mythical Griffin (part lion, part eagle) and Wyvern (a dragon without hind legs).

Coronets: Immediately above the shield is a coronet, indicating the bearer's rank of duke.

Imperial Eagle and Princely Coronet: These unusual features show that the duke was a Prince of the Holy Roman Empire—a dignity conferred in 1705.

The Churchill crest is blazoned as a Lion couvant guardant Argent, supporting with its dexter Forepaw a Banner Gules, charged with a dexter Hand appaumée of the first, Staff Or. (This crest, with the dexter Hand appaumée converted into a V-sign, forms the logo of the International Churchill Society and Finest Hour.) The Churchill motto Fiel Pero Desdichado (Spanish for “Faithful but Unfortunate”) is also displayed.

The Spencer Arms

These are a little more complex. The shield of Hugh le Despencer in the fourteenth century was Quarterly Argent and Gules, in the second and third Quarters a Fret Or over all a Bend Sable (see Figure 3). There was some dispute as to whether the later Spencers were descended from him, but a good case can be made that they were—through several female lines. By the time of Charles Spencer, Third Earl of Sunderland (1674-1722), the Bend Sable had acquired three Escallops Argent (see Figure 4), partly to distinguish this branch of the family from other Spencers—who bore, for example, five Mullets Argent or three Fleurs-de-Lys Or on the Bend Sable.

The Spencer crest was blazoned: Out of a ducal Coronet Or, a Griffin's Head between two Wings expanded Argent, gorged with a Collar gemel and armed Gules. (Just to confuse matters, a ducal coronet in a crest—as shown here—can be assigned to anyone, regardless of status, and should not be confused with a coronet of rank placed above the shield.)

The Spencer-Churchill Arms

Because the First Duke of Marlborough left no surviving son, the title was allowed to pass to his eldest daughter in 1722 and then (in 1733) to the son of his next daughter, who had married Charles Spencer, Third Earl of Sunderland. [continued overleaf]
The Fifth Duke of Marlborough (1766-1840), who had been born a Spencer, was authorised in 1817 to take and use the additional name of Churchill, in order to perpetuate the name of his illustrious great-great-grandfather. At the same time he was empowered by Royal Licence to quarter the arms of Churchill with his paternal coat of Spencer. It is from this date that the familiar design of Churchill quartering Spencer originates. It would be normal in these circumstances for the paternal arms (Spencer) to take precedence over the maternal (Churchill), but because the Marlborough dukedom was senior to the Sunderland earldom, the procedure was reversed in this case.

In 1705, in recognition of his victory over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim the previous year, the First Duke had been granted the Manor of Woodstock, which was transferred to him from the Crown by Act of Parliament. Here was constructed the magnificent palace we know today.

When the Fifth Duke's arms were quartered in 1817, a further augmentation of honour was added to his achievement; this incorporated the bearings on the standard of the Manor of Woodstock and was borne on a shield, displayed over all in the centre chief point, as follows: Argent a Cross of St George surmounted by an Inescutcheon Azure, charged with three Fleurs-de-Lys Or. (This inescutcheon represents the royal arms of France.) These quartered arms, incorporating two augmentations of honour, have been the arms of all subsequent Dukes of Marlborough—together with both crests. Subsequently, the Seventh and Ninth Dukes, as Knights of the Order of the Garter, were able to encircle their arms with the Garter (as could the First, Third and Fourth Dukes of Marlborough before them).

Figure 4 (left): Shield of Charles Spencer, Third Earl of Sunderland (1674-1722), who married the second daughter of the First Duke of Marlborough in 1699; he became father of the Third Duke and ancestor of all subsequent holders of the title. Figure 5 (right): Banner of Sir Winston Churchill, carried at his state funeral. Note the crescent, indicating his position as heir to the second surviving son of the Seventh Duke of Marlborough. The arms include both augmentations of honour awarded in the 17th and 18th centuries.

The Rt Hon Sir Winston Churchill KG OM CH TD
A person's arms should not be confused with anyone else's. Sir Winston's, when displayed in full, could not be confused with the armorial bearings of the contemporary Duke of Marlborough because no Duke of Marlborough was a Knight of the Garter at the same time as Sir Winston, so would not have been able to display its insignia. Also, his helms are those of a knight, whereas dukes show those of a peer. Thus no confusion could arise and, indeed, this is the form in which the arms are permanently shown on Sir Winston's stall-plate in St George's Chapel, Windsor (where the arms of all Knights of the Garter since the Order's founding in 1348 are displayed).

To avoid any possibility of confusion, a system of cadency marks can be used; by this system each son of a marriage shows a different mark on his father's arms. Thus the eldest son bears a Label of three points Argent (i.e. a narrow white horizontal strip across the top of the shield, with three short vertical pendants); he removes the Label on his father's death, when he inherits his father's undifferenced arms. The second son permanently shows a crescent and the third son a mullet (i.e. a five-pointed star).

Lord Randolph Churchill (1849-1895) was born the third son of the 7th Duke of Marlborough, so would in theory have borne the Spencer-Churchill arms differentiated by a mullet. However, he was less than eighteen months old when his next oldest brother died, grew up as the Seventh Duke's second surviving son, and would have inherited his brother's right to a crescent. Winston, as the eldest son of Lord Randolph, would—in 1895—correctly have inherited his father's arms, i.e. Spencer-Churchill differentiated by a crescent. Occasional representations of Sir Winston's arms, showing a mullet, are sometimes seen in books, but these are quite wrong.

On becoming a Knight of the Order of the Garter (KG) in 1953, Sir Winston would have been entitled to supporters to his arms, but these were never granted because he never got round to applying for them. There are grounds for believing that he was offered a further augmentation of honour to his armorial bearings in 1945, but that he declined because he felt that his arms were already somewhat crowded. Had this been awarded, the new arms would have passed to his son and grandson, but not to subsequent Dukes of Marlborough (who would not have been descended from him).
Had he wished, Sir Winston could have displayed the insignia of his other honours below his shield. These were the Order of Merit (OM), the Order of Companions of Honour (CH) and the Territorial Decoration (TD). Although never used in his lifetime, Figure 6 shows the full armorial bearings of Sir Winston Churchill (with crescent, but omitting OM, CH, TD) as they could correctly have been displayed. Note the correct width of the Bend Sable in the Spencer quarterings, while Charles Lusted’s version—to be mildly critical—is rather too narrow and more in the nature of a Bendlet. Note also the mantling, which is more traditional than Lusted’s.

I hope that readers who have followed the thread of this ramble through some heraldic byways will agree that Sir Winston Churchill’s armorial bearings exemplify the claim of Heraldry to be “the shorthand of history.”

GLOSsARY

Achievement (of Arms): The complete set of emblems, including shield, crest, supporters etc.
Affronty: Facing the observer.
Appaumée: Of a hand, showing the open palm.
Argent: Silver (more usually shown as white).
Armed: Refers to an animal’s weapons, including, for example claws, beak, horns etc.
Armorial Bearings: As for Achievement.
Arms: Coat-of-arms, i.e., strictly the shield, but it has come to mean the whole Achievement.
Azure: Blue.
Bend: A broad diagonal band from the dexter chief of a shield to the sinister base.
Bendlet: About half the width of a Bend; a Bendlet sinister is from sinister chief to dexter base.
Blazon: Heraldic terminology.
Canton: A square in the dexter chief of a shield, usually filling about one-eighth of it.
Centre Chief Point: The centre of the shield near the top.
Charge: Device borne on a shield.
Chief: The top part of the shield.
Coat-of-Arms: See Arms.
Couchant: A beast in the lying position, with head raised.
Cross of St. George: Argent a Cross Gules.
Debruised: Refers to a charge overlaid by another charge.
Dexter: The righthand side from the point of view of the bearer of the arms, so the lefthand side from the point of view of the observer.
Escallop: A scallop shell, usually its convex back.
First: Refers to the first tincture mentioned (thus, in the case quoted, Argent). This formula avoids the need for repetition.
Fleur-de-Lys: A stylised lily. Azure three Fleur-de-Lys Or were the royal arms of France.
Fret: A Masque interlaced by a Bendlet and a Bendlet sinister.
Garter (The Most Noble Order of the): The United Kingdom’s senior order of chivalry, founded by King Edward III in 1348.
Gemel: A pair.
Gorged: Collared.
Guardant: With the face looking out of the achievement towards the observer.
Griffin: A monster, with the hind parts of a lion and the head,

breast, claws and wings of an eagle; it also has ears.
Gules: Red.
Inescutcheon: A shield borne as a charge on the main shield of the arms.
Label: A narrow horizontal strip across the top of a shield, usually with three short vertical pendants—usually Argent—which is displayed by an eldest son until his father’s death, when he removes the Label on inheriting the undifferenced arms.
Lozenge: A diamond-shaped charge.
Masle: A voided Lozenge.
Mullet: A five-pointed star.
Or: Gold (more usually shown as yellow).
Quarter/Quartering/Quarterly: Relating to the division of a shield into four (or more) segments.
Rampant: Position of a beast, showing the sinister hind-leg on the ground, with all other legs paws the air.
Sable: Black.
Sinister: The lefthand side from the point of view of the bearer of the arms, so the righthand side from the point of view of the observer.
Targe: Shield borne at a funeral.
Tincture: All the metals (gold and silver), colours and furs used in Heraldry; so to refer to a “colour” has a strictly narrow meaning, excluding, e.g., yellow and white.
Voided: Refers to the centre of a charge being cut out, allowing another tincture to show through.
Wyvern: A monster with the appearance of a dragon, with a dragon’s barbed tail but no hind-quarters or back legs.
RACING TO VICTORY

WINSTON CHURCHILL AND THE LURE OF THE TURF

BY KATHARINE THOMSON

In 1951, Clementine Churchill wrote to an old friend, remarking on her husband’s peculiar new interest: “Have you seen his horse Colonist II?...I do think this is a queer new facet in Winston’s variegated life. Before he bought the horse (I can’t think why) he had hardly been on a racecourse in his life. I must say I don’t find it madly amusing.”¹

Clementine could not have been more wrong. Before their marriage, Winston had not only been on racecourses but had ridden round them, with some success. As Chancellor of the Exchequer, he had presided over a revolutionary change in racecourse betting. And in the next thirteen years he would go on to become one of the most successful racehorse owners and breeders in England.

Given Sir Winston’s background, it would have been more surprising if he had not been interested in racing. His maternal grandfather, Leonard Jerome, was a great supporter of the turf in America, building his own racecourse, while between 1889 and 1893 Lord Randolph Churchill, Winston’s father, was a leading English owner. Lord Randolph only really became interested in horses after his withdrawal from politics in 1886, buying a black filly, “L’Abbesse de Jourrare.” (The public promptly labelled her “Abscess on the Jaw.”)

Nobody had any great hopes for the Abbesse, and although Lord Randolph did enter her for the Oaks (a classic race for fillies), he did not bother to back her or even to watch the race, disappearing instead on a fishing holiday. Possibly the Abbesse felt she had a point to prove, for she amazed everybody by winning. Her owner (in between remarks on the fishing) wrote to Lady Randolph: “Just a few lines to tell you how overjoyed I was last night to hear of the Abbesse winning the Oaks. I hope you were there to see her win....What a surprise...We must not any longer talk of ‘worthless animals.’”²

The Abbesse went on to win over £10,000 in her career, and 16-year-old Winston was as enthusiastic about her as his father. From Harrow he explained, “I have been congratulated on all quarters on account of the ‘flukey filly.’ After another success he wrote: ‘I drank the Abbesse’s health in lemon squash and we eat [sic] her luck in strawberry mash.”³

Even before this, young Churchill had been fond of horses; at school in Brighton he liked riding better than anything else. He took to horseracing as a cavalry subaltern at Sandhurst, and his delight in the sport comes across years later, in this passage from My Early Life:

Horses were the greatest of my pleasures at Sandhurst. I and the group in which I moved spent all our money on hiring horses...We organised point-to-points and even a steeplechase in the park of a friendly grandee, and bucked gaily about the countryside.”⁴

Churchill was anxious to excel. “I should like nothing better than to win the cavalry prize,” he told his mother.⁵ He duly took part in the competition, but failed to win—just:

Ms. Thomson is a member of the cataloguing team on the Churchill Papers at the Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge. “Racing to Victory,” an exhibition on which this article is based, is on display through 30 July at the National Museum of Horseracing, Newmarket, near Cambridge.

Churchill with a thoroughbred colt, 1950s. Horsefolk tell us that one has to have quite a way with animals to get this close to a young colt.

Illustrated London News, 1954

Finest Hour 102/26
Unfortunately the race was later declared void. Moreover, the review *Truth* suggested that the winner had been a “ringer” substituted for another horse, while all those in the race must have been in on the plot; or as *Truth* put it, “the coup which resulted in the defeat of a hot favourite by the last outsider in the betting.” Churchill, by then in India, was upset by these allegations and urged his mother to take legal action, but the matter was allowed to drop.

Being stationed in India was no bar to racing, as Churchill had been given a racing pony, Lily. Lady Randolph asked him to sell the pony: “You don’t know but everyone else does that it is next to impossible to race in India & keep clean hands.”

Churchill, however, was determined to have his way, protesting that everyone raced, and that selling Lily “would...rob my life out here of one strong interest.” Lady Randolph relented, and Churchill duly raced his pony, although being unused to the conditions, Lily proved a disappointment.

As a member of the regimental polo team, however, Churchill had ponies to draw on, taking part in several races, including one with “a ripping line of 49 fences” where he was one of only five from thirteen to finish. Though he never won, he came third three times, and as this letter to Jack shows, enjoyed himself immensely: “We have a pony race meeting this week here and I have entered some of my numerous polo ponies in every race - & hope to have some fun.

Chocolate-pink sleeves and cap will appear for the first time on Indian soil.” (These were his father’s racing colours, and the colours of Churchill College today).

Pony racing was all very well for a young Hussar; less so for an ambitious MP. The chocolate and pink colours were not to be seen for another fifty-two years, when the unimportant Lieutenant Churchill had become one of the great statesmen of the twentieth century.

*continued overleaf*...
Almost exactly halfway between these two periods in Churchill's life, he had another more bruising encounter with the turf. In 1925, as a Chancellor of the Exchequer permanently trying to balance the books, Churchill was presented with the idea of a tax on betting.

The betting laws of the time were certainly in need of reform since, although it was legal to bet on the course, or by telegraph to a betting office, most people gambled illegally with cash on the street. Even on the racecourse conditions were far from ideal, as this disapproving Cabinet report points out:

The payment of £1 2s 6d for admission to Tattersall's Ring enabled one to see the horses in the paddock before each race. But the Ring itself was made up of a Sahara of asphalt occupied by a howling mob of bookmakers and their clerks packed cheek by jowl with burly runners dashing here and there. There were far too many of these toughs pushing and jostling the unfortunate spectator, who was compelled to shove as in a rugby scrum in order to obtain breathing space in the narrow strip of grass between the asphalt and the rails which made an apology for a lawn.

The Government's idea was to register the street bookmakers, and set them up in offices. In theory, betting could in one stroke be regulated and taxed at a rate optimistically estimated at £17 million a year.

Churchill was no longer the carefree young man scrambling round racecourses on his polo ponies. He had to placate public opinion and was nervous about appearing to encourage gambling. Writing to his advisers in the Treasury, he warned that "it would be essential to prohibit any notice, placard, list of betting odds, or other street sign which would flaunt itself before the passer-by...Do not suppose that I have in the slightest degree made up my mind on this proposal, about which I entertain the gravest doubts." As he told a deputation of experts, "I am afraid we might be accused...of having deliberately spread and multiplied the vice - I won't say vice, but evil."

This was a far cry from Churchill's own racing days, but despite his concerns, he went ahead and imposed the tax in the budget of spring 1926. Unfortunately it proved difficult to enforce and roused great opposition among the racing fraternity. A petition received from the trainers of Newmarket complained about "the very serious effect" of the tax, as it was putting off racegoers. The Home Secretary warned that Churchill was alienating both God and Mammon, "in other words, the Churches and the betting fraternity, both of whom are supporters of the Tory Party."

Churchill himself favoured sitting tight, "simply to let the tax work itself into the life of the community," but as opposition grew, was forced to cut the rate of tax twice. As this still did not mend matters, he finally repealed the measure. Reluctant to give up a revenue of some £3 million entirely, however, he introduced a new scheme which did prove a success, the totalisator, or "tote," a machine which registered bets and gave the odds automatically. Setting out the advantages of the tote in a letter to the Home Secretary, Churchill explained:

The rowdy rascal element so prominent on our race courses is eliminated. The running of horses to suit the interests of the bookmakers disappears, and an altogether cleaner and healthier condition prevails...It would yield a revenue to the upkeep of bona fide racing sport, and the contributions could be collected in the easiest manner.

The tote is still used on British racecourses today, and earned the thanks of the industry. As Lord Hamilton
of Dalzell, one of the Stewards of the Jockey Club, told Churchill, “you have helped us to make racing a better and a straighter game than it has ever yet been; and you have helped to prevent its becoming a game that only millionaires and sharps can play.”

Churchill had not made much political capital out of his services to racing, but he was to receive his reward years later when he finally returned to the sport. In 1949, the Epsom vet Major Anthony Carey Foster (later Sir Winston’s racing manager) saw an unprepossessing grey colt running in France; while only half-fit, the horse still finished second. Impressed, Carey Foster bought him for the trainer Walter Nightingall, who showed him to Christopher Soames, Churchill’s son-in-law. Churchill was Leader of the Opposition, having been cast out as Prime Minister in 1945; Soames evidently felt that his father-in-law needed a new interest and talked him into buying the grey. The horse’s name was Colonist II, and a great racing partnership was born.

Churchill did not make his foray into racing without opposition. It seemed uncomfortably like a throwback to a privileged aristocratic past, from which a modern politician might prefer to distance himself. Clementine was frankly disapproving, and her secretary Jo Sturdee actually wrote him a letter warning that he might damage his reputation. She also told one of Churchill’s former assistants: “Had you heard Mr Churchill is now going in for owning race horses?...I must admit I intend to have a bob or two on them. All the same I told him I thought it would lose him votes at the General Election.”

Churchill stuck to his guns despite these criticisms, and at Salisbury, in August 1949, Colonist II carried his old colours back onto the racecourse. Christopher Soames later admitted his fears over the race:

I was very worried before the race—not because I did not think it would win but because I was frightened something might go wrong, or the unforeseen happen...At the start he jumped off in front and...never looked like being caught...just strode away from them and won comfortably by four lengths...There was a terrific cheer from the crowd when he won - and they all surged forward to see him come in and gave him a wonderful reception.

The race-goers had backed Colonist heavily, sure that Churchill’s horse could not lose, and the shout “Winnie wins!” became a familiar one as Colonist went from strength to strength. Far from being an electoral liability, Lord Derby told Churchill that “the Tory cry at the next election would be ‘the Conservatives and Colonist.’” Churchill’s popularity was undamaged and racing correspondents were equally impressed. One said that “this tough and indomitable grey horse has performed miracles. No horse in living memory has put up such a sequence of wins in good-class races in one season. Eight wins...in 11 races, reads like something inspired, and that...was just what this horse seemed to be, by the great spirit of his indefatigable owner.” Colonist even reflected Churchill’s politics by running best on courses bending to the right. He was held by his owner to have been sent by Providence as a comfort for his old age to console him for his disappointments. continued overleaf...
Colonist won thirteen races in his career and nearly £12,000 in prize money. He was even mentioned in Hansard, as when called on by a Labour MP to sell him. Churchill retorted: “I could sell him for a great deal more than I bought him for, but I am trying to rise above the profit motive.”24

Covered in glory, Colonist retired to the royal stud at Sandringham. (Churchill is said to have vetoed an earlier suggestion in this line with the words, “To stud? And have it said that the Prime Minister of Great Britain is living on the immoral earnings of a horse?”)25

Colonist was only the best-known of Churchill’s horses; in all, Walter Nightingall saddled seventy winners for his most famous owner. A lucky buy of an American-bred brood mare by Christopher Soames encouraged Churchill to set up his own stud, first at Chartwell, then at Newchapel in Surrey. Le Pretendant, Colonist’s half-brother, won the Churchill Stakes, and also ran in the Washington International. High Hat walked away with the Ali Khan Gold Cup. Vienna took the Prix Ganay in France, and although not bred by Churchill, the filly Dark Issue provided him with a classic victory by winning the Irish 1000 Guineas in 1955. Churchill had to miss this race, explaining that “The General Election was my owner, and I was already entered among the runners.”26

Even as Prime Minister, Churchill almost always managed to make time to watch his beloved horses run. He had pictures of them in his bedroom at Chartwell, which may still be seen. It was a great blow to him when, in 1964, the year before his death, he had to give them up because of ill health. His last letter to his trainer shows his attachment to the sport which had given him such pleasure, both in youth and old age:

It is very sad for me to have to end my racing activities owing to the fact that my health does not allow me to attend race meetings any more. I know that this decision will cause sorrow to you too, since we have had such a long association. My mind goes back to the Spring of 1949, when Christopher persuaded me to buy


colonist. He gave us all great excitement and pleasure, and he was also the forerunner of many successes....It doesn’t fall to many people to start a racing career at the age of seventy-five and to reap from it such pleasure.27
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English-Speaking Peoples

REFLECTIONS ON THE ANGLO-AMERICAN RELATIONSHIP

BY THE HON. CASPAR W. WEINBERGER, GBE

Watching Winston S. Churchill, America's newest guided missile destroyer, glide down the ways to be launched at the Bath Iron Works in Maine (see page 10) inevitably led to reflections on the US relationship with the UK, past and present. The Winston S. Churchill is a technological marvel, outfitted with state-of-the-art offensive weapons and the Aegis system, the world's foremost defense against aerial attack. Indeed, this Aegis system, which is on our cruisers and destroyers, could be the foundation of a mobile missile defense program were it not for Mr. Clinton's implacable opposition to any effective missile defense.

While watching this ship and thinking about her namesake, I was asked by a young reporter: “Do you think it is appropriate to name one of our destroyers after a foreigner?” I was almost too surprised to answer. I told my interrogator that I thought it entirely appropriate and that this was a fine tribute to a man who was, perhaps, this century's most important and valuable person. As an afterthought, I added that in any event Mr. Churchill was an American citizen (honorary, 1963). The reporter’s surprise at this led me to wonder if it was not time—for the benefit of latecomers—for a brief essay on the Anglo-American relationship.

Since the end of our Civil War, the American relationship with the UK has been closer and of a different nature from that which we have had with any other country. We have fought in two world wars together, as well as in Korea and the Persian Gulf. Britain has been the ally on whom we could always count—even in smaller actions, such as the air attack on Libya. That is why it was so important for the United States to support Britain in the Falklands in 1982. Britain has stood beside the United States not only in war but also in the difficult periods following war. It has been a staunch supporter of NATO and of our bilateral activities. And now in Kosovo, the UK is once again America's strongest and surest ally.

Of course, there have been differences: the Suez crisis in the 1950s, compounded by the dynamics of the 1956 presidential election; and the intervention in Grenada in 1983, after which, for a short time, there were diplomatic tensions between the US and the UK. Nevertheless, our militaries have always worked closely together, sharing training, intelligence and other vital information.

Our official relationship has been greatly bolstered by close personal friendships at all levels. The most legendary of these were between Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, and Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher. Personal friendships flourished across the Atlantic between members of both countries' governments during the Reagan and Bush administrations. And President Clinton seems to work well with Prime Minister Tony Blair.

At the launching of the Winston S. Churchill, it was evident that William Cohen and George Robertson, defense chiefs for the US and the UK, respectively, have formed a similar and valuable friendship. Janet Langhart Cohen and Lady Soames (Winston Churchill's daughter and a celebrated author in her own right) also get along splendidly. It is close personal friendships such as these that are the real glue of alliances. It is always much harder to disagree with or follow different paths from your close friends. In today's world of shifting alliances and bewilderingly fast changes in governments, policies and people, it is enormously important for both countries to have sheet anchors in each other.

And so, both because of our relationships and because of who he was, it is appropriate for us to honor Winston Churchill, who, almost alone, made it possible for America to enter the war for the world's freedom while it still could be won.

I asked that young reporter to try to imagine what our world would be like today if Winston Churchill had not been Prime Minister throughout World War II. Indeed, we all might ask ourselves that. Any answer is almost beyond imagining.
One hundred years ago:
Spring 1899 • Age 24
The First Campaign

In late March 1899, on his way home from Egypt, Churchill wrote to his grandmother explaining his decision to leave the Army for a writing career: "Had the army been a source of income to me instead of a channel of expenditure I might have felt compelled to stick to it. But I can live cheaper & earn more as a writer, special correspondent or journalist; and this work is more congenial and more likely to assist me in pursuing the larger ends of life."

To Churchill "the larger ends of life" meant a career in politics. His son Randolph reports in the official biography that Churchill even consulted a fashionable palmist, Mrs. Robinson, who claimed to see favourable omens in his hand. Churchill was courted by a number of Conservative constituencies who wanted him to stand as their candidate at the next general election.

One of them was Oldham, a working-class district with two MPs one of whom, James Oswald, was in poor health. The other Member, Robert Ascroft, asked Churchill to stand with him in Oswald's place at the next election. In the event, it was Ascroft who unexpectedly died on 19 June 1899 and Oswald resigned in turn, setting up a double by-election.

Churchill's Conservative running mate was a trade union leader named James Mawdsley, the General Secretary of the Lancashire branch of the Amalgamated Association of Cotton Spinners, which Ascroft had long served as its lawyer. Matching the young Churchill with a union leader—"The Scion and the Socialists"—was thought to be a good way to appeal to the working class vote as their Liberal Party opponents were both wealthy men. It didn't work. As Churchill later said: "My poor Trade Unionist friend and I would have had very great difficulty in finding £500 between us, yet we were accused of representing the vested interest of society, while our opponents, who were certainly good for a quarter of a million, claimed to champion in generous fashion the causes of the poor and needy."

Prior to the campaign Churchill had written to his namesake, the popular American novelist Winston Churchill, proposing a solution to the possible confusion engendered by the American's forthcoming publication of Richard Carvel and Churchill's own Savrola, then being serialized in Macmillan's Magazine, and his forthcoming The River War:

"Mr. Winston Churchill presents his compliments to Mr. Winston Churchill, and begs to draw his attention to a matter which concerns them both...Mr. Winston Churchill has decided to sign all published articles, stories, or other works, 'Winston Spencer Churchill' and not 'Winston Churchill' as formerly. He trusts that this arrangement will commend itself to Mr. Winston Churchill...He takes this occasion of complimenting Mr. Winston Churchill upon the style and success of his works, which are always brought to his notice..."

The American responded in kind:
"Mr. Winston Churchill is extremely grateful to Mr. Winston Churchill for bringing forward a subject which has given Mr. Winston Churchill much anxiety. Mr. Winston Churchill appreciates the courtesy of Mr. Winston Churchill in adopting the name of "Winston Spencer Churchill" in his books, articles, etc. Mr. Winston Churchill makes haste to add that, had he possessed any other names, he would certainly have adopted one of them...Mr. Winston Churchill will take the liberty of sending Mr. Winston Churchill copies of the two novels he has written. He has a high admiration for the works of Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill and is looking forward with pleasure to reading Savrola."

Seventy-five years ago:
Spring 1924 • Age 49
"The Essential Principle"

Churchill, who suffered his second consecutive by-election loss on 19 March, opened negotiations with the Conservative Leader, Stanley Baldwin, to bring more than 30 anti-socialist Liberal MPs into an informal alliance with the Conservatives, provided the Conservatives agreed not to contest their seats at the next General Election.

On 6 April 1924, Churchill published an article, "Socialism and Shaw," in The Sunday Chronicle, vigorously attacking the minority Socialist government: "The leaders of the Socialist movement themselves have hardly succeeded in shaking themselves free from personal considerations. The Socialist Lord Privy Seal asks the House of Commons to raise his salary from two thousand to five thousand pounds a year—a proceeding perfectly proper on the Capitalist hypothesis, but hardly in harmony with Socialist idealism."

"Mr. Bernard Shaw, that sparkling intellectual and brilliant champion of the Socialist Utopia, squealed like a rabbit when subjected to the mild Lloyd-Georgian super-tax. Even Mr Moseley, the latest recruit, has not yet divested himself of his unearned increments or quit the life of elegance and luxury in which he has his being."

Churchill then set out his own classical liberal philosophy: "The essential principle is personal freedom, the right of the individual to make the best of himself, or, within limits, the worst of himself, if he chooses; the stimulation of all these individual activities by the reward of enterprise, toil, and thrift; and their reconciliation through the laws." The Socialists, he said, aspire to "prescribe from year to year, from month to month, or from week to week, the life and labour of every single citizen;"
Fifty years ago:
Spring 1949 • Age 74
Soviet Policy and India

Churchill was in New York on 25 March 1949 where he spoke at a dinner given by *Time* publisher Henry Luce:

"What is the explanation of the Soviet policy? Why have they deliberately united the free world against them. I will hazard the answer....It is, I am sure, because they feared the friendship of the West more than they do its hostility. They can't afford to allow free and friendly intercourse between their country and those they control, and the rest of the world. They don't see it develop—the coming and going and all the easements and tolerances which come from the agreeable contacts of nations and of individuals. They can't afford it."

Upon his return to England, Churchill found himself under attack within the Conservative Party for accepting the Labour Government's position that India could remain in the Commonwealth as an independent republic. Churchill, whose wilderness years out of power in the 1930s were attributable in part to his unwillingness to accept the Conservatives' compromise over India, was unsympathetic. As he wrote to Lord Salisbury on 7 May 1949:

"...the fatal step towards India was taken when Baldwin supported the Ramsay MacDonald plan in 1930 and enforced it upon the Conservative Party in 1931. I and seventy Conservatives and your Father resisted this for four long years, and were systematically voted down by the Baldwin-Ramsay MacDonald combination, supported for this purpose, I need hardly say, by the Socialist Party in opposition. Once the Conservative Party cast aside its duty to resist the weakening of the Imperial strength, the gap could not be filled, and from this point we slid and slithered to the position we have reached today. I could not therefore accept any reproach for the present situation from any Conservative who supported the Baldwin and Chamberlain policies."

Later in May, Churchill previewed the film "Crusade in Europe" at Chartwell. As one guest recorded: "It was the custom at Chartwell to invite everyone who lived or worked on the estate to view the movies. Among the group of twenty or thirty was an ex-German prisoner-of-war named Walter, who did odd jobs like wood-cutting and lawn-moving....The March of Time film was not under way more than a few minutes before it was clear that it would not evoke happy memories for a former member of the Reichswacht. Churchill rose from his seat at once, tapped Walter on the shoulder, and motioned him to leave the theater with him. Later we learned that Churchill's object in going out was to suggest to Walter that perhaps he would prefer not to see the film that evening. Walter, however, returned to the theater with Churchill and remained till the end."

Twenty-five years ago:
Spring 1974
"Just a Cumudgeon"

For *Finest Hour* 1974 was the Silent Spring and Summer. No issues appeared while we sought a new editor—ironically during the Churchill Centenary, with a six-month exhibition at Somerset House, London. Here many newspapers, loaned by John Frost, were on display recalling Churchill's exploits at Omdurman and the Boer War, his wedding day in 1908, and the events of both world wars.

The exhibit proved a disappointment to the organizers, who said it was drawing only 500 visitors a day instead of the planned 1000. "We have just not succeeded in getting this exhibition sufficiently across to the public," said the organizer, John Colville. The parallel appeal on behalf of the Churchill Centenary Trust ("A Million Pounds from a Million People") was also running behind. "I personally have asked about 350 people for £1 and they have all paid up," Colville added. "There was only one exception—he was just a cumudgeon."

Simultaneously it was announced that Richard Burton would star as WSC in a television documentary, "Churchill's Walk with Destiny," spanning the years from 1934 to 1940 and based on "The Gathering Storm," under which title it was finally produced. In Vancouver, the first volume of the "Collected Works" of Sir Winston was presented to the parliamentary library by former Canadian prime minister John Diefenbaker on behalf of Lady Churchill. Nine others who, with Diefenbaker, were members of Canada's Parliament when Churchill gave his "some chicken, some neck" speech in 1941 were invited to attend the presentation ceremony.
THE LAST ROMANTIC ZIONIST GENTILE

BY DR. YOAV TENEMBAUM

Referring to the years prior to the creation of the Jewish state, the historian Bernard Wasserstein argues that “No British statesman had a more consistent and more emphatic record of support for Zionism as a solution to the Jewish problem than Winston Churchill.” Churchill considered the establishment of the State of Israel “as one of the most hopeful and encouraging adventures of the 20th century.” Only eight months subsequent to the proclamation of the State, Churchill suggested to the House of Commons that “The coming into being of a Jewish State in Palestine is an event in world history to be viewed in the perspective not of a generation or a century, but in the perspective of a thousand, two thousand or even three thousand years.”

Churchill used to trace his Zionism back to the days of the Balfour Declaration, describing himself as “an old Zionist.” His attitude toward Zionism remained as passionate and as explicit following his return to Ten Downing Street in 1951. Now, however, with the State of Israel firmly in place, the images he entertained became perhaps more vivid, more colorful, and as ever imbued with historical resonance.

Thus, in June 1954, Churchill stated to journalists in the United States, “I am a Zionist, let me make that clear. I was one of the original ones after the Balfour Declaration and I have worked faithfully for it.” This was merely the introduction. He went on: “I think it is a most wonderful thing that this community should have established itself so effectively, turning the desert into fertile gardens and thriving townships, and should have afforded refuge to millions of their co-religionists who suffered persecution so fearfully under Hitler, and not only under Hitler. I think it is a wonderful thing.” In a conversation with Israel’s Ambassador in London, Elyahu Elath, Churchill referred to Israel’s population as “the sons of the prophets dwelling in Zion.”

Churchill’s attitude toward Zionism and the State of Israel was distinctively positive, the images he entertained bordering on the romantic. In this respect, Churchill had no equal among British politicians and officials in the first half of the 1950s. On almost any question pertaining to the country, Churchill’s rhetoric, more than that of any other decision-maker or official, was distinctively pro-Israel, reflecting, beyond political considerations and a pure judgement of principle, an emotional attachment to that country and the case it presented.

Thus, on the Suez Canal blockade by Egypt against Israel in 1956, Churchill made it clear to the Foreign Office that “I do not mind it being known here or in Cairo that I am on the side of Israel and her ill-treatment by the Egyptians.” On the fate of Jerusalem, Churchill urged Evelyn Shuckburgh, Assistant Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office, “You ought to let the Jews have Jerusalem; it is they who made it famous.”

While still Prime Minister, Churchill argued that there was no better army in the Middle East than the Israeli Defence Force, and wished to rely on Israel rather than the Arab states in setting up a regional system of defense against the Soviet Union. He insisted that Israel should be supplied with more jet aircraft than either the defence establishment or the Foreign Office wished. He went on to stress his point by telling his Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, “To me the greatest issue in this part of the world is not deserting Israel.” In this context, he warned Eden against following in the footsteps of one of his predecessors. “Ernest Bevin, being temperamentally anti-semitic, made the first mistake of backing Egypt against Israel...I hope...that we both equally condemn the Bevinite anti-semitic policy.”

More remarkable still, Churchill was in favour of Israel’s joining the British Commonwealth. “Do not put that out of your mind,” he said to Shuckburgh. “It would be a wonderful thing. So many people want to leave us; it might be the turning of the tide.”

Churchill’s was Israel’s best friend, and as a friend his attitude was shaped by sentiment as much as by pragmatic considerations. He was emotionally attached to Israel and its people, and his stance was a corollary of this. His oft-repeated, self-declared Zionist sympathies, his emotional attachment to the Jewish people and their restored sovereign entity, permeated his attitude toward Arab-Israeli disputes. He was, perhaps the last romantic Zionist Gentile. Or the last romantic Zionist.
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In the fifty-six years of their married life Winston and Clementine Churchill were often apart. Winston was never content for long unless he was off in search of action and adventure, but Clementine too was affected by wandering. Sometimes it was she who set off for distant parts, leaving Winston at home. In 1935 she sailed away for a three-month cruise to the Far East aboard a yacht belonging to Lord Moyne. VE-Day found her in Moscow at the end of a tour of the Soviet Union. Whenever they were separated, Winston and Clemmie exchanged long letters, supplemented by occasional notes and telegrams. Hence this remarkable edition of 800 exchanges out of some 2000 written between them, which opens with a letter from Mr. Winston Churchill to Miss Clementine Hozier on 16 April 1908, and closes with a note from Clemmie to Winston on 18 April 1964.

Mary Soames is a fine editor. Her unrivalled knowledge of the subject is complemented by literary and historical skills which are gracefully worn but highly professional. Through footnotes, linking passages and biographical notes she dispenses just the right amount of necessary or interesting background information. As she explains in the Preface, many of the letters have been published before, Clemmie’s in Lady Soames’s own life of her mother, Winston’s in the official biography. Nevertheless there is little sense of déjà vu. In bringing together both sides of the correspondence, and eliminating everything else, she has revealed as never before the inside story of a marriage that was also a great political partnership.

It was, of course, a marriage of its time. In the wedding ceremony Clemmie promised to love, Honour and obey. A capable and intelligent woman and a strong supporter of female suffrage, she sacrificed much of her own potential for a husband who never sought to disguise his egoism or his absorption in the masculine world of politics. For him, marriage and family life were one facet of a crowded existence; for her they were a vocation. Yet the marriage worked for a simple reason, tenderly and movingly expressed in the letters of both partners. Winston and Clemmie married for love and the passing of time served only to strengthen the bonds between them.

By the time Winston began to court the beautiful Miss Hozier in the spring of 1908, he was President of the Board of Trade and a member of the Cabinet. Though his political career was advanced he was backward with the opposite sex and never likely to rival Byron or Casanova. In one of his earliest letters to Clemmie he wrote of his cousin Sunny: “He is quite different from me, understanding women thoroughly, getting into touch with them at once, & absolutely dependent on feminine influence of some kind for the peace & harmony of his soul. Whereas I am stupid & clumsy in that relation, & naturally quite self-reliant and self-contained.”

Clemmie had grown up in a rakety, adulterous family. Henry Hozier, Mary Soames informs us, may not have been the father of Clemmie or any of the five children who bore his name. Winston might be awkward with women but from Clemmie’s point of view this must have been a virtue: he was an honest and faithful husband whose commitment to his wife and children were never in doubt. The letters which passed between the two of them in the aftermath of Gallipoli, when Winston was in the trenches on the verge of despair and she was at home fearing every day that he would be killed, display the mutual devotion which enabled them to ride out the storms which afflicted even the happiest of marriages. “We are still young,” Clemmie writes, “but Time flies stealing love away and leaving only friendship which is very peaceful but not stimulating or warming.” “Oh my darling,” Winston replies, “do not speak of friendship to me—I love you more with each month that passes.”

Clemmie knew her place in her husband’s scheme of things, but it was a marriage that enhanced and enriched her life. “I love to feel that I am a comfort in your rather tumultuous life,” she wrote on their eleventh wedding anniversary. “My Darling, you have been the great event in mine. You took me from the strained life by-path I was treading and took me with you into the life and colour and jostle of the high-way.... Eleven years more and we shall be quite middle-aged. But I have been happier every year since we started.”

At the age of fifty Clemmie fell briefly in love under tropical skies with Terence Philip, a fellow passenger on her Far Eastern cruise. Her letters home, which showed how much time she was spending with him, might well have aroused the suspicions of a more jealous husband. But Winston either failed to notice or, perhaps, decided to take no notice. By the time Clemmie returned to England the romance was over and the marriage as strong as ever.

Winston and Clementine wrote for one another’s eyes only, dashing off lively and spontaneous accounts of a kaleidoscope of topics. Personal affairs predominate with news of children, continued overleaf...
friends and relations, births, weddings and funerals, and anxieties about money and health. It is fascinating to see the great historical events of the first half of the twentieth century transformed into the sub-plot of a family history. Mussolini, for example, turns up as a most charming guest at a tea party during a holiday visit by Clemmie to the ruins of ancient Rome.

Readers are bound to be struck by the fact that Winston and Clemmie took so many holidays apart, writing from hundreds or thousands of miles away to explain how much they missed one another. Here perhaps, was one of the secrets of a long and happy marriage: they didn’t see too much of one another but allowed absence to make the heart grow fonder.

Clemmie was Winston’s most loyal supporter. Championing him through thick and thin, she never lost faith in his genius or the sincerity of his convictions. She was, however, a shrewd observer of politics with a mind of her own and acutely aware of the reasons why her husband sometimes aroused hostility and mistrust. A lifelong Liberal with a puritan streak, she sought to restrain the cavalier in Winston the adventurer, the gambler, the rip-roaring Tory, the boon companion of Beaverbrook and Birkenhead. Within a few weeks of his appointment as Prime Minister in 1940 she wrote to warn him “that there is a danger of your being generally disliked by your colleagues and subordinates because of your rough sarcastic and overbearing manner...you won’t get the best results by irascibility and rudeness.” How far Winston was influenced by her is difficult to judge, but she was always to remind him of the importance of winning the trust of the puritan and respectable half of the nation.

There are many glimpses of Winston the statesman in this book but its real value lies elsewhere. It is easy to forget that behind the great oratorical performances and the epic historical works was a man of flesh and blood who shared the joys and sorrows of the rest of the human race. For anyone curious to discover what Churchill was really like off-stage this correspondence is the best possible introduction.

The idea that Churchill had no existence outside politics is a myth. In Speaking for Themselves we see him as a husband, father, friend, host, author, painter, bricklayer, film fan, and lover of good food and drink. Even in the Second World War he somehow found the time to read novels. His letters to Clemmie display a love and concern for his children, and an interest in their fortunes, that few top executives could match today.

The Churchills were both a happy and an unhappy family, a pattern reflected, perhaps, in the mixed fortunes of the children as they grew up. Randolph was courageous and brilliant but rash and uncontrollable, a bull in the china shop of his father’s reputation. Sarah had a successful career on the stage but her emotional instability was a source of great anxiety. The first of a number of crises occurred when, to her parents’ dismay, she decided to marry the entertainer Vic Oliver. “Common as dirt” was Winston’s verdict after his first encounter with his future son-in-law.

Apart from his marriage to Clemmie, the other great turning-point in his private life was the purchase of Chartwell. Although it had its uses as a political headquarters, Chartwell awoke in him an ancestral love of the land. To Clemmie’s dismay, he poured a fortune into the reconstruction of the house and grounds, and costly experiments in farming. He wrote her more than a hundred “Chartwell Bulletins” full of enthusiastic reports on the creation of waterworks and rockeries and the fortunes of a menagerie of animals and pets. Here too he was a fond parent, building a tree-house for the children; and a benevolent country squire, intervening to assist “Mr. and Mrs. Donkey Jack,” gypsies who lived in a shack on the common land above Chartwell.

But for World War II, Churchill would have abandoned politics, pulled up the drawbridge, and settled down to the delights of Chartwell. Or would he?

WSC-CSC: Editor’s Choice

Lady Soames writes, “This photo says it all.” Sir Winston and Lady Churchill celebrating their Fiftieth Wedding Anniversary as guests of Wendy and Emery Rees, La Pausa, Cap Martin, France. Photo by Emery Rees, archive of United Press International.

On her recent book tour in the United States, Lady Soames was often asked for her favorite letters in Speaking For Themselves. These are the portions of letters she quoted in answer to that question on the Diane Rehm radio program, broadcast by WAMU, Washington, D.C. on March 24th. (The first two were written under the same roof, carried back and forth by Blenheim footmen!) A cassette of this interview, including responses to call-in questions by listeners (including one by member Christopher Fortunato of Westlake, Ohio) is available from WAMU. Telephone (202) 885-1200.

From CSC (Blenheim, 12 August 1908):
My dearest. I am very well — Yes please give me a letter to take to mother. I should love to go with you to the rose garden. Yours always / Clementine

From WSC (Blenheim, ca. 13 August 1908):
My dearest — I hope you have slept like a stone. I did not get to bed till 1 o’clock....But from 1 onwards I slept the sleep of the just & this morning am fresh & fit. Tell me how you feel & whether you mean to get up for breakfast. The purpose of this letter is also to send you heaps of love and four kisses. X X X X from Your always devoted / Winston

Finest Hour 102 / 36
From CSC (Kensington, undated, probably September 1908):

My Darling / Thinking about you has been the only pleasant thing today. I have tried on so many garments (all of which I am told are indispensable). ... My tailor told me he approved of you & had paid 10/6d to hear you make a speech about the war in Birmingham — After that I felt I could not bargain with him any more ... I long to see you again — Wednesday Thursday Friday 3 long days — Goodbye my darling I feel there is no room for anyone but you in my heart — you fill every corner — Clementine

From WSC (Hyde Park Gate, London, 3 October 1962):

Darling, I hope you are going on well & that we may come together again tomorrow. I have found it quite lonely & will rejoice to see us joined together in gayety and love. Dearest one I place myself at your disposal & intend to take a walk in the park hand in hand.

With many kisses / Ever loving / W

From CSC (Chartwell, 4 July 1963):

My Darling, The Time has seemed long without you — I shall be on the door-step to welcome you Home. Your devoted / Clemmie

Lastly, Lady Soames was asked to select her favorite letter from the book. She chose Clementine’s letter from London to Winston, serving in Flanders, 6 April 1916:

My own Darling...If you will only listen a tiny bit to me I know...that you will prevail & that some day perhaps soon, perhaps not for 5 years, you will have a great & commanding position in this country. You will be held in the people’s hearts & in their respect. I have no originality or brilliance but I feel within me the power to help you now if you will let me. Just becoz I am ordinary & love you I know what is right for you & good for you in the end.

Your devoted loving / Clemmie

Unlike the eight-volume 1974 Complete Speeches, Hansard records not only speeches, but Bills, Questions and Answers, Interjections, Points of Order, Reports and other statements, more or less the way we find them in Churchill speech volumes like Into Battle or Europe Unite.

“More than the set-piece Debates, these show off Churchill’s ability to think on his feet and engage in repartee. Of course he features much more in those years when he held cabinet position than when he was a back-bencher or, even out of Parliament, as in 1923.”

As a bonus, James appends an example, chosen at random: Churchill’s utterances in the sitting of January and February 1948, when the House was mainly debating foreign affairs. It may have been a random choice but it is certainly a good one. Take for example these exchanges, between WSC, Labour Member Piratin and the Communist Member, Willie Gallacher:

Mr. Churchill (Woodford): The Government has pursued exactly the same policy [in Greece] as that which my right hon. Friend and I went to Athens that Christmas—

Mr. Piratin (Mile End): Shame.

Mr. Churchill: The hon. Member is perhaps a good judge of shame.

[Later] Mr. Churchill: The American Government have adopted to a very large extent the views which I expressed at Fulton nearly two years ago...

Mr. Gallacher (Fife, West): That is where the trouble started.

Mr. Churchill: I am only reporting facts, which are naturally a source of satisfaction to me... I pleaded [in Zurich] for the ideal and objective of a United Europe, and later we formed a Committee of all parties in this country to promote that cause.

Mr. Gallacher: Not all parties.

Mr. Churchill: We formed this all-party Committee, with the exception of the Communists, whom we did not invite, and whom we do not now invite to join us in that or in any other form of social and political activity.

Mr. Gallacher: “Ye rich men, fear and tremble.”

Mr. Churchill: Yes, I think he could have said that to some in Russia as well as here. continued overleaf...

Hansard Churchill: An Index at Last

Michael Richards


Alfred James of ICS Australia has accomplished another great service, following his compilation last year of Churchill’s Letters to The Times. This time it’s a huge, two-volume index to all the Churchill references in Hansard, the official record of Parliament, from the time Churchill entered the House of Commons to the tributes following his death in 1965.

In his preface, James states that Churchill uttered more words in Commons than any other Member. He also notes that the Parliamentary Debates go back a long way, to 1803, and are recorded in five series, of which the fifth (and current) began in 1909. The speeches were recorded verbatim only from 1911, so most earlier speeches were abridged or abbreviated by shorthand writers and newspaper reporters.
HANSARD, continued

Of course, you need access to Hansard to use this index fully. But that is not nearly as hard as digging out the thousands of Churchill references, and now that job is done. Mr. James sent copies of this masterwork to Sir Martin Gilbert and the Churchill Archives Centre, who we are sure will agree with us that he has made an outstanding contribution to Churchill scholarship.

We asked Alfred James what his next opus will be. "I have it in mind to do the same with the indices to The Times, he replied. "These will, of course, make considerable reference to WSC's activities outside the Commons. And this would probably sell better as every major library now has a microfilm run of The Times." We are looking forward to it.

Two Wars at Churchill's Side
Philip Aspden

"Sir Winston Churchill and Sir Edward Spears are the only men who have written books of superlative excellence about both wars," wrote the British historian A.J.P. Taylor. But the links between the two men went well beyond the literary, as Max Egremont's recent biography of Spears demonstrates. They became strongly acquainted when Churchill was in France in 1915. In Spears Churchill recognized a similar spirit to his own: "a man of courage, the possessor of an aggressive questioning intelligence, and an adventurer outside conformist and traditional circles."

Spears, whose parents were British, had largely been brought up in France and spoke English and French fluently. He became a career army officer, joining the Kildare Militia in 1903. In August 1914 he became liaison officer between Sir John French, the British commander-in-chief, and General Lanzera at the headquarters of the French Fifth Army. Ideally suited to his task, he continued in this role throughout the war, being wounded four times and mentioned in dispatches, becoming liaison officer between the British and French war cabinets in 1917. He was sustained in this highly political position by Churchill, by then back in the government.

During the war Spears had married Mary (May) Borden, an American novelist and heiress, who had operated an ambulance unit on the western front. Reluctant to live off his wife's fortune, Spears set out to establish business and political careers after the war. With the help of Churchill he was adopted as the National Liberal candidate for Loughborough, and was elected unopposed in the October 1922 election. Spears went to help Churchill in his Dundee campaign, but Churchill was defeated and Spears magnanimously offered his seat so that Churchill could stand for it at a by-election. Churchill refused, telling Spears to "enjoy your seat in Parliament."

"Exemplarische Gegenspieler"
Till Kinzel


Political scientist Christian Graf von Krockow has written a new life of Churchill with the programmatic subtitle "A Biography of the 20th Century." Without, it must be said, drawing on original research or contributing something substantial to Churchill scholarship, Krockow aims to provide German readers with a fair and truthful picture of Churchill as the exemplary antagonist ("exemplarische Gegenspieler") of tyranny instead of merely a colorful figure. This is a useful and laudable undertaking, since Churchill's achievement is insufficiently recognized by German intelligentsia.

Krockow recognizes that continental, as well as German history debates in particular, focus much more on the importance and influence of radical or extremist
movements from left and right. This is deplorable, he says, because such a parochial perspective does not even begin to help us make sense of our past. He therefore calls for a revision of perspective: the alternative to Communism was not Fascism (or vice-versa), as is often assumed, but Western-style liberal democracy, as practiced in Great Britain and the United States.

Churchill, Krockow reminds us, is especially timely, precisely because he did not share the follies and illusions popular among intellectuals. For this reason alone he is separated by a deep chasm from all those, unfortunately still at work, promoting projects of world salvation by molding a new man. Krockow's fairness in dealing with Churchill's errors (or what he regards as these) stands out because he expressly states that they do not diminish but rather confirm Churchill's stature as the exemplary antagonist of Hitler's tyranny. On the contrary, they teach us a most necessary lesson, namely that man's nature is such as to make liberal democracy by far the most attractive kind of regime.

Claims to infallibility are out of place in human affairs, but Churchill's life, his opposition to Bolshevism and Nazism, amply testify to the validity of his basic instincts. Krockow's focus enables him to reject the weird accusations by contemporary historians that Churchill was wrong to remain intransigent in his stance against Hitler. Krockow reminds us of the crucial distinction we have to keep in mind when thinking about this subject: Hitler was not a statesman but a gambler, and it does little credit to Churchill's detractors that Churchill then (and now, one is tempted to add) proved to possess a much clearer and more precise understanding of the nature of the tyrant than those whom Krockow aptly calls "battered know-alls" (nachträgliche Beserwissers).

Mr. Kinzel is currently researching on a dissertation on Allan Bloom's culture critique in the context of political philosophy at the Technische Universität Berlin, where he teaches classes in English and American Literature, from Shakespeare to the Modern American Novel.

concludes that World War II "would have been won if he had never lived, for there was never a time when the British people were prepared to lay their heads on Hitler's chopping block" (380).

Such an incredible remark puts me in mind of Arthur Schlesinger Jr.'s riveting conjecture (Churchill Proceedings 1994-1995): what would have happened had Lenin died of typhus in 1895, had Hitler been shot on the Western Front in 1917, had Churchill been killed by the car on Fifth Avenue in 1931 and had Roosevelt been murdered by the assassin in 1933? Or just one or two of the above?

Would Britain sans Churchill have stood the test in 1940? Not if you read the private memoranda of Chamberlain and Halifax in the days before it became obvious, even to them, that life in Hitlerized Europe would be intolerable for Britain. There was probably never a time when the Poles of Warsaw were prepared to lay their heads on the block either; but they had no Churchill, so Hitler and then Stalin chopped away.

Churchill was born to a social butterfly and a political wastrel, Payne informs us. Lady Randolph slept around, and Lord Randolph had no redeeming characteristics whatever, a cad and a demagogue who lusted for power and died insane. Such a summary of Winston's parents would be devastating if true, yet there is enough that is true to make it sound devastating.

This goes on throughout the book. Churchill himself is "a roving and not especially brilliant Undersecretary of the Colonies, a statesmanlike President of the Board of Trade, a calamitously incompetent Home Secretary" (133) who uses troops to shoot down striking miners—well, if he didn't, he wanted to. In 1911 he steals the Admiralty from the more deserving Haldane through a relentless campaign with the Prime Minister. (In fact, Asquith took some time to decide on Churchill, and only after WSC displayed initiative in the Agadir Crisis.)

In World War I, when Churchill goes to Belgium to direct the defense of Antwerp and offers to sacrifice his office in that effort, his gesture is dismissed as grandstanding, since Antwerp fell anyway. King Albert's opinion was that Churchill's role at Antwerp delayed the enemy long

continued overleaf...
A REAL PAYNE, continued...

enough to save the Belgian Army and secure the northern French ports, "a service we shall never forget." You won't find the King's opinion here.

Churchill's conduct of the Admiralty is scarcely by the Gallipoli affair, where all his mistakes are aired along with a handful of errors by others: Payne admits that Gallipoli was lost by Kirchener's inaction and incompetence. Thrown out of power, Churchill departs for the front, where he is "a cautious sensible solider with a perplexing habit of going off to meet high officials on short notice" (164) and is thoroughly detested by his men. (In fact, most of those high officials arrived demanding to meet him, and he left beloved by his men, who saw a failed politician arrive and a respected leader depart.) Later in the war, as Minister of Munitions, Churchill "produced tanks on a vast scale" (168)—but his real accomplishment, producing munitions sufficient to supply the army through 1919, gets no mention.

Payne's treatment of Churchill's twowars career is sophomoric. On the 1921 Middle East settlement his chief impression is that Churchill placed two inappropriate kings on the thrones of Iraq and Jordan. (The former's dynasty governed thirty-seven years; the latter's grandson governed wisely and well until his death a few months ago.) There is not one word on the Irish settlement, which kept the peace in Ireland for half a century. As for Churchill's opposition to Dominion status for India, Winston "couldn't talk about Gandhi without foaming at the lips" (197). Really!

In this account Churchill almost singlehandedly causes the 1926 General Strike by his mistakes as Chancellor of the Exchequer. (In fact, he merely followed recommendations of experts, something Payne says he always resisted.) In the midst of it, Churchill produces "an inflammatory broadsheet," the British Gazette, "designed to terrify the strikers into submission" (185). Modern readers of the Gazette will wonder where the terrifying parts are, and how much Churchill had to do with the Gazette's sur-

feit of boring Government pronouncements. In its last issue, Payne says, Churchill writes about how he alone "convinced a small group of men" to let him produce the Gazette. This is all arrant nonsense, as any reader of more factual accounts knows. But it is very typical of Mr. Payne's biography.

The author makes it his business not only to misrepresent but to misinterpret. Churchill's joking quip on one of his New York trips that he had simple tastes and was happy to put up with the best is transformed into "only the best satisfies me" (202). To prove WSC's disregard for his "social inferiors" Payne invokes Phyllis Moir—the only secretary who was less than devoted (204). As for social superiors, Churchill defends Edward VIII in the 1936 Abdication crisis "not so much out of gallantry but to defend himself" (224). Isn't this remarkable: His wife thought Winston's defense of Edward was carrying gallantry too far, and courting destruction through generosity.

On World War II, Payne admits that Churchill's speeches are inspirational, but he swallows wholesale all the criticisms of Churchill as a wild man who must be restrained from foolhardy ideas, spoonfeeding us critiques sans encomiums. Thus we get heady doses of Alanbrooke's iconoclastic and negative book about Churchill's leadership—but never that of Ismay, who wrote quite the opposite. Indeed Ismay's memoirs are not even listed in Payne's bibliography.

For Payne the end of the war was the end of glory, as John Charmley would write in similar vein a generation later. Payne calls the 1945 election Churchill's "first death," and derides WSC's "Gestapo speech" (338), never considering the solid sense that lay in it, or how totalitarian certain Socialist councils later became in Britain. At Potsdam WSC fails because "he hadn't done his homework" (341). All he can think about is nuking the Soviets—a nugget Payne found in Alanbrooke (342).

Even modest scholars know that Churchill's party was thrown out of office in 1945 because the voters were weary of the war and the Tories who had caused it; but according to Payne, Churchill loses because "he had mastered them too long...taken all the power to himself, leaving none to others, and they were weary of him" (343). Does anyone believe this?

In 1945, "like many very rich men," Churchill wonders whether he has enough money to live on (349). But Churchill wasn't rich in 1945, and did indeed wonder; his fortune wasn't secure until 1948. To make his fortune he engaged in writing some of his "worst books," like The Second World War: Payne summarizes Churchill's lines at the end of Volume II about 1940 ("this tremendous year") as his poorest: "a schoolboy could have written this passage, and done it better. There is no sharpness in the vision; only a blur of triumph." Funny how it's still in print.

The last twenty years of Churchill's life comprise a "withered garland," producing nothing. His scintillating reappraiser as Leader of the Opposition, rather than Churchill's second premiership and postwar books are dismissed or ignored. WSC has strokes and lapses into melancholia; "frittering his time away" is how Payne sees Churchill at 85, an age when most people are be happy to be alive and frittering. And, of course, the proverbial "Black Dog" of melancholy was a Churchill characteristic since his earliest days: "too often for his own comfort his round cherubic face was a mask for desolation and despair" (9).

Reading this book makes you wonder, in the light of so many testimonials to Churchill's prevailing optimism until his very last years, just how one author could have got one subject so wrong. Could he have undertaken his book with predisposed opinions brought upon by his own unhappy childhood or visions of grandeur as an author? Perhaps there are no great authors, there are only authors, and the glory belongs to all of them.
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Sinking Lusitania

A
n old red herring, that Churchill conspired to set up RMS Lusitania to be sunk by a German submarine in 1915, recently surfaced on Listserv Winston. In response we posted Harry Jaffa’s 1980 article, “Churchill and the Lusitania,” which shoots this notion full of holes. (You’ll find it in the “opinion” section of our website.)

No sooner had we exploded the Lusitania theory than someone insisted, “but

what if Churchill was presented with the option to set her up (to bring America into the war)? Wouldn’t he have taken the gamble?” Toronto student Graham Taylor puts this hypothetical to rest so deftly—with such relevance to Churchill’s entire philosophy—that we thought readers would like to see his words. -Ed.

The concept that Churchill might have accepted a ‘painful-but-necessary’ option to influence America to go to war by sinking RMS Lusitania rests on five ideas that are both repulsive in themselves, and entirely contrary to the principles for which Churchill stood: (1) Allies can be manipulated and misled if the manipulator’s goals are right. (2) The right of free nations to choose their own course can be set aside in wartime if a benevolent foreigner knows better. (3) “Neutrality” is an abstract concept created by lawyers and diplomats far removed from the realities of war. (4) American civilians are fair game if their deaths can advance political ends. (5) Civilian deaths are acceptable if they serve a higher strategic purpose.

I unequivocally reject the first three, and I think the reason should be self-evident: honesty, national freedom, and the rule of law cannot be set aside, even in war. Finally, if Churchill had caused Lusitania to be sunk, he would have been consenting to the sacrifice of human lives in the interests of perverting honesty, law and freedom.

-Graham Taylor
INSIDE THE JOURNALS

John G. Plumpton

One of the missions of Finest Hour is to bring its readers the best and latest in Churchill scholarship. Some scholarship is first published in scholarly and even popular journals, and to cover that area we offer abstracts. Readers should bear in mind that abstracts represent the author's view but not necessarily that of the editor, Mr. Plumpton or of Finest Hour.

European Union


Winston Churchill’s call in 1945 for a “United States of Europe,” a federation of European states to promote harmonious relations between nations, economic cooperation, and a sense of European identity, has caused him to be regarded as the father of European unity. While in opposition, Churchill argued forcefully at home and abroad that a united Europe was the best means to heal residual hatred from the Second World War. Yet Churchill’s rhetoric is sometimes difficult to reconcile with his ambivalence regarding Britain’s role in his proposed federation, particularly after he returned to power in October 1951.

This paper explores several questions: What did he mean by a United States of Europe? What was to be Britain’s role in a unified Europe? How did Churchill’s commitment to European unity fit with his deep commitment to preserving Britain’s status as a global power? How did Churchill’s political ambitions affect his European unification initiative? How did Churchill’s beliefs and actions change upon his regaining office?

Churchill coined the term “United States of Europe” in a Saturday Evening Post article in February 1930. He believed that “obsolete hatreds” could be appeased by the American federalist model, but that Britain would not belong. “We have our own dreams. We are with Europe but not of it. We are linked but not compromised.”

The threat of Nazi Germany caused him to put the issue away until he proposed an Anglo-French Union as France was falling to the Germans in June 1940. In December of that year he spoke of a postwar Europe of five Great Powers (United Kingdom, France, Italy, Spain and Prussia) and four confederations operating in a Council of Europe to include a “supreme judiciary and a Supreme Economic Council to settle currency questions.” Privately he was still determined to maintain close links with the United States and the British Commonwealth, and to maintain Britain as a world power in its own right.

In 1942, expressing concern about “Russian barbarism” threatening Europe’s revival, he focused less on the primacy of the English-speaking world. “We will have to work with the Americans,” he wrote, “but Europe is our prime care.” In January 1943 he issued a paper calling for “an instrument of European government formed by units including the great European powers and blocs made up of smaller states.” This paper was attacked by the Foreign Office for vagueness.

In the postwar years, Churchill’s advocacy of European unification served as a forum for reestablishing his status in his own party in Britain, and on the international scene. Only months after the war ended he advocated a “United States of Europe” to unify the continent “in a manner unknown since the fall of the Roman Empire.” The federation would be one of several regional units in the new United Nations. He did not believe the United Nations could prevent a future European war without a united Europe. He gave his most famous speech on this topic in Zurich on 19 September 1946. He now visualized the United States of Europe as one of four U.N. pillars, along with the British Empire and Commonwealth, a U.S.-led Western Hemisphere, and a Soviet sphere. The first step would be an alliance between France and Germany. He asked General de Gaulle to “take Germany by the hand and rally her to the West and European civilization,” but the French President insisted on British participation at the beginning stage.

In January 1947 Churchill chaired the newly organized Provisional United Europe Committee comprised of British political leaders, academics and religious leaders. He also attempted to set up a bipartisan organization, the All Party Group, within Britain to promote a united Europe, but failed to gain the support of Prime Minister Clement Attlee. (See his Commons exchange with Willie Gallacher on this subject, page 37.)
The inspirational rhetoric of his public speeches envisioned elements of supranationalism, though he was still unwilling to jeopardize Britain's privileged relationship with other English-speaking nations by joining in a European federation. In 1947 and 1948 he sought to link the United Europe initiative in Britain with like-minded continental groups. He founded the United Europe Movement in Britain, served as its president and sought Labour support for it. He was now placing Britain closer to the heart of European unification than ever before.

At the Congress of the European Movement at The Hague on 7-10 May 1948 Churchill's European unity strategy paid rich dividends. He made several highly publicized speeches and in his keynote address Churchill sketched out his vision of a united Europe and Britain's place in it, emphasizing that it was "impossible to separate economic and defence from the political structure." He called for a European Assembly and spoke of three world pillars in the United Nations—the USSR, the United States and Western Hemisphere—and a Council of Europe that included Britain "linked to its Empire and Commonwealth." He hoped to reach a time when people would be proud to say, "I am a European," and would think of themselves as much European as of their native land.

He next faced the task of organizing formal institutions for a united Europe. He hoped a Council and Assembly of Europe would provide a forum for his views while Labour was in power and would hasten the reentry of Germany into the European family. Creating the institutions gave him a sense of purpose and combative enjoyment he had not felt since the war, but it tested his convictions versus his rhetoric. It was also like squaring a circle trying to maintain close relations with the USA and the Commonwealth while drawing closer to Europe.

Churchill acknowledged these two visions of European unity but tried not to define the organizational structure at this stage. At the European Assembly in July 1949, he addressed the intergovernmental-federal debate by suggesting that all possibilities be explored. His main goal was to foster a Europeanism which would include Germany.

Until his return to office, Churchill's strategy of building confidence and sentiment for European union without rigid constitutional clashes with continental wishes to construct just such arrangements, Treaties to pool coal and steel and to establish a European Army severely tested Churchill's delicate balancing act of engaging Britain with its Atlantic, Empire and Commonwealth responsibilities on acceptable terms.

After Churchill's motion creating a European Army—though not a supranational one—was passed by the European Assembly, he faced the problems of spelling out the structure. Constructing a European Army brought Churchill back to the role of national sovereignty. Privately, he hoped for national divisions under a "SHAEF-like command with a civilian Defence Chief responsible to existing national governments acting together." He believed that a European Army without national contingents would not have a fighting spirit. Publicly, he preferred to comment on proposals of others rather than present schemes of his own.

In London, President Eisenhower gave an impassioned speech on European unification. Although Churchill called the speech "one of the greatest speeches by an American in my lifetime," he and Eisenhower differed on the extent of unification and it soon became evident both men were moving in opposite directions on the issue.

Did Churchill manipulate the European Movement for political gain or did he sincerely accept its implications for Britain and the continent? Though he never expressed unqualified support for a federal Europe, favouring instead an intergovernmental approach, he fully exploited his status while out of power to avoid making hard choices. His public utterances appear closer to accepting a federal Europe than he was prepared to do in office. In a 29 November 1951 Cabinet memorandum, Churchill said unequivocally that Britain should not become an "integral part of European integration" as it would "forfeit our insular or commonwealth-wide character."

What did Churchill's more than two decades of involvement in European unity ultimately mean? Was it simply political partisanship, an egotistical need to possess an international public forum, a display of innovative thinking, a means of maintaining Europe's balance of power with minimum British commitments, a last-ditch attempt to preserve Britain's global status in a superpower world, or some combination of the above? Historians have divided into two camps on the issue. Some do not see Churchill's statements as inconsistent with his action, since there never was a real chance, under Churchill, for Britain to participate in a supranational European organization. Others insist Churchill sincerely believed in the progressive merging of continental sovereignty but was unsure of Britain's membership in it in the immediate or near future.

We can, however, draw the following conclusions: Whatever his intentions, Churchill's words inspired and energized continental sentiment for a solution to Europe's postwar weakness and lack of recovery. Providing legitimacy with his prestige, Churchill gave continental proponents of a united Europe political cover and helped them create forums to convert public sentiment into governmental policy. Churchill's rhetoric also began debate, which continues to this day within Britain, about its future as a world power and the role Europe could play in that endeavour. Though in guarding Britain's independence Churchill may have looked to the Victorian past to solve the problems of the present, it would not be the first time in history that ideas and goals from the past propelled a nation, and a continent, into the future.
Churchill in Stamps: Farewell and Appendix

Pages 277-282: WRAPPING IT UP...
Catalogue numbers are Scott (#) or Stanley Gibbons (sg). A slash mark (/) indicates a set with a common design from which any value is usable. Carus and Minkus catalogue numbers, when mentioned, are identified by name.

Our philatelic biography of Winston Churchill ends on page 279, and is then followed by a thick sheaf of appendices, of which we will give you some of the flavor in the next few installments. There is, as foregoing installments have demonstrated, no end to what you can do in portraying Churchill's life with Churchill commemorative stamps and the infinite variety of Churchill-related (C-R) stamps. While it is much less organized than the standard approach of "collecting everything" and inserting stamps in an album country by country, some may find this concept more interesting. Every "C-R" collection is different, and how you design it is limited only by your own research and imagination.

277. Dwight Eisenhower's tribute, as Churchill's coffin was carried up the Thames to embark for its final resting place at Bladon, was as fine a eulogy as anyone could have written, and still carries wisdom for today. It covers the last three pages of this biography, illustrated by stamps depicting Churchill and Eisenhower. On this page are an Ajman "World Peace" label and a Turks & Caicos Islands souvenir sheet #298a, sg MS432.

278. The eulogy continues, with another Ajman Eisenhower label and a Cook Islands souvenir sheet #421a, sg MS511.

279. Ike's tribute concludes as Sir Winston walks into the sunset, illustrated by Umm al Qiwain sg 65/141, Minkus 66/66A; and a Manama souvenir sheet dedicated to Roosevelt but also showing Eisenhower and Churchill, Minkus 335, Carus 399.

280. Our Appendix begins with a list of Churchill's major decorations (which needs to be updated with the help of Douglas Russell's book, The Orders, Decorations and Medals of Sir Winston Churchill). Illustrating the Order of the Garter are Haiti #604, sg 1104; St. Christopher, Nevis, Anguilla #292, sg 309; and Umm al Qiwain sg 66/142, Minkus 67/67A.

281. Additional British Honors include Freeman of Douglas, Isle of Man (post-1980 issue). Dubai #120B-123B, sg 147-50 (black bordered) depict the Garter-topped casket lying in state.

282. The first of a two-page listing of Churchill's books is illustrated with Churchill commemoratives on a bookish theme: Nicaragua #C584/C589, sg 1556/60; Sharjah sg 201/231, Minkus 213/213A; and Haiti #608, sg 1118.

(To be continued)
VALIDATION

"...At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our final, affectionate though sad goodbye to the leader whom the entire body of free men owes so much.

"May God grant that we, and the generations who will remember him, heed the lessons he taught us: in his deeds, in his words; in his life...

...May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity, no man is denied opportunity for fulfillment.

"And now to you, Sir Winston, my old friend—goodbye."

--Gen. Dwight Eisenhower

a broadcast, as Churchill's coffin was carried up the Thames

---APPENDIX---

1.2 ADDITIONAL BRITISH HONORS

Lord Rector of Aberdeen University
Vice Rector of Edinburgh University
Chancellor of Bristol University
Honorary Fellow, Merton, Oxford
Honorary Doncher, Grey's Inn
Companion of Literature
Chairman of the Trustees, Churchill College, Cambridge
Honorary Academician Extraordinary of the Royal Academy, London
Elder Brother of Trinity House
Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports
Grand Seigneur of HUDSON'S BAY

Sunday Times Literary Award
Liverman of Mercer's Company

Honorary Life Member, Association of Men of Kent and Kentish Men


Honorary degrees from Oxford, Queen's, Bristol, Aberdeen, Leyden, London, St. Andrews, Liverpool and Cambridge.

---APPENDIX---

1.1 MAJOR DECORATIONS

Privy Councillor
Order of Merit
Companion of Honour
Fellow of the Royal Society
Nobel Prize for Literature
Grooten Medal, Netherlands
Charlemagne Prize, France
Williamsburg Award, U.S.A.
Freedom House Award, U.S.A.
Benjamin Franklin Award, U.S.A.
Knight Companion, Most Noble Order of the Garter
Military Merit of Spain Order
Punjab Medal
Egyptian Medal with Clasp
Queen's Medal for South Africa
1914-1915 Star
1939-1945 Star
Africa Star
Italy Star
France and Germany Star

2.1 BOOKS

Malakand Field Force, 1896
The River War (2 Vols), 1899
The New World (3 vols), 1930
London to Ladysmith, 1900
Ian Hamilton's March, 1900
Mr. Brodrick's Army, 1903
Lord Randolph Churchill (2 Vols), 1906
For Free Trade, 1906
My African Journey, 1908
Liberalism & the Social Problem, 1909
The People's Rights, 1910
The World Crisis (5 in 6), 1923-31
My Early Life, 1930
A Roving Commission (U.S. title)
India, 1931
Thoughts and Adventures, 1932
--And These Storms (U.S. title)
Marlborough (4 Vols), 1933-38
Great Contemporaries, 1937
Ams and the Covenant, 1938
--While England Slept (U.S. title)
Step by Step, 1939
Into Battle, 1941
Blood, Sweat & Tears (U.S. title)
Wit & Wisdom

“A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION MAKES SLAVES OF ITS SUBJECTS”

There’s a gem around every corner of Lady Soames’s marvelous compilation of her parents’ correspondence (reviewed, page 36). This one, written to his wife after Churchill’s second speech to Congress in 1943, stopped us in our tracks:

“Although after 12 arduous years [President Roosevelt] would gladly be rid of it, it would be painful to leave with the war unfinished....To me this would be a disaster of the first magnitude. There is no one to replace him....On the other hand, the Constitution says there must be an election, and even now when it is twenty months away [November 1944] all thoughts are turned to the question of who is to hold the power. We should certainly not allow such a state of affairs in our country, but a written Constitution makes slaves of its subjects and is in this case totally unfit to the waging of war.”

“DUKE OF BARDOGS”

CHURCHILL ON A DUKEDOM

The possibility of Churchill’s receiving a Dukedom after the war led to speculations about what his son would be known as. (Page references are from Sir Martin Gilbert, Winston S. Churchill, Vol. 8, “Never Despair,” London: Heinemann, Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1988.)

1947:
In February Churchill acquired 120-acre Bardogs Farm, adjacent to Chartwell Farm, for £8700. About a quarter of it was rented in tenancies. In a letter to his barrister, Leslie Graham-Dixon, discussing a possible dukedom, WSC wrote with what we must think was tongue in cheek: “Duke of Bardogs would sound well, and Randolph could be Marquess of Chartwell.” (327 footnote 4; Churchill Papers, 1/34; Dixon to Gilbert, 15Mar82). Earlier, George VI had offered WSC a knighthood, the Order of the Garter, to which he famously replied (but not to the King): “I could hardly accept His Majesty’s offer of the Garter when his people have given me the Order of the Boot.”

1952:
On 22 February Jock Colville and Lord Moran (Churchill’s private secretary and physician respectively) went to Lord Salisbury for advice; the PM was “not doing his brief” and was indifferent to business. He hated delegating anything, yet he quickly noticed and reacted against any plan to “kick him upstairs.” Salisbury felt WSC might go to the Lords and remain Premier, with Eden leading the House as effective Premier.

Colville said: “He won’t do it. I did once suggest to him that he should go to the Lords, and thought at first he was taking it seriously, when he said: ‘I should have to be the Duke of Chartwell, and Randolph would be the Marquess of Tooleidro. I saw that he was laughing at me.” Salisbury agreed, saying, “He regards us in the Lords as a rather disreputable collection of old gentlemen.” (Rather the way the Lords seem to be regarded by Tony Blair’s present government...)

They agreed that one person might persuade Churchill to go to the Lords: The Queen. But soon he made another remarkable comeback with a great fighting speech, and the matter was laid aside. (703; sce also Moran’s Churchill: Struggle for Survival, pp. 375-8, quoting Colville; and Colville, Fringes of Power, p. 642.)

1955:
By the time Churchill resigned on 4 April, it had been determined that no further dukedoms would be offered except to Royal personages. Yet WSC was different from other Prime Ministers and an exception was considered. The Palace asked Colville if they could offer a dukedom, confident that Churchill would refuse it. Colville took some soundings. Churchill told him that he would never accept: “First of all what could he be Duke of?” Colville reported. “Secondly, even if he were Duke of Westerham, what would Randolph be? He could only be Marquess of Puddleduck Lane which was the only other possession he had apart from Chartwell. And thirdly, and quite seriously, he wished to die in the House of Commons as Winston Churchill.”

The oddest thing then happened. On April 5th the PM donned his frock coat and top hat for his Audience, and Colville, knowing he was hopelessly in love with The Queen, feared that despite all WSC’s assurances he might accept out of his affection for her.

Churchill returned from the Palace with tears in his eyes: “Do you know, the most remarkable thing—she offered me a Duke.” With trepidation Jock asked what he had replied. “Well, you know, I very nearly accepted, I was so moved by her beauty and her charm and the kindness with which she made this offer, that for a moment I thought of accepting. But finally I remembered that I must die as I have always been—Winston Churchill. And so I asked her to forgive my not accepting it. And do you know, it’s an odd thing, but she seemed almost relieved.”

(1123-24; Colville to Randolph Churchill 8Jun65.)

CHURCHILL ON NAPOLEON

Graham Taylor writes: “I should probably know the answer to this one, but what did Churchill find so fascinating about Napoleon? He didn’t relateg him to the ‘power-mad dictator’ heap, so there must be something he found attractive.”

Surely it was his reverence for France, and for great war leaders (he wrote cogently about Caesar and Marlborough) that led Churchill to Napoleon, not to mention that the Corsican made quite an impressive comeback—like WSC. Remember that as early as Harrow, he fore-
Department of Myths and Fables: The Churchill-Fleming Non-Connection

The story that Sir Alexander Fleming or his father (the renditions vary) saved Churchill’s life has been roaming around the Internet lately. We must have had fifty emails about it. Charming as it is, it is certainly fiction. The story apparently originated in *Worship Programs for Juniors*, by Alice A. Bays and Elizabeth Jones Oakbery, published ca. 1950 by an American religious house, in a chapter entitled “The Power of Kindness.”

According to Bays/Oakbery, Churchill is saved from drowning in a Scottish lake by a farm boy named Alex. A few years later Churchill telephones Alex to say that his parents, in gratitude, will sponsor Alex’s otherwise unaffordable medical school education. Alex graduates with honours and in 1928 discovers that certain bacteria cannot grow in certain vegetable molds. In 1943 when Churchill becomes ill in the Near East, Alex’s invention, penicillin, is flown out to effect his cure. Thus once again Alexander Fleming saves the life of Winston Churchill.

Dr. John Mather writes: “A fundamental problem with the story is that Churchill was treated for this very serious strain of pneumonia not with penicillin but with ‘M&B,’ a short name for sulfadiazine produced by May and Baker Pharmaceuticals. Since he was so ill, it was probably a bacterial rather than a viral infection as the M&B was successful.

“Kay Halle, in her charming book *Irresistible Churchill* (Cleveland: World 1966) comments (p. 196) that Churchill ‘delighted in referring to his doctors, Lord Moran and Dr. Bedford, as M&B.’ Then, when Churchill found that the most agreeable way of taking the drug was with whisky or brandy, he commented to his nurse: ‘Dear nurse, pray remember that man cannot live by M and B alone.’ But there is no evidence in the record that he received penicillin for any of his wartime pneumonias. He did have infections in later life, and I suspect he was given penicillin or some other antibiotic that would have by then become available, such as ampicillin. Also, Churchill did consult with Sir Alexander Fleming on 27 June 1946 about a staphylococcal infection which had apparently resisted penicillin. See *Churchill: Taken from the Diaries of Lord Moran* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1966), p. 335.”

Official biographer Sir Martin Gilbert adds that the ages of Churchill and Fleming (or Fleming’s father) do not support the various accounts circulated; Alexander Fleming was seven years younger than Churchill. If he was ploughing a field at say age 13, Churchill would have been 20. There is no record of Churchill nearly drowning in Scotland at that or any other age; or of Lord Randolph paying for Alexander Fleming’s education. Sir Martin also notes that Lord Moran’s diaries, while mentioning “M&B,” say nothing about penicillin, or the need to fly it out to Churchill in the Near East.
Available Again: Two Famous Ceramics

DOUGLAS J. HALL

"VERY WELL, ALONE."

In his speech in the House of Commons on 4 June 1940, referring to the "colossal military disaster" of Dunkirk, Winston Churchill said, "...we shall defend our island...if necessary alone...we shall fight on the beaches...we shall never surrender." David Low drew, in the London Evening Standard, what was to become perhaps the best remembered Allied cartoon of World War II: a solitary steel-helmeted soldier standing on the seashore, waves breaking at his feet, looking skywards and shaking his fist at a swarm of approaching aircraft. The caption read, "Very well, alone."

In 1990 the History in Porcelain Company, following the success of its earlier figure of Churchill on the doorstep of Number 10 Downing Street (see page opposite), commissioned Andrew Turner to model a special Churchill figure to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Britain. Mr. Turner, drawing inspiration from Churchill's words and Low's cartoon, portrayed his subject in siren suit and steel helmet standing arms akimbo on the foreshore at Dover, binoculars hanging around his neck and at his feet a tangle of barbed wire from the makeshift defences which by then festooned the beach to hinder a possibly imminent invasion. Churchill's defiant posture and resolute expression, superbly represented by Turner's 11 1/2-inch high, finely detailed figure, surely evokes David Low's caption, "Very well, alone."

The figure was originally offered in the UK at £575 ($930) in a limited edition of five hundred but unfortunately the Ashmor Fine China Company, which had been producing the History in Porcelain figures, went into liquidation after only twenty-one examples had been completed. The good news is that recently another high-class Worcester porcelain business, Albany Fine China, has acquired the fixed assets of Ashmor Fine China, including the moulds for many of the figures in the History Porcelain series. Albany Fine China is well established as a specialty producer of high quality bird and animal models but does not wish to become directly involved in the distinctly different venture of marketing historical figures. However, it is able to procure the part-time services of a highly skilled painter, formerly employed by Worcester Royal Porcelain and Ashmor Fine China, and can provide pottery facilities to enable a strictly limited number of this fine Churchill figure to be produced on a made-to-order basis. Delivery is normally three months after your order. However, since the manufacturer keeps a small stock against orders, you may receive one of these much more quickly if you order early.

Churchill Stores (contact information on page 2) offers this figure for $750, $180 less than its original list price. Please order through the Churchill Stores catalogue. As usual, all items sold by Churchill Stores are in support of The Churchill Center and Societies.  

Left: Andrew Turner's outstanding porcelain commemorated the Battle of Britain. Above: Turner was in part inspired by David Low's cartoon by the same title, defying the oncoming Luftwaffe, June 1940.
"SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL, 10 DOWNING STREET, JUNE 4th 1940"

Such was the somewhat extended title of this large-scale china figure, pictured in colour on the cover of Finest Hour 55. On 4 June 1940 the Dunkirk evacuation had just been completed. In the House of Commons the Prime Minister of three weeks standing declared, "We shall go on to the end," in a peroration that will live as long as English is spoken.

In 1985, to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of VE-Day, David Porter, one-time Chairman of ICS (UK), commissioned the History in Porcelain Company to produce an 11 1/2-inch-tall figure of Churchill acknowledging the crowd gathered outside 10 Downing Street to see him leave for the House of Commons to make his historic speech. The figure was modelled by Andrew Turner and potted by Ashmor Fine China, Worcester.

The detail is finely crafted and the hand-finished paintwork reputedly took 200 hours to apply, much of it requiring the artists to work with single-haired brushes. Churchill holds his right arm aloft to give his familiar V-sign. (I fear that is either something of an anachronism or, at best, a piece of artistic license—the Prime Minister did not "invent" his V-sign until August 1941.)

The facial detail is fastidiously painted but opinion was divided over whether Mr. Turner quite captured the Churchillian expression. Certainly he gave the figure rather less hair than his subject actually had in 1940 which, for some, resulted in an overly egg-headed appearance. Nevertheless, whilst the critics carped the enthusiasts flocked to reserve their copy of the figure.

The promotional literature announced a limited edition of 350 and there was later some controversy when production was extended to 375 examples "due to unprecedented demand." Limited editions are normally regarded as sacrosanct. The controversy flared again when unnumbered examples started to be sold although the original edition had not sold out. That somewhat unethical practice was defended because the figures were being sold in aid of the Guinea Pig Club, a six hundred-strong association of severely burned airmen and air-raid victims who had been operated upon during World War II by the pioneering plastic surgeon Sir Archibald McIndoe. Purists would argue, and did, that deserving charity or not, thou shalt not exceed thy declared limited edition. Later Albany Fine China acquired the assets of Ashmor Fine China and found that the records of the latter showed that only 200 figures had been produced.

The first figures were sold with a "Certificate of Authenticity" signed by Lady Soames, Lord Home (PPS to Neville Chamberlain 1937-40 and Prime Minister 1963-64), Sir John Colville and Lily Friend, a member of Churchill's household staff. Price in the UK was £555. The figure, shipped and insured to the USA was priced at $1000, the sales benefitting ICS.

Few of the figures have been seen on the British secondary market. An example was auctioned by Phillips, London in 1991 making only £400. Another was included in a single lot, consisting of more than thirty items of Churchilliana, which was sold by Sotheby's, London in 1996 for a total of £2070. That purchase, which included many sought-after pieces, represented a wonderful windfall for the lucky buyer but was hardly bountiful to the unfortunate seller. I have just one report of a sale in the United States: a 1993 catalogue included the figure at $1500.

In addition to the "Alone" figure shown opposite, Ronald Smith has also organised the production of "second editions" of "10 Downing Street" with both Ashmor and Albany backstamps as a Churchill Stores offer, at the same $875 as the "Alone" figure, inclusive of professional packing and insured airmail. Order from Churchill Stores (contact information on page 2). As with the "Alone" figure, a small stock is kept on hand against upcoming orders, so members may receive their copy sooner than the normal three-month lead time if they order promptly.
By Curt Zoller (Curt@fia.net)

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

937. Whom did Churchill wish to be Godfather to Randolph? (C)

938. Who wrote the introduction to Churchill’s book, Liberalism and the Social Problem? (L)

939. Which American Vice President criticized Churchill’s Fulton speech, calling him "the Mephistopheles of alliances and power politics"? (M)

940. In what year was Churchill initiated into the Freemasons? (P)

941. In 1936 Churchill wrote “How to Stop War.” Where can you find it? (S)

942. What was the code name for the Dunkirk evacuation? (W)

943. Where can you find the correspondence between WSC and Bourke Cockran, American lawyer and Democratic Member of Congress? (C)

944. How much did Churchill receive from The Strand Magazine for each of five articles about his African travels? (He ultimately sold two more for the same price.) (L)

945. Roosevelt wanted a painting of the Big Three at Yalta and Douglas Chandor was chosen as the artist. What happened to the painting? (M)

946. In 1905 Churchill was offered the Financial Secretaryship to the Treasury. He was, however, able to convince the Prime Minister to appoint him to a different position. What was it? (P)

947. Several times Churchill commented on his fate if his father would have been American rather than his mother. What would have been his position, in that case, with regard to involvement in Europe? (S)

948. In which article, published in September 1924, did Churchill consider the effects of atom bombs delivered by misiles against cities, military installations and naval yards? (W)

949. Who commented about WSC: “With all his faults, his is the lion heart?” (C)

950. How did the British publisher of Churchill’s Second World War manage to squeeze 20,000 more copies out of a limited supply of paper? (L)

951. Which prominent American commented: “I saw the Englishman, Winston Churchill...he is not an attractive fellow.” (M)

952. In how many speeches did Churchill refer to “blood, toil, tears and sweat”? (P)

953. In Marlborough, Churchill puts forward a threefold rule of conduct for nations. What is it? (S)

954. What were Germany’s two greatest errors in World War I, according to Churchill? (W)

955. Whom did Churchill send as his personal representative to Chiang Kai-shek in 1943? (C)

956. In which of Churchill’s articles did he quote Tennyson’s “Locksley Hall”? (L)

957. The Duke of Marlborough achieved a famous victory over the French, commanded by Marshal Villeroy in 1706 during the War of the Spanish Succession. What was the name of the town for which it was named? (M)

958. What was Churchill’s word of advice for budding artists? (P)

959. On 19 November 1939 Churchill reported to the War Cabinet the impact of German minelaying opposite the entrance of the Thames estuary. What was his recommended response? (S)

960. At the height of the Battle of Britain WSC commented: “We must regard the generalship here shown as an example of genius in the art of war.” Who was the genius? (W)

Answers to Churchilltrivia in FH 101:

(913) John Colville served three Prime Ministers: Neville Chamberlain, Winston Churchill and Clement Attlee. (914) Frederick Woods wrote about “Churchill’s Method of Writing” in Artillery of Words. (915) When comparing the US Constitution to the Socialist Party Churchill said the Constitution “declares all men to be born equal,” the Socialist Party “All men must be kept equal.” (916) Churchill bought Chartwell in September 1922. (917) Roosevelt later admitted to Harry Hopkins that his “Unconditional Surrender” demand at Cairo was a slip of the tongue. (918) In Polish fighter squadrons WSC said one Pole was worth three Frenchmen. (919) Nellie Hozier was a nurse in Belgium in 1914; captured by the Germans, she was released almost immediately. (920) The Malakand despatches were entitled “The War in the Indian Highlands” and signed “A Young Officer.” (921) The architect who designed Blenheim was Sir John Vanbrugh. (922) Churchill is buried at the Church of St. Martin’s in Bladon, Oxfordshire. (923) On 8 March 1944 WSC minute the Defense Council regarding bacteriological warfare “...if our enemies should indulge in this form of warfare, the only deterrent would be our power to retaliate.” (924) Admiral Keyes was Naval Chief of Staff during the Dardanelles affair. (925) Chamberlain’s response about Churchill in the government was, “I won’t have anyone who will rock the boat.” (926) WSC signed his letters to The Harrovian “ Junius Junior.” (927) Churchill had his first heart attack during the night of 26 December 1941 while visiting Washington, D.C. (928) The Williamsburg Award was presented at Draper’s Hall, London, 7 December 1955. (929) General Montgomery defined leadership as “The capacity and the will to rally men and women to a common purpose, and the character which inspires confidence.” (930) Operation “Felix” was a German plan to seize Gibraltar. (931) Lady Gwendolen (“Goonie”) Bertie married Winston’s brother Jack. (932) Churchill quoted “Pretty Polly Oliver” in “Women in War” in The Strand Magazine, 2/38. (933) After Churchill’s death his son returned the Garter to the Queen, as is customary; Her Majesty later loaned the Insignia for display at Chartwell. (934) No Churchill speeches were broadcast from the House of Commons. (935) “Never give in” was in a speech on 29Oct41 to the boys at Harrow School. (936) Churchill’s remark about “fire and force of valiance” was made on 26Dec45, at the death of Admiral of the Fleet Sir Roger Keyes.
AMPERSAND

PERSONALITY OF THE CENTURY
As we go to press, former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu writes in the May 10th Time: "It is one of the 20th century's ironies that the most poignant tribute to Winston Churchill came from one of the most repugnant tyrants of our time. Toasting the British leader at Yalta in February 1945, Joseph Stalin said, 'I can think of no other instance in history where the future of the world depended on the courage of one man.' Without that one man, whose abhorrence of tyranny was matched by his contempt for its appeasers, the second half of the century would have become a Nazi-dominated nightmare. That the world witnessed instead the triumph of democracy, the defeat of totalitarianism (including the downfall of Stalin's own empire) and the emergence of new nations—not least the rebirth of Israel—must be attributed to Churchill's indomitable leadership and prophetich vision."

RIDDLES: RESIDENCES AND CAMPAIGNS LISTS IN FH 103...
Last issue we committed two errors in naming Churchill's London residences. (11 Morpeth Mansions not 12, and Number 11 does carry the blue plaque.) Thanks to Lady Soames's Speaking for Themselves, we have a much more complete list of residences. And from Ronald Cohen we have a complete list of Churchill's campaign record (16 wins, 5 losses)—but both will have to wait. We're out of room!

Recipes From No. 10
by Georgia Landemare (Churchill Family Cook, c.1940s-50s)
Updated & annotated by Barbara Langworth <b_langworth@conknet.com>

Stovary is a British term initially used to describe a dish that is served after dessert to cleanse and refresh the palate. Today it more often refers to tidbits served as appetizers, as well as to more substantial dishes that can be served for lunch, high tea or light supper.

Pâte à choux is the stuff of cream puffs and éclairs.

Mrs. Landemare makes a long puff filled with a shrimp mixture and a round puff filled with ham and chicken. I've used one pastry recipe to make some of each.

CHOUX PASTE (about 5 dozen bite-sized puffs)
1/4 lb butter
10 oz. water (1/2 pint UK, 1 1/4 cup US)
Pinch of salt
4 eggs
4 oz. (3/4 cup) flour

In a saucepan put water, butter and salt and bring to the boil. Mix the flour in all at once and beat well until the mixture leaves the sides of the pan. Remove from the heat and allow to cool for a minute or two* then gradually add the 4 eggs one at a time. (* or transfer to food processor fitted with steel blade; add eggs. Process until mixture is blended, smooth and shiny, 30-45 seconds.)

Using a pastry tube or press make small puffs (profiteroles) by piping straight up and small éclairs piping sideways on a greased pastry sheet.

Bake at 400° for 10 minutes and lower to 350° for 15-20 minutes more. Cool.

Whip 8 oz. heavy cream until stiff. Use half in each of these:

ÉCLAIRS AUX CREVETTES
Finely chop about 1/4 lb. cooked shrimp; add 1 tsp anchovy paste (recipe calls for "anchovy essence") and cayenne pepper to taste. Stir in half the whipped cream.
Split small éclairs on one side. Fill with mixture.

DUCHESSE ÉCARLATTTE
Finely chop about 1/4 lb. ham and chicken. Add cayenne pepper to taste and stir in half the whipped cream.
Split open the profiteroles and fill with the mixture.
BLAZON OF THE
SHIP'S ARMS
USS WINSTON S.
CHURCHILL:

Shield: Per fess enhanced nebuly Argent and Gules, a cross of the like surmounted by a fleur-de-lys Azure, in base a book expanded Or, leaved of the first below a lion passant guardant of the fourth.

Crest: From a wreath Argent and Gules a trident head per chevron Azure and of the first superimposed by a wreath of laurel and oak Or.

Motto: A stacked bipartite scroll Gules doubled Argent inscribed IN WAR: RESOLUTION and IN PEACE: GOOD WILL Or.

Belt: A belt Azure fimbriated and inscribed THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER Or.

Seal: The arms as blazoned in full color upon a white oval enclosed by a dark Azure collar edged on the outside with a rope Or and bearing the name USS WINSTON S. CHURCHILL at top and DDG 81 in base Or.

SYMBOLISM OF THE ARMS

Shield: The Cross of St. George and the fleur-de-lys are adopted from Churchill's augmentation on an inescutcheon on his ancestral coat of arms. Red is emblematic of valor and sacrifice. The red cross on the white field refers to the flag of St. George, who became Patron of the Most Noble Order of the Garter in 1348. The gold lion on the red field recalls Great Britain's heritage. The lion embodies strength, courage and determination. The nebuly alludes to the sky or clouds and highlights Britain's taking the full thrust of German air power in the Battle of Britain. The stylized book underscores Winston Churchill's fame not only as a gifted statesman and inspiring war leader, but also as an orator and author who was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature.

Crest: The trident symbolizes sea prowess and highlights USS Winston S. Churchill's vertical launch capabilities. The trident is divided per chevron suggesting a "V", emphasizing victory in war (Churchill's famous rallying sign) and defense strength in peace. The laurel recalls honor and high achievement and the oak strength and resolve.

Note: In 1953 Her Majesty The Queen made Churchill a Member of The Most Noble Order of the Garter, the premier British Order of Chivalry and the highest honor she could bestow.