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Churchill did not believe that war could be used freely as raw power might permit. Justice concerned him.

“We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries...because we are made of sugar candy.”

“The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.”

“Amity Street or Henry Street? Number 8, 197 or 426? An archeological investigation by our intrepid explorer.”
ER, ABOUT THOSE AIRCRAFT

The cover of Finest Hour 127 is a monstrosity. The aircraft at extreme tight is presumably a Hurricane—86% of our aircraft were initially Hurricanes—but it is given the Spitfire’s elliptical wings! The other two aircraft have a portly profile, four guns instead of eight, and appear to be powered by six-cylinder engines instead of twelves. The cockpit of the aircraft at lower left is given four panels on the exposed side, and resembles neither a Spitfire nor a Hurricane, having no visible radiator at all. Ugh! There are literally thousands of photos of those aircraft. Might not the artist have seen one of them? Admittedly most of those who flew them are dead. But not all! I continue to enjoy Finest Hour.

SIR ANTHONY MONTAGUE BROWNE KCMG CBE

DEFC, HIGH HALDEN, KENT

Editor’s response: My dear Anthony,

Sorry about the cover. You flew ’em, you should know! Artists take liberties. I must say how hard it is to get good color artwork for our covers. It is the one part of FH that lives “from mouth to hand.” I am never more than two numbers away from running out! Lady Soames and Minnie Churchill have saved me numerous times with good things from their own collections; or WSC’s paintings. I am glad you continue to enjoy FH. With all good wishes to Shelagh. Yours ever, RML.

ANOTHER SASSOON

On reading “Sassoon Revisited” in FH 126 I am reminded of another WWI poem by him, after he became disillusioned, “The General” (1917)

“Good-morning; good-morning!” the General said.

When we met him last week on our way up the line.

Now the soldiers he smiled at are most of them dead.

And cursing his staff for incompetent swine.

“He’s a cheery old card,” grunted Harry to Jack

As they slogged up to Arras with rifle and pack.

But he did for them both with his plan of attack.

ROBERT BROWN, NORTH VANCOUVER, B.C.

ON WAR CRIMES

In “Why was Churchill so forgiving of the Germans?” (FH 115:28-31, also on our website) Lloyd Robertson writes that in the House in 1946, Churchill advised against judging “vast categories of Germans” as “potentially guilty,” and above all against condemning the “ordinary people” of Germany. When ordinary people are subjected to cruelty, he allegedly said, “there are great numbers... who will succumb...”

I searched for this quotation thoroughly, including Hansard. WSC made two speeches mentioning resistance to Nazis in 1946 and neither included this quotation, nor were these sentiments expressed. This is an example of the many cases in which, for political reasons, false impressions of wartime Germany are being created.

KENNETH DUNJOHN

Editor’s response: I can advise where Mr. Robertson found that quotation. Do the speeches you checked include the one of 12 November 1946? Three references, all identical, contain the words Robertson quoted: Churchill, The Sinews of Peace (1948, p.233); Gilbert, Winston S. Churchill, vol. VIII (1988, p. 284); Rhodes James, ed., Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches 1897-1963, (1974, p. 7402). Assuming this speech is one of those you checked, it is remarkable (but hardly the exceptional) that Hansard failed to record all of his words. Whether he said these exact words in the Commons, or added them to his book, does not alter his attitude toward the defeated Germans—which was clear in scores of examples and incidents.

ALL HAIL QUEEN MARGRETHE

I am resigning. As an artist I am truly appalled with your negligence of Churchill’s legacy as an Artist. You should portray him as an artist first and as a diplomat second. His art is the self-exploration of his soul which guided his policy-making. (Hitler was an artist as well.) Recognize his diplomacy as an “art form,” for art requires much more critical-thinking skill than basic and advanced war strategy. All Hail Her Majesty Queen Margrethe II of Denmark; Artist First, Monarch Second!

DR. KAHLIL O. CRAWFORD, TORONTO

MORE DE GAULLE

May I suggest an issue of FH concentrating on the Churchill-de Gaulle relationship? Keep up the good work.

GILBERT MICHAUD, QUEBEC

Editor’s response: The standard work on the subject is François Kersaudy’s Churchill and de Gaulle (London: Collins, 1981; New York: Atheneum, 1982), a balanced and powerful examination. We will be on the lookout for anything new and unique that might come to us; reader recommendations are welcome. —Ed.
PRESIDENT’S LETTER

T H E C E N T R E

ANOTHER YEAR, ANOTHER TERM:
Looking back on the past thirty-six months, it is impossible not to see an upward trend, not only in worldwide interest in Sir Winston, but in all the organizations which serve his memory.

Three plus years at the Churchill Centre’s helm, and having recently been elected, to another two-year term as President, provides a convenient opportunity to share with you some perspective on Churchill, The Churchill Centre and its development.

Three years ago I expressed my concern that interest and enthusiasm in and for Churchill, his thought and ideas had plateaued; and that, unless Churchill Studies received some new and substantial impetus, a decline was inevitable. While there may indeed be a decline sometime in the future, I have seen no evidence of it. To be sure, the Library of Congress Exhibit here in the United States, the new Churchill Museum in London, and the steady flow of new books on Churchill and Churchill-related themes have contributed hugely to providing this necessary impetus. But in a real sense the various institutions and organizations, including ours, devoted to Churchill scholarship and the perpetuation of his legacy, have done their share as well. And from where I sit, I see them continuing to expand their programs and commitment “to keep the memory green and the record accurate.”

Another perspective I offer you is the magnificent contribution made by the Churchill family to whatever success the Centre may claim.

I have written and spoken on many, many occasions of the role Lady Soames has played in the Centre’s development—as Patron, as confidant, as highly active conference participant, as adviser, as constructive critic and perhaps, most importantly, as a warmly cherished friend.

And we should clearly recognize that Winston Churchill and Celia Sandys have made substantial and truly meaningful contributions to the Centre as well. Time and again we have asked Winston to address various Centre functions, to render quiet but vital assistance in fund raising efforts, and to lend a helping hand in touchy personal relationships. He has been a strong and persuasive advocate for the Centre. At our request, Celia has graciously and elegantly represented the Churchill family at numerous Centre events; and has promoted the Centre in many of her books and during her frequent public appearances. She, too, has helped us satisfactorily to resolve certain rather dicey matters. Both have rarely turned down any request, and then only reluctantly and for extraordinary reasons. We are deeply grateful to them both.

No doubt with the passage of a few additional years other perspectives will emerge. But until they do, my focus and that of our Board of Governors will be squarely and exclusively on the exciting and event-filled months ahead.

B O A R D O F F I C E R A N D G O V E R N O R E L E C T I O N S

Your Board of Governors met in Quebec for a day preceding the recent conference, elected new officers and made several new assignments. Elected as a Governor is Gary Garrison of Marietta, Georgia, a retired corporate communications consultant and Churchill Centre Associate, who becomes Local Affairs Coordinator, replacing Judy Kambestad. Re-elected as a Governor, Judy now applies her talent to another important project, membership development. Re-elected were Chairman of Academic Advisers James Muller and Trustees Chairman Richard Langworth. The Board reelected three officers: President Bill Ives, Vice President Charles Platt, and Treasurer Christopher Hebb. Suzanne Sigman, a former teacher and owner of a young people’s bookshop, was re-elected as a Governor and is now Secretary, and remains our Educational Programs Coordinator.

Secretary Douglas Russell, after twelve faithful years, is leaving us owing to the demands of his work as a Judge of the Iowa District Court. Jim Lane is also leaving the Board, although he remains active in efforts to expand our programs and presence in the Pacific Northwest. We are most grateful to Doug and Jim for their selfless devotion of time and energy, and are sure they will continue to be involved and in view at future Churchill Centre events.

Newly elected to the Board of Trustees is Marcus Frost of Mexia, Texas, a Churchill Centre Associate who joined us after hearing about the Centre at Bletchley Park in 2001. Marcus, who owns a large rock crushing company in Mexia, has been an enthusiastic supporter of many projects in that short time, and with his wife Molly is a familiar figure at our events. We welcome his wise counsel.

We are blessed with a surfeit of talent and enthusiasm of which any organization would be proud. We owe them, and you our members, everything. —RML
**DATELINES**

**FORTY YEARS ON**

LONDON, JANUARY 31ST— On the fortieth anniversary of Sir Winston Churchill’s funeral, a wreath was laid on the Thames, where his coffin was carried to the awaiting train to Bladon. The ceremony was made all the more poignant by the fact that the ring of poppies was placed from the deck of the original funeral ship, *Havengore*, by Sir Winston’s great-granddaughter Sophie Perkins, 16, and led the service from Tower Bridge.

“It’s a great honour to be able to lay this wreath,” said Miss Perkins, who is studying at Marlborough College in Wiltshire. “I am very proud to have this wonderful man as a great-grandfather.”

*Havengore* carried Sir Winston’s body on part of his last journey on 30 January 1965. Churchill, who died on January 24th, was laid to rest in the Oxfordshire village of Bladon following a service at St. Paul’s Cathedral. While Churchill’s coffin lay in state at Westminster Hall, more than 320,000 members of the public queued for hours to pay their respects.

The Lord Mayor of London, Michael Savory, helped Sophie lay the wreath, and remembered the original scene: “I stood in the crowds in 1965 as the funeral procession passed by. Everything was silenced, even the horses’ hooves were specially muffled. The only sound was the occasional squealing of the wheels of the gun carriage that bore Sir Winston’s body.”

The ceremony marked the launch of a new role for *Havengore*. From September she is promoting the triumph of liberty by taking Churchill’s archive in facsimile form to eastern Europe. The ship is regrettably for sale, since the owner, Owen Palmer, must return soon to Australia. For information telephone (01634) 813057 or email mail@havengore.com.

**PRESERVING FUNERAL TRANSPORT:**

The launch *Havengore*, above, carried Churchill’s coffin to Waterloo Station, where it was placed aboard the historic coach that had once borne the coffin of Edith Cavell (above right). The coach, too, is restored, and preserved at Pacific Palms Resort in California, with appropriate signage (right). Completing a triumvirate, the steam locomotive “Sir Winston Churchill,” which drew the coach to Bladon, is also preserved.

**THE FINEST HOUR**

INDUSTRY HILLS, CALIF., AUGUST 31ST— It is appropriate on this anniversary to note that the coach which took over the coffin from the *Havengore* in 1965 has also been carefully preserved. During a round of golf at Pacific Palms Resort with the marketing manager for the resort, I noticed the an old railway coach on the property. I found this to be very interesting and told her what a great piece of history it was.

As the accompanying sign states, this is the car in which Sir Winston Churchill was moved to his final resting place in 1965. Long before, this same coach was used to transport Edith Cavell to her resting place.

**Quotation of the Season**

“In the Middle East you have arid countries. In East Africa you have dripping countries. There is the greatest difficulty to get anything to grow on the one place, and the greatest difficulty to prevent things smothering and choking you by their hurried growth in the other. In the African Colonies you have a docile, tractable population, who only require to be well and wisely treated to develop great economic capacity and utility; whereas the regions of the Middle East are unduly stocked with peppery, pugnacious, proud politicians and theologians, who happen to be at the same time extremely well armed, and extremely hard up.”
place during World War I. Cavell was a British nurse who had been executed by the Germans as a spy.

When World War II began and scrap metal was needed, the old coach was slated for demolition; but Churchill, who had known and admired Edith Cavell, intervened to spare it. Later he expressed the wish to travel in it to his own grave. On 30 January 1965 this coach bearing his coffin was towed out of Waterloo Station to its destination at Bladon Churchyard, near Blenheim. Sir Winston had received his wish. The coach rests in what I have been told is a replica of St. Andrews Station.

—M. G. Dionne

LOCAL CHAPTER REPORT

ACTION THIS DAY AWARD

QUÉBEC, OCTOBER 2ND— Congratulations to New England Churchillians, who have won the Action This Day Award for the second year in a row. They had two local fund raising activities, the most new members, and tied with Georgia, North Carolina and our allied friends in Vancouver for school and community programs. Joe Hern, their leader, gave Churchill presentations to large audiences in the Boston Community. Georgia, North Carolina and The Churchill Society of Vancouver Island also had community programs. New England tied with Desert Churchillians and Vancouver for the most member events. Desert came in second, and was the only Affiliate which raised funds for the Churchill Centre, in addition to its other activities.

In the past year Churchill Centre local organizations and allies held thirty-six member events for a total of 1451 attendees and brought in seventy new members. California Desert, California South, Georgia and North Carolina gained full affiliate status. Gary Garrison of Georgia, taught classes on Churchill at a senior center and Joe Hern of New England gave “magic lantern” presentations on WSC to community organizations. The Rt. Hon. Sir Winston S. Churchill Societies of Vancouver, Edmonton and Calgary held essay contests or debates. The Other Club of Toronto, with the Churchill Society for the Advancement of Parliamentary Democracy completed their three-year fund raising program to revivify the Toronto statue of Churchill (FH 128), adding large display boards in the city park. Most of the groups are currently distributing Celia Sandys’ Churchill to local and school libraries.

The total scores for all the local groups far surpassed last year’s scores, which reflects their increased activities. Gary Garrison has been elected to the Board of Governors and is now Local Affairs Coordinator. Judy Kambestad has moved to Membership Development Coordinator. The Churchill Centre and its allies thank Judy for a job well done.

LOCAL NEWS:

NOTICE TO READERS

We report all the news of events past and coming that we are sent to by local affiliates or the local affairs coordinator. However, local and national news is gradually being shifted out of Finest Hour, which has a three-month lead time, and into the Chartwell Bulletin, which takes much less time to produce and is a better vehicle for timely information. Recent Bulletins have been full of this news. The Bulletin appeared three times in 2005 and we hope it will soon appear between each issue of FH. For the very latest news of past and coming events, always consult our website, www.winstonchurchill.org, or contact your nearest affiliate from the list published in each issue of FH and the Bulletin.

CHURCHILLIANS IN OZ, 1991

VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA, SEPTEMBER 10TH— Member Neil Kenworthy writes: “In your a list of previous Churchill Conferences I was surprised to see that one was held in our capital city, Canberra, in 1991, and that it was addressed by the then-U.S. Ambassador to Australia and Nauru, Melvin Sembler. I’m puzzled that I can’t recall ever hearing of this event. Were you present, and who organized it?”

In 1991 we had about fifty members in Australia—widely scattered, of course, but mostly around Australian Capital Territory, Victoria and New South Wales. So, when >>
Secretary Sampson Visits Villa Mirador, Casablanca

CASABLANCA, MOROCCO, JULY 20TH— In Anfa, one of the most picturesque and oldest areas of Casablanca, Villa Mirador was constructed in 1935 by Paul Andre Jules Cauvin, a fabric agent born in Paris and residing in New York. After the Allied landings in Morocco in November 1942, the villa was used by American forces.

During the Casablanca Conference on 14-24 January 1943, the villa housed Prime Minister Winston Churchill. It was here in Churchill’s famous traveling map room that he, Roosevelt and their combined chiefs of staff, laid plans for the campaigns to be launched against Germany, Italy, and Japan, and declared that the war would be carried on until the unconditional surrender of the Axis powers.

During the Conference the President and Prime Minister also met with Sultan Sidi Mohammed Ben Youssef and Crown Prince Moulay Hassan (now Sultan Mohammed V) and conferred with General de Gaulle, leader of the Free French Forces, and General Henri Giraud, French High Commissioner in North Africa.

On 2 May 1947, Villa Mirador was derequisitioned by the U.S. Army, and purchased by the U.S. government; American Consul General Charles W. Lewis, Jr. took possession. The purchase actually included “Bellevue II” which encompasses the villa, and “El Minzah,” an adjoining plot of land north of the villa, which now contains recreational facilities used by the Consulate General staff.

The map room has been preserved on the ground floor and today contains photographs of Churchill, Roosevelt, de Gaulle, Crown Prince Hassan, and others who participated in meetings there during the conference. A plaque on the door notes the occasion.

—THE HON. DAVID A. SAMPSON
DEPUTY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Above right: Executive Director Dan Myers presents a Churchill Centre oil on canvas painting, “Churchill After Karsh,” by Martin Driscoll (FH 114) to Deputy Secretary Sampson at the Department of Commerce. Mr. Sampson said, “The Churchill portrait will serve as a daily inspiration for the challenges of our time.”

Roger champagne and Wyndham Estates cabernet, thanks to the kindly intercession of our good friend Christian Pol-Roger in France. We then flew on to Canberra and Melbourne, winding up in Sydney.

The Winston Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia beautifully organized several meetings, as did Peter Jenkins in Victoria, our then-Australian representative, who is still a member. Peter’s painting of Winston Churchill adorns the cover of Finest Hour 73, which reported the events.

The actual conference comprised three events: dinner with Australian Churchill Fellows at the Memorial Trust in Sydney; the Embassy visit and a dinner at the Commonwealth Club, Canberra; and a party with Churchill Fellows at the Hotel Swanstead in Melbourne. At the U.S. Embassy, which in keeping with Canberra practice represents each nation’s architecture (its style is Colonial Virginian) we were welcomed by Melvin Sembler, now the American Ambassador to Italy. (He has the distinction of having been appointed to each of his posts by a different President Bush.) In 1991, he told us that the Embassy cornerstone had been laid on—ready for it?—7 December 1941! The then-Ambassador wired home on the 8th: “What do we do now?” The President or Secretary of State Hull replied: “Keep building the damn thing, lest the Aussies think we’re on the run!”

We had a grand time, traveling on the wonderful “Ghan,” riding camels, watching crocs in the Alligator River being dive-bombed by plumed birds in steamy Kakadu, drinking gallons of Fosters, eating widgey grubs (not me) on a tourist station, snorkeling the Barrier Reef and dining royally.

This proved the high point for a time of “ICS Australia,” and membership has bumped along ever since. The problem has always been the “two D’s”: Distances and the Dardanelles. (Yes, in Australia, they still remember the terrible losses of the ANZACS in 1915, and Churchill comes in for his
share of the blame.) Right now, Alfred James represents us in Australia, where we have many longtime members. Mesers. Kenworthy and James are in touch, along with our friends at the Churchill Memorial Trust of Australia. We hope for future activities soon in a great and friendly land. —RML

HOW MANY WORDS?
BOSTON, SEPTEMBER 10TH— Through the wonders of computer science (via Ian Langworth, Northeastern University), we can advise that the present corpus of works by and about Winston S. Churchill exceeds 50 million words (325 megabytes) including 13 million (80 megabytes) by WSC himself.

In terms of word count, Churchill’s top eight works are:
The Complete Speeches, 5,200,000
The Second World War, 1,600,000
The Collected Essays, 860,000
The World Crisis, 824,000
Marlborough, 779,000
English-Speaking Peoples, 510,000
Lord Randolph Churchill, 278,000
The River War, 200,000
*does not count appendices

This discovery immediately led Sir Martin Gilbert to ask Ian for word counts for the official biography. The total for the eight biographic volumes (including the first two by Randolph Churchill) is 3,111,090 words. The sixteen Companion or Document Volumes published to date add another 5,382,066, for a grand total of 8,391,156.

For lovers of statistics, but risking possible brain-death: six copies of all of the above can fit on one 25¢ compact disk. One copy would fill a mere 1/100,000th of the Northeastern University College of Computer Science system, which holds 11 terabytes (11,000 gigabytes).

What would Sir Winston make of this? We know what his biographer thinks. Once accused of having told “only one-tenth of the story of Winston Churchill,” Sir Martin replied: “Really—that much?”

LOCAL CONTACTS
TCC Official Affiliates in Bold Face

Local Affairs Coordinator:
Gary Garrison (ccggary@bellsouth.net)
2364 Beechwood Drive, Marietta GA 30062
tel. (770) 509-5430, fax (770) 565-5925
Deputy Coordinator
Paul Courtenay (ndege@tiscali.co.uk)
Park Lane Lodge, Quarley
Andover, Hampshire SP11 8QF UK
tel. (01264) 898267

Sir Winston S. Churchill Society of Alaska
Judit & Jim Muller (ajfwm@uaa.alaska.edu)
2410 Galewood St., Anchorage AK 99508
tel. (907) 786-4740; fax (907) 786-4647

Churchill Centre Arizona
Larry Pine (lpine@chartwellgrp.com)
4927 E. Crestview Dr., Paradise Valley AZ 85253
bus. tel. (602) 445-7719; cell (602) 622-0566

California: Churchillians of the Desert
David Ramsay (rambo85@aol.com)
74857 S. Cove Drive, Indian Wells CA 92210
tel. (760) 837-1095

Churchillians of Northern California
Richard Mastio (rcmastio@earthlink.net)
2996 Franciscan Way, Carmel CA 93923-9216
Res tel. 831-625-6164

Churchillians of Southern California
Leon J. Waszak (leonwaszak@aol.com)
235 South Ave. #66, Los Angeles CA 90042
tel. (323) 257-9279; bus. tel. (818) 240-1000 x5844

Churchill Friends of Greater Chicago
Phil & Susan Larson (parker-fox@msn.com)
22 Scottsdale Road, LaGrange IL 60526
tel. (708) 352-6825

Detroit: Gary Bonine (bo9@charter.net)
3609 Lake George Road, Dryden MI 48428
tel. (810) 796-3180

England North: ICS/UK Northern Chapter
Derek Greenwell, “Farriers Cottage”
Station Road, Goldsborough
Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 8NT
tel. (01432) 863225

Florida North:
Richard Streiff (streiff@bellsouth.net)
81 N.W. 44th Street, Gainesville FL 32607
tel. (352) 378-8985

Georgia: Gary Garrison (ccggary@bellsouth.net)
2364 Beechwood Drive, Marietta GA 30062
tel. (770) 509-5430; fax (770) 565-5925

Nebraska: Churchill Round Table of Neb.
John Meeks (jmeeks@wilddhattr.com)
7720 Howard Street #3, Omaha NE 68114
tel. (402) 968-2773

New England Churchillians
Joseph L. Hern (j hern@fhmboston.com)
340 Beale Street, Quincy MA 02170
res. tel. (617) 773-1907; bus. tel. (617) 248-1919

Churchill Society of New Orleans
Edward F. Martin
2328 Coliseum St., New Orleans LA 70130
tel. (504) 582-8152

North Carolina Churchillians
A. Wendell Musser MD (amusser@ncrr.com)
1214 Champions Pointe Drive
Durham NC 27712; tel. (919) 593-0804

Ohio: Northern Ohio Churchillians
Michael McNemar (mtn@walterhav.com)
1301 East 9th St. #3500, Cleveland OH 44114
tel. (216) 781-1212

Washington Society for Churchill
Christopher H. Sterling, Pres. (chriss@gwu.edu)
4507 Airlie Way, Annadale VA 22003
tel. (202) 994-0363

Churchill Centre South Texas
James T. Slattery (slattery@fed-med.com)
2803 Red River Creek
San Antonio, TX 78259-3542
Mobile: (210) 601-2143, Fax: (210) 497-0904

North Texas: Emery Reves Churchillians
John Restrepo (cuen@angol.com)
4520 Lorraine Avenue, Dallas TX 75205
tel. (214) 522-7201

Toronto: Other Club of Ontario
Norm & Jean MacLeod (jeana@idiirect.com)
16 Glenalora Ct., Ashburn ON L0B 1A0
tel. (905) 655-4051
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Calgary: Rick Billington, Pres. (rnbill@telus.net)
2379 Longridge Drive, Calgary AB T3E 5N7
tel. (403) 249-5016

Edmonton: Dr. Edward Hus ton, Pres.
(jehutson@shaw.ca)
98 Rehwinkel Road, Edmonton AB T6R 1Z8
tel. (780) 430-7178

British Columbia: Christopher Hebb, Pres.
cavell_capital@telus.net
1806-1111 W. Georgia Street, Vancouver BC
V6E 4M3; tel. (604) 209-6400

Vancouver Is.: Victor Burstall, Pres.
burst@shaw.ca P. O. Box 2114, Sidney, BC
V8L 3S6 tel. (250) 727-7345
LONDON, SEPTEMBER 12TH—
Ninety-seven years after
Winston and Clementine
Churchill held their wedding
reception in 52 Portland Place,
the Churchill Society of the UK com-
memorated the union with a dinner
on the same spot—now the offices of
Davis Coffer Lyons Leisure.
This significant London address
was where Winston Churchill and
Clementine Hozier were re-introduced
at a dinner party in
March 1908. Four years
previously they had met
for the first time. Then,
Winston had just stared
transfixed at the beauti-
ful Clemmie; flustered,
she had signalled a beau
to rescue her from this
uncomfortably discon-
cerning young Member
of Parliament.
In 1908 Winston
didn’t miss his chance,
and engaged Clementine
in conversation. Greatly
taken with each other,
they began keeping com-
pany. Winston proposed
(Clementine thought he
would never get around
to it) at the Temple of
Diana at Blenheim in
the summer, and they
were married in
September. On the 12th,
Clementine Hozier left
52 Portland Place (home
of her great-aunt by
marriage) for the church
and and the couple
returned there for the wedding recep-
tion.
On the 97th anniversary of the
wedding, ICS(UK) member David
Coffer, owner of the premises, munifi-
cently hosted an “Edwardian Dinner” in
order to boost the profile of ICS UK’s
educational project, with a view to
attracting major donations.
Family members attending
included Lady Soames, the Hon.
Nicholas Soames MP
introduced
Conservative
Party leader
Michael
Howard, who used the
words of Roy Jenkins to pay
tribute to “the greatest
human being ever to occupy
10 Downing Street.” In an
evening so flush with Tory
aristocracy, the Radio Times
couldn’t resist noting, it was
a little teasing of Andrew
Roberts, “to point out in his
speech—albeit obliquely—
that at the time of his
wedding Churchill was a
Liberal.”

ANNUAL
GENERAL MEETING
Recent Annual General
Meetings have been held at a
variety of Churchill sites, viz.,
the Cabinet War Rooms,
Harrow, Blenheim, Chartwell,
Bletchley Park and the
Churchill Archives Centre at
Churchill College,
Cambridge. The 2006 AGM
will, for the first time, take
place at The Royal Military
Academy Sandhurst on
Saturday 29th April.
It was at the Royal
Military College (as Sandhurst was called
until 1939) that young Winston was
trained as a Gentleman Cadet in 1893-
94, prior to his commissioning in 4th
Queen’s Own Hussars. Details will be
circulated later to UK members.

NEWLY ENGAGED: Winston S. Churchill, MP with his
fiancée, Miss Clementine Hozier, shortly after their
engagement in August 1908.
By Adam Lindsay Gordon

1959: “...a time of sombre reflection. On April 19, at dinner alone with Jack Colville, Churchill recited two stanzas which Colville wrote down ‘because,’ he later recalled, ‘I thought he was applying the words to himself.’ Winston was in a dreamy, contemplative mood,” Colville later wrote. ‘I had never heard him quote those poems before—which interested me as I know all his usual poetic quotations very well.” —Sir Martin Gilbert

All is overt fleet career,
Dash of greyhound slipping thongs,
Flight of falcon, bound of deer,
Mad hoof-thunder in our rear,
Cold air rushing up our lungs,
Din of many tongues.

Once again, one struggle good,
One vain effort:—he must dwell
Near the shifted post, that stood
Where the splinters of the wood,
Lying in the torn tracks, tell
How he struck and fell.

Crest where cold drops beaded cling,
Small ear drooping, nostril full,
Glazing to a scarlet ring,
Flanks and haunches quivering,
Sinews stiffening, void and null,
Dumb eyes sorrowful.

Satin coat that seems to shine
Duller now, black braided tress
That a softer hand than mine
Far away was wont to twine,
That in meadows far from this
Softer lips might kiss.

All is overt this is death,
And I stand to watch thee die,
Brave old horse! with bated breath
Hardly drawn through tight-clenched teeth,
Lip indented deep, but eye
Only dull and dry.

Musing on the husk and chaff
Gathered where life’s tares are sown,
Thus I speak, and force a laugh,
That is half a sneer and half
An involuntary groan,
In a stifled tone—

‘Rest, old friend! thy day, though rife
With its toil, hath ended soon;
We have had our share of strife,
Tumblers in the masque of life,
In the pantomime of noon
Clown and pantaloons.

‘With a flash that ends thy pain,
Respite and oblivion blest
Come to greet thee. I in vain
Fall: I rise to fall again;
‘Thou hast fallen to thy rest—
And thy fall is best!”

Churchill Centre member Jack Mens of Frederick, Maryland, informs us that Cozy Cap Tavern, now Cozy’s Restaurant, a tourist stop, beer garden and dance hall near Thurmont, Maryland, was twice visited by Winston Churchill. Wilbur Freeze, then proprietor of the tavern, said the Prime Minister twice played the jukebox there on his visits to the late President Roosevelt’s “Shangri-la” (now Camp David) in the Catoctin Mountains. Mr. Freeze said that each time, Churchill came in on a Sunday afternoon, stood around for about fifteen minutes after dinner, and dropped nickels into the nickelodeon. Meanwhile, the President and Harry Hopkins waited patiently in the automobile outside. There was a popular rumor in and around Thurmont that an aide at least once tactfully told WSC that Roosevelt was waiting, although “the Prime Minister never kept him over long.”

Mr. Mens’ own town of Frederick, immortalized in Whitter’s famous poem “Barbara Frietchie,” also has its Churchill story. Here as the Presidential party passed through, FDR recited the poem’s best-known lines. Then from beside him came Churchill’s deep, expressive voice, reciting the entire poem, verses which stirred every heart:

“Up from the meadows rich with corn / Clear in the cool September morn / The clustered spires of Frederick stand / Green-walled by the hills of Maryland....Up the street came the rebel tread / Stonewall Jackson riding ahead / Under his slouched hat left and right / He glanced; the old flag met his sight / ‘Halt!’—the dust-brown ranks stood fast / ‘Fire!’—out blazed the rifle blast....‘Shoot if you must this old gray head’ / But spare your country’s flag,’ she said...”

We can find one reference to a Churchill visit to Shangri-la. If he visited Cozy Cap Tavern on two Sundays, one was 16 May 1943, during the “Trident” conference (the party left Washington on Saturday and returned Monday). We would be grateful to know if and when Churchill made another visit. The full text of “Barbara Freitchie” is in FH 72.

Beginning 1950, reports of unidentified flying objects (UFOs) proliferated in Britain. Even Lord Louis Mountbatten stated his belief that the Earth was being visited by aliens. Churchill demanded to know the truth about flying saucers, historians Andy Roberts and David Clarke revealed while researching a book on UFOs and the Cold War. “What does all this stuff about flying saucers amount to?” Churchill minuted his advisers in 1952. “What can it mean? What is the truth?”

Churchill was shown a report by Sir Henry Tizard, one of his most trusted scientific advisers during World War II and a key figure behind the development of radar. Tizard saw no threat from UFOs. All sightings, he reported, were explainable by natural events such as the weather or meteors, or were normal aircraft. But Britain followed the American lead in underplaying the sightings, and a few months later an order went out expressly banning all RAF personnel from discussing UFO reports with anyone not in the military.

Roberts and Clarke believe that the UFO sightings were the product of “mass hysteria,” an urban myth strong enough to penetrate the highest echelons.
**Churchill’s Uniforms**

**Q:** I am writing an article about Winston Churchill and require confirmation of the uniforms in which he appears during WW2 and after. He appears to have adopted uniforms to circumstances. The best I found is: First Lord of Admiralty when he was on a warship; RAF Air Commodore in France in 1944; Colonel of 4th Queen’s Own Hussars in Berlin in 1945 and France in 1947. Am I right?

—Jean-Louis Swiners, Editor in Chief

L’Encyclopédie du Leadership et de la Stratégie

**A:**

His nautical dress was that of the Royal Yacht Squadron, of which he was a member; there was no special uniform for the First Lord of the Admiralty.

His Royal Air Force uniform was that of Honorary Air Commodore of 615 (County of Surrey) Fighter Squadron, Royal Auxiliary Air Force; he was given this honorary appointment in 1939.

He wore two different Army uniforms. One was that of Colonel, 4th Queen’s Own Hussars; this was his original regiment in which he was commissioned from 1895 till 1899 (being appointed Colonel of the Regiment in 1941). The other Army uniform was that of Honorary Colonel, 4th/5th (Cinque Ports) Battalion, The Royal Sussex Regiment. He received this honorary appointment in 1941, soon after becoming Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports.

You can tell the difference between the two Army uniforms by their cap-badges and collar badges. The 4th Hussars’ cap-badges are gold-coloured and show a circular design surrounding the number IV, with a crown above. He wore this uniform in Egypt and Italy, also in Paris in 1947 when he was presented with the Médaille Militaire.

The cap-badge of 4th/5th Royal Sussex was larger: a silver cross with a plume behind; collar badges were similar, but in black metal. This uniform was worn prominently at Yalta, the Rhine Crossing, Berlin, Potsdam, and briefly in Italy.

If the Army cap-badge is not visible, look at the collar badges. Those of 4th Hussars are shiny; those of 4th/5th Royal Sussex are dull.

Many people think that his nautical uniform was that of an Elder Brother of Trinity House, but I have seen no photos of him wearing this in World War II. For examples of this uniform, which he wore at Antwerp in 1914, see Gilbert, *Winston S. Churchill*, vol. 3, *The Challenge of War 1914-1916*, plates 10 and 11.

He always wore his Royal Yacht Squadron dress when on board ship. He certainly wore 4th Hussars uniform when he was in the area where the regi-
ment was located (Middle East). There appears to be no good reason why he preferred the 4th/5th Royal Sussex uniform, especially in 1945, since this battalion was not in the places he visited at that time. Perhaps he wore the RAF uniform when travelling by air, and certainly when visiting RAF units; also when he thought the population might appreciate the work of the RAF, e.g., Athens or Paris. He also wore it in Teheran (for no very good reason that I can see). As a whole, although some thought must have gone into his choice of uniform, I don’t think it was always precise. —PHC

Q: Upon meeting with Adenauer in 1953, Winston Churchill drew three circles on the back of a menu, symbolizing the United States, Europe and Great Britain. I am wondering if this drawing still exists, and/or whether there is a picture of it available?

—Gunda Windmüller, Denmark

A: There certainly is some Konrad Adenauer correspondence, but this does not appear to be the menu in question, though you are most welcome to visit with us and check. I suppose it will all depend on whether the menu was kept by Churchill or Adenauer. However, the idea of the three overlapping circles representing the British Empire, America and Europe, with Britain at the Centre of all three, is an older Churchillian device. The earliest reference I have seen comes from an article written by Churchill in 1930 entitled “The United States of Europe.” I enclose a brief passage from an essay I have written which touches on this:

“...the key to understanding this article is an understanding of where Churchill saw Britain. This is what he says: ‘But we have our own dream and our own task. We are with Europe, but not of it. We are linked, but not comprised. We are interested and associated but not absorbed.’

“To Churchill Britain at that time was not just a European power. She was a global power. Her Empire gave her a presence in every continent. She should be prepared to act as a guarantor of Europe and to encourage and perhaps participate in schemes that brought Europeans closer together, but she also had the interests of her dominions to consider. And then there was the question of the United States. Churchill felt, perhaps because of his background more than most, that the shared language and culture gave Britain a unique position as the bridge between the old and new worlds. To quote the conclusion of his article: ‘Great Britain may claim, with equal justification, to play three roles simultaneously, that of an European nation, that of the focus of the British Empire, and that of a partner in the English speaking world. These are not three alternative parts, but a triple part...’”

—Allen Packwood, Director, Churchill Archives Centre

Q: Can you please attribute a remark in which Churchill builds on the words of a French memoirist he admired, in regard to American soldiers arriving in France during World War I. Churchill allegedly said, “The impression made upon the hard-pressed French by this seemingly inexhaustible flood of gleaming youth in its first maturity of health and vigour was prodigious.”

—Salena Hastings, Pearson Prentice Hall, Boston

A: This is from Churchill’s World War I memoirs, The World Crisis, vol. III, part 2 (London/New York: Thornton Butterworth/Scribners 1927, Chapter XIX (“The Surprise of the Chemin des Dames”), page 454 of the English edition, which reads:

“Pierrefeu has described in a moving passage the next event. Now suddenly the roads between Provins and the front towards Meaux and towards Coulommiers began to be filled with endless streams of Americans. The impression made upon the hard-pressed French by this seemingly inexhaustible flood of gleaming youth in its first maturity of health and vigour was prodigious.”

—Salena Hastings, Pearson Prentice Hall, Boston

...
THE WINSTONIAN IDEAL: Churchill did not believe that war could be used freely as raw power might permit. Justice concerned him...he did not confuse justice with winning. While he had a true sense for when the war would end, he went on to say that force would be required to preserve peace after the victory. Because he held such power in Britain, and in the Grand Alliance, his insight was a great asset for the coalition at war and the peace to come. Had he been badly wrong, it would have had equal but negative impact.

Churchill’s Views

Sixty-five years of age and experienced at war, Winston Churchill already possessed views on war termination by 1939. There can be peace, but no peace too comfortable; one must keep dry powder close at hand; war recurs in human affairs.

But that military part of the human story is a tragedy, as he wrote to his wife Clementine in 1909, while in Germany observing maneuvers: “Much as war attracts me and fascinates my mind with its tremendous situations - I feel more deeply every year...what vile and wicked folly and barbarism it all is.” For Churchill, statesmen in peacetime have much to do with ameliorating hatreds and nipping conflicts in the bud.

Once engaged in war, however, Churchill often sounded like Clausewitz, calling for the maximum use of force. He could be ruthless. He used, advocated, or at least considered fearsome weapons: gas, area bombing, the atomic bomb. When he believed a war was just, his strategy was to break the enemy will and produce complete and decisive victory.

Yet Churchill did not believe that war could be used freely as a state policy tool, as raw power might permit. Justice concerned him deeply, and he did not confuse justice with winning. His views on peacemaking were not predictable, but complex. He was esteemed by the Irish Republican Army’s Michael Collins, who said that without Churchill as a Minister after World War I

Professor Harmon is a Churchill Centre academic adviser who for four years offered a course based on Churchill’s memoirs, The Second World War, at the Marines’ Command & Staff College, Quantico, Virginia. The author thanks Charles Robert Harmon, Professor Emeritus of History at Seattle University, for reviewing his draft manuscript.
there would not have been the Irish-English treaty creating Home Rule for southern Ireland.

Justice has a counterpart: magnanimity. Churchill admired a Roman adage: “War down the strong; bear up the weak.” He advocated harsh war against Imperial Germany in 1914, but after victory he opposed popular demands to “squeeze Germany until the pips squeaked.” Generosity towards the weak or defeated helps distinguish man from the animals; it might create peace and prevent wars. The theme of his six volumes of World War II memoirs was actually drawn from a motto he had proposed to the French after World War I: “In war, resolution. In defeat, defiance. In victory, magnanimity. In peace, good will.

And Churchill was an advocate of collective security. He had supported the League of Nations between the wars and the United Nations afterward. Many other regional security alliances also won his endorsement.

Churchill's “End State” for WW2

What does Churchill see, peering through the smoke of war towards the future? We may discern nine pillars of his postwar architecture: (1) The character of this war is a fight against unmitigated evil; it justifies and even demands total war by the Allies. (2) There must be complete surrender of the Axis powers. (3) The defeated will be punished and disarmed, while the victors remain armed. (4) The victorious powers seek no new territories. (5) Postwar relations between states will be guided by a spirit of equality and non-aggression. (6) Occupied Europe will be reborn in democratic forms, including constitutional monarchies, parliaments, congresses, or other legitimate representative institutions. There is no room for totalitarianism. (7) Europe must reunite; France and Germany must be friends—even military partners. (8) Britain would retain a leading postwar role with Commonwealth and Empire, and a special relationship with the Americans. (9) There would be a new world body, a security system, with the idealism of the League of Nations but without its faults. It would not destroy state sovereignty, but it would keep the peace between sovereign states. The three key members would be the UK, USSR and USA.

1942

As early as 1942 came public Allied statements ordaining punishment of Axis war criminals. Initial concern was on breaches of international agreements against aggression. Soon enough, officials added related subjects: mass murder of prisoners of war and genocide. Citizens still ask, of the Holocaust, “Did the Allies know?”

Governing circles did. Churchill's early denunciations of persecution of the Jews include a November 1935 article in a popular magazine (The Strand); Hitler read this in translation and literally threw a fit. During World War II, state terrorism of the Jews was periodically reported in world newspapers, and officials were briefed by escapees and others. Some systematic murders behind the Wehrmacht’s eastward advance were chronicled by Germans themselves and transmitted to the rear in Enigma cipher; Bletchley Park read certain documents almost as quickly as Hitler.

Nine of the Allies published their collective opposition in January 1942. That October Churchill >>
followed with a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, calling these “systematic cruelties...amongst the most terrible events of history.” He looked towards war’s successful end, the “entrainment of human rights,” and the end of “racial persecution.” One year later, in October 1943, foreign ministers met and published over the signatures of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill a declaration with such a Biblical ring that historian John W. Wheeler-Bennett later judged it obviously authored by WSC. It warned those who had not yet soaked “their hands with innocent blood” to “beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done.”

When the Big Three met in Teheran a month later, there ensued a famous conversation about what to do with the German war criminals, retold in Churchill’s Closing the Ring. Stalin suggested executing 50,000 of the German officer corps. Roosevelt, enigmatically, replied that merely 49,000 would do. Churchill walked out. His steady position in the war years was that the worst fifti to 100 individuals should face justice swiftly, and then the world should move forward. Other leaders were less decisive: meetings at Tehran and Yalta renewed conviction about the need for punishment without settling the number or types of war crime trials, how and where to conduct them, etc. These matters would roil through 8 May 1945.

1943

When President Roosevelt pronounced the words “unconditional surrender” in public, it caused consternation. Adding to the confusion was Churchill, whose recollections about it proved mixed. Sir Martin Gilbert has written that both principals came to Casablanca in Morocco with at least one briefing paper on which appeared the words “unconditional surrender.” Certainly Roosevelt is the man who publicly called it policy. Its great advantage was that it assured Washington that even after Germany lost, Britain would stay in the war against Japan. For similar reasons it was a guarantee to Moscow, an absolutely key ally.

Churchill liked the phrase. But, beginning a good argument over grand strategy, he wanted to exclude Italy and thus unwind the Axis. Churchill’s request was to require “unconditional surrender” only from Germany and Japan. FDR disagreed, and in London so did the British War Cabinet. Italy was included. Italian negotiations, while messy, yielded a complete surrender, growing confidence in the new Italian government, and a special status of “co-belligerent” that recognized the role of Italians in driving out the Germans. Italy was also given to expect early entry into the post-war “World Organization,” although Soviet opposition would delay that reward for a decade.

The worry over Germany was of another kind. The Allies recognized the argument that a public policy of “unconditional surrender” might make Berlin fight harder. Prime Minister Churchill’s mild reply was that there was no evidence for it. More pithily, he wrote to Harry Hopkins in 1945 that it was “false” to say the demand for ‘Unconditional Surrender’ prolonged the war: “Negotiation with Hitler was impossible. He was a maniac with supreme power to play his hand out to the end, which he did....”
restated the idea forcefully in March 1946 in the “Sinews of Peace” speech at Fulton, Missouri.

As the luncheon closed, the PM spoke of the central pier in Britain’s postwar security architecture: the relationship with the United States. In Churchill’s words that day, “Proposals for a world security organization did not exclude special friendships devoid of sinister purpose against others,” including a “fraternal association” of the Americans and the British. There might even be common citizenship, or a common passport. The military might continue the wartime bilateral “Combined Staff” arrangement. Having displayed such surprises, he then said, of course, “he was expressing only personal views.”

His American interlocutors were pleased, including Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, a former appeaser whose contempt for Churchill had been undisguised as late as 1940. Welles now let slip that it was important to get all this written down before the war ended: “After the war relaxation would set in, and a tendency towards isolationism.” Roosevelt himself would make a similar remark, surely frightening Churchill about the defense of Europe against Soviet encroachments. This may be why, in October 1944 in Moscow, Churchill cut the “percentages agreement” so suggestive of the spheres of influence he knew Roosevelt opposed.

And yet this disagreement about a long-term Western troop presence in Europe helped shape an allied conviction: both Roosevelt and Churchill agreed that the system of world security must be agreed upon before war’s end. Ten weeks after D-Day in France, conferees gathered in northern Washington, D.C., at Dumbarton Oaks, to lay down parameters of what would become the United Nations. Its charter would be crafted in San Francisco by delegates from over four dozen countries. All that occurred before victory over Japan.

1943-44

What of the fate of Germany? The War Cabinet had a “Post Hostilities Planning Committee” meeting many months before D-Day. International wartime conferences addressed the problem. Much was done at the level of the European Advisory Committee, created in 1943, staffed by foreign ministers, and meeting in Lancaster House, London. Through the next year, these officials worked out the details of how Germany would be occupied. Three zones were planned; one would later be shifted for strategic reasons; a fourth zone would be added for France, increasingly influential, and the beneficiary of WSC’s lobbying. The results were largely practical. More intriguing is what was not done with Germany. Many statesmen of the early 1940s wished to divide or demilitarize Germany to avoid a third world war in the 20th century. Churchill often favored detaching Prussia. Other Allied leaders and foreign affairs specialists had different ideas. And almost all leaders changed their minds.

The stiffest plan for impairing Germany in the long term was typewritten, double-spaced, on one and a half small sheets of paper. Prepared by American Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, it was actually initiated by FDR and Churchill on 15 September 1944. It read in part: “This programme for eliminating the war-making industries on the Ruhr and in the Saar is looking forward to converting Germany into a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in its character.” Churchill quickly reconsidered, and withdrew his support. The document died.

1944

Winning was causing its own problems. Chief among these, for Churchill personally, was the fate of Poland. That country had seen little but tragedy since 1939. By mid-1944, Auschwitz alone was swallowing 12,000 lives a day, and Churchill knew about it. Poland’s fate was no mere postwar question; it was a vivid weekly problem during 1944 and 1945.

The Prime Minister and government worked, agonized, and nearly despaired. Poland’s case vividly showed how statesmen live in tension between their visions and what is actually possible. On paper, the idea of an independent and democratic Poland was agreed upon—even by Stalin. But off the paper’s edge, and around the table, and all over the room, Polish affairs were a shambles.

There were two exile parties, each hoping to form the Polish government. There were two nascent conventional armies, growing up under Western and Red Army wings. There were conflicting guarantees by the Poles’ friends. Many charge Roosevelt with double-dealing, but Churchill also disappointed the Poles by agreeing early to an amazing Soviet request—to physically shift the state westward, to notable Soviet advantage and German disadvantage.

Churchill acceded for three reasons. He could not afford to lose Soviet help, in that early-war period. Second, he knew that rejecting Moscow’s gambit, in combination with ongoing Axis success in the East, could let Russia make a separate peace, as in 1917. Third, Stalin had a political ace to play. After the Great War, and the subsequent Soviet-Polish war, Lord Curzon had recommended settlement of the Polish-Soviet border along an ethnic and cultural line. This Curzon Line lay well west of the actual border between the two countries before 1939. All Stalin had to do, in World War II, >>
was revive the idea. How could British diplomats call unreasonable what they had recommended?

Hard-line Poles in London, their countrymen’s eyes upon them, refused to accept new boundaries, and so drove Churchill to distraction. Their meetings became overheated. But Churchill and Stalin were as stubborn as these Poles, and held more power, in the end Poland was shifted westward. The Soviets’ war termination planning of 1944 hurt Poland in two other ways. Both destroyed potential leaders of a postwar political renaissance. In August 1944, the Red Army was within reach of Warsaw, and broadcast a message to the residents to rise up. Only too ready to do so, they were shot to pieces by German forces—15,000 in the underground army died, as did tens of thousands of other Poles. The second tragedy concerned only 16 people—but they were London-based leaders of a future Polish democracy. Moscow invited them eastward to confer with other Polish exiles the Communists were readying for the takeover. They went, were kidnapped, and never returned. Churchill’s moral indignation at this is impossible to overstate. (See “Apologize for What?,” FH 125:7.) By Spring 1945 he had only declining hopes for central and Eastern Europe in the postwar world.

1945

The last year of the war opened with disappointments, including Germany’s new “vengeance” weapons. The Yalta conference proved yet another. Although the Soviets did pledge to declare war against Japan almost as soon as Germany surrendered, much else went poorly at Yalta. President Roosevelt’s physical weakness was as apparent as Marshal Stalin’s confidence and the Red Army gains signified on staff maps.

There was no resolution of questions over the amount of reparations to be demanded by the USSR. The Soviets declined to promise to vacate northern Iran, and this would lead to the first post-1945 crisis—resolved largely by the strength of President Truman. The two sides at Yalta exchanged promises on POW releases, and on this the Soviets generally delivered, but later the NKVD executed ten thousand souls returned by the West from German prison camps. In military strategy, Churchill made a last pitch for his famous, divisive proposal to land in the northern Adriatic Sea, and drive north, bringing Western troops from the Adriatic up to Vienna. His concept was again rejected, and Vienna would spend ten years in Soviet hands until an Austrian State Treaty of peace was signed.

Churchill hurried away from the Crimea and refreshed himself in Greece. There he addressed a thrilled crowd, the largest he’d ever seen, 40,000 people in a square in Athens. Greece was a country he had done much for, and his “deal” for its freedom in October 1944 (part of the percentages agreement) may have deterred Stalin from giving more than minimal aid to Communist rebels in the post-1945 civil war. In later years Churchill always showed pleasure in his controversial decisions about Greece, believing he’d helped save the country’s future.

Spring 1945 brought questions over the line of march. The most vital came as a surprise, which Stephen Ambrose described in Eisenhower and Berlin, 1945. Ike announced that instead of driving on at Berlin, he would turn most armies southward, towards Leipzig and Dresden. The British were stunned. This opened up a new strategic question. What was more important: to crush remaining German armies, or to take their capital? General Eisenhower took the former view. He said the Soviets were better poised to take Berlin, the German forces had migrated southward, and reports came of Nazi plans for a last stand in an Alpine “redoubt.”

The British answer was on the political value of Western soldiers’ boots in Berlin. But while Churchill protested openly, Eisenhower was unmoved, and Washington left the decision largely to the general in the field. In the end, four of the places closest to Hitler’s heart fell about the same time. The Soviets took the German capital. The American Seventh Army swept up Munich and Berchtesgaden in Bavaria, while the US
Third Army took Linz in Austria. Unconditional surrender of the Germans came May 7th.

Churchill received the news from a loyal aid, Captain Pym, who had charge of the all-important map room. Teasing, the Prime Minister said to Pym: “For five years you’ve brought me bad news, sometimes worse than others. Now you’ve redeemed yourself.”

Victory created new problems. Two of them were closely connected: the Soviet ally was unmanageable, and the Americans’ postwar occupation duty would be short—Roosevelt had said “two years.” When the Soviets had been poised to take over the capitals of Central and Eastern Europe, Churchill had cabled FDR: “March as far east into Germany as possible.” When Roosevelt had died in 1945, his successor Harry Truman received a similar Churchillian telegram: “Shake hands [with the Russians] as far east as possible.”

Summer did find US forces well to the east of lines prepared at earlier conferences for post-war occupation, but after VE Day, Eisenhower proposed to draw them back. Churchill begged the US to see them as a bargaining bit, while prodding the Soviets on concerns such as Poland. Again Churchill lost the debate. The long narrow zone in Germany was vacated by the GIs, an event Churchill identified at the time as “one of the most melancholy in history.” The Western allies continued to hold to intra-war agreements, while their Eastern comrade continued to violate many of them.

Peace was formalized in five treaties, made in Paris, and signed in February 1947. These covered the lesser powers: Italy, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, and Finland. Years of interest in a formal peace treaty for Germany withered away amidst the problems of the four-power occupation and cold war rivalries, and the last American effort died in 1951.

Three Conclusions

There can never be certainty about how long a war will run. What is certain is that planning for war termination bears directly upon the making of policy and its supporting strategies, and is therefore vital throughout the course of the war. In the UK, planning for the “end state”—as it is now called—was up and running, by fits and starts, in 1942, and 1943. But that is not to pretend that the silver cup held everything Churchill had hoped for. He had reason to title the last of his six WW2 volumes, Triumph and Tragedy.

Secondly, it must be admitted that some questions are better postponed than fully answered before victory. FDR was known for postponing the divisive or merely unpleasant, and sometimes Churchill took this route too. In 1944 he avoided a few postwar issues rising in the Commons, lest it undercut the total war effort. As late as January 1945 the Prime Minister slapped at his hard-working Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, for presuming too much about the moods in Europe and Germany after victory: “It is a mistake to try to write out on little pieces of paper what the vast emotions of an outraged and quivering world will be either immediately after the struggle is over or when the inevitable cold fit follows the hot….there is therefore wisdom in reserving one’s decisions as long as possible and until all the facts and forces that will be potent at the moment are revealed.”

If Churchill occasionally found wisdom in reserving decisions, more often than not he decided. The need for a wide and permanent “system of general security” after war was recognized formally as early as 1941, by the Atlantic Charter. No later than mid-1943, Churchill was in official talks on the shape of the future “World Organization.” Which postwar riddles can be solved during the fighting, and which cannot? Much depends upon prudence, timing, and opportunity.

Third, this contest revealed Churchill as a man with a true sense for when war would end in Europe. If we look, and on this narrow matter very few historians have—we find his predictions about the pace of the war and its end-date to be very good. In the Commons on 31 October 1944, after initial cautious words about when war would end, he ventured a projection: “Let us assume, however, that the German war ends in March, April, or May…” Over and over, he proved better at estimating the end-date than high officials and military commanders, allied or British—including Dwight Eisenhower, George Marshall, John Dill, Alexander Cadogan, Alan Brooke and other British service chiefs.

Deservedly famous for prewar predictions, Churchill also deserves plaudits for his estimates and plans related to war’s end. Because he held such power in Britain, and in the Grand Alliance, his insight was a great asset for the coalition at war and the peace to come. Had he been badly wrong, it would have had equal but negative impact. Unfortunately, the old war horse was not as focused on his own prospects, or those of his Conservative Party. The Tories were thrown out in elections during the Potsdam Conference. This was a near-total surprise to Churchill. But he declined all obvious opportunities to criticize the British electorate. His magnanimity, so visible in victory, could also be seen after his party’s defeat in the balloting. Churchill accepted the advice he himself had offered the House of Commons in a speech of 1944: “At the bottom of all the tributes paid to democracy, is the little man, walking into the little booth, with a little pencil, making a little cross on a little bit of paper…”
Wartime Questions Today: The Doctrine of Preemption

BY GEORGE F. WILL

WHAT CHURCHILL KNEW: That America may be casualty averse has been a constant recurring anxiety, as Winston Churchill could have told us—and in fact did tell us when he came to North America immediately after Pearl Harbor. Churchill gave a speech in which he said, “We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries, across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies, because we are made of sugar candy.”

No, we are not. We are much tougher than our enemies understand.

What I will say tonight about the war of terror draws heavily on my earlier life as a professor and student of political philosophy. A long life in journalism and around Washington, D.C., has taught me not just that ideas have consequences, but that only ideas have large and lasting consequences. We are in a war of terror being waged by people who take ideas with lethal seriousness, and we had better take our own ideas seriously as well.

I think the beginning of understanding the war is to understand what happened on 9/11. What happened was that we as a people were summoned back from a holiday from history that we had understandably taken at the end of the Cold War. History is served up to the American people with uncanny arithmetic precision. Almost exactly sixty years passed from the October 1929 collapse of the stock market to the November 1989 crumbling of the Berlin Wall—sixty years of depression, hot war, and cold war, at the end of which the American people said: “Enough, we are not interested in war anymore.”

The trouble is, as Trotsky once said, “You may not be interested in war, but war is interested in you.” And this was a war with a new kind of enemy—suicidal, and hence impossible to deter, melding modern science with a kind of religious primitivism. Furthermore, our enemy today has no return address in the way that previous adversaries, be it Nazi Germany or Stalin’s Russia, had return addresses. When attacks emanated from Germany or Russia, we could respond militarily or we could put in place a structure of deterrence and containment. Not true with this new lot.

Preemption: Necessary but Problematic

In 1946, Congress held what are today remembered, by the few who remember such things, as the “Screwdriver Hearings.” They summoned J. Robert Oppenheimer, head of the Manhattan Project, and asked him if it would be possible to smuggle an atomic device into New York City and detonate it. Oppenheimer replied that of course it would be possible. Congress
Oppenheimer answered: “With a screwdriver.” What he meant was that every container that came into the city of New York would have to be opened and inspected.

This year, seven million seaborne shipping containers will pass through our ports. About five percent will be given cursory examination. How hard would it be, then, to smuggle in a football-sized lump of highly enriched uranium sufficient to make a ten-kiloton nuclear weapon to make Manhattan uninhabitable for a hundred years? The moral of this story is: you cannot fight terrorism at the ports of Long Beach or Newark. You have to go get it. You have to disrupt terrorism at its sources. This is a gray area. It’s a shadow war. But it is not a war that we have any choice but to fight.

This leads us directly to the doctrine of preemption, with which there are several problems. First, we do not yet have—as it has been made painfully clear—the intelligence capacity that a doctrine of preemption really requires. The second problem with preemption is encapsulated in Colin Powell’s famous “Pottery Barn principle,” which Mr. Powell explained to the President before the second war with Iraq began: If you break it, you own it. Iraq is broken; we own it for the moment. And we are therefore engaged in nation building.

The phrase “nation building” sounds to many conservatives much the way the phrase “orchid building” would sound. An orchid is a complex, wonderful, beautiful, natural thing, but it is not something that can be built. We all know it took thirty years in this country to rebuild the south Bronx. And now we have taken on a nation to build.

There are those who say that neoconservatives—and most of my friends are neoconservatives, although I am not quite—have exported the impulse for social engineering that conservatives have so rightly criticized over the years at home. There is, of course, an element in this critique of President Bush’s policies that echoes in part the contemporary liberal version of isolationism. The old isolationism of the 1920s and 1930s was a conservative isolationism, and it held that America should not go abroad into the world because America is too good for the world. The contemporary liberal brand of isolationism—the Michael Moore view of the world—is that America should not be deeply involved in the world because the world is too good for America. This is not a serious argument, even though seriously held.

President Bush has said, in a phrase he got from Ronald Reagan, that it is cultural condescension to say that some people are not ready for democracy. Tony Blair, in July 2003, after the fall of Baghdad, came before a joint session of Congress and gave a wonderful, generous, good ally speech, in which he said that it is a “myth” that our values are simply “Western values,” or simply a product of our culture. Our principles, he said, are “universal,” embraced by all “ordinary people.” The problem is that this belief—that every person is at heart a Jeffersonian Democrat, that all the masses of the world are ready for democracy—might lead you not to plan very carefully for postwar nation building. If this is true, then nation building should be a snap, because everyone is ready for democracy.

Realists know better. They know there was a long, 572-year uphill march from Runnymede to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787. Even more sobering, our Constitutional Convention was followed in less than seventy-five years by the bloodiest Civil War the world had ever seen, to settle some leftover constitutional questions. We know from our history how difficult regime change is.

The Miracle of America

One of the mistakes our enemies have made—and one of the reasons I wish our enemies would study American history to disabuse themselves of some of their grotesque errors—is their belief that we are squeamish about defending freedom and about the violence of war. They persist in the assumption that we are casualty averse. People have been making that mistake since General Howe made it in the Battle of Brooklyn Heights in the Revolutionary War. He chased us across the East River and figured that was that. It was said again after the Battle of Shiloh in April, 1862—up to that day the bloodiest day in American history. Many observers thought the North would sue for accommodation and, in the words of Horace Greeley, let our erring sisters go in peace. It did not turn out that way.

The First World War produced the worst carnage the world had ever seen, but not once during the war did a picture of a dead British or dead French or dead German or dead American soldier appear in a newspaper of any of those countries. In the Second World War, the first picture of an American soldier dead in the surf in the Pacific did not appear in Life magazine until it had been held up in the War Department (as the Pentagon was then known) for nine months. The war in Vietnam produced more anxiety about graphic journalism, where it was suggested that in fact it was television that caused the American will to break. In fact, the American will never broke—but that is another matter.

This has been a constant recurring anxiety in America, as Winston Churchill could have told us—and in fact did tell us when he came to North America immediately after Pearl Harbor. Churchill gave a speech in >>

asked how it would be possible to detect such a device. Oppenheimer answered: “With a screwdriver.” What he meant was that every container that came into the city of New York would have to be opened and inspected.
which he said, “We have not journeyed all this way across the centuries, across the oceans, across the mountains, across the prairies, because we are made of sugar candy.” No, we are not. We are much tougher than our enemies understand.

Character and the Power of Ideas

One hundred years ago, people believed not only that war was inevitable, but that war was good for us. Without it, they thought, we would have to look for a strenuous domestic challenge that would be the moral equivalent of war—something elevating that would pull us out of ourselves and into great collective endeavors as war does. Tocqueville said, “war almost always enlarges the thought of a people and elevates its heart.”

Stravinsky, the great composer, said war is “necessary for human progress.” All of these men echoed Immanuel Kant, who said “a prolonged peace favors the predominance of a mere commercial spirit, and with it a debasing self-interest, cowardice, and effeminacy and tends to degrade the character of the nation.”

There is much to be said for the commercial spirit, but as Tocqueville warned us, if a people is only concerned with material well-being, only concerned with commercialism, they lack something—they lack the heights of nobility and character and aspiration. But first things first: get people into this enveloping culture of capitalism. Nor is this to say that we are a materialist people. The American people almost never vote their pocketbook as is commonly said, and almost never vote merely on economics. We are a much more morally serious and complicated people than that.

And throughout our history it has not mattered whether we were arguing about abolition, immigration, prohibition or desegregation. All of the great arguments that have roiled American politics over the years have not been pocketbook issues. They have been about the soul of the country and what kind of people we would be.

Well, the kind of people we are is a people who rise to the challenge of the new kind of enemy we have today. Our enemy has ideas. They are vicious, bad, retrograde, medieval, intolerant, and suicidal ideas, but ideas nevertheless. And we oppose them with the great ideas of freedom and democracy, which America has defined better than anyone in the world. And we turn to these people with an energy they could not have counted on. Winston Churchill in his war memoirs recalled the words of a British foreign secretary, Edward Grey: “The United States is like a gigantic boiler. Once the fire is lighted under it, there is no limit to the power it can generate.” And these enemies improvidently lit a fire under us.

We have done this before. In September 1942, General Les McGraw of the Army Corps of Engineers bought for the government about 90,000 acres of Tennessee wilderness along the Clinch River not far from Knoxville. There was nothing there. But soon there were streets and shops and schools and homes and some of the finest physics labs the world had ever seen. And thirty-five months later, on a desert in New Mexico, there was a flash brighter than a thousand suns and the atomic age began. Thirty-five months from wilderness to Alamogordo. That is what America does when aroused, because, as I say, we are not made of sugar candy.

Today we are the legatees of all the giants on whose shoulders we stand. We live in circumstances our parents did not live in, or our grandparents. We live in a time in which there is no rival model to the American model for how to run a modern industrial-commercial society. Socialism is gone. Fascism is gone. Al-Qaeda has no rival model about how to run a modern society. Al-Qaeda has a howl of rage against the idea of modernity. We began in 1945 an astonishingly clear social experiment: We divided the city of Berlin, the country of Germany, the continent of Europe, indeed the whole world, and we had a test. On the other side was the socialist model that says that society is best run by edicts, issued by experts from above. The results are clear: We are here, they are not. The Soviet Union tried for seventy years to plant Marxism with bayonets in Eastern Europe. Today there are more Marxists on the Harvard faculty than there are in Eastern Europe.

We must struggle today with the fact that the doctrine of preemption is necessary, and with the serious problems it entails. But what we must have overall is the confidence that our ideas are right. I grew up in Lincoln country and I am reminded that in 1859, with war clouds lowering over the country, Abraham Lincoln gave a speech at the Wisconsin State Fair. Lincoln told the story of an Eastern despot who summoned his wise men and gave them an assignment. Go away and think, he said, and come back and give me a proposition to be carved in stone to be forever in view and forever true. The wise men went away and came back some days later, and the proposition they gave to him was: “And this, too, shall pass away.”

Lincoln said: Perhaps not. If we cultivate our inner lives and our moral selves as industriously and productively as we cultivate the material world around us, he said, then perhaps we of all peoples can long endure. He was right. We have and we shall persevere, in no small measure because of the plucky brand of people, true to these ideas, such as those that have formed around the college we here celebrate tonight.
Churchill's appreciation for General George S. Patton, who died sixty years ago this December, can be summarised by his remarks read by his son Randolph at the White House in 1963, upon Sir Winston's receiving from President Kennedy honorary citizenship in the United States: “Our comradeship and our brotherhood in war were unexampled. We stood together and because of that fact the free world now stands.”

Churchill was always ready to support and recognise the worth of dynamic leaders, especially military leaders. His admiration for Patton as a brother campaigner in arms in World War II is well recognized, and closely followed General Patton’s efforts in all the many theatres of war in North Africa, Italy and the allied invasion and advance to Berlin. He understood Patton’s frustrations during the period when he was sidelined, between “the soldier slapping incident” in Italy and his command of the Third US Army in France, having experienced for himself similar “wilderness” periods in his own career. But for Patton, like Churchill, reverses served as an indispensable springboard for further achievements. They were kindred spirits.

Churchill was particularly impressed by General Patton’s counter-offensive rescue of hopelessly outnumbered Americans at Bastogne in the Ardennes in the “Battle of the Bulge”; and in Patton’s leadership of the Cobra Plan and the battle for France. (“Cobra” was a deception to make the Germans, who feared Patton more than any other Allied general, believe that Patton was in England with a fictitious First Army, waiting to launch an invasion after the Normandy “diversion.”)

On 1 April 1945, Churchill in London cabled President Truman that the liberation of Prague by Patton’s Third Army “might make the whole difference to the postwar situation in Czechoslovakia,” and would influence the politics of the nearby Balkan countries. He also directly appealed to Eisenhower: “I am hoping that your plan does not inhibit you to advance to Prague,” supporting Patton’s distrust of the Soviets.

On 12 December 1945, after Patton’s unexpected accident which led to his death, Churchill sent the General a telegram: “I earnestly hope that you are making a good recovery. Your accident has caused pain to your British friends and comrades who have admired your brilliant services in the common cause.”

Mrs. Patton replied on the 19th: “Your telegram to my husband was one of the first that came and I need not tell you how pleased he was to receive it. I believe that the sympathy and concern of his associates is helping just as much towards his recovery than any other factor. Thank you for yours with all my heart.”

Paralysed from the neck down, George Patton died of an embolism on 21 December 1945. Churchill cabled Eisenhower the next day: “Pray accept my deep sympathy in the loss of our gallant comrade General Patton, that great captain of war.” American Ambassador to Britain Gilbert Winant replied five days later:

“Dear Winston, I have just received the following message from General Eisenhower for delivery to you: ‘My heartfelt thanks for your expression of sympathy over the loss of General Patton. The death of this great leader and gallant comrade has been a severe blow to the U.S. Army’.”

To date the only senior statesman ever to honour General Patton’s grave in Luxembourg is Churchill, who laid a wreath on it during a visit in 1946.

Cometh the hour, cometh the men? We give thanks for General George Patton and Winston Churchill for their shared inspirational qualities, and for the Anglo-American relationship that is so much needed in today’s troubled world.

Mr. Marshman is a member of ICS (UK). We are grateful to The Churchill Archives Centre Cambridge for permission to quote the Churchill-Patton correspondence from the file CHUR 02/142/031.
The Statesman Admired Most

BY FRED GLUECKSTEIN

On leave from Harvard University to work on his honors thesis, John Fitzgerald Kennedy spent most of 1939 in London. When Hitler invaded Poland in September and England and France declared war, Kennedy, his parents Joseph and Rose, brother Joe, and sister Kathleen, were seated in the gallery at Parliament, where they intently listened to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, and others including Winston Churchill, explain the British government’s decision to go to war.

“Churchill’s speech,” Kennedy historian Robert Dallek wrote, “giving evidence of the powerful oratory that would later inspire the nation in the darkest hours of the war, left an indelible impression on Jack.”

Even as a youngster, John F. Kennedy had been a Churchillian. Kay Halle, a Kennedy and Churchill family friend, recalled visiting Jack in hospital when he was a teenager. She found him in bed reading Churchill’s memoirs of World War I, The World Crisis.

Kennedy’s interest in Churchill was rekindled in 1937 when, at the age of twenty, he and a friend traveled throughout Europe. Fascinated by the dynamics of European politics and the threat of war, he returned to England in 1938 to work with his father, Joseph P. Kennedy, who had been appointed Ambassador to Great Britain by President Franklin Roosevelt in December 1937. Traveling around the European continent, Kennedy met with high-level U.S. officials, who did so as a courtesy to his father. His travels led him to become a student of European politics.

With war on the horizon, Ambassador Kennedy, who had a reputation for pacifist leanings, was convinced that England would be defeated by Germany. This outraged Churchill, as witnessed by Harold Nicolson on 14 June 1939 while dining with Churchill,

“IT May be true, it may well be true,” he says, “that this country will at the outset of this coming war, and to my mind almost inevitable war, be exposed to dire peril and fierce ordeals.... Yet these trials and disasters, I ask you to believe me, Mr. Lippmann, will but serve to steel the resolution of the British people and to enhance our will for victory. No, the Ambassador...
should not have spoken so, Mr. Lippmann; he should not have said that dreadful word.”

An independent thinker uninfluenced by his father, young Jack was mesmerized by Churchill’s speech in defense of the government’s decision to go to war. The result was immediate. With the help of Arthur Krock, a family friend and New York Times columnist, Kennedy turned his Harvard senior thesis, “Appeasement at Munich,” into a best-seller titled Why England Slept in 1940. It has been reported that Joseph Kennedy, more interested in promoting his son’s career than even in promoting appeasement, purchased thousands of copies of the book which helped propel its heavy sales.

Of more note, however, was John Kennedy’s disclosure that his title, Why England Slept, was inspired by Churchill’s 1938 work, While England Slept (the American title of Arms and the Covenant). Later in 1955, Kennedy published another book, Profiles in Courage, which some considered a work along the lines of Churchill’s Great Contemporaries. Jack Kennedy did not have a chance to meet Churchill until twenty years after Why England Slept was published.

Historian Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. described the circumstances: “He and Jacqueline had a house in Cannes in the late Fifties with William Douglas-Home, the playwright, and his wife. One evening they dined with Churchill on the Onassis yacht. It was not altogether a success. Churchill, now an old man, had a little difficulty in distinguishing which of the group that came aboard was Jack Kennedy, and when this finally sorted out, the conversation was hard going. He had met his hero too late. But Churchill remained his greatest admiration.”

Christopher Matthews, broadcaster, journalist and Churchill Centre Trustee, wrote in his Kennedy and Nixon what happened immediately after Kennedy’s unsuccessful meeting with Churchill at Cannes. “Jacqueline Kennedy couldn’t resist teasing her husband, who had made a point of wearing a starched white dinner jacket for the occasion. ‘I think he thought you were the waiter.’”

Interestingly, Jackie had met Churchill before her marriage to Jack. During her first trip to Europe, a seven-week excursion in July and August 1948, Jacqueline Bouvier, 19 years of age, spent some of her time in London. Historian and biographer Sarah Bradford, in her book America’s Queen: The Life of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, wrote of the encounter: “The highlight was seeing her wartime hero, Winston Churchill, at a Buckingham Palace garden party: she stood in the reception line twice for the repeated thrill of shaking the great man’s hand.”

On 15 July 1960, Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts accepted the Democratic Party’s nomination for President of the United States at Memorial Coliseum in Los Angeles. Kennedy said in part:

The times are too grave, the challenge too urgent, and the stakes too high, to permit the customary passions of political debate. We are not here to curse the darkness, but to light the candle that can guide us through that darkness to a safe and sane future. As Winston Churchill said on taking office some twenty years ago: If we open a quarrel between the present and past, we shall be in danger of losing the future.

The 1960 Presidential campaign, which pitted Kennedy against Republican Vice President Richard M. Nixon, captured the interest of Americans—and others. Across the Atlantic, Sir Winston Churchill, now 85 but still a keen observer of American politics, carefully followed the unfolding events. At that time, some fifteen years after the end of World War II, Churchill was well aware that the threat of Soviet expansion endangered the security of America and her allies.

Kennedy, some observers have remarked, ran to the right of Nixon. Churchill would not have been surprised to read that Kennedy invoked WSC’s words to buttress his position on the major foreign policy issue: Soviet expansion and the threat of nuclear war. There are many, incidentally, who believe that Churchill had an affinity—never displayed publicly, of course—for Democratic candidates and their views of world affairs. Always to the chagrin of Republicans, Richard Langworth, editor of Finest Hour, has suggested that “if Churchill had the vote he would have voted for the Democratic presidential candidate in the last twelve elections of his lifetime.”

>>
A review of Kennedy’s speeches, remarks, statements, and press conferences during the 1960 presidential campaign showed that the Democratic contender quoted Churchill no fewer than nine times. As an example, on 26 August, just over a month after accepting his party’s nomination, Kennedy addressed the convention of Veterans of Foreign Wars in Detroit. He noted it was a time “…where the nation is treated with less respect and more arrogance by its enemies around the world, and regarded with such doubt by friends.” He talked about the threats posed by the communists to the security of the United States, which included the proximity of “enemy rockets” off the coast some ninety miles away.

“These are unpleasant facts, unpleasant to face,” Kennedy continued. “But face them we must; for as Winston Churchill told the British House of Commons, in a period of similar peril for Great Britain: ‘We shall not escape our dangers by recoiling from them.”’

Toward the end of the campaign on 2 October, Kennedy appeared with former President Harry S. Truman and other dignitaries at the Chase Hotel in St. Louis. Kennedy told the gathering: “…in 1946…President Truman brought to Fulton one of the great figures of the English-speaking world, and on that historic day in March Winston Churchill bluntly confronted our nation and the world, with the fact that from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an Iron Curtain had descended across the continent.”

Churchill, Kennedy continued, “warned the world that time is plenty short, that we cannot, and I quote him, ‘take the course of allowing events to drift along until it is too late,’ and that ‘our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them or by merely waiting to see what happens.’

“He [Churchill] called for action to establish conditions of freedom throughout the world, to strengthen our western alliances and the United Nations, and he particularly emphasized these words which have meaning for us today: ‘From what I have seen of our Russian friends and allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they so much admire as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than weakness. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength.’”

On October 27th Nixon (a longtime friend and admirer of Kennedy, as Chris Matthews points out) issued a statement on the topic of freedom. It contained the only known reference to Churchill in Nixon’s official speeches or statements during the campaign: “Back in 1940, in the darkness of WW2, Winston Churchill spoke with brave contempt of the day when the corroding finger of Hitler would be scourged from the face of this planet, and when men and women and children would climb again to the sunny uplands of peace.”

Speaking about the satellite nations of Eastern Europe under Soviet domination, countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania, Nixon then invoked Churchill’s earlier words: “Twenty years later, in this year 1960, those of us who are free are resolved that the day shall surely come where everywhere people shall have a free choice of freedom and the corroding finger of communism shall be gone from the earth.”

By 1960, Nixon had met Churchill twice. The first time was on 25 June 1954, and again in 1958, when he visited WSC in London. Nixon wrote of that first encounter in 1954: “I still remember the eager anticipation, even the excitement, that I felt that day as I waited for his plane to come into view. I had already traveled extensively abroad. I had met many national and international leaders and many famous celebrities. But none matched Churchill as a larger-than-life legend.”

But Nixon’s carefully planned 1954 welcome took an unexpected turn, as Chris Matthews’ book describes: “Vice President Nixon stood on the tarmac at National Airport as…Churchill walked right past him to the microphones. The young American vice president had lost the chance to deliver to his hero a welcoming speech he had sweated the entire night to prepare.”

On the last evening of Churchill’s three-day 1954 visit, Nixon joined Churchill at a dinner given at the British Embassy. During private discussions, Nixon asked WSC about his views regarding talks with the Soviet leaders that had succeeded Stalin. Nixon wrote: “He said that the West must have a policy of strength and must never deal with the communists on a basis of weakness.” Interestingly, this was that theme espoused by Churchill—to deal with the Soviets from strength rather than weakness—that Kennedy would effectively...
articulate, using Churchill’s words, six years later in the Presidential campaign.

On 8 November 1960, John F. Kennedy won the presidency by just over 100,000 votes of a record 68.8 million cast. In a letter dated December 2nd, to Consuelo Balsan, formerly Duchess of Marlborough, Churchill wrote: “Kennedy certainly has tremendous tasks before him.” He added: “I had a friendly exchange of letters with him after his election.”

While visiting the United States for the last time in April 1961 aboard Aristotle Onassis’ yacht, Christina, President Kennedy telephoned and invited Churchill to Washington to spend a couple of days. WSC’s Private Secretary Anthony Montague Brown took the call and declined the invitation, telling the President that Sir Winston, now 86 and in frail health, could no longer undertake such a journey.

Two years later, on 9 April 1963, President Kennedy proclaimed Churchill the first honorary citizen of the United States by Act of Congress. Again Churchill was too frail to come to Washington, and watched the ceremonies on television. His son Randolph and grandson Winston appeared on his behalf at the White House. In what must also be viewed as a personal and heartfelt tribute to a man he greatly admired throughout his life—and whose words he used so purposefully in the electoral campaign three years earlier—Kennedy said of Churchill in his own eloquent manner:

…We meet to honor a man whose honor requires no meeting—for he is the most honored and honorable man to walk the stage of human history in the time in which we live. Whenever and wherever tyranny threatened, he has always championed liberty. Facing firmly toward the future, he has never forgotten the past. Serving six monarchs of his native Great Britain, he has served all men’s freedom and dignity. In the dark days and darker nights when Britain stood alone—and most men save Englishmen despaired of England’s life—he mobilized the English language and sent it into battle. The incandescent quality of his words illuminated the courage of his countrymen.

Given unlimited powers by his citizens, he was ever vigilant to protect their rights. Indifferent himself to danger, he wept over the sorrows of others. A child of the House of Commons, he became in time its father. Accustomed to the hardships of battle, he has no distaste for pleasure. Now his stately Ship of Life, having weathered the severest storms of a troubled century, is anchored in tranquil waters, proof that courage and faith and the zest for freedom are truly indestructible. The record of his triumphant passage will inspire free hearts for all time.

Endnotes

10. Ibid., 446.
12. Ibid.
I am a sixth form history student and have been given the following essay assignment: "Examine the extent to which Winston Churchill himself was to blame for his political isolation in the years 1929-39." I have been researching the subject, but I am finding it hard to find the best information.

Can you offer me some guidance? I am not asking you to write the essay for me but would be very grateful if you could advise me what events and points you would suggest that I consider.

—Anna Richards

Dear Anna,

Your request is an interesting one. You may wish to look especially at Martin Gilbert's book, *The Wilderness Years*, originally written to accompany a television documentary by the same name; the book has recently been reprinted by Pimlico in the UK and is available from amazon.co.uk, or you may find it in used bookshops. For more in-depth research, you can of course consult Martin Gilbert's official biography, *Winston S. Churchill*, vol. 5.

While the claim that Churchill was himself responsible for his political isolation was often made by his political opponents—and gains verisimilitude from his support for the King in the abdication crisis and his opposition to self-government for India, both of which tended to separate him from potential sympathizers—the more crucial question is whether the British governments of the 1930s should have been more receptive to Churchill’s warnings of German rearmament. If so, then Churchill may have contributed to the problem by taking unpopular positions on other issues—but the governments of the decade have the larger blame. There is then the further question of whether Churchill’s positions on those questions (abdication and India) should be blamed. I am friendlier to the criticism usually made of him on abdication than on India; but both matters are controversial.

I hope this answer is helpful in pointing the way to further illumination, but please don’t hesitate to get back in touch with me if you have further questions after you have done more research.

Prof. James W. Muller
Chairman
CC Board of Academic Advisers

Pondering the Wilderness Years

Dear Anna,

This is an ambitious and a challenging project. We are glad you are tackling it and will try to give you a few thoughts. A list of eighteen of Churchill’s “flaws and mistakes” is on our website, page id=46. Written in somewhat jocular style, it does suggest areas (items #6-7-8) where Churchill did his chief cause (rearmament) no good in the 1930s. Also read “Churchill the Great? Why the Vote Will Not Be Unanimous,” by Douglas Hall, also on our website, page id=822. This covers over all of Churchill’s career, but has much to say about the 1930s, where his problems were in part self-inflicted.

Professor Muller makes a key point: the blame for failing to rearm sooner lies more with the British governments of the 1930s: but you may wish to investigate areas where Churchill—although right on the merits—lost ground with his colleagues and increased his political isolation:

1) He was at least partly right that India’s premature independence would result in a bloodbath between Hindus and Muslims, which was proven in 1947; but as Manfred Weidhorn and others have pointed out, people tend to prefer to be governed by their own rascals, however deplorable they may be, rather than by a distant foreign power.

2) Churchill was right that Sir Samuel Hoare committed a breach of Parliamentary Privilege by attempting to alter the views of the Lancashire cotton growers on the India Bill, but had no chance of winning his case. Explain why in your own way.

3) Churchill misjudged the mood of the country by appealing for more time to consider the proposed marriage of Edward VIII to a divorced American. You should explain why Parliament would accept this, even if his spouse did not become Queen. (You might contrast the thinking then with the thinking now, since “Queen Camilla” seems today quite acceptable to many people.)

4) Consider looking at Churchill’s relations with his party leader, Stanley Baldwin, through the several good Baldwin biographies and two Churchill books recommended below. Baldwin trifled with the nation’s defense and had to answer for that. But he was a brilliant politician who read Churchill very accurately, and always played their relationship to his advantage. You might elaborate on just how Baldwin did this.

Le Grand Charles
A reader asked us to confirm Churchill’s reply when asked if he thought de Gaulle was a new Joan of Arc, and he supposedly answered, “Yes, but my bishops won’t let me burn him.” The quotation is often cited and may be accurate, but our best reference is slightly different. It is from Kay Halle’s usually reliable book, Irrepressible Churchill (Cleveland: World Publishing, 1966), page 213:

WSC to Brendan Bracken: “You may have your single cross to bear but I have the double cross of Lorraine.”
Bracken: “But...remember, Winston...he thinks of himself as the reincarnation of St. Joan.”
WSC: “Yes, but my bishops won’t burn him!”

We should point out that despite their disagreements over wartime strategy, Churchill and de Gaulle nursed a healthy respect for one another, and de Gaulle was especially fond of Lady Churchill. When Sir Winston died de Gaulle wrote her, “In the great drama, he was the greatest.”

“Grudge no toil...Fear no foe.”
“If the human race wishes to have a prolonged and indefinite period of material prosperity, they have only got to behave in a peaceful and helpful way towards one another, and science will do for them all that they wish and more than they can dream....Nothing is final. Change is unceasing and it is likely that mankind has a lot more to learn before it comes to its journey’s end....We might even find ourselves in a few years moving along a smooth causeway of peace and plenty instead of roaming around on the rim of Hell....Thus we may by patience, courage, and in orderly progression reach the shelter of a calmer and kindlier age....Withhold no sacrifice; grudge no toil; seek no sordid gain; fear no foe. All will be well.”

Kathryn Venditti (kvenditt@ashland.edu) asked for the origins of this relevant remark. Most of it is from Churchill’s speech at the Lord Mayor’s Banquet at the Guildhall, London, 9 November 1954; see The Unwritten Alliance (London: Cassell, 1961) as well as in the Complete Speeches (New York: Bowker, 1974). National Geographic’s Churchill issue (August 1965) stitched in the last line (“Withhold no sacrifice...”) from WSC’s speech in Ottawa on 14 January 1952; see Stemming the Tide (London: Cassell, 1953).

Bossmom, Bottom, Bosom?
Vardan Astrid from Bulgaria asks us for more regarding Churchill’s remark about Sir Alfred Bossmom: “Neither one thing nor the other!” According to Kay Halle (op. cit., 118), Churchill said this in 1932, as an aside to a colleague in the House of Commons when Sir Alfred Bossmom was speaking. He thought “Bossmom” was odd because it was neither “bottom” nor “bosom.” Alfred Bossmom, a successful architect as well as a Member of Parliament, was known for the lavish parties at his house at Carlton House Gardens, London.

“Never be separated from the Americans”

“Anthony Eden...said that his Cabinet colleagues had asked him to speak on this occasion on behalf of them all. It therefore fell to him to express their sense of abiding affection and esteem for the Prime Minister and their pride in the privilege of having served as his colleagues. He himself had enjoyed this privilege for sixteen years, others for varying shorter periods; but all, whatever the length of their service, had the same strong feelings of affection for him. If in a succeeding Government they met with success, this would be largely due to the example which he had shown them: if they did less well, it would be because they had failed to learn from his experience and skill as a statesman. They would remember him always—for his magnanimity, for his courage at all times and for his unfailing humour, founded in his unrivalled mastery of the English language. They would always be grateful for his leadership, and for his friendship, over the years that had passed; and they would hope to enjoy in future his continuing interest and support in their endeavours.

“Churchill’s final words to those Ministers not in the Cabinet made a strong impact on those who heard them. ‘He wished to make two points,’ Lord De L’Isle and Dudley later recalled: “Man is spirit,” and “Never be separated from the Americans”.”

Wit & Wisdom
On Sunday, 30 January 2005, we were much reminded of the fortieth anniversary of the funeral of Winston Churchill. For the best part of sixty years, Churchill’s towering personality and enormous zest for life and for politics had illuminated British public life, to that memorable funeral, a televised-around-the-world pageant of British ceremonial and of the Anglo-American special relationship, when he for the last time played the leading part. It had indeed been joked about Churchill years earlier that he so longed to be the central character in every drama that when he went to a wedding he wished he was the bridegroom and when he went to a funeral he longed to be in the coffin. In 1965, after careful planning, and in a funeral with lots of soldiers, leaders from all over the world to pay homage, military bands, and the Stars and Stripes flying alongside the Union Flag throughout London, he had his final wish.

On that day, there were many tears and great nostalgia for the 1940s—Churchill’s, and (it was frequently said) the British people’s, Finest Hour, when he had twice given the lion roar of freedom in the fight against totalitarianism, against Hitler in 1940 and against Stalin in 1946. That Churchillian roar had been one of the things that made people believe in the triumph of freedom, even when the days were dark and victory seemed so far away.

When he died it was confidently expected that historians would soon cut him down to size, and so revise his reputation negatively, since so much of his reputation was linked with the personality of the man himself, more indeed than was generally appreciated; historians have recently shown just how hard he worked at creating his own image, as a relentlessly autobiographical spin-doctor before the idea had been invented. David Reynolds’ recent In Command of History (2004) shows how far his best-selling memoir, The Second World War, was crafted for that purpose, and how far indeed the British political and military establishment connived at the process, scented the chance to put an authorised version of Britain’s World War II before a worldwide reading public under Churchill’s name. To an extent Churchill has remained ever since a useful asset in British international policy: President George Bush, a Churchill admirer who keeps a bust of Sir Winston in the Oval Office for inspiration, had it as a loan from the British government.

Dr. Ramsden, is Professor of Modern History at Queen Mary College, London, Vice Chairman of The Churchill Centre’s academic advisers and author of Man of the Century: Winston Churchill and His Legend Since 1945. Reprinted by courtesy of the author from The Tablet of 29 January 2005 which also provided the artwork.

The truth is, though, that Churchill has remained in the English-Speaking World the dominant figure from the 20th Century, and revisionist historians have done little to dent his image. When Time magazine did not make him “Person of the Century” there was a storm of objections. Two years later, when the magazine made Rudolph Giuliani its Person of the Year for 2001, it re-endorsed all the qualities for which Churchill had seem to stand, which had seemed out of date before the war on terror began. Giuliani on 9/11 derived great comfort from remembering Churchill and 1940, quoting him freely over the next days and weeks to reassure New Yorkers.

We may ask from where Churchill himself derived his motivation, and just what it was that he believed in, so that he could so effectively communicate with the people he led as war leader and cold warrior. Churchill was, as a man of his time, class and education, saturated in the Christian tradition, and his speeches were at least as full of references, quotations and allusions to the Bible, the Prayer Book and Christian hymns as they were to English literature. His verdict on the decolonisation of Africa and Asia was drawn from Isaiah (“Thou hast multiplied the nations and not increased the joy”), and his support for harsh punishments for offences committed against children from St. Matthew (“Whosoever shall offend against one of these little ones…”). Often such quotations were mere acts of conversational bravado, just like his fondness for quoting at length songs by Gilbert and Sullivan, or English and American poetry, but on occasion they could have deeper significance.

Many noticed, for example, the emotional pull exerted by his wartime radio broadcast as Prime Minister, beginning with the reminder that it was Trinity Sunday*, so evoking the shared community of speakers and listeners. and implicitly identifying the British cause with Christianity against Godless Nazi evil. It is hard to imagine any politician making such an appeal today—or most of his audience understanding it.

*From 1 Maccabees 3:58-60, in the Protestant Apocrypha. This is part of the King James Bible Churchill knew, but not in more recent editions of the Bible. See “Wis & Wisdom,” FH 111. —Ed.
Arguably, Churchill relied more on such Judaeo-Christian writings than on secular literature, for although his History of the English-Speaking Peoples made virtually no reference to Shakespeare or the major poets—though he occasionally quoted them as a literary flourish. This was despite the title of the books, and although he discussed at length the King James Bible and Cranmer’s Prayer Book, he made favourable references to The Pilgrim’s Progress, and noted with satisfaction that all these Christian texts had been carried across the Atlantic by the Pilgrim Fathers and so translated into North America the same language and beliefs, “an enduring link, literary and religious, between the English-speaking peoples of the world.”

Churchill had then a great respect for the Christian tradition as a factor of continuing contemporary relevance, and he invariably deprecated attempts to downgrade that tradition, for example in the contentious 1920s Commons debates about a modernised Anglican prayer book. He had been brought up in the 1880s firmly within the Anglican tradition that had then barely changed for two centuries. In his post-1945 short story, The Dream, when he seems to meet the ghost of his father while dozing over a painting, he instantly responds to Lord Randolph Churchill’s question about his religion by saying he is “Episcopalian.”

His direct involvement with the Church was though at best semi-detached. He did not find its easy to find time for the selection of Anglican bishops when he was Prime Minister (though he bristled if this was noticed by his staff), and once said that he was not a pillar of the Churchill but more like a buttress—he supported it from the outside. There was in 1951 a press photograph of Churchill, the other party-leaders and their wives attending a Church service to launch the general election campaign—those were the days! He was caught on camera looking extremely bored, though that may be only because he was for once in his life having to listen to somebody else talking, without even the right of interruption.

Churchill was not a Christian believer in any conventional sense. Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury thought that WSC “had a very real religion, but it was a religion of the Englishman. He had a real belief in Providence, but it was God as the God with a special care for the values of the British people.” Fisher recalled that for Churchill, the dome of St. Paul’s Cathedral surrounded by the fires of 1941 nevertheless had an acute appeal that was both emotional and national. Churchill had given orders that St. Paul’s must be saved from the bombers at all cost, even if it meant sacrificing other nearby buildings, and when damage was actually done to the Cathedral by incendiaries, care was taken that the news was not reported by the press. Just as his speeches in 1940 appealed to the common language and literature, so the round dome of St. Paul’s, not unlike the bowler-hat and high forehead of Churchill himself, stood for the tradition in which he asked the British people to put their faith.

What Churchill seems never to have had was a belief in a personal God. He joked as he aged that he was ready to meet his maker, and speculated as to whether the Almighty was looking forward to their interview with equal pleasure; but he did not in fact believe in an after-life, except perhaps as perpetual sleep in surroundings of peaceful, black velvet. Extensive government planning for his funeral had the bleak operational code-name “Operation Hope-Not.”

What Churchill did believe in was himself, fate, and his personal vocation to leadership. He wrote that when he became Prime Minister in 1940, he felt that he was “walking with destiny,” and that all his past life had been a preparation for that hour and that task. He was indeed burdened with an almost megalomaniacal self-belief, even as a young man, and this largely explains his early unpopularity among army contemporaries and ministerial colleagues who found him far too bumptious for his own good.

It was self-belief that kept him going through all the buffets of his first forty years in public life, when every ladder was followed by a lengthy snake, a switchback ride that would have led any lesser man to throw in his hand, choose another career, or retire. He was after all almost 65 when war came in 1939, the age at which most men would have chosen a quiet life.

But not Winston, who was raring to go and convinced that he was the only man for the job. As indeed he was, for it remains extremely hard for the informed historian to imagine any scenario without Churchill as Prime Minister in which Britain would have fought on in 1940 and finished among the winners in the Second World War. And without Britain fighting on, it is hard to imagine the scenario in which totalitarianism would have been defeated at all—at least without a very lengthy period of the utmost horror all across Europe.

Believing in himself as he did, he found within the capacity to make the British people believe in themselves too, a crucial historical act that even today can be cited to cynics as proof that individuals can and do make a difference. “We are all worms,” he had remarked to Violet Bonham-Carter with theological correctness thirty-four years earlier, “but I do believe that I am a glow-worm.”
Here is a piece of interesting trivia of curiosity to Churchillians like me: Where was Lady Randolph Churchill, née Jennie Jerome, born and raised?

Most of us know that Winston Churchill’s mother was born in Brooklyn, New York. But where? What did her home look like?

The available data, gleaned from articles, books, and the Internet, produces three contending Brooklyn addresses: 8 and 197 Amity Street and 426 Henry Street. During a visit to the east coast my wife Lynn and I visited all three locations, took pictures, and came away somewhat satisfied as to the true birthplace.

Let us begin with three facts on which all the references completely agree:

1. Jennie Jerome was born on 9 January 1854, when her father Leonard was 36 and her mother Clara 29. Jennie was 20 when she gave birth to a premature Winston on 30 November 1874, confirmed in a letter she wrote her mother on 9 January 1888: “Do you know that it is my birthday today? 34!!! I think for the future that I will not proclaim my age.”*

   Curiously, in a letter Jennie wrote to Randolph in 1883, she states that she was three years younger than 21 at Winston’s birth. In view of massive evidence to the contrary, it is safe to consider this simply the style of disguising one’s actual age, which some people still employ today.

2. Jennie was born in Brooklyn, which was not at that time part of New York City. Brooklyn, Staten Island (Richmond) and part of Queens were not incorporated into the city until 1898. (Being Brooklyn born and raised, I can testify that to locals, Manhattan is “New York” or “the city,” while Brooklyn is just “Brooklyn”—and forget about “Manhattan” or “Kings County.”) The name stems from the southern portion of the village of Breukelen—one of the six original Dutch villages that now comprise the borough.

3. All three addresses are in that part of Brooklyn called Cobble Hill, South Brooklyn, or originally Ponkiesbergh by the Dutch. Cobble Hill is bordered by Atlantic Avenue on the north and Degraw Street to the south. South Brooklyn is composed of the of Brooklyn Heights, Carroll Gardens, Cobble Hill, Gowanus, Red Hook, and Park Slope.

   All three supposed birth house locations are within a third of a mile from the eastern waters of Upper New York Bay. The closest address was about 300 yards from the bay. This is where the South Ferry docked, carrying top-hatted commuting business gentlemen and travelers from Wall Street and Manhattan, including Leonard Jerome and his brother from work, and Clara Jerome and her four girls from shopping.

   Both existing houses—197 Amity Street and 426 Henry Street—are narrow, three-story, brick brownstones, attached buildings typical of the homes in Cobble Hill, which is now a middle-class neighborhood of working people. Their construc-

---


David and Lynn Druckman live in Chicago and Tucson when they are not traveling the world, often in search of arcane Churchilliana. See David’s “South African Escape,” *FH* 47, “Coming to Grips with Gallipoli,” *FH* 90, and “Hotel Mamounia, Morocco,” *FH* 108.
tion is indistinguishable from that of the neighboring houses.

Although Leonard Jerome made and lost millions of dollars in his life, even in 1854 these were modest homes, which compare not at all with such splendid residences as the Jerome Mansion on Madison Avenue and 26th Street in Manhattan, which Jerome built in 1860.

Let us now consider the three contending addresses. The Wikipedia free encyclopedia on the Internet (which is editable by anyone) stated that Jennie was born at “8 or 197 Amity Street.” But 8 Amity Street no longer exists. The lowest house number we could find was 74. The former location of 8 Amity Street is now the busy north lane of the present Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, primarily built in the 1950s.

The narrow brownstone at 426 Henry Street, generally recognized as the true birthplace, bears a plaque to that effect, dedicated in 1952.

According to The South Brooklyn Network (www.southbrooklyn.net/c_hill.html), number 426 was the home of Jennie’s uncle, where her parents, Leonard and Clara Jerome, lived prior to her birth. According to Anita Leslie, “Soon after this baby’s [Jennie’s] arrival the Jeromes moved to 8 Amity Street, a house with a garden.”

Other sources state that the Jeromes lived at 197 Amity Street just after Jennie’s birth and until 1860. But Clara Jerome and the girls also lived in France and Newport, Rhode Island during this period. No sources provide direct evidence that Jennie was actually born at 197.

My opinion is that the plaque is correct. Jennie was indeed born at 426 Henry Street, although shortly after the event, the Jerome family moved to 8 Amity Street, which is unfortunately no longer extant. But I did not find contemporary papers documenting her birth or infant addresses.

Interested readers are encouraged to send their thoughts to the editor.

THE CONTENDERS FOR THE HONOR OF JENNIE JEROME’S/LADY RANDOLPH CHURCHILL’S BIRTHPLACE:

Number 8 Amity Street no longer exists, but is a long-shot anyway. Its location (top left) is now the busy northbound lane of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway—“BQE” in local jargon. Number 197 Amity Street (above center), where the Jerome family lived after Jennie’s birth, is often named as her birthplace but doesn’t get the honors, in the author’s opinion. And the winner is: 426 Henry Street (right), which correctly bears the bronze plaque. A Brooklyn map (above left) pinpoints the three locations, all within walking distance: 8 and 197 Amity Street (top pointers) and 426 Henry Street (lower pointer). The map is by courtesy of www.mapquest.com.
125 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1880-81 • Age 6
“Rather like a volcano...”

Winston was back in London after he and his family had spent November and the first part of December at Blenheim Place where his mother, Lady Randolph, had not enjoyed a happy stay. Jennie to her mother: “It will be great fun going to Paris together....I quite forget what it is like to be with people who love me....I loathe living here. It is no use disguising it, the Duchess hates me simply for what I am—perhaps a little prettier & more attractive than her daughters. Everything I do or say or wear is found fault with. We are always studiously polite to each other, but it is rather like a volcano, ready to burst out at any moment.”

The volcanoes that were, respectively, Ireland and Lord Randolph, did in fact burst out that winter. The “boycott”—named after its first victim, the unfortunate Captain Boycott — was introduced by the Irish Land League whereby those who evicted tenants from their land were shunned by the community. As Churchill described it in his biography of his father, Captain Boycott’s “servants left him. The local shopkeepers refused to serve him. The blacksmith and the laundress declined his orders. His crops remained ungathered on the ground....Nothing was more unexpected than the precision with which an impulsive and undisciplined peasantry gave effect to this new plan. Whole counties conspired together to make it complete. Every class in the population acquiesced. Public opinion supported the Land League and no moral force sustained the government of the Queen.”

The reaction of the Liberal government was surprisingly extreme—suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, something Churchill described in his father’s biography as “desperate, unwarranted and ill-chosen.” With one exception, the Conservative Party had no problem with once more suspending civil liberties in Ireland. That exception was Churchill’s father, Lord Randolph, and he ignored entreaties from his Fourth Party comrades and Disraeli alike in attacking the Liberal government on this issue. Winston wrote: “[T]he repressive measures, involving as they did immense abridgments of liberty and wholesale suspension of the most elementary civil rights, offended deeper instincts in Lord Randolph’s nature. If as a party man he disliked the Government, he hated Coercion for its own sake; and this double tide of antagonism carried him to lengths which, for a time, disturbed and even destroyed the harmony of the Fourth Party.”

100 YEARS AGO
Winter 1905-06 • Age 31
“I have been much put off.”

On 3 January 1906, Churchill traveled to Manchester to begin his first election campaign as a member of the Liberal Party. While Manchester was solidly Conservative, it was also the center of Free Trade fervor, the home of Cobden and Bright; and Free Trade was to be the issue on which the election campaign was to be fought.

“Everything I do or say or wear is found fault with.” —Lady Randolph Churchill, 1880. “We have fought together through testing times: we have learnt to appreciate each other’s good qualities and to be kindly indulgent to qualities less good, if indeed they exist.” —Stanley Baldwin, 1931
of the vote in Manchester where Conservatives lost all eight seats they had held. Nationwide, Liberals won 377 seats, Conservatives only 157.

75 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1930-31 • Age 56
“A great liner is sinking in a calm sea...”

In a letter to his son on 8 January 1931, Churchill predicted the fall of the Labour Government and Baldwin’s return as Prime Minister—but said he had no desire to join the Cabinet and “be saddled with all the burden of whole-hog Protection, plus unlimited doses of Irwinism for India. I shall be much more able to help the country from outside. I feel a great deal stronger since the Indian situation developed, although most people will tell you the opposite. It is a great comfort when one minds the questions one cares about far more than office or party or friendships.”

On 26 January 1931, Churchill spoke in the Commons against his own party’s India policy for the first time, a day after Lord Irwin had freed Gandhi from prison which, Martin Gilbert writes, “provoked an immediate and widespread protest both from British officials in India and from Conservatives in Britain.”

Churchill reminded the House that Congress party leaders with whom the British government was negotiating were neither democratic nor representative of the Indian masses to whom Britain owed a “duty and trust...No one can pretend that this draft of a constitution is based upon any democratic conception, or that the Indian Executive and Assembly will in any way represent the masses of India. These masses will be delivered to the mercies of a well-organised, narrowly elected, political and religious oligarchy and caucus. Those 300 million people who are our duty and trust are often forgotten in these political discussions.

Churchill concluded with a metaphor drawn from the Titanic disaster: “The great liner is sinking in a calm sea. One bulkhead after another gives way; one compartment after another is bilged; the list increases; she is sinking; but the captain and the officers and the crew are all in the saloon dancing to the jazz band. But wait till the passengers find out what is their position!...then I think there will be a sharp awakening, then, I am sure, that a reaction of the most vehement character will sweep this country and its unmeasured strength will once more be used. That, Sir, is an ending which I trust and pray we may avoid, but it is an ending to which step by step and day by day, we are being remorselessly and fatuously conducted.”

The next day, Churchill resigned from what had effectively been the Tory Shadow Cabinet, writing to Stanley Baldwin: “Now that our divergences of view upon Indian policy have become public, I feel that I ought not any longer to attend the meetings of your ‘Business Committee’ to which you have hitherto so kindly invited me. I hope and believe that sincere and inevitable differences upon policy will not affect the feelings of friendship which have grown up between us during the last six years. I need scarcely add that I will give you whatever aid is in my power in opposing the Socialist Government in the House of Commons, and I shall do my utmost to secure their defeat at the general election.”

Mr. Baldwin replied a day later: “I am grateful to you for your kind letter of yesterday and much as I regret your decision not to attend the meetings of your old colleagues, I am convinced that your decision is correct in the circumstances....Our friendship is now too deeply rooted to be affected by differences of opinion whether temporary or permanent. We have fought together through testing times: we have learnt to appreciate each other’s good qualities and to be kindly indulgent to qualities less good, if indeed they exist ...”

50 YEARS AGO
Winter 1955-56 • Age 81
“He kissed my hand!”

After Christmas with his family at Chartwell, Churchill headed for the south of France to stay with Emery Reves at his villa, La Pausa, which had been built for Coco Chanel in the 1920s. Clementine ill and remained in England.

On 16 January 1956, Aristotle Onassis came to dinner and Churchill wrote about it in a letter to his wife the next day: “All the children go home today by one route or another, Arabella & Celia were both vy sweet to me. Diana will give you accounts. She seems vy well & mistress of herself. Randolph brought Onassis (the man with the big yacht) to dinner last night. He made a good impression upon me. He is a vy able and masterful man & told me a lot about whales. He kissed my hand!”

On 29 January, Clementine wrote to her husband of a luncheon she had with his first love, Pamela Lytton, née Plowden: “Your Pamela has just been to luncheon with me, looking exquisite & pretty in spite of her intense pain—We exchanged the names of our drugs & I have put her on to demanding pethidine from her doctor—I, for my part, am going to explore one of her pains killers.”

Churchill spent January revising the second volume of his History of the English-Speaking Peoples. He returned to England on 10 February and saw Clementine off on a voyage to Ceylon, from which she wrote on 5 March: “We have just been to the Zoo which is said to be the most beautiful in the world—the animals are glossy & well kept & it is a bower of flowers—The Elephants are of all sizes down to babies 30 inches high which are fed on a bottle.” Churchill replied: “I am vy glad that the ‘Zoo’ is so attractive, but I think it wd be better not, repeat NOT, to bring more than three 30 inch elephants to Chartwell!”
Churchill as Soldier

A Standard Work

Paul H. Courtenay


Full disclosure first: Douglas Russell has been Secretary and a Governor of The Churchill Centre, also a District Court judge. With these credentials one might expect a knowledgeable and lucid account of this important phase of Churchill’s life, and the author does not disappoint. His own army experience gives him a better feel for military life than that available to many other writers, while his exceptional understanding of the British Army’s regimental system adds to the confidence of the reader.

Russell is also the author of The Churchill Centre publication The Orders, Decorations and Medals of Sir Winston Churchill, and his comprehensive, not to say encyclopaedic, knowledge of this subject adds authenticity to the flair with which he tackles the fascinating theme of this book.

Much of what his book discloses has inevitably been published elsewhere, but one of the strengths of this offering is the way in which each of Churchill’s military adventures is covered in some detail and contributes to the whole picture of how the Army shaped his early life. We read comprehensive accounts of his days at the Royal Military College (as Sandhurst was then called), in Cuba, with the 4th Hussars, in India, the Sudan and South Africa, with the Queen’s Own Oxfordshire Hussars in the Territorial Army, and finally his return to full-time soldiering during the First World War, which was unique for an ex-cabinet minister.

An early poem, written at Harrow, reveals Churchill’s patriotic outlook, while a rarely quoted extract from his speech to a mob in Leicester Square, which he led in tearing down barricades outside a theatre while a Sandhurst cadet, struck a similar chord. WSC’s achievements at Sandhurst are noted and the diligence which he applied to the subjects he especially enjoyed (such as horsemanship) is fully detailed.

More and tougher riding instruction in the 4th Hussars highlighted before the scene switches to Cuba, from where one of Churchill’s press reports showed great insight into guerrilla warfare: “The Spanish officers anticipate a speedy end to the war...I confess I do not see how this can be done. As long as the insurgents choose to adhere to the tactics they have adopted...they can be neither caught nor defeated.” Russell leaves Cuba concluding that WSC had proved to be steady under fire and sturdy enough to endure the rigours of active service in the field; he had had his “private rehearsal” and as a result knew for certain that he was well suited to the demands of the profession of arms.

Russell notes that Churchill always used his highly placed connections “as a springboard, not as a sofa,” and always to get into a battle—never to avoid it. Thus he found his way to the Malakand Field Force, where his ambition to be known for personal courage could be temporarily satisfied. Returning to Bangalore, he wrote his account of the campaign and started to write Satrola. It is good to have confirmation of what any reader of Satrola must quickly realise, namely (as WSC wrote to his mother) that “All my philosophy is put in the mouth of the hero.” In another letter home at this period he wrote, “Nor shall anyone be able to say that vulgar consideration of personal safety ever influenced me.”

And so to the Sudan, where the journey up the Nile and its climax in the charge at Omdurman are well known (and will become even more so when James Muller’s new edition of The River War is published). After the battle WSC opined, “...I speculated on the shoddiness of war. You cannot gild...
it. The raw comes through.”

Next came the Boer War. Russell reports a conversation on the voyage to South Africa in which another journalist recalled Churchill’s words to him: “The worse of it is that I am not a good life. My father died too young. I must try to accomplish whatever I can by the time I am forty.”

Russell considers that this revelation does much to explain WSC’s unabashed ambition and his reputation for being pushy and egotistical: his heart felt reason for acting boldly to make a name for himself and for his impatience about getting into politics at an early age. The famous armoured train incident, and Churchill’s capture and subsequent escape, cover familiar ground. Later, describing the relief of Ladysmith, the author reveals some interesting, if minor, discrepancies between WSC’s own recollections and those of some other participants.

Territorial Army service in the Queen’s Own Oxfordshire Hussars is of interest, not least because it is a major activity in Churchill’s life which has been largely overlooked. WSC was a conscientious TA officer, who brought his squadron to a high state of efficiency. One noteworthy event was when doubling his roles as a QOOH major and First Lord of the Admiralty, Churchill took two squadrons of the regiment to Portsmouth for a tour of naval ships and installations.

Finally, we reach the First World War and are told about Churchill’s intervention at Antwerp; although he later admitted that his presence had been a mistake, a number of eye-witnesses asserted that his energetic activities there gained an extra five or six days for the Allies and played a valuable part in ensuring that the Channel ports in France were not overrun. Churchill’s service on the western front is covered in detail, with familiar accounts of his time with 2nd Battalion, Grenadier Guards, followed by command of 6th Battalion, The Royal Scots Fusiliers.

Douglas Russell has been most successful in drawing together all the strands of Churchill’s military life into one coherent whole and—familiar though much of the story may be—he keeps up the momentum, so that the reader never becomes bored by repetition of the well-known. His footnotes are very full and informative, revealing the depth of his knowledge and the quality of his research.

Having recounted the facts, the author draws perceptive conclusions. He stresses that, following the First World War, Churchill came to recognise the significance of both aerial and armoured warfare. He was reminded of what he had already discovered in the Sudan and Natal: that frontal assaults by infantry alone were doomed to fail against modern weapons and were a futile waste of lives. He laid emphasis on the importance of close coordination between sea and land forces in amphibious operations, so that the failure of the Dardanelles should not be repeated. He learnt the strategic importance of multiple fronts against an enemy—the failure of Gallipoli and the collapse of Russia notwithstanding.

Alliances, too, were crucial. Where, after all, would Great Britain have been without the French army, the troops and resources provided by its Commonwealth partners and, finally, the weight of American manpower and industry? He laid stress on logistics, particularly the provision of adequate manpower and munitions and their allocation. Strong, unified political leadership in the Cabinet was essential to guide the course of a war. Churchill learnt the value of an open mind to new strategies and tactics and especially to new technologies. Finally, he came to view war not as romantic or glorious, but as merely tragic; he was profoundly moved by the suffering of the common people and junior ranks. He never forgot them.

Despite a high number of typographical and similar errors (largely the fault of the publisher rather than the author, which will be corrected in future editions, this is a most valuable, well-written and scholarly work on a neglected theme; Churchillians will want to read and admire it.

**...But This One is Utterly Optional.**

**PAUL H. COURTENAY**


Referring to Churchill’s funeral, the very first word of the introduction to this book is his burial place, “Blandon,” which does not exactly inspire confidence in what is to come. The first disadvantages the reader will notice is the absence of maps, and of references attributing quotations. To be fair, many quotations do state their origin in the text, but this is far from universal; in particular, a number of Churchill’s alleged sayings are given no attribution, thus cannot be verified.

The book is generally accurate in the chronology of Churchill’s career, but consists essentially of a large number of quite lengthy extracts from other peoples’ writings, linked with historical summaries. Where the book scores is with numerous statements by little-known people, such as Harrovian contemporaries, junior officers and others who encountered Churchill at various times, and some of these may not have been widely published before.

One of these writers is >>
A Tour de Force on Churchill and Canada

BARRY GOUGH

The Great Dominion: Winston Churchill in Canada, 1900-1954, by David Dilks. Foreword by The Lady Soames LG DBE. Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers, 457 pp., illus., $45. Member price $XX

Churchill visited Canada nine times, travelled from coast to coast, and had a fair knowledge of its leaders—and people—in a way that few writers have appreciated. David Dilks, Neville Chamberlain’s official biographer, former Vice-Chancellor of Hull University, and the leader in Canadian Studies in the UK, provides a remarkable window on this aspect of Churchill’s life and travels. Equally valuable is the Canadian content of this book: inside comments from the likes of William Lyon Mackenzie King, longest serving Premier of Canada, or the British Commonwealth for that matter; of Prime Minister Lester Pearson; and of Brooke Claxton, Minister of Defence.

The Canadian commentary provides a wonderful counterpart to the Churchill documents and to journals and insights provided by those travelling with Churchill on his visits: John Colville, Lord Moran, military staff giants Ismay and Alanbrooke. Generally speaking American voices are kept out of this work, leaving it an Anglo-Canadian tryst or encounter.

The book begins with discussion of Churchill’s speaking tours. The first was in 1900-1901, with the young war correspondent recounting adventures in South Africa, including his escape from the Boers’ grasp. He received, and receiving warm applause from Canadian audiences in Ottawa, Montréal, Toronto and Winnipeg for Canada’s conspicuous part in the Boer War. He pointed out that Canada’s sacrifices on kopje and veldt had not been made in vain. In fact, opined Churchill, the war had added to Canada’s power and prestige, promoted the unity of the British Empire, and making possible the prospect of a united South Africa.
This was flattering, and confirming, and his audiences, often hearing the opposite about this messy imperial conflict, loved it. The editor of a Winnipeg paper gives an insight into Churchill before his address in that city, and this is typical of the jewels that Dilks has found for us:

Before the curtain went up the lecturer looked through the peephole in it, and speaking to the manager of the theatre, who stood at his elbow, asked him for his estimate of the sum of money ‘in the house.’ To the present writer, standing in the wings, a Winnipeg lawyer and leading citizen who was next to him expressed disappointment on hearing the lecturer thus openly show his interest in the yield of cash to be reaped from the lecturer....Churchill left Winnipeg by train dressed snugly in a coon-skin coat he purchased at the Hudson’s Bay Company...with warmest memories, enhanced reputation, and padded coffers.

Churchill came again on the eve of the Wall Street Crash, pondering international and imperial problems in Suez, Egypt and Singapore. Now his fame was assured by his World Crisis volumes and many cabinet positions. He was a person to be watched and to be described, by such as the Toronto Star: “...the most nearly universal genius in captivity....All that has come to him—of inspiration, experience, triumph, mastery—he has not sought. It has simply come, as breezes seek Aeolian wires.” Churchill made twelve speeches on that tour, writing to his wife of his regard for Canada’s future and independent mindset:

The immense size and progress of this country impresses itself upon one more and more every day...The sentimental feeling towards England is wonderful. The United States are is [is] stretching their [its] tentacles out in all directions, but the Canadian National spirit and personality is becoming so powerful and self-contained that I do not think we need fear the future....

Churchill renewed his friendship with Mackenzie King on this visit, and took the opportunity to inquire into the recent and celebrated constitutional difficulty involving the Governor General, Viscount Bing of Vimy, and two Canadian premiers, King and Meighen. King, always suspicious of Churchill, found he had more support from WSC than expected. As King was prime architect of the evolution of the Commonwealth he seems to have been an important influence on gaining Churchill’s appreciation of the Commonwealth ideal of autonomous dominions and governments within the British Empire. On wartime visits Churchill made much of Canada’s growth and economic power, so vital to the Allied victory. Three large chapters, one for each great meeting—Argentia, 1941 and the 1943-44 Quebec conferences (Quadrant and Octagon)—are full of documentary snippets offering insights into high-level diplomacy and strategy. The Argentia meeting, to establish the theme of a United Nations and to lay down principles for a postwar world, is worked out against a backdrop of personal discord between Churchill and King, with WSC attempting some fence mending. The second centred on discussions on nuclear energy, strategy, and future direction of war. The third shows closer bonds of Commonwealth, a meeting of the War Committee of the Canadian Cabinet, and a press conference with Churchill. Dilks provides lovely bridges to the materials, and identifies with editorial skill various prominent figures who grace these pages. This is a rich tapestry of Canadian political life.

The best most original scholarship is the post-1945 era. Churchill came to Canada in 1952 and 1954. He was bullish on the country, as he so said in Ottawa in 1952, in the presence of Prime Minister St. Laurent:

Upon the whole surface of the globe there is no more spacious and splendid domain open to the activity and genius of free men, with one hand clasping in enduring friendship with the United States, and the other spread across the ocean both to Britain and to France. You will have a sacred mission to discharge. That you will be worthy of it I do not doubt. God bless you all.

It was a wholesome, generous tribute, but Churchill was not in top form. Recently in Washington he had strenuously and unsuccessfully fought against Dean Acheson and the Joint Chiefs of Staff about the evolution of a Supreme Command, North Atlantic.

Churchill, older and weaker now, was energized by sentiment: he pushed upon the Canadians to retain “Rule Britannia” as the Royal Canadian Navy’s signature song, but Canadian statesmen had to point out that the more appropriate “Vive la Canadienne” had been officially adopted. Still, the hosts yielded agreeably to the appeals of the guest, and “Rule Britannia” was played by the RCAF band on all suitable occasions when Churchill was present.

Claxton, in a rare insight, tells us that Churchill was delighted with Canadian-built Sabre aircraft sent to Britain and used in RAF squadrons, because as Churchill said, the existing air capability of fighter aircraft of the Hunter and Swift type were no match for the Russian MIGs.

Canadian postwar loans to Britain, and similar debts written off from the World War II receive scant treatment here. These were years of mighty Canadian commitment to NATO and to European security, and before 1956, when Canada departed from British policy on the matter of Suez, 1956, the, the Anglo-Canadian alliance was fixed and inviolate.

This is a grand and handsome book, a superb companion to modern histories of Canada and the UK as seen through Churchill’s eyes and those who saw Churchill in Canada. Bringing together so much vast information, some of it hitherto unavailable, makes it an imperishable book, a credit to author and publisher alike. It gives enhanced value to the Canadian side and insights into modern history, so often neglected. Of course it shows aspects of Canadian independent thought and muted paranoia, for having to grow up with John Bull as well as Uncle Sam was never, and could never, be easy.
WHENCE THE AASR?*

"THE ANGLO-AMERICAN SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP, coined by Churchill and regularly dredged up by politicians of all stripes and both sides of the Atlantic, is questioned anew...

1. EUROPEANS DO NOT DO WAR...

“How Strong Are Shared Values in the Transatlantic Relationship?,” by Alex Danchev, Professor of International Relations, University of Nottingham. British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 2005, vol. 7. A full transcript of this article and a response by CC academic adviser Warren Kimball are available by email; please contact the editor.

"W e are the ally of the United States not because they are powerful, but because we share their values," said Tony Blair in 2003. But how much will the desire to live up to a transatlantic past alleviate the inevitable tensions now that Europe has lost importance for many Americans, and Europe has lost faith in America?

We live in an era when the idea of an alliance of values seems either quaint or oppressive, and even contradictory when one remembers that, recently, 43 percent of Americans felt that torturing suspected terrorists could sometimes be justified, when there is no similar feeling amongst Europeans. Moreover, there are broad differences between Europe and the US over capital punishment, income inequality between rich and poor, the tax burden and religious observance.

Although the two sides of the Atlantic may recognise the same core concepts (such as the rule of law, freedom of speech, equal rights and religious toleration), their interpretations of them are strikingly different.

Europeans do not do God. No European would express himself as did President Bush during the election: “Freedom is the Almighty God’s gift to every man and woman in this world.” Europeans do not do self-belief, and are bemused by America’s “can do” attitude. Europeans do not do China: that huge country, indeed, the wider world generally, barely features on Europe’s radar. Europeans do not do verbalization: the open, unselfconscious, affirmativeness of American speech is something totally alien to the European way of expressing themselves. And Europeans do not do war, as the German and French Foreign Ministers said exactly in the run-up to the 2003 Iraq War.

The alliance of values is therefore overblown and oversold. Europeans and Americans, in Kagan’s words, “agree on little and understand one another less and less…they do not share the same broad view of how the world should be governed, about the role of international institutions and international law, about the proper balance between the use of force and the use of diplomacy in international affairs.”

The Atlantic alliance was created for the Cold War: each was then dispensable to the other. Europeans and Americans are, however, no longer blood brothers; they are merely friends. The old common threat has gone, and for many Americans, Europe is no longer in the eye of the storm, and may never be again. For many Europeans, America is no longer the beacon of hope, and is neither loved nor trusted.

The transatlantic relationship still has formidable assets, perhaps the greatest amongst them the stories it tells to sustain itself. The truth lies somewhere between the monumentalised past and the mythical fiction. Once upon a time, we held these truths to be self-evident. But not any more.

—Abstract by Robert Courts

2. BRITONS DO NOT DO VICHY...

When nations are fighting for life, when the Palace in which the Jester dwells not uncomfortably is itself assailed, and everyone from Prince to groom is fighting on the battlements, the Jester’s jokes echo only through deserted halls, and his witticisms and commendations, distributed evenly between friend and foe, jar the ears of hurrying messengers, of mourning women and wounded men. The titter ill accords with the tocsin, or the motley with the bandages.

—Churchill on Bernard Shaw, Great Contemporaries, 1937

Professor Danchev is a very nice man and a scholar whose cause is deconstructing the Anglo-American Special Relationship (AASR). He has previously offered his thoughtful book On Specialness: Essays in Anglo-
American Relations (FH 105:38) and a retort-provoking edition of Alnbrooke’s Diaries (FH 112: 34). The theme of his article described opposite is similar: the Special Relationship is a dangerous shibboleth and distraction; Britain must abandon her slavish adherence to America and blend with Europe, where she is culturally and philosophically at home. Against this philosophy, Churchill’s 1930 words about Britain and Europe (see next page) seem antique.

Who is right? Pardon the cynicism, but what has Britain had out of France lately, besides the 2012 Olympics? Perhaps in retaliation for that, Jacques Chirac remarked that the UK’s main gastronomic contribution to European agriculture was Mad Cow Disease. (He never dined in a good pub?) But, of course, we must make allowances for our Jacques.

Professor Danchev says that “statespersons” should reject the AASR because, among a list of things they do not do, “Europeans do not do war.” No, and they’d better not, considering what they did with it in the previous century, which Churchill described as “more common men killing each other with greater facilities than any other five centuries put together in the history of the world.”

America’s enterprise and affirmativeness may be superficially demonstrated by comparing the continental G-8 economies with America’s (and, for that matter, Britain’s, Australia’s and Canada’s). Granted, American attitudes toward individual enterprise are stronger, and there are congruent contrasts in approaches to health care. But it is really quite impossible to lump each side of the Atlantic into opposite baskets. In the Baltic one meets Poles driving BMWs, who got where they are with a work ethic comparable to America’s. Many motivated, successful individuals live in Britain and Estonia and Italy, and if you look hard you might even find one or two of them in France or Germany or Belgium.

If “Europeans do not do God,” they must be too sophisticated to believe in a higher power than themselves. Isn’t it odd, then, that established religion exists in Europe but not America? Or that the first thing the Russians did when they cast off Bolshevism was to recommission their surviving Orthodox priests, to bless among other things the bones of the Romanovs, dug up and reinterred at St. Peter and Paul Cathedral?

And Europe has religious laws that would shock Americans. Britain’s Labour government offered a bill to ban speech or writing “likely to stir up...religious hatred,” not only against major religions but any established sect including atheists and humans. If it passes, you could go goaI for saying something unkund about Druids. (That was before July 7th.) In Italy, author Oriana Fallaci was indicted for vilifying not Roman Catholicism but Islam, saying the Islamic invasion of Europe proceeds not only in a physical but also in a mental and cultural sense: “Servility to the invaders has poisoned democracy with obvious consequence for the freedom of thought, and for the concept itself of liberty.”

These are remarkable abridgments of something Churchill held dear, along with Jefferson and, one hopes, a few others still.

Professor Warren Kimball—Churchill Centre academic adviser, author of important works on the wartime relationship, and no knee-jerk Winstonophile—wrote an eloquent riposte to Danchev in the same British journal. Even eliminating Churchill’s “soaring rhetoric” on the Anglo-American Special Relationship, Kimball wrote, doesn’t fundamentally alter the case for its existence.

Danchev’s skepticism, Kimball says, is driven by current politics. While not supporting the decision to fight in Iraq, Kimball asks: “Why put the blame on the Special Relationship? If the current political stance of the British government is unappetizing, elect a different leadership!” Large numbers in the last UK election did just that, voting for the Liberal Democrats. Like the Anglo-American Iraq enterprise, Kimball notes, the AASR has always been “practical and realistic.” Are not the roots of the current situation in Iraq and the entire Middle East a perfect example? (They are, if you ignore how much oil the half trillion we’re spending on Iraq would have bought.)

Kimball finds Danchev’s list of things Europeans do not do clever. (A colleague crafted two especially for Britain: “Britons do not do Euros...Britons do not do Vichy.”) But Danchev’s assumption of a homogeneous Europe undermines his argument, Kimball explains:

Consider now the parallels between Britain and America, from former American Ambassador to London Raymond Seitz in the first Churchill Lecture (1998):

...today the genuine “special relationship” really exists outside the official body of government intercourse and well beyond the headlines and photo ops. You see this in all manner of public policy, from welfare reform to school reform, from zero-tolerance policing to pension management. You see it in every scholarly pursuit from archaeology to zoology, in every field of science and research, and in every social movement from environmentalism to feminism...in financial regulation and corporate governance and trade union interchange...along the cultural spectrum from the novel to the symphony and from the movies to rock ‘n’ roll...in the big statistics of trade and investment, and in the tiny statistics of transatlantic tourism or transatlantic flights or transatlantic phone calls...You see it in the work of the Churchill Centre and its allies.

Perhaps Professor Danchev

>>
BRITONS DO NOT TO VICHY...
has chosen an impossible task, much as the writers of the stillborn, 448-article European Constitution: to find nationhood in the disparate nations of Europe to which individually the world owes so much: science, literature, culture, democracy. The voters who rejected efforts to lump them all into a single constitutional stew might have had their own ideas as to what Europeans do and do not do.

More than Britain’s future, the challenge posed by this kind of thinking is to Western civilization itself. The Anglo-American Special Relationship is nothing more than a distillation of the only rational model for liberal democracy. Many in Europe, where the model was born, have no stomach to defend it anymore. It seems almost a death wish, recalling Toynbee’s maxim: “Civilizations die from suicide, not murder.”

And perhaps that’s the root of America’s differences with her old allies in Europe. Google “Anglosphere” and you will find a grass-roots movement to ally the English-Speaking democracies, and non-English speakers with similar goals, as disparate as India and many nations east of the old Iron Curtain: a far wider community than even Churchill envisioned.

“Anglospherists adhere to the fundamental customs and values that form the core of English-speaking cultures, such as individualism, rule of law, honoring covenants, and the elevation of freedom to the first rank of political virtues.” At present anyway, the part Europe Professor Danchev describes does not. It will be interesting to watch how the nations in the middle tilt.

—Richard M. Langworth

3. FROM THE CANON

THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

BY WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, 1938 • PART I

Editor’s note: We publish this long, reflective article not as a prescription for modern times but as a seed light on Churchill’s thinking when he wrote it, and on those concepts of his that may be worthy of reflection. It was published in The Saturday Evening Post and in The News of the World on 9 May 1938, under the heading “Why Not ‘The United States of Europe’?” An abridged version, “A Great Big Idea,” appeared in John Bull on the same day. Reprinted by permission of Winston S. Churchill.

Idea are born as the sparks fly upward. They die from their own weakness; they are whirled away by the wind; they are lost in the smoke; they vanish in the darkness of the night. Someone throws on another log of trouble and, effort, and fresh myriads of sparks stream ineffectually into the air. Men have always tended these fires, casting into them the fruits of their toil—indeed, all they can spare after keeping body and soul together.

Sometimes at rare intervals something exciting results from their activities. Among innumerable sparks that flash and fade away, there now and again gleams one that lights up not only the immediate scene but the whole world. What is it that distinguishes the fortunes of one of these potent incendiary or explosion ideas from the endless procession of its fellows? It is always something very simple and—once the surroundings are illuminated—painfully obvious. In fact we may say that the power and vitality of an idea result from a spontaneous recognition of the obvious.

For instance, not far from the fire there is a rubbish heap, and as the weather has been very dry for some time and the night breeze is blowing in that direction, one single spark out of all the millions has suddenly acquired enormous importance. It has fallen glowing upon the rubbish; and there is the heap beginning to smoulder, smoke and break into flame; and already there is a blaze and everyone can see for himself the rubbish heap and that the spark has set it alight. No one knows how far the flames will go, whose buildings will be threatened or what will happen next. There is no lack of excitement and bustle about and running around, and no one—not even the slowest—has any doubt but that something unusual has happened, or that it all arose from the spark and the rubbish heap coming together in this way. But what to do about it is quite a different tale.

So when the idea of the United States of Europe drifted off upon the wind and came in contact with the immense accumulation of muddle, waste, particularism and prejudice which had long lain piled up in the garden, it became quite evident that a new series of events had opened.

To quit a metaphor before it becomes a burden, never before have some four hundred millions of the strongest, most educated and most civilized parent races of mankind done themselves so much harm by their quarrels and disunion as have the great nations of Europe during the 20th century. Never had they more reason to be discontented with the condition to which they have reduced themselves, and never could they see more clearly at once the cause of their misfortunes and its remedy. They have only to look around to see the fair regions they inhabit starved and impoverished by the greatest of all wars, disturbed by hatreds and jealousies which the conflict has aggravated, and burdened at every point by fetters and barriers they have themselves created and must spend a large part of their income to maintain.
Then comes science, gathering power every day, and stimulated by the stress and fury of the great war. New possibilities of profitable cooperation in industry, compulsive need for wider and more reasonable distribution of productive effort are apparent to the humblest unbiased intelligence. White coal from mountain torrents readjusts the disparity of mineral deposits. Electric cables transmit, or offer to transmit, new sources of energy and wealth in directions and to areas hitherto unconsidered. Aircraft fly in a day across half-a-dozen frontiers.

Lastly there is the economic and financial portent of the United States. Here is a region little larger than Europe and occupied by only a fraction of its population. Here, too, are regions of vast resources and educated inhabitants, but they are progressing, and prosper at a speed and in a degree never before witnessed, and still increasing. Their resources, although better distributed and disposed, are not so much greater than those of Europe; their population is far smaller.

What are the causes which are favouring the New World and hindering the old? The demand of the masses in all countries is for higher economic well-being. Science and organization stand ready to supply it. Knowledge is not confined to one side of the Atlantic Ocean. Why, then, is the contrast between American and European conditions so cruel and their rates of material progress so unequal? To find the answer, we have only to look at the rubbish heap upon which a brisk flame has already begun to crackle.

We must regard this heap a little more closely in the growing light. It has been the growth of centuries, and even millennia have passed since some of its still-existing materials were deposited. In the main, it is made up of the bones and broken weapons of uncounted millions who brought one another to violent deaths long ago. Upon these, three or four centuries have cast masses of rotting vegetation, and latterly an increasing discharge of waste paper. But in it, mixed up with all this litter, scattered about and intermingled, are some of the most precious and dearly loved treasures of the strongest races in the world. All the history books of Europe are there; its household gods; all the monuments and records of wonderful achievements and sacrifice; the battle flags for which the heroes of every generation have shed their blood; the vestments of religions still living and growing in the minds of men; the foundations of the jurisprudence still regulating their relations one with another—all flung and blended together.

Clearly the burning of the rubbish heap is not so small a matter as it seemed at the first glance. Should Europeans let it burn away and start afresh, or must the conflagration be promptly extinguished and the rubbish heap preserved for the sake of the precious relics and possessions it contains? Certainly if this is the choice, and the only choice, there will be two opinions about the burning, and men and nations and interests and social organizations of all kinds will range themselves on opposite sides. But is there no other course? Is there not a more complicated, but more scientific method of dealing with this pile which cumbers the earth? Has not Europe the wisdom, the strength, the patience, by the same process to rescue its treasures and incinerate its rubbish?

Continuing to inspect the burning dump, we observe that it is overlaid with a tangled growth and network of tariff barriers designed to restrict trade and production to particular areas. This network is the product of modern times. It has markedly increased since the Great War. In fact, every improvement which science has been given to European communications has been tripped up and rendered largely nugatory by this new and immense apparatus. Nothing like it is to be seen in the United States.

An English member of the House of Commons—an impeccable Conservative—Sir Clive Morrison-Bell, has had the wit and ingenuity to construct a model of the tariff walls of Europe. He mounted a large-scale map and built in imitation brickwork and at their relative heights around the frontiers of the different states the tariff walls which exist in Europe today. The Governor of the Bank of England invited him to place it on view in the bank parlour. Since then it has been exhibited in the parliaments and at conferences in most of the great capitals. One specimen has now reached Washington.

Sir Clive Morrison-Bell claims that his model enables people to "visualize the idea" and that "its presence does not make a fleeting but a lasting impression," giving "an advantage over the written or spoken word." This is no doubt true. No European can gaze upon the astonishing spectacle of these internal tariff walls of Europe without being amazed at embarrassments and difficulties in spite of which the peoples of Europe get their daily bread.

This lively impression is stimulated by a glance at the map of the United States and by observing that throughout the whole of that vast territory, possessing within its bounds almost every commodity necessary for modern life, there is no obstacle or barrier of any kind except those which Nature has raised and which science is overcoming. Certainly it would seem that the free interchange of goods and services over the widest possible area or over very wide areas, is a dominating factor in the rapid accretion of material wealth.

But this idea of European unity, so novel to untutored ears, is no more, in fact, than a reversion to the old foundation of Europe. Why should it appear startling to its inhabitants? Europe has known the days when Rumanians lived on the Tyne and Spaniards on the Danube as equal citizens of a single state. She has dwelt in nearer centuries in the catholicity of Christendom. She has rested her >>
UNITED STATES OF EUROPE... emancipated body upon the venerable structure of the Holy Roman Empire. She has seen, as if it were but yesterday, the sword of Napoleon uplifted in a cause which, cavil you may, meant and could only mean, in the terms of political science, a revival under Gallic forms of Roman solidarity. And even in the lifetime of living men she has enjoyed the spectacle of united Italy and endured the overflowing strength of united Germany. Everywhere, in every age, in every area however wide, over every grouping of peoples however diverse, unity has made for strength and prosperity for all within its circle. Why should Europe fear unity? As well might a man fear his own body.

Upon the petty states, principalities and tribalisms of Europe each intermediate organism had to grow. The majestic Roman scene had passed away. The clammy bonds by which medieval Christendom had mastered anarchy must be torn asunder. The fierce youth, nationalism, was born for this peculiar task. But nationalism is an agent and not an end. It is a champion and not a breadwinner. It is a leader and not a story, a process and not a result.

The Treaty of Versailles represents the apotheosis of nationalism. The slogan of self-determination has been carried into practical effect. The weaker or less fortunate competitors in the struggle of races have been set free. The old imperial organizations within which they had been compressed have been disbanded or burst. The Treaties of Versailles and Trianon, whatever their faults, were deliberately designed to be the consummation of that national feeling which grew out of the ruins of despotisms, whether benevolent otherwise, just as despotism grew out of the ruins of feudalism. All the inherent life thirst of liberalism in this sphere has been given full play.

Europe is organized, as it never was before, upon a purely nationalistic basis. The scissors of treaty-making and boundary-drawing have cut sharply through the fringes and across disputed border lines. But in the main the Treaties of Versailles and Trianon represent the fullest expression of national and racial feeling which Europe has ever known.

But what are the results? First of all, there is a gasp of relief and expansion, and immediately thereafter a sense of weakness. The organization of Europe today is at once more onerous and less economically efficient than it was before the war. More than seven thousand miles have been added to her customs barriers. Every new frontier has increased the cost in time and money of the transport of goods. A traveller is forced to descend at stations whose names he cannot pronounce and to justify himself to states of which he has never heard. Professor de Maddriaga complains that a journey from Paris to Stockholm—although the distance is less than the diameter of many American states—requires no fewer than six different kinds of coins and stamps, the passage of seven different frontiers and the use of five different languages.

The empire of the Hapsburgs has vanished. That immense, unwieldy, uneasy, but nevertheless coherent entity has been Balkanized. Poland has escaped from her eighteenth-century dungeon, bristling with her wrongs and dazzled by the light. The whole zone of Middle Europe, from the Baltic to the Aegean, is split into small states vaunting their independence, glorying in their new-found liberty, acutely self-conscious and exalting their particularisms. They must wall themselves in. They must have armies to defend the ramparts. They must have revenues to pay the armies. They must have foundries and factories to equip them. They must have national industries to make themselves self-contained and self-supporting. They must revive half-forgotten national languages just to show how different they are from the fellows across the frontier. No more discipline of great empires: each for himself and a curse for the rest. What a time of jubilee!

In this vale of tears nothing is more disappointing than getting one’s own way. The peoples of Middle Europe, famished by the privations of the Great War, have indulged in a banquet of Dead Sea apples. Even our own pet Ireland has found the task of rejoicing over freedom regained strenuous and bleak.

Nationalism throughout Europe, for all its unconquerable explosive force, has already found, and will find, its victorious realization at once unsatisfying and uncomfortable. More than any other world movement, it is fated to find victory bitter. It is a religion whose field of proselytizing is strictly limited, and when it has conquered its own narrow world, it is debarred, if it has no larger aim, by its own dogmas from seeking new worlds to conquer.

The stages of human development press upon one another’s heels and now here, now there, block or trample down one another. Loyalty to the tribe is overtaken by loyalty to the nation; loyalty to the nation obstruct loyalty to the continent; and some day we may see loyalty to the continent a danger to mankind. But nothing is gained by cutting out the intermediate stages. Each must find its place in the procession. Each will have its part to play in the assembly, and from every man will some day be required not the merging or discarding of various loyalties, but their simultaneous reconciliation in a complete or larger synthesis.

I am always twitted with using warlike metaphors. But in my life I have been brought in contact with many wars, small and great, and ever since Armageddon the world is familiar with military modes and phrases. In that harsh school pupils received lifelong impressions. Under the pressure of war, men and nations learn to discard unessential things. They reach
“WHY CANNOT EUROPE
in time of peace utilize a
little of the wisdom she
has bought so dearly in
the crunch of war?”

out in thought and grasp realities. They mine and countermine among fundamentals. The ordeal is over. Lessons as well as scars have been received. Necessity is the mother of invention, and military organization is the result of intensely concentrated thought. Everyone knows a lot about it. Battalions and brigades are gathered together in a division, and the division forms part of a corps or army. The armies are grouped under a commander-in-chief, and finally the commander-in-chief is subordinate himself to the allied generalissimo.

Imagine the ruin which would overtake the army, if there were nothing but battalions and brigades and divisions; if divisional generals sought to meet together in a council of war to settle on every plan, arrange for all the supplies and give their views upon the strategy and policy to be pursued. Imagine, on the other hand, a supreme command which had nothing between itself and the numerous divisions, all marching and manoeuvring independently. Either method has but to be considered to be found manifestly absurd. Why cannot Europe in time of peace utilize a little of the wisdom she has bought so dearly in the crunch of war? Why cannot the civilian realize himself as French, German, Spanish or Dutch, and simultaneously as a European and, finally, as a citizen of the whole world. The flame of war has passed, its hideous losses have been written off. Europe might at least gather such experience from that time of trial as has been left upon the ground.

The resuscitation of the Pan-European idea is largely identified with Count Kounenhove-Calergi. He has conducted his campaign from Vienna. The headquarters are well chosen. The

plight of Vienna since the Great War constitutes the bitterest example of the waste and folly of the present system. This forlorn capital, for centuries the seat of an empire, now merely the nodal point of severed or strangulated railways, a London walled in by hostile Irelands, makes its unanswered appeal. It is right that that appeal should be no longer mute. The form of Count Calergi’s theme may be crude, erroneous and impracticable, but the impulse and the inspiration are true.

We have, further, a manifesto issued by the bankers in 1927, stating in effect that Europe is slowly strangling herself and that if her economic policy is not reversed she may find herself utterly impoverished and bankrupt. The report of the Consultative Committee of the League of Nations, published May, supports the bankers.

Finally M. Briand, one of the most powerful and eloquent of European statesmen, has, with the deft vagueness of an experienced parliamentarian, proclaimed to League of Nations his adherence to the cause of a United Europe. He would like to see some “federal link” established between all these different states. “The most important component” of that “federal link” should be “economic agreement.” He branded the European customs barriers as “mountain chains that divided one state from another.” He gained the support of Herr Stresemann and of Dr. Benes. Whereupon the Assembly appointed a committee, under direction to report as soon as may be.

Thus we may exclaim with Zola, “Truth is on the march,” but the time has certainly not come when we can complete the quotation—“and nothing will stop her.” Let her, then, march forward, and let us aid her march. The farther she can get the better. We may be quite sure she will not get far in the immediate future to do anything but good.

Concluded next issue. 

*Becoming Winston Churchill* is an outgrowth of Zoller’s *Finest Hour* article, “The Earth is a Generous Mother: William Bourke Cockran, Churchill’s American Mentor” (*FH* 115, Summer 2002) and McMenamin’s “Becoming Winston Churchill,” delivered at the 2004 convention of the American Political Science Association. It will contain all known Churchill-Cockran correspondence (25,000 words), the major portion of which occurs between 1895, when Churchill was 20, and 1906, when WSC achieved his first executive office as Colonial Under-Secretary. *FH* readers may obtain an electronic version of McMenamin’s text from the author at mcmenamin@walterhav.com.

While Churchillians know of Bourke Cockran, he is sadly little-known in American history. Yet Cockran, who died in 1923, was a free trade, anti-imperialist Democrat Member of Congress whose friend Theodore Roosevelt called him “the greatest orator using the English language today.” Cockran’s Republican colleague in Congress from New York, Hamilton Fish, Jr., said that, except for Theodore Roosevelt, Cockran was the ablest man he had ever met, and that he had more knowledge of history than anyone in his generation.

In 1906, Churchill wrote his first cousin, Shane Leslie (who later became Cockran’s brother-in-law) and asked him to tell Cockran that “I regard his as the biggest and most original mind I have ever met. When I was a young man he instantly gained my confidence and I feel that I owe the best things in my career to him.”

In 1930, Churchill wrote of Cockran in *Thoughts and Adventures:* “I have never seen his like, or in some respects his equal….his conversation, in point, in pith, in rotundity, in antithesis, and in comprehension, exceeded anything I have ever heard.”

Even in his seventies Churchill remembered his old friend, telling Adlai Stevenson that Cockran “taught me how to use every note of the human voice like an organ….He was my model—I learned from him how to hold thousands in thrall.”

Excerpts from the book may be published in future issues; for readers who would like a flavor of what is in store for them, we reprint below, with the authors’ permission, the prologue to *Becoming Winston Churchill.*

It began with a love story. Born on different sides of the Atlantic, two Americans—a man and a woman—met in Paris in the spring of 1895, each grieving a lost love. They had led political lives at the highest level in their chosen lands. Attractive and strong-willed, they were immediately, magnetically drawn to one another. They rode horses and bicycles. They went to plays, restaurants, museums and glittering dinner parties. They talked and they argued, in English and in French. They became lovers.

Their affair was intense and exhausting, each too strong for the other. They reluctantly parted that summer, friends still. That autumn, she asked a favor. Would he take her 20-year-old son under his wing on his first journey to the land of her birth, and provide a strong man’s influence, something needed but unreceived from the boy’s late father? The man would and did, because he had no child of his own. And because she asked.

He immediately recognized the young man’s courage, strength and brilliance—truly his mother’s son. He was the first man, but not the last, to see this. For the next ten years, when no one else could or would, he taught the young man all that he knew through word and deed, showing him how to place principle over party, helping him to use the English language as a painter would a palette, offering himself as a role model as if the young man were his own son, stepping silently back once he was done and the young man’s public career had well begun.

The two lovers in turn remarried—but not to one another. Still, along with her son, he was at her side the day she died, twenty-six years after they met, the friend she had promised always to be. Two years later, he was gone as well.

And less than two decades after their deaths, her son’s courage saved his country. And the world.

The man was Bourke Cockran. The woman was Lady Randolph Churchill, the former Jennie Jerome.

Everyone knows her remarkable son.
CHURCHILL TRIVIA

Questions on contemporaries (C), literary (L), miscellaneous (M), personal (P), statesmanship (S) and war (W) arranged in four sets of six.

1567. I his maiden speech in the Commons, Churchill commented favorably on what British Commissioner of South Africa? (C)

1568. Churchill started painting in 1915. Who wrote about WSC’s early painting experiences in A Number of People (1939)? (L)

1569. What was the name of the Grand Committee, formed to consider the 1904 Aliens Bill, which Churchill was appointed? (M)

1570. Why did Churchill have to improvise his opening remarks during his maiden speech in Parliament? (P)

1571. Reginald McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, proposed to build four dreadnoughts in 1908 and, if necessary, six in 1909. Why did Churchill and Lloyd George oppose these plans? (S)

1572. On 13 August 1913, Churchill sent a lengthy memorandum to the Committee of Imperial Defence on a likely war between which two sets of alliances? (W)

1573. Who was Colonial Secretary when Churchill was appointed Undersecretary of State for the Colonies in 1905? (C)

1574. Who wrote about the 1914 Ulster Crisis: “Churchill was indeed in our eyes the villain of the piece, the author of the ‘Plot’ or Pogrom”—with Asquith and Seeley as his weak accomplices.” (L)

1575. Summarize the questions Churchill asked Prime Minister Asquith about women’s suffrage in December 1911. (M)

1576. What was the subject of Churchill’s first speech from the Opposition benches in 1904? (P)

1577. What was the 1914 “Curragh Revolt”? (S)

1578. In January-February 1909, the Cabinet debated how many dreadnoughts to build. How many did Churchill and Lloyd George favor? (W)

1579. Who were Churchill’s two Principal Private Secretaries during the early years of World War I? (C)

1580. In The World Crisis, Churchill wrote that the Royal Navy made no important contribution to naval literature. Which American Admiral wrote the “standard work on Sea Power” according to WSC? (L)

1581. Who was technically responsible in 1911 for the safety of reserves of naval cordite, some of which was stored in London magazines? (M)

1582. Which Parliamentary constituency did Churchill contest as a Liberal candidate in 1906? (P)

1583. What did Churchill say during the Korean war about appeasement from the position of strength? (S)

1584. How many times did Churchill watch German Army maneuvers as a guest of Kaiser Wilhelm? (S)

1585. Which wife of a British Prime Minister quoted in her diary her husband’s remark, “Of course Winston is intolerable. It is all vanity—he is devoured by vanity…” (C)

1586. Which close friend did Churchill refer to as “Linky”? (L)

1587. An editor of The Morning Post was among Churchill’s many critics before the outbreak of World War I. Who was he? (M)

1588. What was the cause of Winston Churchill’s temporary estrangement in 1914 from his cousin, the Duke of Marlborough? (P)

1589. Long before the start of World War I, Churchill predicted how the German attack on France would develop. What was his prediction? (S)

1590. What was the first major British naval disaster of World War I? (W)

ANSWERS

A Number of People (1939). (L)

Norwich Arabist (1939). (L)

Norman H. Long (1939). (L)

On the order paper, which lists topics of speeches, Lloyd George, who preceded WSC, had listed an amendment to to the Law. (1570). (L)

On the day in 1914, the House was adjourned. Has the House of Commons ever been effectively consulted on the part of great numbers of women to assume statesmanship (S) and war (W) (1570). (L)

On August 5, 1914, the British light cruiser Amphion was torpedoed and sank, with the loss of one British officer, 150 enlisted men, and nearly all the prisoners. (1579). (L)

On February 19, 1914, the Standing Committee on Agriculture reported that the Acceptance of Home Rule by Northern Ireland is a fundamental question of Irish nationalism and constitutional reform. On this subject, what did the House move? (1573). Edward Marsh and James Muster-Smith. (1580). Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan. (1581). Churchill, as Home Secretary. (1582). From strength is magnanimous and noble and might be the surest way and perhaps the only way to save the British Empire. (1583). Hugh Gough and three officers offered their resignations in protest against being sent to the Koyasan war about appeasement from the position of strength. (1584). Hugh Gough and three other officers gave their resignations in protest on the floor of the House to 1914. (1587). My dear Sir, on 20 March 1914, at the request of the House, I addressed the House of Commons on the subject of the Koyasan war. (1588). Of course Winston is intolerable. It is all vanity—he is devoured by vanity…” (1589). Churchill was indeed in our eyes the villain of the piece, the author of the ‘Plot’ or Pogrom”—with Asquith and Seeley as his weak accomplices.” (1590). Churchill was appointed Undersecretary of State for the Colonies in 1905. (C)
“It may be that these societies,
dazzled and dizzy with their own schemes of aggression and the prospect of early victories,
have forced their country against its better judgment into war.

They have certainly embarked upon a very considerable undertaking. [Laughter]
For after the outrages they have committed upon us...
they must know that the stakes for which they have decided to play are mortal.

Here we are together facing a group of mighty foes who seek our ruin;
here we are together defending all that to free men is dear.

Twice in a single generation the catastrophe of world war has fallen upon us;
twice in our lifetime has the long arm of fate reached across the ocean
to bring the United States into the forefront of the battle....

Prodigious hammer-strokes have been needed to bring us together again,
or if you will allow me to use other language I will say
that he must indeed have been a blind soul who cannot see
that some great purpose and design is being worked out here below
of which we have the honour to be the faithful servants.

It is not given to us to peer into the mysteries of the future.
Still, I avow my hope and faith, sure and inviolate,
that in the days to come the British and American peoples will,
for their own safety and for the good of all,
walk together side by side
in majesty, in justice, and in peace.

—WSC, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, 26 DECEMBER 1941 • PHOTOGRAPH: LIBRARY OF CONGRESS