SUMMER 2006 • NUMBER 131

14 Churchill Centre High School Teacher Seminars: Elmhurst College and Fletcher School, Tufts University • by Suzanne Sigman

Absent Friends: 16 Caspar Willard Weinberger GBE 1917-2006 • by Richard M. Langworth
17 "Champagne for Everyone": The Greatness of Bill Deakin • by David Dilks

20 Whodunnit? Listening in on Roosevelt and Churchill • by Warren F. Kimball

Three Churchillians on Current Contentions: 22 Churchill and the Sterilisation Issue • by Paul Addison
38 Churchill's Memoirs of the Debate • by Andrew Roberts; Priced by Robert Strauss
47 "Champagne for Everyone": The Greatness of Bill Deakin • by David Dilks

Churchilliana: 24 Churchill Coins Mark War's Anniversary • by Devtry White
26 An Historic Souvenir of "Torch": Harry Hopkins' "Short Snorter" • by Michael Richards

30 Eddie Marsh: A Profile • by David Freeman

33: Winston S. Churchill and Robert R. McCormick • by Philip and Susan Larson

39 BOOKS, ARTS & CURIOSITIES
The editor says Michael Dobbs's latest Churchill novel is his best... Curt Zoller finds Ronald Cohen's new Churchill bibliography comprehensive and expensive... Dan Myers says One Christmas in Washington worth reading—anyway... Hugh Owen's glimpses of the Great Man... David Reynolds on Industrial Chartwell... Woods Corner offers two new finds... More Questions by Paul Courtenay and Curt Zoller.

Despares PJS At the Centre 5 • Datelines 10 • UK News 11 • Around & About 12
Riddles: Inside the Journals 44 • Woof, C/o? 49 • Questions 46
Churchilltrivia 51 • Immortal Words 52

Finest Hour
PUBLISHED BY THE CHURCHILL CENTRE FOR CHURCHILLIANS WORLDWIDE
A MEMORABLE COVER

Congratulations on the cover of FH 129.

It is exquisite. This is a beautiful picture of our Patron at an important historical milestone. It is among the most attractive and memorable covers I have seen on any issue, and my collection now goes back fifteen years to #67.

MERLIN OLSON, NEW YORK, N.Y.

WARTIME QUESTIONS

My article, "Wartime Questions to Postwar Answers" (FH 129) really has a nice look to it. I cannot overstate my appreciation for FH for printing my work all these years since 1986. I set up the original title, "Wartime Answers to Postwar Questions," as a kind of riddle in itself: "Answers" had to be supplied during wartime questions." In print it's reversed, which is amusing. We can see the new headline as word play, appropriate to the "riddle." And, if we prefer, we may read the words as suggesting a continuum, as if a fuller sentence would read "From Wartime Questions to Postwar Answers: Churchill moves towards war termination."

I'm a happy guy. What a great ten years I've had, engrossed in this deep reading, book collecting, and writing—much of it for FH.

CHRIS HARMON, ALEXANDRIA, VA

MEETING ONE OF THE FEW

I enjoyed Robert Courts' RAF article in FH 127. A long time ago I met an old man who told me about flying out the RAF base near Chingford in 1940. I really didn't comprehend the full meaning until he said he had made 250 sorties from June to September—about five flights a day, all of them in combat conditions. Modestly he remarked that he was surprised he had survived. He went on to become an actor with the Home Office. I guess that after the Battle of Britain, the quiet life appealed to him.

DAVID KERR, STAFFORD, VA

THE CATS (FH 127:18)

Nelson did not originate at Number Ten; he was a black kitten who came to us at Admiralty House in 1939, and when we moved to Downing Street he moved with us. The resident in Downing Street (not a personal pet of the Chamberlains) was Munich Mouser, who was dispossessed. Smokey was a grey cat who resided at Number Ten Annex. At Chartwell, Orange Cat Tango, aka Mr. Cat, was originally Mary's cat, but was seduced from the nursery by upstairs life. He died at Chartwell and Jock Colville gave us Jock I. Then there was Jock II, and the rest supplied by the National Trust.

The Lady Soames LG DBE, London

CHURCHILL TO KENNEDY

In my article titled "The Statesman John Kennedy Admired Most" (FH 129), I discussed President Kennedy proclaiming Sir Winston the first honorary citizen of the United States by Act of Congress on 9 April 1963. Recently, I ran across the letter Churchill wrote to President Kennedy accepting the honor, in Memorial Addresses in the Congress of the United States and Tributes in Eulogy of Sir Winston Churchill (Washington: GPO, 1965). Readers may enjoy recalling this elegant letter, which you tell me was composed by Sir Anthony Montague Browne, who certainly knew WSC's sentiments.

FRED GLUECKSTEIN, SYKESVILLE, MD.
as readers of this column know, I have been concerned that since time’s swift passage has taken most of Churchill’s contemporaries, along with their memories and recollections, we soon will be faced with the gradual diminution of interest in Churchill and appreciation of all he represents. A recent occurrence suggests that this may not be the case, at least not in the near future.

The Churchill Centre recently considered various proposals to increase member value, among which was the suggestion that access to the Centre’s Listserv (internet chat room), should be limited to members only. This suggestion had a rational basis: most of those who visited the chat room are already members; non-members would continue to have access to public portions of the Centre’s website; non-members could continue to send questions or comments to the staff, the Centre’s officers or the editor of Finest Hour, the basic North American membership dues of $50 ($10 for students) are hardly a financial hardship for anyone; the cost of hosting and monitoring the chat room, presently nil, might change; and the most inflammatory and ridiculous material posted to the chat room over the years has tended to come from non-members.

After weighing these points against the fully expected accusation that any limitation to chat room access was a non-Churchillian restriction on free expression, the Executive Committee unanimously voted to limit chat room access to the Centre’s members. That decision and the reasons for it were immediately conveyed to those registered for the Listserv.

A flood of adverse reaction inundated us at once. Emails begot emails which begot more emails ad infinitum. The committee’s decision was described as dumb, stupid, wrongheaded, insensitive and elitist. Much of the criticism came from our own members, who of course would not be affected at all by this action.

All the objectors wanted was for anyone and everyone to be able to say whatever he or she wanted to say about Churchill in whatever manner they chose—in our chat room. The rational basis for the proposed limitation was either brushed aside or ignored. The passion for the right of unfettered expression about Churchill outweighed all else.

The collective message was loud and clear: rescind our prior action! We heard it, and in a special meeting called upon four hours notice, unanimously did just that. We also approved plans to rename the listserv Churchill Chat (suggested by a member), actively to promote the usage of the chat room (suggested by another member) and make it a more integral part of The Centre. While the Executive Committee may have stumbled into this imbroglio, it decisively and purposefully marched out of it.

The aftermath of our restoration of prior policy has been quite positive. With the help of Todd Ronnei and Jonah Triebwasser (who remains our chat room moderator), Churchill Chat was moved to a state-of-the-art Google Groups page, which offers various ways to receive postings and follow threads on its site: http://groups.google.com/group/ChurchillChat. Anyone can read the messages, but to send a post, you have to register. One of our closest collaborators, who works at Google, assures us this is completely safe, does not get you on any spam lists, and gives you posting access to all the other Google chat rooms. Best of all, the cost to the Centre is still zero.

There were further positive outcomes. Several Listserv users who had not renewed their Centre membership were reminded to do so, and did. Use of the chat room increased immediately. The Churchill Centre demonstrated that it will listen to its members and is willing to (and can) turn on a dime to correct perceived mistakes.

By far the most significant aspect of this episode was the immediate and spontaneous outpouring of deep-seated passion for Churchill. Those who challenged our initial decision did not do so merely because they worshipped the principle of free access and open debate. They wanted the opportunity to criticize, lament and emote in a variety of ways about Churchill whenever they were moved to do so. They demanded that even the most crackpot complaints about Churchill and the most fulsome praise be heard and debated. While some of that passion may have been dormant of late, the original proposal certainly rekindled it and brought it quickly to the surface.

I wish I could claim that the Churchill Centre had the foresight and sagacity to have known ahead of time how its proposal would play out, how we and our members would benefit from this dust-up, and that we planned and took the action for just that reason. Alas, I cannot. However, dare one speculate what benefits might be achieved and what passions might be aroused if, say, a proposal were made to raise the North American subscription rate from $50 a year to $500? Hmm.

Bill Shea
PLAN OR COINCIDENCE:
WHAT KILLED LESLIE HOWARD?

LONDON, NOVEMBER 20TH— Speculation fostered by the UKTV History production "Churchill's Bodyguard," based on a new book about Detective-Inspector Walter Thompson (Finest Hour 119:15), is that British screen idol Leslie Howard, who died when his plane was shot down over the Bay of Biscay in June 1943, was killed because the Germans thought they were shooting at Winston Churchill and his bodyguard.

Howard, who played Ashley Wilkes in Gone With the Wind and was considered for the lead role in a prewar film on Lawrence of Arabia, had a business manager, Alfred Chenhalls, who closely resembled Churchill, affecting similar clothing and a homburg hat. According to the new book by Tom Hickman, German spies believed Churchill was returning from North Africa in a commercial plane refueling in Lisbon and flying home by the route chosen, to their misfortune, by Howard and Chenhalls.

Linda Stokes, Thompson's great-niece, who unearthed his diaries, actually believes Howard and Chenhalls were "doubles," used to throw the Germans off the trail. But this is likely the product of a vivid imagination. Churchill himself wrote of the incident: "The brutality of the Germans was only matched by the stupidity of their agents. It is difficult to understand how anyone could imagine that with all the resources of Great Britain at my disposal I should have booked a passage in an unarmed and unescorted plane from Lisbon and flown home in broad daylight. We of course made a wide loop out by night from Gibraltar into the ocean, and arrived home without incident. It was a painful shock to me to learn what had happened to others in the inscrutable workings of Fate." (The Hinge of Fate 742.)

Actor Sir Laurence Olivier long ago reacted to contemporary suggestions that Howard had been "sacrificed" to protect the Prime Minister by saying Howard's death was nothing more than a coincidence: "Whatever [Churchill's] faults may have been, he was anything but a moral coward; he would never have condoned the killing of another person to save his own skin." (Carlos Thompson, The Assassination of Winston Churchill, Gerrard's Cross: Smythe, 1969, 82).

Hickman's book, Beside the Bulldog: The Intimate Memoirs of Churchill's Bodyguard, which inclines toward the sensational over this and other episodes, will be reviewed in our next issue.

CHURCHILLIAN AUSSIES BATTLE IT OUT

CANBERRA, DECEMBER 6TH— Australia's Churchillophile Prime Minister, John Howard, says the Anti-Terrorism Bill approved by the House and Senate is "absolutely essential fully to protect Australia against the threat of terrorism," but the bill, like the American Patriot Act, has stiff opposition on the grounds of civil liberties.

Australia's Law Council, which represents more than 40,000 lawyers, has spearheaded opposition to the legislation. Earlier, the council ran advertisements featuring quotations on liberty by Winston Churchill, Benjamin Franklin, and former Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies. This is yet another case where WSC is invoked by opposite sides in a bonzer argument.

GIVE 'IM THE CHAIR

LONDON, JANUARY 1ST— Churchill was determined to send Adolf Hitler to a gangster's death if he were captured, according to notes taken at War Cabinet meetings released today. "If Hitler falls into our hands we shall certainly put him to death," Churchill said. "Not a sovereign who could be said to be in the hands of ministers, like [the] Kaiser. This man is the mainspring of evil. Instrument—electric chair, for gangsters, no doubt available on Lease Lend."

The newly published notes, taken by Deputy Cabinet Secretary Sir Norman Brook, provide the first insight into what was said during hitherto secret debates. Churchill favored the electric chair for Hitler, and thought a trial of Nazi ring-leaders would be "a farce... all sorts of complications ensue as soon as you admit a fair trial." Elsewhere, Churchill describes de Gaulle as the "greatest living barrier to reunion and restoration of France: insensate ambi-

---

DATELINES

Quotation of the Season

I would endure with patience the roar of exultation that would go up when I was proved wrong, because it would lift a load off my heart and the hearts of many Members. What does it matter who gets exposed or discomfited? If the country is safe, who cares for individual politicians, in or out of office?"

—WSC, HOUSE OF COMMONS, 20 JULY 1936
don”; and suggests that Gandhi, then on a hunger strike, should be allowed to "starve to death." When ministers decided to free Gandhi on compassionate grounds if he seemed likely to die, Churchill replied, "If you are going to let him out because he strikes, then let him out now." Gandhi was freed in 1944. Churchill also grumpily acquiesced with allowing the U.S. Army to enforce segregation of black soldiers (Empire troops in British forces were integrated). And he remarked that the "U.S. soldier eats five times what ours does__let them cut down themselves before presuming to address us."

CHURCHILL SEIZES PIRATES

DUBAI, JANUARY 22ND—
The U.S. Navy's guided missile destroyer USS Winston S. Churchill (FHL 10) chased and boarded an apparent pirate ship in the Indian Ocean and detained twenty-six men for questioning. Indian and Somali crewmen were aboard a traditional dhow, said Lt. Leslie Hull-Ryde of U.S. Naval Forces Central Command in Bahrain.

The dhow stopped fleeing after Churchill twice fired warning shots during the chase, which ended 54 miles off the coast of Somalia. U.S. sailors boarded the dhow and seized a cache of small arms. The crew and passengers were to determine which were pirates and which were legitimate crew members, Hull-Ryde said.

Sailors aboard the dhow told Navy investigators that pirates hijacked the vessel six days ago near Mogadishu and thereafter used it to stage attacks on merchant ships. Churchill was part of a multinational task force patrolling the western Indian Ocean and Horn of Africa to thwart terrorist activity and other lawlessness during the Iraq war.

The Navy said it captured the dhow in response to a report from the International Maritime Bureau in Kuala Lumpur on Friday that said pirates had fired on the MV Delta Ranger, a Bahamian-flagged bulk carrier that was passing some 200 miles off the central eastern coast of Somalia. Hull-Ryde said the Navy was still investigating and would discuss with international authorities what to do with the detained men. Piracy is rampant off the coast of Somalia, which is torn by renewed clashes between militias fighting over control of the troubled African country.

On 2 May, Churchill was the first ship of the Nassau Expeditionary Strike Group to return from a six-month deployment in the war on Islamic fascism, arriving at her home port in Norfolk. —JM KRANE, AP

NEW VIRGINIA CITIZEN

RICHMOND, MARCH 9TH— Sixty years ago, Winston Churchill made a brief stop in Virginia's capital during a tour of the United States after his famous "Iron Curtain" speech at Fulton, Missouri. Appearing with Gen. Eisenhower, Churchill made a rousing 20-minute speech about the importance of Anglo-American ties before 600 people on the floor of the House of Delegates, which has now named Churchill an honorary Virginian.

Churchill is only the fourth person to receive the honor, joining former prime minister Margaret Thatcher, who served as Chancellor of The College of William and Mary from 1993 to 2000; Lafayette, the French marquis who led Colonial troops in the American Revolution; and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the philanthropist who financed the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. Said the resolution's sponsor, delegate Vincent Callahan (R.-Fairfax): "Churchill, to me, with a few others, is one of the dominant leaders of the 20th century."

The bill to honor Churchill, who incidentally refused to meet with the press that day in 1946, received unanimous support on Wednesday from both the Virginia houses.

—MEGHAN HOYER, THE VIRGINIAN-PILOT

STRAIT-JACKETED!

NORWICH, ENGLAND, MARCH 15TH—The Hon. Nicholas Soames MP, Sir Winston's grandson, called it "absurd and pathetic," and fuss and consternation reigned in the media regarding a statue of Churchill in a strait-jacket. The life-size, glass fibre edifice was erected in Norwich as part of an exhibition by the charity Rethink, hoping to promote understanding of mental health problems.

A charity manager pointed out that Churchill documented his depression—his "black dog"—and they are hoping that the statue will illustrate what people with mental illness can achieve. (WSC suffered from mental illness?) They had spoken to the Churchill estate when the idea was first put forward, which did not approve. The charity decided to go ahead anyway because they "thought it was worthwhile." Whatever happened to respect and compassion?

BOUND UP IN CONTROVERSY: The image isn't big, and you can see the point they wish to make, but really...
Rethink finally removed the statue after protests that it was in bad taste. A spokesperson said, "the owners of the building have asked us to remove it. We are very disappointed." One wonders why they ignored the family's objections in the first place.

Another statue problem involves the famous image in the Members' Lobby of the House of Commons: Churchill's left foot, which everyone rubs on passing, is wearing away, and a hairline crack has appeared in the appendage. Says Malcolm Hay, the parliamentary curator of the works of art, "Bronze is quite a soft metal and people's vigorous appreciation of Churchill over the decades has now resulted in the danger of creating holes in the statue unless we do something about it." The big debate is whether to stop people from touching the statue and restore it, or allow them to continue paying their respects as usual.

—DOROTHY JONES, LANCASTER

THANK YOU FOR SMOKING
LONDON, MARCH 15TH—The Cunard cruise liner Queen Victoria is due to go into service in December 2007. I was pleased to note that her amenities include a "Churchill's Cigar Lounge." This is one in the eye for the British Government which recently introduced legislation banning smoking not only anywhere in restaurants and pubs but in private clubs. One can only imagine what the great man would have had to say about this egregious interference with individual freedom.

—DAVID E. RABAY

NO CIGARS ON STAGE
GLASGOW, MAY 15TH—Smoking by actors on stage will not be tolerated in Scotland, despite moves to relax new anti-smoking laws south of the border. A spokesperson for Caroline Flint, the public health minister at Westminster, said exemptions were being considered to "ensure smoking can take place on stage during live theatrical performances, or during film and television recording" in England. Smoking in public places, including theatres and sound stages, has been banned in Scotland since March 26th. The change has proved controversial in the theatre community. It is claimed that portraying characters or historical figures who smoke, such as Winston Churchill, will be impossible under the new legislation. However, the Scottish Executive yesterday confirmed it would not be making any exceptions.

—PHIL MILLER IN THE HERALD

"CRUSH PAK-BANGLA TERRORISM"
BHOPAL, INDIA, APRIL 18TH—"Lack of determined Indian response has brought more attacks on temples and civilians," says J. G. Agrora in the Central Chronicle. "Terrorists must be crushed; not embraced. Only the strong offensive against terrorists can blunt terrorism. Pak-Bangla demographic aggression and terrorist attacks are acts of war against India. [The] doctrine of 'hot pursuit' of international law must be invoked to chase and crush the terrorists.

"History teaches that in the clash of civilizations and of nations, the ruthless have always won; and the benevolent have always lost. Here it is relevant to quote Sir Winston Churchill, who deprecated the British policy of avoiding confrontation with Germany before the outbreak of Second World War thus:

"Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a small chance of survival."

—WWW.CENTRALCHRONICLE.COM

LA PAUSA NO! FOR SALE; WENDY REVES WELL
PARIS, MAY 20TH—Internet sources and Country Life recently carried adverts for La Pausa, "Coco Chanel's fabled villa" in Roquebrune, Cap Martin, France, owned by Emery and Wendy Reves from the 1950s. Sir Winston spent many weeks here after his retirement as premier in 1955. Finest Hour contacted mutual friends and Colin Randall, Paris bureau chief of the Daily Telegraph, to establish that La Pausa is not for sale; the original report (in the Telegraph) was based on inaccurate information from the estate agents, Aylesford Ltd. Mme. Reves remains alive and sentient, though frail, as she reaches her 90th birthday (today) but she does not receive visitors. She is well cared for at La Pausa and at her chalet in Glion, Switzerland, where she spends more of her time.

Emery Reves was Churchill's literary associate from the 1930s to the 1960s, placing his articles and books with publishers outside Britain. Wendy
Reves, a Churchill Centre Associate and honorary member, financed publication of The Churchill War Papers, the three companion or document volumes to volume VI of the official biography (Finest Hour 1939-1941) by Sir Martin Gilbert CBE. Seven further companion volumes are projected to cover 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, the Opposition period (1945-51), the second premiership (1951-55) and retirement (1955-65). This project is now being taken up by Hillsdale College in Michigan. References to Emery and Wendy Reves and the War Papers may be found using the search engine at www.winstonchurchill.org.

FIFTY YEARS OF HEADLINES
LONDON, MAY 25TH-OCTOBER 6TH—Politics, finance and circulation wars, explosive exposés and exclusives, intrigue, in-fighting and infamy: from hot metal to hot gossip, this new exhibition involving Finest Hour cuttings editor John Frost brings to life the growth, development, rivalry and union of the British newspaper industry over the past 100 years, staged to mark the centenary of the Newspaper Publishers Association.

The chosen front pages and themes serve primarily as a backdrop to illustrate how reporting has changed, rather than being a history of each topic in the 20th century.

Displays also remind visitors of some of the headlines that became legendary, encapsulating the mood of the nation. They include the 1912 Daily Mirror headline "Titanic sunk—no lives lost"; the Daily Mirror's 1939 Hitler headline, "Wanted for murder...for kidnapping"; The Sun's 1982 headline, "Gotcha," about the sinking of the Argentine warship Belgrano in the Falklands war.

Approximately 2600 UK and Irish newspaper and weekly/fortnightly periodical titles, about 90% of current acquisitions, are received in the Newspaper Legal Deposit Office. In recent years the Library has been active in undertaking projects to open up access to its newspaper collections and enable readers to view newspapers remotely via the internet.
LONDON, FEBRUARY 4TH, 1959—“I sometimes wonder what would have happened had not my father, after whom I am named, been one of the rebel leaders who captured Winston Churchill sixty years ago during the South African War,” wrote Philip Kok of Benon, Transvaal, South Africa, to the Daily Mirror. “My father had actually been responsible for the wrecking of the armoured train in which Churchill was travelling as a war correspondent. That night he was held prisoner in a stable guarded by my father’s named Uncle Frans, and to their dying day four of my uncles. My Uncle Frans wanted to shoot Churchill out of hand. My father objected...’I’ll shoot you first’ was his final word to Uncle Frans, and to their dying day those two men never spoke to each other because of that. Although the history books state that General Louis Botha, the Boer commander, captured Churchill, the report is as I have given it to Sir Winston in a letter.”

This cutting, supplied by John Frost (see page 9), supplies a claimant we haven’t read of before among those involved in capturing WSC after the 1899 armoured train attack—although “captured” is probably not the right word for the brothers Kok.

Celia Sandys’ Churchill Wanted Dead or Alive (HarperCollins, 1998) establishes Field Cornet Sarel Oosthuizen as the “galloping horseman whose levelled rifle finally convinced Churchill that escape was impossible.”

Churchill himself thought his captor was General Louis Botha, later the first Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa. But Celia Sandys discounts this, suggesting that her grandfather may simply have misunderstood Botha’s spotty English, noting that there is no mention of the capture in Botha’s profuse correspondence. As to the Kok brothers, many Boers undoubtedly guarded Churchill at one time or another after his capture, so it is quite possible that Philip Kok’s father and brothers may have been among them. 
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2006 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

In recent years the Annual General Meeting of ICS (UK) has been held at a variety of Churchill sites, viz., Blenheim, Harrow, Chartwell, Churchill College (Cambridge), Bletchley Park and the Cabinet War Rooms; on 29 April 2006 the current year’s meeting was, for the first time, held at the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst. It was at the Royal Military College (as Sandhurst was known till 1939) that the young Churchill trained for his Army commission. He passed the entrance examination at the third attempt in 92nd place out of 102 and entered the RMC in September 1893. Here for the first time he really exerted himself, because he was studying subjects which greatly interested him; the result was that he graduated in December 1894 in 20th place out of 130 before being commissioned in 4th Queen’s Own Hussars early in 1895.

The meeting was held in the Indian Army Memorial Room, a fine setting for the purpose, and it was good to be able to welcome Bill Ives, Chuck Platt and Judy Kambestad from The Churchill Centre Board of Governors; also João Carlos Espada (President of ICS/Portugal)). Ninety-four members and guests attended.

After the formalities, followed by lunch in the Old College dining room, and before a short guided tour of the immediate area, the main event of the afternoon was an enthralling talk by Hugh Lunghi; he was one of WSC’s Russian interpreters at the Big Three meetings at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam (as well as on visits to Stalin in Moscow), and is probably the sole survivor of those who attended all the plenary sessions at all three of these major historical events. Substantial extracts from the script of Hugh Lunghi’s remarks will be published in FH 132.

BACK TO POTSDAM

Following the 2004 International Churchill Conference, which ended at Potsdam, it was observed that, whereas the villas occupied by President Truman and Marshal Stalin each bore a plaque recording their residence for the Big Three meeting held there in July 1945, no such record had been placed at the villa occupied by Churchill (and his daughter Mary, who accompanied him as aide-de-camp). On 1-6 May 2006, some thirty-five members of ICS(UK) and The Churchill Centre, headed by Lady Soames, paid a memorable visit to Berlin, principally to dedicate a plaque marking her father’s stay at the Villa Urbig. The highlight was on 4 May when Lady Soames presented a plaque to the villa’s current owners. Lady Soames also met Frau Gerlicke, who was the daughter of the 1945 owner and—her family—had been evicted by the Russians to house the delegation.

The full week’s programme also included an introduction to the 1945 conference by Nigel Knocker, a glimpse of the postwar Cold War by Bill Ives, and a look at Allied espionage and intelligence operations in East Germany by Nigel Dunkley. Other events were a tour of the city, a visit to the Seelow Heights (where the battle for Berlin began) and visits to the Allied Museum at Charlottenburg, the Commonwealth War Graves cemetery and the 1945 conference venue at Schloss Cecilienhof. A further highlight was a dinner at which the principal guest was Dr. Helmut Kohl, former German chancellor and an avid Churchillian; Dr. Kohl spoke eloquently of his admiration and Lady Soames responded. A full report with illustrations will appear in FH 132.

JOHN CROOKSHANK

We record with great regret the death on 1st May 2006 of ICS(UK) Committee member John Crookshank, who was a keen and knowledgeable Churchillian; he was a valuable member and handled the publicity for the 2004 conference; many members will remember him that year at Portsmouth and on the visit to the Ardennes. He was also a contributor to Finest Hour.

—PAUL H. COURTENAY

TOURING THE WOODFORD CONSTITUENCY

A unique tour of Sir Winston Churchill’s constituency was organized by ICS (UK) recently. Churchill represented Woodford as Member of Parliament from 1945 to 1964; from 1924 to 1945 it was part of the Epping constituency, which he also represented.

We began at the Sir James Hawkey Hall in Woodford, Essex. Its foundation stone was laid by Churchill in 1954, and it opened in his presence the following year. Sir James Hawkey, WSC’s longstanding friend, was chairman of the Constituency Association in Woodford for many years; he had been one of Churchill’s few supporters during the 1938 Munich crisis. Sir Winston subsequently attended a number of
TOURING WOODFORD...
functions in the hall, and we viewed various memorabilia, photographs and a ship's bell, all associated with former British naval vessels bearing the name Churchill; as well as a magnificent painting of the great man.

We then traveled to the Churchill statue on Woodford Green, sculpted by David McFall, which was unveiled by Lord Montgomery in 1959. We proceeded along roads used by Churchill in his election tours, past a number of buildings he visited. Our next stop was the West Essex Conservative Club, where Churchill first spoke in 1924. He was a regular visitor thereafter, particularly to the annual garden parties. Large crowds would attend to see him tour the stalls and hear him speak. In front of the Club is a bust of Churchill by the Italian sculptor Luigi Fironi.

We also visited the City of London Cemetery, where Sir Winston's beloved nurse, Elizabeth Everest, was buried in 1895. Churchill and his brother Jack attended the funeral and they paid for the headstone.

Passing the Royal Wanstead School where Churchill attended a fete in 1957 and addressed thousands of people, we proceeded to the White House in Woodford Green, home of Sir Stuart Mallinson, with whom WSC stayed on his election visits. Sir Stuart was a great supporter of the Anglo-American alliance, and created in his grounds an arboretum with over 100 trees planted by world statesmen, ambassadors, military, religious and civic leaders.

The visit concluded with drinks and a buffet lunch at my home, where we enjoyed several of Sir Winston's favourite dishes: cold ham mousse (FH 106), salads (FH98) and Boodles Fool (FH 100). There was an opportunity to view some fifty items of local memorabilia, including Churchill letters, telegrams, photographs, Christmas cards, election addresses and posters.

Thanks to local members Norman and Sheila Creswell and Raymond and Hilary Warner for their help; and to my wife, Katy, for aid with catering, and as my fellow raconteur and photographer.

—TONY WOODHEAD
Quoting Shakespeare—and Moore

Q: I am told that Churchill quoted the famous speech by John of Gaunt in Shakespeare's Richard II, act 2, scene 1: 'This scepter'd isle,' etc. Can you tell me the speech? —W. D. Reeves

A: Churchill knew his Shakespeare particularly Richard II. In The Gathering Storm, when visiting the fleet after becoming First Lord of the Admiralty for the second time in a war with Germany, he reflects on his experiences twenty-five years before and quotes other lines from the play: "For God's sake let us sit upon the ground and tell sad stories of the death of kings" (act 3).

He did quote some of Gaunt's famous lines but not all—not in a speech, but in the opening of an article, "Let's Boost Britain," in the weekly Answers for 28 April 1934, reprinted in The Collected Essays of Sir Winston Churchill (London, 1975), vol. 4, "Churchill at Large," page 291:

WSC: This week we celebrate St George's Day, which is also Shakespeare's Day, who wrote the noblest tribute ever penned to this England of ours:

"This royal throne of kings,
This scepter'd isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This happy breed of men, this little world:
This other Eden, demi-paradise, and this precious stone set in the silver sea..."

The words still thrill like the blast of a trumpet; thrill, I suspect, the Scots and Irish and Welsh among us as well as the English. They move us not only because they are beautiful, but because they are true—as true today in the reign of King George the Fifth as they were under Royal Elizabeth.

***

Churchill's remarks after his fleet visit are so haunting that we thought our readers might like to be reminded. The quotation, "Some banquet-hall deserted," is from Irish poet Thomas Moore....

WSC: It was, like the others, a lovely day. All went well, and in the evening we anchored in Loch Ewe, where the four or five other great ships of the Home Fleet were assembled.... My thoughts went back a quarter of a century to that other September when I had last visited Sir John Jellicoe and his captains in this very bay, and had found them with their long lines of battleships and cruisers drawn out at anchor, a prey to the same uncertainties as now afflicted us. Most of the captains and admirals of those days were dead, or had long passed into retirement. The responsible senior officers who were now presented to me as I visited the various ships had been young lieutenants or even midshipmen in those far-off days....

The perfect discipline, style, and bearing, the ceremonial routine—all were unchanged....It seemed that I was all that survived in the same position I had held so long ago. But no; the dangers had survived too. Danger from beneath the waves, more serious with more powerful U-boats; danger from the air, not merely of being spotted in your hiding-place, but of heavy and perhaps destructive attack!

...I motored from Loch Ewe to Inverness, where our train awaited us. We had a picnic lunch on the way by a stream, sparkling in hot sunshine. I felt oddly oppressed with my memories.

"For God's sake, let us sit upon the ground And tell sad stories of the death of kings."

No one had ever been over the same terrible course twice with such an interval between. No one had felt its dangers and responsibilities from the summit as I had, or, to descend to a small point, understood how First Lords of the Admiralty are treated when great ships are sunk and things go wrong. If we were in fact going over the same cycle a second time, should I have once again to endure the pangs of dismissal? Fisher, Wilson, Battenberg, Jellicoe, Beatty, Pakenham, Sturdee, all gone!

"I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet-hall deserted
Whose lights are fled;
Whose garlands dead
And all but he departed."

---

CONFERENCES CALENDAR

2006
Chicago, 27 September-1 October: 23rd Intl. Churchill Conference

2007
Vancouver, B.C., 12-15 September: 24th Intl. Churchill Conference

2008: New England
2009: Great Britain
2010: San Francisco
2011: Ottawa
Churchill Centre High School
Teacher Seminars

Winston Churchill:
Thoughts and Reflections
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Illinois, March 11th

The second Churchill Centre seminar, with eighteen participating teachers, met with broad approval by attendees, though detailed evaluations revealed our formula is not yet perfect. The seminar series is a complex undertaking because so many components change each time we offer one: geographic location, time of year, venue, instructors and topics. Overall enrollment was lower than our first seminar last year in Washington, but our no-shows were fewer, perhaps because of our email reminders including the day’s schedule.

Steve Hayward, a member of The Churchill Centre College of Fellows, did an excellent job handling three sessions, with Centre governors Susan and Phil Larson presenting a fourth session on “Churchill and Chicago.” Susan gave a splendid introduction to the exciting nature of historical inquiry, describing her and Phil’s delight in uncovering previously unknown material about Churchill’s visit and their quest for primary documents and contemporaneous news accounts. This in and of itself would seem motivating to history lovers. They used PowerPoint to illustrate their presentation, showing cartoons, photographs and newspaper articles.

Steve Hayward compared many aspects of Churchill to other leaders, particularly American presidents. I joked that a better sub-title for the program might have been “From Cicero to Bush II;” his suggestion of “Plato to NATO” had a better ring.

In discussing Churchill’s political style, Hayward noted that Churchill was ideally suited to be a U.S. president, consensus is not always required and presidents have some unilateral powers. He felt WSC was out of sync with the British cabinet style: discuss, ponder, discuss more, and ponder until consensus is reached. After listening to him, several teachers expressed their resolve to read his excellent book, Churchill on Leadership.

We hope in future to have two professors for each seminar. We asked a lot of Steve Hayward to cover more than four hours, and we are grateful that he was able to do so. Executive Director Dan Myers and Joe Troiani, a CC member from Chicago, were in the audience and offered support and confirmation at various points throughout the day.

A notable change for our second seminar was the inclusion of reading materials, sent to teachers in advance. My Early Life will be included in each seminar: a splendid introduction to Churchill and his world. Over 90 percent of teachers rated the book highly.

Other readings included the essays “Mass Effects in Modern Life” and “Shall We Commit Suicide?” Are we so democratic that we can’t recognize excellence? Steve shared a question he often presents to his own students: Would you rather be elected president of the United States (or another democracy) or be the premier of China (a dictator)? Churchill’s political writings speak to a basic tension in American politics; Americans want to look up to their presidents, but don’t want to think that their president is looking down on them.

As in Washington, several teachers expressed an interest in future seminars. This reminds us continually to evaluate our seminar program, examining the balance between breadth and depth. Should we continue our efforts to reach more teachers by scheduling seminars in more cities, or should we offer a second seminar to previous attendees? This year an in-depth experience was offered through our two-week, NEH-sponsored Summer Institute. Since none of our one-day seminars has been over-subscribed, this offers a cautionary tale.

Comments from teachers on the essay contest for the Chicago conference caused the contest’s conclusion date to be advanced to June 6th so as not to conflict with SATs in May. The needs of teachers must always be considered.

From Early Life to Finest Hour
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Medford, Mass., April 29th

Twenty-four high school history teachers attended our seminar in association with The Fletcher School. New
MOST TEACHERS, with one week at best to cover World War II, tell us they want to make the time count. For the first time, parts of our sessions received 100% excellent ratings.

GREAT SPEAKER, TOUGH QUESTIONS, RAPT ATTENTION: Prof. John Maurer’s PowerPoint lecture (above) was scintillating; high school teachers (below right) took detailed notes and came back to us with penetrating questions that taxed at least FIT’s editor! Summation panel (above right) comprised (l-r) Maurer, Langworth, Pfaltzgraff, Hern, Nutter and Hutchinson.

Engrail Chmchilli.im Dr. Robert Pfaltzgraff, Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies at the Fletcher School and the President of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, graciously hosted us.

The day-long seminar of four sessions began with Richard Langworth’s, “Churchill on Churchill,” based on WSC’s autobiography My Early Life, which teachers were sent in advance. While sharing a selection of salient remarks from the book, Richard offered perspective on Churchill’s early life and brief notes on the many offices he held through 1929. Academic Adviser Professor John Maurer followed with two PowerPoint-enhanced lectures on “The Gathering Storm: Churchill and the Fight to Rearm Britain” and “His Finest Hour: Churchill in 1940.”

In addition to My Early Life, teachers received a 150-page excerpt from Churchill’s Memoirs of the Second World War and several articles by William Manchester. In “Gathering Storm,” Professor Maurer described the intellectual climate of the 1930s and popular thinking against WSC’s beliefs. Using photographs, documents, charts and diagrams, Maurer “Britain’s Divided Body Politic,” a vivid contrast to Churchill’s own view expressed in the abridged version of The Gathering Storm.

In “Finest Hour: Churchill in 1940,” Professor Maurer reviewed the strategic plans of Hitler, Stalin and the British and French. After explaining the many reasons major British politicians and historians gave for making peace with Hitler (including those of Alan Clark and John Charmley), Maurer detailed Churchill’s own strategy in 1940. Maurer reminded us that issues of war and peace are more often battles of ideas, not just physical conflicts. Great leadership, then, is about great communication skills.

The day concluded with a five-member panel discussing “Churchill’s Relevance Today,” moderated by Joe Hern, chairman of New England Churchillians. In addition to the instructors, the panel included Dr. Pfaltzgraff; Dr. Deborah Winslow Nutter, Senior Associate Dean of the Fletcher School; and NE Churchillian Ted Hutchinson, editor of the Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics.

Ted stressed Churchill’s willingness to work hard to gain a clear understanding of facts and issues: an extremely relevant character trait that should be demonstrated to students. He could lead and speak on these issues because he had done his homework. Deborah Nutter believes that Churchill had a “kaleidoscopic mind.” He thought strategically in the long term. “Strategic minds,” she noted, “are irritating minds.” As a leader he was able to change. His capacity for self-learning was all-important to his success. Robert Pfaltzgraff recalled reading Churchill’s war memoirs in Life and described his life-long interest in Churchill. In addition to an increased understanding of WW2 and the postwar era, he learned about perseverance and overcoming adversity.

Teacher evaluations provided good information for improving our work. For the first time, parts of the sessions received 100% excellent ratings. Our thanks to Karen Linebarger who reproduced, packed and shipped the materials to the Fletcher School.
Caspar Willard Weinberger
GBE
1917-2006

BY RICHARD M. LANGWORTH

Cap Weinberger was our first friend in high places. One can read about his long career everywhere; we here should remember more over what he thought of Winston Churchill, and what he meant to Churchillians.

In 1982, when we were reviving the old Churchill Society, our past president, bookseller Dalton Newfield, offered to send our announcement to his customers. "I have some notable people," he confided.

He did indeed. A few weeks later I was holding a personal cheque for $15 (as it then was!) from the Secretary of Defense. I promptly sent it back and we made Caspar Weinberger an honorary member. Later he became a Churchill Centre Trustee, and was instrumental in opening several doors to distinguished people who also became friends and supporters.

In 1985 he addressed our Boston conference at the Parker House. President Reagan and George Schultz were in Geneva with the Russians, and he was the senior cabinet officer in the country. The Secret Service closed a Boston street to drive in from Logan, marching him in under heavy guard, nervous about revolving doors and elevators. While he was with us, a direct line to the White House was kept open behind the podium.

Since he had to return immediately to Washington he spoke before dinner, regretting that he could not stay for his favorite lobster bisque. He said this pre-dinner speech reminded him of the Chinese dinners in San Francisco, which he had attended as a California assemblyman in the 1950s.

His speech, "Churchill: An Uncomfortable Hero," recalls his lifelong admiration for the statesman whose voice he first heard in 1941 as an infantry recruit, crackling over the ether on primitive radios in distant barracks, hurling defiance at the enemy and courage to the world: "I was certainly moved more completely I guess than I had been by any speech since."

He explained why Churchill was an uncomfortable hero: "How can you emulate anyone who has seen action on three continents and written five books by the time he was 26? When he entered the Cabinet he was 33. When he resigned as Prime Minister he was 80. [One must] feel extraordinarily humble when it comes to Winston Churchill."

When next I saw him, at a House of Commons dinner in 1989, he was "Sir Caspar" in Britain, having received from The Queen the Grand Cross of the Order of the British Empire for his help in the Falklands war. I asked if he was glad his Secret Service guards were gone. He said it was the best thing about leaving high office.

Caspar Weinberger was in Washington for nearly thirty years. Having previously served in California state government, he said the work in DC was not that different—you just had to add about nine zeros to everything. He was the longest-serving Secretary of Defense. He had as much to do with the demise of the Soviet scourge as anyone short of President Reagan.

In 1999 we held a lobster dinner at the East
Wind Inn in Tenants Harbor, Maine, following the launch of USS *Winston S. Churchill* at the Bath shipyard. Cap and Jane and Cap Jr. were part of a guest list that included Lady Soames, Winston and Luce Churchill, and almost our entire Board of Governors. Now into his eighties, he was animated as ever, and full of anecdotes about the man he and we had come to respect above all others. He had a fine Churchill library and knew the saga well enough to converse easily with advanced scholars.

Even though he was 88, I was shocked to hear he was gone. He had remained active as chairman of Forbes, Inc., keeping a schedule that would floor men twenty years younger. "I can't get him to slow down at all," said his longtime aide Kay Liesz on the telephone one day. I reminded her of what Alistair Cooke once told me, that he would never completely retire, "because I have observed that those who do often immediately keel over." Yes, said Kay, "that's Mr. Weinberger." Alistair Cooke lived to 95. Both of them demonstrate that age is measured not in years, but in the state of one's mental apparatus.

A friend in England wrote: "The left wing, of course, linked him with Margaret Thatcher and the Falkland Islands, which is why they hated him—but that was why I thought he was a great guy." Apropos that subject, one last little story.

At our Washington conference in 1993, the former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, attended our dinner on the night after the then-Mrs. Thatcher had addressed us at the British Embassy. "What did she say?" asked Mrs. Kirkpatrick. She said (I replied): "A lot of people in the American government were against us in the Falklands, but Cap Weinberger was not one of those people."

Ambassador Kirkpatrick paused for a moment and said, "I was one of those people, you know."

In far too deep to back out, I replied, "Well, you were wrong, weren't you?"

She thought a little and then said, "You know, on balance, I think I probably was!"

Churchill quoting Lord Rosebery will form the epilogue to Caspar Weinberger's life: "Honour to the brave who will return no more. We shall not see their faces again....Their places, their comrades, will know them no more, for they will never return to us as we knew them. But in a nobler and higher sense, have they not returned to us today? They return to us with a message of duty, of courage, of patriotism. They return to us with a memory of high duty faithfully performed; they return to us with the inspiration of their example. Peace, then, to their dust, honour to their memory."

"Champagne for Everyone":

The Greatness of Bill Deakin

BY DAVID DILKS

"A man of great spirit and courage." Such were the terms in which Keith Feiling wrote from Christ Church to recommend F.W. Deakin to Winston Churchill seventy years ago. All those present today, and a far greater number beyond these shores, will recognise the acuity of a devoted tutor's judgment.

Though he felt shy and nervous in this company, and swiftly discovered that Churchill expected his research assistant to be as tough in constitution and concentrated in thought as himself, Bill Deakin fitted in from the start at Chartwell. Soon we find Churchill writing "I like Mr. Deakin very much," and a little later, "Deakin has been here four days and has helped me a lot. He shows more quality and serviceableness than any of the others."

Hitherto, Churchill had sought danger and political excitement and had written about his experiences—placing them in the context of larger themes, to be sure, but with his own figure prominent in the foreground. Hence a delicious remark of the former Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, when yet a further volume of *The World Crisis* appeared, "I am immersed in Winston's brilliant autobiography, disguised as a history of the universe."

Churchill's life of the First Duke of Marlborough, by contrast, represented an enterprise different in its nature, and it was for this that Mr. Deakin had been recruited. The events of more than two centuries earlier must be recreated in the imagination and reconstructed; vast archives, at The Hague and Vienna >
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no less than Blenheim, must be trawled. Churchill was bent upon the rescue of his great ancestor’s reputation from the ravages inflicted upon it by Macaulay. For his literary assistant, an academic historian accustomed to appraise sceptically, this situation held an immanent conflict. But as Bill once put the point soon after Churchill’s death, he had “surrendered without terms long ago to the magic of the man.”

To be close to Churchill was a privilege for which it was worth paying; the price, which Bill observed for the rest of his life, was one of strict loyalty and discretion, the dividend beyond calculation. Possessing the accomplishments of a scholar, he soon acquired something still rarer. For in the study at Chartwell, starting late at night and not ending until three or four in the morning—after which he would drive across country to Oxford and teach at Wadham from nine—Bill learned “vastly more of the sense of history than my formal education as a student, and later as a teacher, ever taught me.” The point was no doubt apparent to Bill’s academic colleagues from an early date; we must doubt whether it brought them much joy.

When wishing to be boisterous or intimidating—no infrequent event—Churchill would address his young assistant as “you god-damned don.” However, Bill realized at an early stage—indeed, he could scarcely have worked for Churchill on any other terms—that such turbulence passed in the twinkling of an eye.

He won his master’s confidence swiftly and completely; immediately after the Anschluss of 1938, Churchill sent him to Prague to discuss with President Benes the state of Czechoslovakia’s defences. In research and discussion at Chartwell Deakin saw, and helped Churchill to appreciate, the conduct of coalition warfare in the hands of a master. Soon both of them were to witness the process in its modern guise.

One day early in 1939, Bill said to Mr. Churchill (in those formal days, they invariably addressed each other as “Mr. Churchill” and “Mr. Deakin”), “You know I have never asked you for anything on my own behalf, but now I want to make a request. I’m anxious to join the Territorials. Would you send a letter of recommendation to the Oxfordshire Hussars? After all,” he added brightly, “I’m only asking for a chance to get killed.” Churchill wrote at once to the Commanding Officer, “I can say from my own intimate knowledge of him for several years that he is in every way fitted to make an excellent officer.”

Once the last volume of Marlborough was published, Churchill had embarked upon A History of the English-Speaking Peoples, with Deakin as his indispensable coadjutor. In the intervals of training with the army, Bill discussed lustily with him the question of whether King Alfred ever burnt the cakes, and emerged chastened when his master explained that at times of crisis, myths have their historical importance. At the height of the Norwegian campaign in the spring of 1940, the two of them debated the reign of Edward the Confessor; and a few months later, with the Battle of Britain raging, Captain Deakin lunched alone with the Prime Minister. Even Churchill had by now abandoned the idea of early publication, and the book did not appear for the better part of two decades.

Bill realised in the army, as young men from Cumberland mingled with those from Devon, each group speaking a language more or less incomprehensible to the other, that there was all the same something called England, which meant everything to them all. After Northern Ireland, he was posted to highly secret duties in the United States and then on his own insistence came back in 1942, because he did not wish to serve out the war behind a desk.

When it was decided that Captain Deakin should be parachuted into Yugoslavia to discover the whereabouts and activities—indeed, the identity—of Tito, he can scarcely have expected to return. He wrote to Churchill from Cairo in May 1943 on the eve of his departure: “I am glad to go and hope to be able to establish a useful liaison and in any case send back information of value.” With what we must think a conscious echo of Captain Oates, and with a nice display of English understatement, he added, “It will be some time before I can extricate myself from the Balkans again....”

Evelyn Waugh, who saw something of Bill in Yugoslavia, believed him “a very loveable and complicated man,” a “very clever, heroic man.” We have no need to quarrel with those words. We may notice in passing that after their first meeting, Waugh described Bill’s “Hindu legs, ascetic face,” which I mention because this provides the sole recorded instance in which
anybody ever applied the word "ascetic" to him.

It is sometimes thought that Churchill wrote about the Second World War only when it was clear that he could make advantageous financial arrangements. In reality, he was resolved that if health lasted he would follow the habit of a lifetime; having lived in the eye of the storm for six years, he would do what he was uniquely qualified to do: speak for himself. Thus Mr. Deakin, who insisted on leaving the Embassy in Belgrade to return to his Fellowship at Wadham, had scarcely reached London before he found himself intercepted by Churchill and asked to deal with the political and diplomatic sides of the memoirs.

To this enormous task Bill devoted himself. By his mastery of languages, wide intellectual interests, coiled energy, cordial relations with colleagues in Whitehall, orderliness in dealing with many millions of words, harmony with Churchill, he made the enterprise possible. Thus a volume a year for six years. When the last part of The Second World War had appeared, work resumed upon A History of the English Speaking Peoples. A few weeks after his retirement as Prime Minister, we find Churchill writing to his wife, "In a quarter of an hour I expect Bill Deakin. I must bring him along if I can"; which meant that he must seek Bill's renewed help.

There was no doubt of his capacity to do that; the Warden had a thousand duties here and elsewhere, but it would not have lain in his nature to refuse anything that Churchill asked. To the end, he and Pussy remained amongst the closest friends of the Churchills. When Sir Winston dined for the last time with the Other Club, in his 91st year, he asked the Warden of St. Antony's to accompany him. I once heard Bill admit—though only under the most direct questioning—what he would never have said unsolicited: that he was proud of that fact.

An integral part of Churchill's purpose in writing The Second World War had been to make clear the scale and nature of the British and Commonwealth effort. In his different style, Bill determined that justice should be done, in a quiet, scholarly but effective way, to that heroic enterprise.

The process began under the direct impetus of the Warden, who convened at St. Antony's in 1962 a pioneering conference which discussed Britain and European Resistance during the war. It was an event notable on many grounds, not least of which was that there gathered in this College those who had taken a leading part in the resistance in their own countries in Europe, together with academic commentators; in some instances the two categories overlapped.

Bill's own writings—about Mussolini and the collapse of fascism, the activities of Richard Sorge, and other subjects—were based upon a mastery of documents in many archives, and an understanding of politics and character deepened by his long association with Churchill. Bill too had experienced his time of violent excitement and wrote about it, though with reluctance and—because he could say nothing about Enigma—under many inhibitions.

He always "saw the skull beneath the skin," sensed subtleties and layers of meaning hidden from others. In these last years, it was not possible to be with him without recalling Churchill's valediction of Balfour:

"As I observed him regarding with calm, firm and cheerful gaze the approach of Death, I felt how foolish die. Stoics were to make such a fuss about an event so natural and so indispensable to mankind. But I felt also the tragedy which robs the world of all the wisdom and treasure gathered in a great man's life and experience and hands the lamp to some impetuous and untutored stripling or lets it fall shivered into fragments upon the ground."

Bill's modesty, carried to the point of a fault; his charming habit of treating the young on level terms; his wholly unfeigned interest in others and anxiety to help them; the natural dignity which enabled him to disdain the frailties of old age—all provide an example to be treasured until our own time is come. The courage and spirit which Professor Feiling discerned seventy years ago remained undimmed. Asked what the doctors thought about his condition, he replied, "They're very vague about everything. Only one thing is certain; that I don't give a damn."

When Bill arrived at the convalescent hospital at Le Beausset just before Christmas, after a major operation which he had been thought unlikely to survive, he was asked "Is there anything we can do for you, Monsieur Deakin?" "Certainly," he replied. "Champagne for everyone."

Churchill once remarked mischievously of a Prime Minister who left office early, "For myself, I always believed in staying in the pub until closing time." In this College we knew that the last man to leave any good party would always be the Warden. His interests were legion, his friends to be found the world over. His hospitality, not least of the mind, was boundless, and his company an enduring delight:

"They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead; they brought me bitter news to hear, and bitter tears to shed; I wept as I remembered how often you and I had tired the sun with talking, and sent him down the sky."
EITHER CHURCHILL AND FDR were stupidly careless and cavalier, or they just did not care if conversations in their quarters were overheard and passed on to Stalin and his cohorts.

Whodunnit? Listening in on Roosevelt and Churchill

There is no question that President Franklin Roosevelt was "bugged" by Soviet intelligence during the Teheran and Yalta conferences. That is not new information (as illustrated by the publication dates of the sources cited below). But as one recent look at such electronic eavesdropping concludes, FDR's "profound ignorance of the Bolshevik dictatorship...and wishful thinking" prompted him to "walk into a surveillance trap, not once, but twice, and willingly." The word "willingly" is a resuscitation of the hoary FDR-as-naif argument that has been around since the Second World War. The reality is that FDR "knowingly" walked into what Soviet agents set as a surveillance trap—and that is a very different situation.

One of the traps inherent in secret intelligence collection is the they-know-that-we-know phenomenon. Intelligence libraries are filled with tales of double-, triple-, and quadruple-crosses. During meetings with Stalin, both the British and American delegations knew their quarters were bugged. Anna Roosevelt, the President's daughter, recalled the secret service agents finding listening devices at Yalta. Stalin was correct to wonder, as one Soviet intelligence operative recalled, if the Anglo-Americans "know we are listening to them" and, presumably, misleading their Soviet eavesdroppers.

"During his conversations with his collaborators [advisers] Roosevelt always expressed a high opinion of Stalin." They know we are listening, commented Stalin, "yet they speak openly!" When Beria claimed that the microphones were too well hidden to be spotted, Stalin marveled: "It's bizarre. They say everything in fullest detail_." One can read that as FDR-the-naive, or FDR-the-shrewd, knowing full well that his words were heard and using the opportunity to try to convince the Soviet leader that the West was not dedicated to the overthrow of his government.

Few accuse Winston Churchill of naivete, especially about the Soviet Union; yet his quarters, at Yalta and during previous meetings with Stalin, were also wired by the Soviets. In August 1942, during the Prime Minister's first stay in Moscow to meet Stalin, Churchill received warnings that his rooms were bugged. He was skeptical, but played to the secret listeners by calling the Russians "lower in the scale of nature than the orang-outang," intending that they-know-that-he-knew.

I have found no record of the British telling the Americans of the eavesdropping that took place in Moscow in 1942, but a nation that shared the ULTRA secret would certainly have shared its knowledge of Soviet electronic eavesdropping. Since the so-called servants at Teheran were obviously carrying sidearms under their uniforms, it was obvious to all that service was not their primary task.

At the Yalta conference, Churchill wrote in his memoirs, his Russian hosts gave "kindly attention" to "every chance remark." When a British official commented that a large fish tank had no fish in it, goldfish quickly appeared. When another complained that they had no lemon peel to use in their drinks, "a lemon tree loaded with fruit" materialized the next day. Perhaps this was merely nearby "servants" overhearing their British guests, but the more likely listener was a microphone with a tape recorder, and British officials were well aware of what had happened in the past.

Professor Kimball is Treat Professor of History at Rutgers University and Visiting Professor of History at The Citadel.
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Few accuse Winston Churchill of naivete, especially about the Soviet Union; yet his quarters, at Yalta and during previous meetings with Stalin, were also wired by the Soviets. In August 1942, during the Prime Minister's first stay in Moscow to meet Stalin, Churchill received warnings that his rooms were bugged. He was skeptical, but played to the secret listeners by calling the Russians "lower in the scale of nature than the orang-outang," intending that they-know-that-he-knew.

I have found no record of the British telling the Americans of the eavesdropping that took place in Moscow in 1942, but a nation that shared the ULTRA secret would certainly have shared its knowledge of Soviet electronic eavesdropping. Since the so-called servants at Teheran were obviously carrying sidearms under their uniforms, it was obvious to all that service was not their primary task.

At the Yalta conference, Churchill wrote in his memoirs, his Russian hosts gave "kindly attention" to "every chance remark." When a British official commented that a large fish tank had no fish in it, goldfish quickly appeared. When another complained that they had no lemon peel to use in their drinks, "a lemon tree loaded with fruit" materialized the next day. Perhaps this was merely nearby "servants" overhearing their British guests, but the more likely listener was a microphone with a tape recorder, and British officials were well aware of what had happened in the past.
Perhaps, as some claim, the eavesdropping permitted Stalin to learn of "moods" and "attitudes of his diplomatic counterparts," though the value of such psychological intelligence is questionable, especially with Churchill's volatile mood swings. Perhaps it provided key information about Anglo-American strategies for such later litmus-test issues as the postwar political fate of eastern Europe. But there is no evidence that such was the case, and what happened in 1945 had already been decided by prior political arrangements and military events (read that as Churchill and Roosevelt recognizing the need to have the Soviet Union as an ally in order to defeat Hitler and his Nazis, followed by the reality, as of summer 1944, of the Red Army's rapid advance across the central European plains). We need to be careful about a-historical, "reading backward" interpretations by the new perfectionists, who insist that Churchill and Roosevelt should have become Cold Warriors even before the Grand Alliance defeated Hitler.  

The fact is that, probably at Teheran and definitely at Yalta, both Churchill and Roosevelt and their advisers assumed that the Russians had bugged their quarters. Soviet listening devices were routinely installed at such meetings, and understood by the Anglo-Americans to be there when they came to meet with Stalin and, presumably, with other Soviet leaders.

That makes it persuasive, based on evidence and actions, to argue that neither Churchill nor Roosevelt said (or intended to say) anything that Stalin could not hear. One historian of the Teheran Conference has argued that "Roosevelt would probably not have been unduly concerned" about having his conversations overheard. After all, one reason FDR had come to Teheran was to demonstrate to the Russians that he could be trusted.

The same attitude characterized both Churchill and Roosevelt at Yalta. Their private strategies were their public positions, at least to Stalin. Neither was plotting to overthrow the Stalinist regime, nor to "cheat" the Soviet Union of the fruits of victory. As for the postwar political structure, both Churchill and Stalin had observed that, in the Russian leader's oft-quoted phrase: "whoever occupies a territory imposes on it his own social system." The Anglo-Americans had their secrets, particularly about the atomic bomb project, but there is not a shred of evidence or even rumor that Churchill and Roosevelt discussed the Manhattan Project, privately or at the conference table, with each other or anyone else when they met with the Soviet leader.

Most American and British leaders and officials believed Germany, not the Soviet Union, was the enemy. Criticize both Roosevelt and Churchill, if you wish, for adopting negotiating and long-term strategies regarding Stalin and the Soviet Union that, after the Cold War experience, seem to some to have been misguided. Condemn them both for thinking they could trust Stalin. "Poor Neville Chamberlain believed he could trust Hitler. He was wrong," said Churchill. "But I don't think I'm wrong about Stalin." But understand that while Roosevelt and Churchill may have walked "willingly" and knowingly into surveillance traps, neither of the two Anglo-American leaders failed to understand that the so-called trap could serve their own purposes.

So where does this leave us? Either Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, two men who led their nations to victory in the Second World War, were stupidly careless and cavalier, or they just did not care if conversations in their quarters were overheard and passed on to Stalin and his cohorts.

Endnotes


3. Sergei Beria, Beria, My Father: Inside Stalin's Kremlin, ed. Françoise Thorn, transl. Brian Pearce (London: Duckworth, 2001), 92-93. As the son of Stalin's secret police chief, Lavrenti Beria, Sergei's recollections are certainly suspect. The editor makes no mention of notes or records used by Beria, making specific quotations attributed to Stalin dubious at best. But Beria's depiction of Stalin's reaction to the product of Soviet eavesdropping at Teheran and Yalta contradicts no other evidence and, in the context of that era, is plausible.

4. David Reynolds, In Command of History: Churchill Fighting and Writing the Second World War (London: Allen Lane, 2004), 326. Reynolds and others speculate that Churchill was too naive throughout the war about the dangers of Soviet listeners during conferences. Perhaps, but that assumes he said things privately that were greatly different from what he was telling Stalin—a difficult case to prove. See ibid., note 12 on p. 611.


endnotes concluded on page 32...
As Secretary of State for the Home Department (February 1910-October 1911) Churchill was much interested in the possibility of sterilising the "unfit." Like most educated people of the time, he was much impressed by the theory of eugenics. Eugenics was based on the belief that heredity was far more important than environment in determining the physical and mental qualities of the population, and the eugenics movement enjoyed a considerable vogue between the turn of the century and the First World War.

According to the eugenists, Britain was threatened by the "degeneration of the race." The "unfit," who were concentrated among the poor, were reproducing themselves more rapidly than the "fit," who were to be found mainly among the middle classes. The remedy, they argued, was for Governments to practise positive eugenics through tax incentives to the middle classes to have more children, and negative eugenics through measures to prevent the procreation of the unfit.

In 1904 the Balfour Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the "feeble-minded." When the commission reported in 1908 it recommended that certain categories of the mentally inadequate should be compulsorily detained in institutions. As the Home Office was the department responsible for mental institutions, the proposal went to Herbert Gladstone, who deferred a decision, leaving the matter to be taken up by Churchill.

Shortly after Churchill's appointment as Home Secretary he received a pamphlet extolling the practice of the 'sterilisation of degenerates' in the state of Indiana, where it was provided for by state law. In May 1910 he sent a minute to the Permanent Secretary, Sir Edward Troup, asking him to examine the idea: "I am drawn to this in spite of many Party misgivings....Of course it is bound to come some day." The pamphlet was forwarded to Horatio Donkin, Medical Adviser to the Prison Commission, whose verdict was scathing. "The real fact is," he wrote, "that no one hardly who tries to propagate doctrine or stimulate action in the matter of sterilisation has informed his or herself of the elementary grammar of Heredity ..." Having visited mental institutions in the United States, Donkin continued, he had gathered that all the instructed and sensible doctors regarded the propaganda for sterilisation as "the outcome of an arrogation of scientific knowledge by persons who had no claim to it." In case there was any remaining doubt about his views, Donkin characterised the Indiana pamphlet as "a monument of ignorance and hopeless mental confusion."

There matters rested for the moment. On 15 July 1910, Asquith and Churchill received a deputation on mental welfare which included Montague Crackanthorpe, president of the Eugenics Society. Crackanthorpe made a renewed plea for the segregation of the feeble-minded, and pointed out that in the United States some states had laws forbidding marriage between the mentally retarded. Churchill cautiously replied that there were "immense difficulties" surrounding the question, and that some might think that it belonged "more to the politics of the future." But if anything could be done to segregate the 130,000 feeble-minded people "so that their curse dies with them," future generations would be grateful.

Behind the scenes, and in spite of the outright opposition of Donkin, Churchill was still pursuing the idea of sterilisation. At the end of July Troup tried his best to dissuade him. In the present state of feeling, Troup argued, it was "useless to attempt anything. I don't think any Committee, Departmental or Parliamentary, wd have courage to report in favour of the proposal whatever the opinions of the individual members might be." But Churchill pressed on. In September he wrote a memorandum to his officials explaining why he was so attracted to the idea of sterilisation.

Professor Addison is the director of the Centre for Second World War Studies at the University of Edinburgh, and author of Churchill: The Unexpected Hero (FH 127:37) and Churchill on the Home Front (1992), from which this article is excerpted by kind permission.
I am surprised that Dr Donkin, with his great experience, should throw doubts upon the enormous influence of heredity in the transmission of defects physical, mental and moral. A very large proportion of criminals are abnormal only in the weakness of their faculty of self-control. Surely that weakness is definitely traceable in a great number of cases to parentage. I cannot agree with him that "virtue and vice, honesty and dishonesty" are "concrete virtues acquired by the individual." On the contrary it is natural to men, in contradistinction to animals, to be virtuous and to be honest, to have that restraining power to repress the baser promptings of their lower nature, and virtue and honesty are the rule and not the exception in the human species. A minority exhibit a failure to control the primary animal promptings, and a still smaller minority again use their intelligence from a definitely immoral standpoint. It is that middle class, whose human intelligence is so far defective as to deprive them of the average restraining power, that we should seek by sterilisation of the unfit to prevent.

This question must be considered in its proper place in relation to the treatment of the mentally defective. For my part I think it is cruel to shut up numbers of people in institutions, to them at any rate little better than prisons, for their whole lives, if by a simple surgical operation they could be permitted to live freely in the world without causing much inconvenience to others. I certainly do not look forward to that millennium for which some scientists appear to hanker when the majority of the human race will be permanently confined within the walls of state-maintained institutions, attended by numerous doctors, and guarded by legions of warders.

It is rare to discover in the archives the reflections of a politician on the nature of man. Churchill's belief in the innate virtue of the great majority of human beings was part and parcel of an optimism he often expressed before the First World War, "Churchill's intentions were benign, but he was blundering into sensitive areas of civil liberty." As Churchill explained to Asquith, he was certain that one day the "acquiescence" of the feeble-minded in a sterilising operation would enable a large number of them to regain their liberty. In the meantime he proposed a stopgap measure for the segregation of children. No more was heard of this and if a bill was drafted it never saw the light of day. But the momentum in favour of legislation continued after Churchill's departure from the Home Office. In 1912 the Government introduced a bill for the detention of various categories of the feeble-minded, but withdrew it after opposition from libertarian back-benchers. In 1913 the bill was reintroduced with amendments to disarm the critics, and passed into law as the Mental Deficiency Act. By this time the power to prevent the procreation of the unfit had been whittled away to exclude all but the pauper mothers of illegitimate children. There was no mention of sterilisation.

Churchill's intentions were benign, but he was blundering into sensitive areas of civil liberty. The same can be said of his policy towards aliens, a problem which briefly returned to haunt him. Churchill had led the Liberal opposition to the Aliens Act of 1905. In the Manchester by-election of 1908 he had claimed, with some justification, that the Liberal Government had "practically smashed" the act and rendered its worst aspects "nugatory." He also promised that the Government would make further concessions by establishing receiving houses and reducing the naturalisation fee. The first of these promises was carried out by Gladstone in 1909, but the second was overlooked.
Churchill Coins Mark War's Anniversaries

BY DEVOY WHITE

Recent anniversaries of the end of World War II contributed additional commemorative coinage featuring the image of Sir Winston. Some are in gold, all of which are NCLT (non-circulating legal tender) intended for collectors and issued in small quantities. The status of most others is unclear until a record of the size of the issue is published in annual catalogs. Until then, only some silver and all cupro-nickel coins should be considered LT (legal tender). But while some may be used as LT, their quality of production suggests that they were probably intended as NCLT.

The interesting thing about this group is the individual beauty and imagination that went into each coin. Commemoratives usually contain a relatively simple bust portrait of the honored individual on the reverse (see the Benelux example), but many of these new issues are miniature works of art.

Consider these examples: Churchill and the Queen Mother walk through the ruins of Buckingham Palace. Churchill and the King wave to the crowds on VE Day from the palace balcony. Churchill, decorated with a carnation, stands before the ornate gates of Ten Downing Street. Churchill, with cigar, before an aerial dogfight and a falling German aircraft with London in the background. Churchill announces the liberation of the Channel Islands in Parliament. Many are small copies in precious metal of previously published pictures, and all are remarkable for their depth and clarity.

In 2005 the Isle of Man also issued a new 1 Crown Churchill/WW2 commemorative in silver and cupro-nickel using the same artwork on the £5 coin pictured below.

Over one hundred Churchill commemorative coins are currently known to the author, in addition to hundreds of medals and medallions. In addition, a number of “facsimile” paper currency items are now being offered for sale on eBay. Since no paper currency was ever issued with Churchill's portrait, these are curiosity items with no historical or monetary value.

All coins listed here are from my personal collection and are in addition to those reported in FH #120. Photography is by the Fleming Color, Sacramento, California.


2. Isle of Man, 1995, gold, £5. Fiftieth anniversary of the end of WW2. Churchill giving his famous V-sign. Obverse: Queen Elizabeth II. Also in silver and cupro-
ISLE OF MAN, continued
nickel. The cupro-nickel version may be legal tender but this is at the present time unclear.


Marks the end of WW2.
Churchill, London Blitz and aerial dog-fight. Obverse: Queen Elizabeth II.


5. Gibraltar, 2004, silver, £5. Churchill at the gates of Number Ten Downing Street, wearing a carnation. Obverse: Queen Elizabeth II.

6. Isle of Man, 2005, gold, 1/5th Crown. Sixtieth anniversary of the end of WW2. Produced ten years after the £5 gold piece, this carries a similar though not identical facial portrait and a more distant perspective, with a more accurate bow tie. Obverse: Queen Elizabeth II. Also in silver & cupro-nickel.

7. Solomon Islands, 2000, silver, $10. Queen Mother's Centenary.
Churchill and The Queen Mother walking in wreckage of the bombed Buckingham Palace after a bombing attack in 1930. Obverse: Queen Elizabeth II.

S. Mauru, 1996, silver, $1. Queen Mother's Centenary (same artwork as above).

After the bombing the then-Queen famously exclaimed, "Now we can look the East End in the face." Obverse: The Great Seal of Nauru.

After the
Historic Souvenir of "Torch":
Harry Hopkins' "Short Snorter"

BY MICHAEL RICHARDS

In London on 25 July 1942, the Anglo-American allies met to plan forthcoming war strategy. Representing President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins urged his colleagues to avoid "procrastination and delays" and to decide immediately to launch OPERATION TORCH, the invasion of North Africa.

It was an historic conference, as Joseph J. Plaud, President and Founder of the Franklin D. Roosevelt American Heritage Center remarks: "This of course was the first major American action in the war...It would appear then that this short snorter was a testament to this fateful decision in World War II, in which the major participants all signed the note...It’s a wonderful and historic piece that should be preserved."

Autograph collector Gary Schulze recently acquired the short snorter 10 shilling note pictured opposite, once carried by Harry Hopkins and signed by distinguished members of the "Short Snorter Club." Although we have seen a few, we don’t believe we have seen a better collection of World War II autographs on a single piece of paper.

A "short snort" is a quick drink, and during World War II, fliers conceived of a Short Snorter Club. The website of the 456th Bomber Group describes the short snorter as a "bond of friendship amongst the crewmembers or comrades in arms, and it existed typically as paper money signed by two or more men and then separated (torn) so that when all were together again they would still have the money for a drink."

Another version of a short snorter consisted of a roll of bills, each from a different person and/or place, all attached to form one long chain. The Library of Congress, which exhibits one of the latter, states: "The longer your 'short snorter,' the more countries you visited." Their example is six feet long, begins with a dark green U.S. Silver Certificate, and includes a blue Congo franc, a deep red Chinese yuan, a light-green Ceylon rupee, and yellow, brown and purple currency ranging from a Palestinian 500 mils note to a Tripolitanian lire.

Although derived from these practices, the Short Snorter Club of VIPs was rather different. Flying the Atlantic then was much more hazardous for "the good and the great" than it is today. Churchill’s private secretary, John Martin, wrote in Downing Street: The War
"YOU MUST always carry with you a dollar bill signed by the short snorters who admitted you....If you meet another short snorter and challenge him to produce his bill and he can't, he has to pay a dollar to each short snorter present. The PM is a short snorter and has been caught in this way. All of which must sound, as it is, a little mad"—John Martin, *Downing Street: The War Years* (London: Bloomsbury, 1991, 85-86): "The rule is that you must always carry about with you a dollar bill signed by the short snorters who admitted you and any others who may be added. If you meet another short snorter and challenge him to produce his bill and he can't, he has to pay a dollar to each short snorter present. The PM is a short snorter and has been caught in this way. All of which must sound, as it is, a little mad."

A 10 shilling note would do as well as a dollar. This one carries a printed legend on its border: THE HONORABLE HARRY HOPKINS, 'SHORT SNORTER,' NICK-NAME 'HARRY' MADE AT LONDON 25/7/42. In line with the rules cited by John Martin, Hopkins himself did not sign his own bill. The legend around the border was probably written by a British colleague, given the dating style 25/7/42. (Unlike "honour," "honorable" is known to have been spelt without the "u" in Britain.)

On 16 July 1942 Hopkins, General Marshall and Admiral King, had flown to London as Roosevelt's representatives for the meeting that planned "Torch." They were accompanied by Steve Early, the President's press secretary, who was sent to meet with British media personnel. On the evening of the 26th the Hopkins party departed via Preswick, Scotland, arriving back in Washington on July 27th. President Roosevelt, of course, was not in London, nor was Winston Churchill present on July 25th. Clearly, Harry Hopkins added signatures to his short snorter over time. That FDR's and WSC's signatures came later are suggested by their positions, well down in the stack of...
names. Only the first six are known to have been present when this snorter was created. But in all, the signatures are a marvelous collection of great names.

Those who signed the bill on the first day are Dwight D. Eisenhower (Supreme Commander Allied Forces in Europe); Averell Harriman (Roosevelt's special envoy to Churchill and Stalin); Stephen Early (FDR's press secretary); Kathleen Harriman (Averell's daughter); Harry Butcher (Eisenhower's aide); Anthony Biddle (U.S. Ambassador to European exiled governments).

Those probably added later—most likely at the Casablanca conference in January 1943—are Winston S. Churchill; Stan Stanton (?); Hal Blackburne (?); D. C. Loomis (?); Hoyt Vandenburg (U.S. Army Air Corps general, later chief of staff U.S. Air Force); J. D. Love (?); George Durno (White House correspondent, accompanied Roosevelt to Argentina, 1941 and Casablanca, 1943); Jesse]. B. Oldendorf (USN Admiral, accompanied Roosevelt to Casablanca); Franklin D. Roosevelt; D. Ray Cornish (?); G. A. Bisbee (?); and Elliott Roosevelt (FDR's son).

On the obverse are Mattie A. Pinetti and Arlene Dreynal (both Women's Auxiliary Army Air Corps); Harold] R. Alexander (Commander-in-Chief Middle East); Louis Mountbatten (Chief of Combined Operations); George S. Patton (Commander U.S. Army Western Task Force in North Africa and later the U.S. Third Army); two indecipherable names; Ross McIntyre (Admiral and Surgeon General 1941-45, accompanied FDR to Yalta, 1945); F. J. Terry (USN chief yeoman, accompanied Roosevelt to Argentina, 1941); and Anthony Eden (British Foreign Secretary).

Robert Sherwood's *Roosevelt and Hopkins* (New York: Harper, 1948, 685) mentions the obscure George Durno, with a key to when later names were added: "On January 21 [1943] Roosevelt, Hopkins, Harriman, Murphy, and McIntyre drove with Patton to Rabat, eighty-five miles north-east of Casablanca, for a visit to the American troops of the Fifth Army, in training there under General [Mark] Clark's command. [FDR] had lunch in the open air with some 20,000 soldiers. The menu: boiled ham, sweet potatoes, green string beans, fruit salad, bread, butter, jam, and coffee. I am indebted to Captain George Durno, former White House correspondent who accompanied the President on the Casablanca trip, for including in his official report the list of selections played by the Third Division Artillery Band during lunch that day: 'Chattanooga Choo Choo,' 'Missouri Waltz,' 'Naughty Marietta Waltz,' 'Deep in the Heart of Texas' and 'Alexander's Ragtime Band.'"

Clearly Durno was possessed of sufficient jollity to qualify as an ideal short snorter! $
Deputy Secretary of Commerce David Sampson asked us to track what Churchill said on this subject. Here are all instances of "free market" in 13 million words of Churchill writings and speeches. He had parallel things to say on private enterprise, etc.

1903: "The price of sugar in [other countries] meanwhile is kept up by rigid Protection. Every foreigner has to pay more for his sugar, and consequently he buys less, and the consuming power in those countries steadily declines....Now look at England, at the other side of the picture. England has done nothing in the meanwhile. She grows no sugar; she does not give bounties; she has made no observation or remark of any kind. In England sugar becomes cheap, extremely cheap; it becomes cheap in proportion as it gets higher in the countries where it is actually grown. The English people consumed every year (the ratio is altering now in consequence of recent legislation) three times as much per head as the people of France. On the basis of this cheap sugar, which is a benefit and a source of pleasure to great masses of people who use it, a whole range of secondary industries has sprung up—jam, biscuits, soda-water, even blacking, I am told, sweet-meats, preserved fruits, and pickles. We have become the world's confectioners. Chocolat Menier is already made in London. The confectioners in other countries contemplate moving, and in some cases actually do move, their businesses into this great free market where the distribution of the good things of the earth is not distorted and twisted by the avarice and the folly of man." —29 July 1903 (For Free Trade 102-03)

1947: "The French have a saying, 'Drive Nature away, and she will return at the gallop.' Destroy the free market and you create a black market: you overwhelm the people with laws and regulations, and you induce a general disrespect of law....You may try to destroy wealth, and find that all you have done is to increase poverty. In their class warfare, the Government have no right to appeal to the spirit of Dunkirk." —12 March 1947 (Europe Unite 42-43)

1949: "If you make 10,000 regulations you destroy all respect for the law. As Burke said... 'Those who make professions above the ordinary customs of society will often be found in practice to fall far below them.'" —3 February 1949 (In the Balance 21)

"I am all for a free market and a true market. As I told the House two or three years ago, it is only a false and untrue market officially supported that breeds a black market. A sham market can no more escape a black market than a man can escape from his own shadow. Therefore I should myself have been more inclined, had I been in any way responsible, to set the pound free under regular and necessary safeguards and control [Laughter] —certainly, and accept the results, than to the present rigid method of pegging the exchange at the very lowest rate which anyone could possibly conceive."
—28 September 1949 (In the Balance 91)

1950: "Cheap and abundant food is the foundation of our strength. It will be the foundation of our policy. But this can only come in the long run from the workings of a free market."
—21 January 1950 (Complete Speeches 7906)

1954: "It is the policy of both parties in the state to sustain and increase homegrown food on which this island depends so largely for a favourable trade balance and, in the ultimate issue, for its life. It is not an easy task to reconcile the beneficial liberation of our food supply from Government controls with that effective stimulus of home production which is vital. [Interruption.] Hon. Members want the good without the evil; that is often very difficult to solve. It is necessary for the Exchequer to subsidize in one form or another, so as to bridge the gap between the price level reached in a free market on the one hand, and the price level necessary to sustain the welfare of the farmers on the other. Moreover, the gap must not only be bridged in the industry as a whole by maintaining average returns but we must also, in the case of what are called fat stock—___ technical term covering a very considerable field—provide safeguards for individual transactions where necessary."
—3 November 1954 (The Unwritten Alliance 75)
Eddie Marsh: A Profile

COLONIAL OFFICE, S.W.1, 31.8.22

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

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

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

—Christopher Hassall, Edward Marsh (London: Longmans, 1949, 498)

BY DAVID FREEMAN

When Edward Howard "Eddie" Marsh found himself invited to serve as private secretary to the newly-appointed Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies following a party given by Lady Granby on 14 December 1905, he felt intimidated. Despite a superb educational background (Westminster and a first in classics at Cambridge), Marsh doubted his ability to fulfill the expectations of the mercurial Winston Churchill. He was anxious about working for a younger man who—despite having had less formal education than himself—already possessed a growing reputation for brilliance.

Seeking advice, Marsh called upon someone who knew Churchill well:

"I betook myself to Lady Lytton, who was a great friend of his as well as of mine (I learnt afterwards that she had taken a hand in the boosting of me at the party) and poured out my misgivings. Her answer was one of the nicest things that can ever have been said about anybody. 'The first time you meet Winston you see all his faults, and the rest of your life you spend discovering his virtues.'"

The Lady Lytton in question was the former Pamela Plowden, whom Winston had courted five years before. Marsh accepted her advice and the job, a professional relationship that amounted to twenty years, and a friendship that lasted fifty.

Eddie Marsh and Winston Churchill had personalities as different as their childhoods, although both were the products of typical Victorian upbringings. Marsh was born in London on 18 November 1872. His father Howard was a doctor of modest origins who met and married Jane Perceval while working at the Alexandra Hospital. Miss Perceval had inherited a share of the legacy voted by Parliament to the children of her grandfather Spencer Perceval, the only British prime minister ever to be assassinated.

As Mrs. Marsh, Jane saw to it that her son and daughter had strict, albeit nonconformist, religious upbringings. Jane Marsh also gave her children much personal attention with an emphasis on reading instruction, although she closely censored the texts her children saw. Eddie quickly emerged as a child prodigy, having memorized the first four books of Paradise Lost by age...
ten. He began and finished his model academic career two years ahead of the usual ages.

Eddie's Cambridge years at Trinity College considerably broadened his literary knowledge, after a childhood nurtured with Mr. Bowdler's Shakespeare. Poetry became the great love of his life. This trait, and his faultless knowledge of English grammar, contributed to his uncommon adulthood. A severe series of diseases in adolescence left the adult Marsh with fragile health, a wispy falsetto voice and, more cruelly, complete impotence.

In a perverse way this disability may have protected him in an age when homosexual behavior was still a criminal offense in Britain. For Marsh, himself strikingly handsome, was attracted to other young men but in a necessarily platonic way. As his biographer has written, Marsh "cultivated a capacity for friendship which, untroubled by physical desire, could develop into a devotion characteristically feminine in its tenderness." This temperament proved ideal for a man who, while pursuing a career in the Civil Service, chose to use his share of the Perceval "murder money" to establish himself as a patron of aspiring young painters and poets.

Interestingly, the private behavior of Marsh's social circle was well known enough for Lady Randolph Churchill to worry about the wisdom of her son engaging a private secretary who might associate her family with a scandal of whispers. No evidence exists, however, that Churchill ever concerned himself with Marsh's private life. From questioning mutual friends, the youthful Under Secretary learned enough about the Colonial Office official's professional abilities to convince himself that Marsh would make an ideal private secretary. Indeed, this was so. Marsh served Churchill off and on in the same capacity throughout the rising politician's entire ministerial career through 1929.

The secret of their partnership lay in their very different. Great teams consist of individuals that do not copy but rather complement one another. Tactful and patient, Marsh translated the furious energy of his demanding superior with his own quiet and meticulous administrative skills.

In parallel with his professional career, Marsh continued to act as a connoisseur and patron of the arts. In addition to collecting the paintings of Gertler, Spencer and the Nashes, he performed numerous acts of kindness for and befriended many of the great names in twentieth-century English literature including Robert Graves, D.H. Lawrence, Walter de la Mare, and above all Rupert Brooke, for whom he acted as biographer, anthologist and literary executor.

Marsh also served as a bridge between this artistic circle of friends and his political master. He introduced Churchill to professional painters during the otherwise disconsolate period of World War I when the ostracized former minister was taking up his most famous pastime. Marsh also introduced Churchill to Brooke, and to the grim modernism of the War Poets. Churchill was impressed enough to write Brooke's obituary in The Times and to commit to memory many of the haunting stanzas of Owen, Blunden and Sassoon.

Marsh's own literary work took the form of editing five volumes of Georgian Poetry published between 1912 and 1922. He translated Horace and La Fontaine and produced thousands of letters rich with gossipy information. He also acted as a textual editor not only for Churchill but for Hugh Walpole and Somerset Maugham. Churchill responded with his own personal accolade by having Marsh elected to The Other Club in 1932. A knighthood was bestowed upon retirement in 1937 and an autobiography, A Number of People, followed two years later.

Perhaps since he retired prior to World War II,
Marsh today is less well remembered than the other shining satellites who orbited Churchill. Certainly, the Great Man never forgot their close association. In the midst of studying strategy one chilly day during the war's darkest hours, Churchill suddenly paused to look up and observe, "This weather won't do Eddie Marsh any good." The Prime Minister then returned just as quickly to his own cares, and those of the nation.

Typically, when Marsh died in January of 1953, he was at work applying his skills as a literary surgeon to the manuscript of Churchill's *History of the English Speaking Peoples*. Also, at the request of a French magazine, he had been preparing a profile of his most famous associate. "Whether or not it be true that no valet can make a hero of his master, it is certainly not so of a Private Secretary," Marsh wrote of Churchill. "It is enough to say that in my mind he is indisputably the greatest figure in English history."

Further Reading: Owing to his close association with so many prominent people, Marsh figures in the biographies of numerous literary figures including Churchill. Most of these books, though, go back to Christopher Hassall's beautifully written biography, *Edward Marsh* (London: Longmans, 1959) as their own source. While somewhat dated in style, the book is the standard work on Marsh. Eddie's own memoirs, *A Number of People* (London: Heinemann, 1939), typically reflect his modesty in choosing to focus primarily on the many fascinating people he knew, rather than on himself.

*Which Lady Lytton?*

Christopher Hassall (*Edward Marsh*, 120) declares that this famous remark was made by Edith, first Countess of Lytton (1841-1936). But the primary source, Marsh himself (*A Number of People*, 149), identifies the speaker as Pamela, second Countess of Lytton (1874-1971, the former Pamela Plowden), in his own words, as quoted in this article.

Both writers agree that it was Pamela who urged Churchill to choose Marsh at a party given by Lady Granby on 14 December 1905. Marsh confuses us (and probably confused his friend and biographer) by starting his account with the vague words "Lady Lytton"; but he goes on to identify this Lady Lytton as the same person who had urged Churchill to hire him—and his index entry names Pamela, not Edith, as the speaker.

Hassall documents numerous letters and meetings between Eddie and Pamela, who were contemporaries, but not Eddie and Edith, who died three years before Marsh published his memoir, yet does not refer to "the late" Lady Lytton. The evidence is unequivocal. —Ed.
Winston S. Churchill
and Robert R. McCormick

ANTI-ESTABLISHMENT GADFLY AND MAN
OF THE CENTURY: The intriguing story of
what two magnificoes had in common.

BY PHILIP AND SUSAN LARSON

In researching Winston Churchill's three visits to
Chicago, we found evidence of his fascinating
relationship with a local notable, Colonel Robert
R. McCormick of the Chicago Tribune. Both were
strong-willed and opinionated celebrities, whose
strange bonding is a captivating story.

Churchill and McCormick both had famous ances-
tors. McCormick's father was a cousin of Cyrus
McCormick, whose reaper revolutionized American
farming during the 19th century. Churchill's forebear,
John Churchill, was a military hero; WSC's father had
been a notable political personality in the 1880s.

Both were schooled in Britain, McCormick when
his father served Ambassador Todd Lincoln (Abe's son)
and later represented the 1893 Chicago Exposition in
London. Churchill went to Harrow and Sandhurst. Both
their parents largely relied on servants to raise their
children, remaining relatively alopof.

While Churchill excelled in polo, McCormick
played cricket. In World War I both were officers in
France. (McCormick forever after was called Colonel;
Churchill dropped that title after returning from the
front.) Both were cavalry exponents: McCormick
recruited his own cavalry volunteers, his cousin Joe
Patterson organizing his own artillery unit.

McCormick's experiences there left him with a life-
long ill will towards Britain, an attitude echoed through
the Tribune, which he owned and managed from 1911
until he died in 1955. The reasons have never been fully
defined, but probably include his father being snubbed
by then-foreign minister Lord Salisbury, his being hazed
by students or masters, and his being brought up in a
dysfunctional family.

Churchill's cousin Shane Leslie, a lifelong acquain-
tance of McCormick, remarked of the snubbing incident
"that one cup of tea [with Salisbury] in the last century
could have could have changed the status of Britain in
Chicago journalism in the present century." About his
schooling McCormick wrote: "...the brutality of one of
the masters was so great that I have remembered it for
sixty years. I suppose it was a degree of sadism." This
was corroborated years later by other schoolmates.

McCormick hated British pretense, especially by
those made powerful by birth not merit. Ironically,
wrote his biographer, his antipathy to the English aris-
tocracy, "whose rural customs he reenacted in the
Chicago suburbs, became one of the governing passions
of his life....he seemed to love the idea of England, the
manly virtues...while loathing the insufferable pride of a
people drunk with their own sense of superiority." But
McCormick bought his clothes and shoes in Britain,
enjoyed fox hunting, and maintained an English-style
country home in Wheaton, which is now Cantigny.

A second cause of the Chicagoan's Anglophobia
was his strong nationalism. At his school, Ludgrove,
"Bertie" McCormick was deemed a little excessive when
he was found to sleep draped with an American flag. He
took a firm isolationist stand before World War II, sup-
porting the "America First" movement in which Charles
Lindbergh was prominent, and criticized President
Roosevelt for being pro-British. But once America was
attacked, he fully supported his country.

McCormick began to take control of the Chicago
Tribune the year Churchill arrived at the Admiralty, but
there were already Churchill links to the newspaper.
Lord Randolph Churchill wrote at least two articles
CHURCHILL AND MCCORMICK...
for the Tribune on his 1891 trip to Africa. On 21 March 1898 the Tribune took notice of Winston’s first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force, in which WSC made a prescient observation: the “fundamental cause of the native’s antagonism was the intense hatred of the Muslim priests against any advance in civilization which would assail the superstition and (naivete) on which their wealth and influence depend.”

In 1900 the Tribune syndicated Winston’s coverage of the Boer War. A year later, following WSC’s first visit to Chicago, the paper featured a front page picture entitled “Winston Spencer Churchill Who May Some Day Be Premier of England.”

McCormick and Churchill had five encounters and a near-miss or two, but except for 1932, the details are sketchy. Their first meeting was in 1915, when McCormick interviewed Churchill in London as a Tribune war correspondent en route to the Russian Front. Later, in his book, With the Russian Army, McCormick would say of Churchill: “Next to Grand Duke Nicholas he is the most aggressive person I have ever met.”

In a 1915 Tribune article, “Lessons for America from Great Britain’s Shortcomings in this War,” McCormick began the outspoken criticism for which he was later renowned. The British Liberal government which included Churchill, he said, “sent to their death soldiers less trained and equipped than the enemy.” But he complimented Parliament “for greater patriotism and foresight then the American Congress has shown,” and let Churchill off lightly: “...still more a politician, but a patriot [he] held the great fleet mobilized, ready for the rupture. He even had the courage and patriotism to order without sanction of Parliament the supplies that would be necessary for the beginning of war.”

They nearly met again in Chicago in October 1929, when Churchill, his brother and their sons breezed into the Drake Hotel on a transcontinental journey. Bertie was in New York on business, but he arranged for the Tribune cartoonist John McCutcheon to host a lunch with his editors and the Churchills. Also invited was the American financier Bernard Baruch, who in his private railway car accompanied Churchill to New York and the crash of the Stock Market.

In February 1932, when Churchill visited Chicago for the third and last time, McCormick hosted WSC at his residence off Lake Shore Drive at 1519 Astor Street. The details suggest a developing friendship. Bertie dispatched Captain Maxwell Corpening to pick up Churchill at Dearborn Station. Knowing that Churchill was still recuperating after being hit by a car in New York City, McCormick suggested that he might “want to take it easy,” but did offer to “stroll Lincoln Park [or] come down to the office.”

At the Colonel’s home, Churchill was “wont to park himself in front of a certain Cezanne which he considered supremely beautiful,” and to read “Fannie Hurst, which caused him blissfully sad moments of tearful emotion.” The pair “couldn’t have been a happier combina-
tion," wrote the Tribune's Fanny Butcher; but she added that "Churchill caused much gossip when he came to Chicago because he was the guest of one of Chicago's most anti-British pillars [with] a lifelong distrust and hatred of the British." McCormick hosted at least one luncheon, including such celebrities as Donald McLennan of Marsh McLennan Insurance; Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago; and Illinois Supreme Court Justice Frederic De Joung. Mayor Cermak apologized that he was sick and could not make it.

McCormick and Churchill shared an affinity for alcohol. Bertie told his doctor, "The only man I know who can drink more liquor and hold it better than I is Winston Churchill." He held court daily at a sort of executive dining area of the Tribune Building called the Overset Club. At one such session Churchill refused a scotch until the ice was removed. Foreshadowing a later complaint of Eleanor Roosevelt, McCormick's wife Maryland said WSC "drove McCormick crazy because he would want to stay up...until 4." A funny incident occurred when Churchill hosted the Colonel at a London dinner years later. McCormick found the elaborate wine service quite tedious, and then WSC insisted on port after dinner: "This port was laid down by my father in the last century. You would insult any British host by not drinking his port." McCormick replied: "I don't care whether I insult the King, Queen, and the whole British Empire—no thank you." "Good," Churchill agreed heartily, and diplomatically, "then we'll proceed to whiskey and soda." McCormick's newspaper seemed to express his true feelings in 1932. Cartoonist Carey Orr offered a front page cartoon called "The Contrast," showing a determined Churchill with a bright candle entitled "The Loyal Briton Abroad." Below was a slouched American with muted candle, "The Apologetic American Abroad." Two days before, an editorial explained: "Mr. Churchill is of exceptional interest. [His] candor, a little brusque or impatient, and his readiness to charge any bastion of official authority have found...more general sympathy with us than at home. In short, we have rather taken to Mr. Churchill a forthright Briton...seasoned statesman...what he says will profit us." On WSC's Anglo-American themes the editorial stated that British-American relations "must be founded...upon a self-respecting search by both peoples for policies profitable to both."

A Churchill-McCormick conversation is reported by Bertie's valet-gopher, Captain Maxwell Corpening, which suggests their compatibility, though Corpening has a reputation for inaccuracy. The three were relaxing after dinner over whiskey and cigars: "For over two hours I had the privilege of listening to the most brilliant conversation I have ever heard. They discussed world affairs from religion to bird dogs....I am firmly convinced that Churchill had the quicker mind and vocabulary but the Col. was sounder and farsighted." Other meetings between the two were reported but little information on these is available. In July 1933 >
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McCormick met Churchill in London, and in July 1937 McCormick spent at least a night at Chartwell. Another meeting was planned during Churchill’s proposed 1938 lecture tour, when McCormick wrote, "We expect you to stay here for the pleasure of seeing you." But WSC’s trip was canceled owing to the international situation.

Now at their friendship’s height, the two even exchanged presents: Churchill received a portable desk and the Colonel a set of Marlborough, wistfully inscribed, "Hope that the English Speaking Peoples increasingly unite their history in common." On 18 November 1937 McCormick replied: "There was I in an armchair by the fire...the life of the Duke of Marlborough in my hands, looking forward to a voyage into the romantic and glorious past...and someone brings a package...Great Contemporaries History was forgotten while I met your friends and some of my acquaintances __I hope the Christmas season will bring you what cheer and comfort it can in this lunatic world."

McCormick added, "I hear encomiums of you on all sides, not the least of them being that of my driver who remarked 'There’s no baloney about him at all'—the McCormick dugout is always ready to welcome you." Churchill wrote back: "I think often about my pleasant stay with you in that long pilgrimage I made through the states. It was like putting into a safe harbor in the middle of a stormy voyage."23

In 1941, McCormick testified before Congress that the British fleet would never go to the Nazis because "I have known Winston Churchill for twenty-five years—a more thoroughly honorable man never lived."24

But McCormick’s continued vitriolic and even irrational public comments and quotations against the British, and even Churchill himself, became overwhelming during the stress of World War II, when Britain was struggling for survival. McCormick had described the Rhodes Scholarships as a program of British subversion, sending recipients back to America "to act as English cells boring from within."25 During the height of the Battle of Britain, the publisher’s WGN radio station described Blitz damage as "more than annoying and less than decisive__people whose houses have been destroyed can be moved into the unused buildings—of which there are many..."26

In March 1943 a boneheaded Tribune editorial entitled "States across the Sea" suggested admitting European countries to the United States—including the UK: "For the people of Britain particularly, statehood would have many advantages...Membership in our union would give the British an opportunity to rid themselves once and for all of the [burden] of their nobility and the aristocratic system that goes with it."27 Adding insult to injury, the same editorial page summarily dismissed one of Churchill’s pet projects for an invasion of southern Europe: "This talk about the soft underbelly of Europe is nonsense. Nothing soft is offered in that direction."

Broadcasting on WGN, McCormick announced on 22 April 1944: "My friend Winston Churchill sug-
suggested to the Republican Conference at Mackinac, with the approval of President Conant of Harvard, and apparently President Roosevelt, that we repeal our Declaration of Independence and re-enter the British Empire as lower class subjects of the British Crown." Seven years later, on 23 June 1951, he quoted Churchill as having said to Roosevelt: "Together we can rule the world."

Churchill did his best to keep relations positive. At the Quebec Conference in 1943, when asked about the newspaper's "States Across the Sea" article, he replied: "Great Britain and the United States one? Yes, I am all for that and you mean me to run for president?" But a year earlier, in a secret telegram to Roosevelt regarding McCormick's request to publish a daily paper in England, Churchill had remarked: "...no opportunity will be given to him to reproduce in England the lies and misrepresentations which are staple of the Chicago Tribune editorial Policy."£

Churchill must have taken pleasure in assigning the American serial rights to his 1946 book, Secret Session Speeches, to Marshall Field, publisher of the rival Chicago Sun.££ Rumors have surfaced that he did so in anticipation that it would displease McCormick, but we have not discovered any evidence on the matter.

Their last verified meeting was 22 July 1948, at a garden party at Buckingham Palace. Not surprisingly, Churchill at first avoided McCormick. But later, in the words of Richard Norton Smith, "Churchill's natural warmth gradually thawed his resentment, until the two men were seen engaged in polite conversation."££

Two strong-willed individuals, brought together by fate, enjoyed good times together and even had some tender moments. But in the end McCormick's flamboyance and unreasoning prejudices ended the relationship on an unhappy note. The long association concluded primarily on the issue of country. A McCormick biographer caught a key to their relationship when he said, "they shared...a belief in 'my country right or wrong' and differed only in the identity of the country."££
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Churchill's Reputation: The State of the Debate

On 12 November, 1940, in praise of the recently deceased Neville Chamberlain, Churchill said: "History with its flickering lamp stumbles along the trail of the past, trying to reconstruct its scenes, to revive its echoes, and kindle with pale gleams the passion of former days."

What he was talking about—the practice of history—is what I would like to talk to you about today: how various writers have tried to affect Churchill's reputation, including in the massive new medium of cyberspace.

It should be recognised that all history is to a certain extent revisionist: that is not necessarily a negative thing. Revising what has been thought by previous generations is what history is about. Churchill's reputation has gone through several phases from the 1950s, when it was largely hagiographic, to the 1990s, when a new, aggressive, carping tone appeared.

The British Library lists thousands of books with Churchill's name in the title, but it is largely the case that his reputation has remained to an astonishing degree unaffected. He has become an international icon, whose reputation no new information or novel historical analysis will alter.

The Chartwell visitor numbers continue to rise; the U.S. Navy has named a warship after him. He has been voted "Person of the Century" and even "Man of the Millennium" in recent polls. What Churchill called the "grievous inquest" of history has sat and found him to be truly "Great."

Yet Churchill is still attacked: he is certainly still topical, which is astonishing for a man who died forty years ago. For example: his Parliament Square statue was given a Mohican haircut as part of a May Day protest a few years ago, whilst Thabo Mbeki, the President of South Africa, recently said that Churchill was the "primary" reason for the recent problems in Darfur. Whether one agrees or not, it is a sign of the force of Churchill's reputation that such a comment should have been made at all in the context of current affairs.

There are three aspects of Churchill's reputation that I would like to focus on. The first is the Mbeki line: using Churchill's name for the speaker's own political ends. This is true of historians too: on the left there is Clive Ponting. On the right there is David Irving. For example, Irving argues that Churchill positively knew of the planned Pearl Harbor attack, and stopped only short of saying that he was a full-scale drunk. The problem lies with Irving's evidence; when one checks the facts, his views break down again and again.

The second viewpoint is what I describe as the American Libertarian analysis. The prime example is the academic Robert Raico, who in a half hour speech accused Churchill of some thirty crimes ranging from being a drug addict, to being Stalin's lackey, to sinking the Lusitania, to plotting "the destruction of the British and American Empires." What is amazing, above all, is that there were some thirty accusations in a thirty-minute speech! (See also "Real versus Rubbish," FH 123: 38-43. —Ed.)

Then there is the huge forum of the Internet, where the accusations are often bizarre: the Lusitania again, Pearl Harbor, and so on. Perhaps the most extraordinary is the charge that Churchill pursued the prospects of peace with Mussolini in 1945 (yes, 1945). Leaving aside the fact that Churchill would not by that stage have needed peace with Mussolini, the charge goes that the relevant documents are in a waterproof bag at the bottom of Lake Como. So, if one takes issue with them, the conspiracy theorists say, "go and look." If you don't find anything, they say, "you haven't looked hard enough."

Then there are the books, some of which obtain advances I could only dream of. For example, there is "Operation JB," by Christopher Creighton, claiming that Churchill spirited Martin Bormann (Hitler's Nazi Party Secretary) away from the ruins of Berlin in 1945 and set him up in a country house in Britain. The advance for that book was a quarter million pounds—for a book that did not produce any evidence at all. It should surely have been enough for the publishers that the "JB" in the title, referred to James Bond.

One pop-psychologist author states that Churchill was a flasher. True, he did let people into his bathroom to talk to him whilst he was in, or emerging from, the bath. However, that author took the view that Churchill actually got a kick out of exposing himself.

All that can be done in the face of these intemperate attacks is to go continued on page 50...
Tragedies and Triumphs

Yalta Yarn Best Yet

RICHARD M. LANGWORTH


The fourth and latest of Michael Dobbs's Churchill series is his best yet: well grounded historically, with the depth of narration and brilliant character studies that have made his previous Churchill novels famous. "Dobbs is an author who can bring historical happenings so vitally back to life," wrote Anthony Howard, "made all the more impressive by being historically accurate in every respect."

The novel centers around the 1945 Yalta Conference between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin—as seen in retrospect by Churchill and a fictitious protagonist, a Pole named Marion Nowak, who joins him on a 1963 cruise aboard the Onassis yacht Christina. They had first met at Yalta, where Nowak begged to be spirited out of Russia to search for his daughter in the ruins of Warsaw. WSC had left Yalta without him, but Nowak escaped with the help of WSC's valet Frank Sawyers—a sub-plot in itself. Now a servant aboard Christina, Nowak confronts Churchill with a gun, accusing WSC of selling out his country.

There is nary a misstep over historical fact. Dobbs makes the point, for example, that the fire-bombing of Dresden, long blamed on Churchill, was demanded by Stalin—as Sir Martin Gilbert has long established. But some historians may take issue with his portrait of Roosevelt, chairing the conference as the only head of state, yet hardly able to focus on the vital business at hand:

Churchill studied his friend the President...There seemed to be empty spaces in the American's suit, as though he'd shrunk...Roosevelt, the presiding officer at this conference, didn't know where he wanted to go...He had a hacking cough and the skin of his face behind his pince-nez was sticky...and he leant on such weak reeds—Stettinias and the ailing Hopkins, seated behind, who had his head bent as though in prayer, but probably in sleep.

Throughout these pages Churchill is the realist, Roosevelt the dreamer, unlike the characterization of one of my favorite historians, but very much like many reports of Yalta. Opposite is the implacable Stalin, masterfully playing off the Anglo-Americans against each other, determined to dominate Eastern Europe and to dismember Germany, breaking her with reparations, like last time.

Churchill argues for Polish independence; all he gets is the promise, soon to be broken, of unfettered elections. This easily satisfies Roosevelt, but not Marion Nowak, who gets into Churchill's headquarters. WSC says he will do his best, but Nowak mockingly tells him that Poland is lost.

Stalin is convincingly ruthless, a cunning negotiator playing on Churchill's weaknesses, while always giving the anxious Roosevelt a way out, a simple solution to every impasse. The Anglo-Americans are setting up a provisional government in France; surely they cannot object to the Russians setting one up in Poland? "We are agreed that these countries must be ruled by their own people, not some foreign power," Stalin says—then, slyly turning to face Churchill: "Although not quite every country, it seems. Not some colonies. At least, not for a while."

Churchill is apoplectic at this, but it plays to Roosevelt's prejudices. Today it seems almost impossible that an American president could think in 1945 that the greatest threat to world peace was the British Empire:

Churchill sobbed as, little by little, he lost the battle with himself...A few years earlier, when the Wehrmacht stood within hours of total victory, through stubbornness so profound it had bordered on dementia, he had saved the world, yet now it seemed that nothing he might do or say would make the smallest difference. The game was as good as over, decided by the boot of the Red Army.
Here and there we read snatches of actual Churchill dialogue, skillfully paraphrased by Dobbs to fit his scenes. Musing over still-enslaved Poland in 1963, Churchill promises Nowak that the game is not over: Freedom, he says, "does not cease or surrender because tyranny casts its dark shadow across large parts of our planet. Liberty is no harlot to be picked up in the street by a man with a tommy gun," 8Dec44.) But Poland’s fate is certain. "Walls won’t be pulled down by words," Nowak replies.

Churchill himself wrote similarly of this period in his _Triumph and Tragedy_. In later years he mused that he had “accomplished a great deal, only to accomplish little in the end.” He did not, it seems, believe he had achieved his last driving goals: a special relationship between Britain and America, a settlement with the Soviets, peace in the world. As early as 1949 Churchill had predicted the fall of communism—but in 1963 the Soviet grip seems as solid as ever.

What then was Churchill’s Triumph? How did it emerge from tragedy at Yalta (And in Dobbs’s book it definitely did emerge at Yalta, not after the liberation of Eastern Europe a quarter century on.) Ah! To understand how Churchill triumphed, you will have to read the book. •

### BIBLIOGRAPHY...
publication, pages, etc.; but even includes measurements of paper thickness. I’d venture that the page thickness in a pulpy book might vary between, say, Singapore and Tucson. In my opinion the amount of effort to obtain such information might have been better served if Mr. Cohen had illustrated some of the dust jackets associated with the various titles, which would have avoided long verbal descriptions of them. This information would have helped collectors, dealers, and appraisers considerably, since jackets and their variations significantly affect values.

If a picture is worth a thousand words, perhaps this book would be thinner and cheaper if photos, which don’t cost much to print nowadays, were used throughout. I suspect they got lost in the volume of words.

The author’s annotations include extensive material on the development and publication of the titles, with further references to the authenticity of the data. This certainly provides the user with virtually all available information concerning each book and eliminates a considerable amount of further research, but perhaps this might better go into a study of Churchill’s publishing career. Again I am reminded of a remark, this one by Clement Attlee, on Churchill’s _History of the English Speaking Peoples_: “Winston’s book should be entitled, _Things in History Which Interest Me_.”

We are also provided with information on locations where the titles were viewed. While this may be helpful, it is impossible to supply a worldwide location list—nor is it necessary. The computer age and the internet have superseded this need. Even the smallest local library nowadays either subscribes to OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) or RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network), which provide instant information on titles and locations in research, academic, national, museum, public and corporate libraries and archives in 400 lan-
Japanese translations have been listed. will provide similar access to locations whether B1, The War Against the Dutch Republics, would more properly be listed in Section D.

Volume II contains the next four sections. Section B covers "contributions by Churchill to books, pamphlets, leaflets and portfolios." As always there will be bibliographic debates; for example, one can argue whether B1, The War Against the Dutch Republics, would more properly be listed in Section D.

Section C covers "articles, reviews, news reports from war zones in newspapers and magazines." Some of the items are, as the definition implies, not strictly from a war zone, such as C267a.1, "Painting as a Pastime," or C266, "A Cabinet Minister as Art Critic." Again, the depth of the work is shown by comparing entries with Woods, who listed 527 "C" items; Cohen has 706.

Section D covers Churchill speeches in works "compiled or edited by someone else, together with sufficient other material that the work may reasonably be said not to be wholly or substantially by Churchill." Section E covers "all reports of speeches of Churchill in periodical publications no more frequently than weekly and no less frequently than quarterly." I can't help but question the word "all," though the coverage is admirably comprehensive.

Volume III holds the two final sections. Section F contains letters, memoranda, statements, and other miscellaneous in-text contributions in books, pamphlets and leaflets; Section G contains letters to editors and other miscellaneous statements in periodicals. Missing are the Political Warfare Executive Leaflets, which Woods listed (however incompletely). These were Churchill speeches translated into various languages and dropped over occupied or German territories during World War II. Members of the Psychological Warfare Societies are great collectors of this material.

Mr. Cohen's is a monumental contribution to the Churchillian literature and provides extensive and valuable information. The trouble is that the cost of the three volumes makes it unlikely that most people will be able to afford them. Although several Churchill specialist dealers have significantly reduced the price, it is still not within the range of most pocketbooks. Perhaps the marketing experts, who should have an understanding for these things, let the author down by failing to provide sufficient consideration of the need for circulation of what is clearly a standard work. That the press run was only 400 copies, according to some websites, suggests that the publisher may understand this problem, but it is too late to confront now.

Did someone conclude that a work which should be the standard may be regarded as merely esoteric? Hopefully not. Mr. Cohen has labored hard to bring Churchill bibliography many strides forward. Clearly this is the last word on the subject. Since the majority of potential customers are interested in Section A, a separate, slimmer volume containing only the critical major information would benefit many. In the meantime, let us rejoice: a great work is done.

Worth Reading Despite the Howlers

DANIEL N. MYERS

One Christmas in Washington:

Anyone who has read many books about Winston Churchill knows that they can be categorized by periods. There was the hagiographic era, during his lifetime and shortly thereafter; and the revisionist period of the 1990s. Now we are in what might be called the reality period. To paraphrase John Ramsden, we are now viewing Churchill "in the round," i.e., warts and all, but with due respect and by placing the warts within the context of a life that was full of adventure and activism; and a character that never shrank from making hard decisions.

Within this context a pair of Canadians have filled in the gaps on one of the most important conferences of World War II—indeed, the first wartime conference between Churchill and Roosevelt—although I question the subtitle adjective "secret" (it was anything but), or whether it "changed the world." Nonetheless, Bercuson and Herwig, two professors from the University of Calgary, have written an engaging, insightful, and detailed account that captures the flavor and color of the 1941 Washington conference, code-named "Arcadia," only days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. They present an unvarnished picture of Churchill's objectives and strategy for accomplishing them, revealing the man in all of his charm, strength, and inherent biases. More is the pity that the book is so replete with typos and errors!

It is disconcerting to be enjoying a good read only to stumble upon a glaring typographical or editorial error. Your eyes jump and your reading >
halts in mid-sentence, much like hitting a speed bump on a superhighway.

We are told that Churchill met Roosevelt in Newfoundland on "Saturday, August 9" (24); three pages later we read, "Sunday morning, August 9." (The first entry is correct.) And: "For Admiral King, it was a reminder of both the closeness of the war and how unpreparedness [sic] of the United States" (36). Or: "Even though Churchill grew to maturity in the a British upper class..." (76). The Battle of Tripoli is dated 1904; it was 1804. The errors multiply with such rapidity as to make one wonder whether it is worth continuing. (It is.)

Professor Christopher Sterling of George Washington University kindly sent me a list of "howlers." They include the old canard about Lord Randolph and syphilis (63). Sir Winston believed this caused his father's death, but it has been long since disproven and good historians know so. The writers mistakenly claim that WSC won the Nobel Prize for Literature for The Second World War (69); that daughter Marigold was born in 1922 and died in "finfancy" (75); that Churchill returned to the Admiralty in September 1940 (81); that Eden left Chamberlain's cabinet in 1942 (95). The Blue Room in the White House is identified in a photo as being converted after the war to "the current Oval Office"; but the Oval Office dates at least to President Hoover and is in the West Wing, as any viewer of modern television dramas will know.

There are enough clunkers to take up this whole review; the art of editing seems lost. Why then do I recommend the book? Because it tells a fascinating story in detail and represents a major contribution to the literature of this important period.

Particularly engaging are the vignettes on key people. Chapters (replete with errors) cover Churchill and Roosevelt; much better are the thumbnail sketches of major and lesser players including, such as Admiral Sir Dudley Pound, Field Marshal Sir John Dill, Air Marshal Sir Charles Portal, Henry L. Stimson, Harry Hopkins, Cordell Hull, and George C. Marshall.

These vignettes help to make the book, adding a personal touch and providing information beyond the basic story line. Interestingly, the character who stands out is Marshall. With all of the egos and grandees on both sides, the authors credit Marshall with "clear vision and concentrated focus." He embodied "Churchill's greatest hope for a combined war effort and his greatest fear of the United States striking out alone."

The writers cover the full period of Churchill's visit, including his side trips to Canada and Florida. We meet William Lyon Mackenzie King, Canadian Prime Minister, with a brief look at that relationship. (See FH 130 for the full story. —Ed.) Curiously, these two Canadian writers overlook the famous, and not uninteresting, story of the Yousuf Karsh photos in Ottawa, the most famous images of Churchill. Instead, we are told of the PM's "Some Chicken! Some Neck!" speech, received amid a chorus of desk banging by members of the Canadian Parliament, followed by a "brief press conference." How could they miss telling the fascinating story of how Karsh captured the face of bulldog determination with his camera?

On the plus side, the authors treat us to the story of the Gaullists' seizure of the Vichy French islands of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon, off the coast of Newfoundland, in December 1941. This minor incident makes for an intriguing side story and is not widely reported in the Churchill canon. The tensions it created between the British and Americans, particularly between Churchill (who praised the Gaullists in his speech in Ottawa) and Cordell Hull (who was furious for this diplomatic contretemps) is an undercurrent that runs through the second half of the book. This is a story that has not been fully told but which serves as a backdrop to the major discussions that were taking place.

If you can steel yourself to ignore the many printing and editing gaffes, this book is well worth the reading for any student of Churchill and the British-American wartime coalition. •

Forthcoming Works

Winston Churchill's Imagination, by Paul Alkon
(Bucknell University Press, 2006).

Although Churchill is a 1953 Nobel laureate in literature, his famous speeches have overshadowed his other writing. FH contributor Paul Alkon concentrates on key works in modes other than political rhetoric to show how Churchill engages readers with those words and ideas that are hallmarks of his imagination. Chapters include his literary relationship with Lawrence of Arabia; his intense, little-known involvement with cinema in his essay on Charlie Chaplin; and as a script writer and consultant for Alexander Korda; his evocation of paintings as templates for narrative in his first history and his only novel; his imaginative engagement with science and science fiction; the depiction of time, duration, and alternative history in Marlborough; and Churchill's last testament in the realm of imagination, The Dream. (FH 126:45).

Finest Hour has asked historian Ted Hutchinson, editor of the Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics (see p. 14), to continue this column in order to help us keep track of upcoming works.
Encounters at Chartwell and Egypt
CAPTAIN HUGH OWEN RN

My father, Commander J.H. Owen RN, was Sir Winston Churchill's naval adviser for his classic biography, *Marlborough, His Life and Times*, which was published in four volumes in Britain and six volumes in the USA between 1933 and 1938. Churchill also employed a young historian (Maurice Ashley) as an adviser, as well as an Oxford don who had a big part to play. This was Sir William Deakin, who distinguished himself in the Second World War, when he was chosen by Churchill to lead a mission to Tito, leader of the Yugoslav Communist Party, after Germany's invasion of his country in 1941. (See page 17.)

My elder brother (who died aged 14) my twin sister and I were all brought up to admire Churchill and had no difficulty in doing so. When I was about nine my father drove us all from Chatham, where we lived, to Chartwell, where he had an appointment to discuss aspects of the book with the then-Mr. Churchill. We left him at Chartwell while my mother and we three children had a picnic lunch on a hill looking down on the property. From here we could see Churchill and my father pacing back and forth in his garden discussing the book.

On one of my father's later visits to Chartwell, as he told us, Churchill's youngest child, the twelve-year-old Mary (now Lady Soames), came home from school.

"What have you learnt today?" asked WSC.

"We learnt that King John was a very bad king," Mary replied.

"Ah, Commander," said Churchill to my father, "if only our history was so simple."

The next time I saw Winston Churchill was in February 1945, when I was a midshipman (the only one on the ship) serving in the cruiser HMS *Aurora*. After the Big Three Yalta conference between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin in February 1945, Churchill flew to Alexandria, where he had a long talk with President Roosevelt.

Churchill used *Aurora* as his headquarters, though he spent most of the day in Roosevelt's ship, the USS *Quincy*. However, he made time when he returned to HMS *Aurora* to speak to our assembled ship's company, and to tell us about the Yalta conference. He said how well he thought he had got on with Stalin, expressed admiration of the Soviet army and urged the need to be friends with the Russians after the war. He concluded with appreciative remarks about *Aurora*'s war service.

With him were his son Randolph, his daughter Sarah, his doctor Lord Moran, three male and one female secretaries and Inspector Thompson, his Scotland Yard detective. It had been a gruelling trip for the aged Prime Minister, not to mention the President.

"How very old and tired [WSC] was going down the gangway for his visit to Roosevelt," I wrote to my parents. When he left *Aurora* the entire ship's company rushed to the side of the ship to watch him go. As the boat moved away he gave us the V-sign and called out, "God speed and good luck."

He then flew to Cairo where he had meetings with the King of Egypt, the Emperor of Ethiopia, the President of Syria and the King of Saudi Arabia. The latter had come up to Egypt in an American destroyer and returned in the rather larger and more comfortable *Aurora*. Judging by the gifts he gave to each member of *Aurora*'s ship's company, he was more than satisfied.

As a souvenir of the occasion, one of Churchill's secretaries gave me a page of No. 10 Downing Street, Whitehall writing-paper with "Prime Minister" and the royal coat-of-arms on it. I still have it in my photograph album.

Captain Owen, RN (Retd.) is a member of ICS (UK).
Industrial Chartwell

ABSTRACT BY ROBERT H, COURTS

"Churchill's Historical Factory" by David Reynolds. BBC History Magazine, April 2005.

Churchill's literary output was truly astonishing: even while Chancellor of the Exchequer in the 1920s, he managed to produce most of the five volumes in six parts of The World Crisis, a process that was repeated in the 1930s with Marlborough, the first drafts of his History of the English-Speaking Peoples, and again after the Second World War with his war memoirs.

This massive output, always accompanied by Churchill's other interests and duties (including the journalistic output that was the staple of his financial life), was only made possible by the use of an intensive "historical factory." This comprised a number of researchers who would help produce the books which were made up of the "three Ds": dictation, documents and drafts. In other words, passages made up of Churchill's dictation from his own memories, documents he had written at the time, and drafts prepared by the researchers.

By the time The Second World War was written, the unknown young men who had helped Churchill in the 1930s had given way to distinguished academic and military figures, creating a formidable "syndicate" who helped Churchill produce his definitive work.

The work went through many drafts. Churchill hated working from handwritten pages or even typescript. These would be sent off to the printers to be made up into galley proofs. It was then that additional material was put in, corrections and cuts made, and Churchill put in the necessary phrases that made the work unmistakably his. Some of the chapters would go through this process half-a-dozen times before the final version was approved.

Yet, despite the "many hands" who helped produce the work, it is clear that Churchill kept firm control. He saw the project as a whole, not getting bogged down in detail and making sure that the books contained his own inimitable style, language and phrasing.

It could be argued that Churchill did not actually write much of these books himself. But as his researcher Denis Kelly put it, that is "almost as superficial a question as asking a master chef: did you cook the whole banquet with your own hands?"


Churchill must have been the only recipient of the Nobel Prize for literature who was less than thrilled about getting it; he had hoped for the Peace Prize. By that point, Churchill was clinging to office because he felt a mission to stop the Cold War becoming hot. A man of war for much of his life, Churchill wanted to end his career as a man of peace.

He had not ended the 1940s as such. The advent of the Cold War had not surprised him, and he rejoiced that only the West had the atomic bomb. In 1950, after the Soviets' first atomic test, Churchill must have pondered that if the Americans based in Britain were to atom-bomb Russia, it would be upon Britain, not America, that Russian bombs would fall in reprisal. For it was about this time that Churchill turned from assuming the inevitability of conflict with the Soviet Union to seeking to avoid it.

When Churchill returned to office in 1951, he continued the atomic programme. The pragmatic realism that governed his strategic thinking told him that the Soviet Union, while bound to take advantage of a weak opponent, would respect and bargain with a well-armed one. When Stalin died in 1953, Churchill hoped his successors might be more approachable, especially if he could meet them face to face. He therefore adopted the language of peaceful coexistence, and his policy came to be known as "detente."

Churchill wanted a high-level conference as soon as possible. He realised that the H-bomb was not just another new weapon. He wanted to make sure that his Soviet counterparts understood the gravity of the situation. He was disturbed but not panicked by the power of the new weapon, and would have preferred communications with the Soviets to confrontation. At the same time, however, he made sure that Britain did not fall behind in the arms race. The H-bomb was an abhorrent weapon, but if possession of it was the only way to keep the peace in the Cold War, then a peace-loving nation could not afford to be without it.

But Churchill had eventually to abandon hope of a summit meeting with the Soviets, denied as he was support, either in his own Cabinet or in Washington. He did not, however, give up hope of preventing the outbreak of nuclear war. He believed that the men in the Kremlin were realists and made the same distinction between the Soviet regime and the Russian people as he had in 1941. There was, however, little that Churchill could actually do. His voice was one of the most prestigious of those trying to measure up to the H-bomb's apocalyptic menace, and he must have contributed to the foundation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, whose demand for all-round nuclear disarmament was closer to Churchill's position than either he or they can have realised. He was, with a different vision of how to do it, a nuclear disarmer too.
Remembering the SS City of Benares


While not qualifying for review in these pages, Miracles on the Water may be of interest to readers. It concerns the sinking of the British passenger liner City of Benares. Author Tom Nagorski tells us it is "in large part the story of the child evacuees who were traveling on board, and in particular how a handful of them were rescued. Winston Churchill, as you probably know, was deeply opposed to plans to evacuate children; he believed such programs would signal that Britain was losing its stomach for war."

Nagorski, a senior producer at ABC's World News Tonight and winner of three Emmy Awards, "scores a bull's-eye" according to Publisher's Weekly. The Benares, with 406 crew and passengers, was torpedoed by a German U-boat 630 miles out in the North Atlantic on 17 September 1940, in stormy waters. "Those who made it into lifeboats faced gale-force winds and icy waters—a recipe for hypothermia. With the nearest help 300 miles away, the survivors faced long odds. Despite frequent heroism, many drowned or died of overexposure before the HMS Hurricane arrived and rescued 108 survivors. In its search, HMS Hurricane missed Lifeboat 12, and its passengers endured eight more harrowing days on the open sea before being rescued. In all, only thirteen of the ninety children survived. Nagorski, whose great-uncle was among the survivors, bases his narrative largely on eyewitness accounts.

Roland Green in Booklist comments: "Nagorski's thoroughly gripping account of a sinking during the Battle of the Atlantic of World War II has more of tragedy than the miraculous in it. When the British liner City of Benares was hit in the fall of 1940, among those aboard were some hundred children being evacuated to Canada, and most of them were lost. Considering the faulty intelligence and bad weather, the rescue work that was done was a very considerable accomplishment. The real miracle was the survival of lifeboat 12 and most of her forty-six passengers (the boat was designed for thirty) for eight days with minimal food and water."

The sinking did much to validate Churchill's belief that children should not be evacuated from Britain, on the grounds of safety as well as the nation's morale.

The Doctor and the Soldier"

M ajor Philip Carter RAMC, a military medical officer writes: "I would be grateful if you could help me tie down a Churchill quotation: "The spectacle of a doctor in action among soldiers in equal danger with equal courage, saving lives where all others are taking them, allaying fear where all others are causing it, is one which must always seem glorious, whether to God or men."

This fine quotation is from Churchill's first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force 1897 (London: Longmans Green 1898), pages 46-47:

Lieutenant Ford was dangerously wounded in the shoulder. The bullet cut the artery, and he was bleeding to death when Surgeon-Lieutenant J. H. Hugo came to his aid. The fire was too hot to allow of lights being used. There was no cover of any sort. It was at the bottom of the cup. Nevertheless the surgeon struck a match at the peril of his life and examined the wound. The match went out amid a splutter of bullets which kicked up the dust all around, but by its uncertain light he saw the nature of the injury. The officer had already fainted from the loss of blood.

The doctor seized the artery and, as no other ligature was forthcoming, he remained under fire for three hours holding a man's life between his finger and thumb. When at length it seemed that the enemy had broken into the camp he picked up the still unconscious officer in his arms and, without relaxing his hold, bore him to a place of safety. His arm was for many hours paralysed with cramp from the effects of the exertion of compressing the artery.

I think there are few, whatever may be their views or interests, who will not applaud this splendid act of devotion. The profession of medicine, and surgery, must always rank as the most noble that men can adopt. The spectacle of a doctor in action... [rest of quotation as cited by Major Carter]. It is impossible to imagine any situation from which a human being might better leave this world and embark on the hazards of the Unknown.

Editor's note: Finding this was a surprise because I didn't know there was a precedent to this quotation, which I have always thought first appeared in Churchill's article, "The Doctor and the Soldier," published in V.C. for 16 July 1903 (Woods C30, Cohen C223)—an expansion of his account from the Malakand. The article was later collected in a book, The Bravest Deed I Ever Saw: Stories of Personal Experience, A. H. Miles, editor (London: Hutchinson, 1905, Woods B1, Cohen B4). The essay may also be found in the official biography, Winston S. Churchill, vol. 2, Young Statesman, by Randolph S. Churchill (London: Heinemann, 1967, 64.) A copy of "The Doctor and the Soldier," is also available by email from editor.

FineST HOUR 131/45

Woods Corner is a bookish column named for the pioneer bibliographer of Churchill's works, the late Frederick Woods.
CHURCHILL IN PARLIAMENT

Question Time

CHURCHILL was a master of Parliamentary Questions, wherein friends and opponents tried to put him on the spot...and some of the issues from 1943 sound eerily familiar at the moment.

‘Not Due to Slothfulness

On 20 July 1943 a Member drew attention to a statement by the Prime Minister of Canada regarding the lack of recognition of the part played by Canadian troops in Sicilian operations.

WSC: "As I understand it, the point of the Canadian Prime Minister's remarks was that in the initial draft communique...reference was made only to 'Allied' Forces. On seeing this draft the Canadian authorities asked that at the earliest possible date reference should be made to the fact that Canadian Forces were taking part in the landing. Despite some possible security objections, this was at once agreed to by General Eisenhower....

"Owing to the greater distance of London from Ottawa and the six hours difference in time between them, information to this effect reached Ottawa from Washington sooner than from London. But this was not due to any slothfulness or want of appreciation on the part of any British authority....Our hearts go out to the rest of the powerful Canadian Army in this country, who have for more than three years guarded the centre of the Empire from invasion."

Vaccinations

On 22 September 1943 Churchill was asked to state that any man or woman in the Services could refuse to be vaccinated without suffering any penalty.

WSC: "Inoculation is voluntary in all three Services...In the Navy, however, in the interests of the health of ships' companies, it is necessary to refuse to those who have not been inoculated permission to land in ports where there may be a danger of contracting any of the diseases against which this treatment is aimed. If individuals who refuse to be inoculated have been threatened in any way, and if my hon. Friend will forward the particulars to the Ministers concerned, the facts will be looked into."

The Sword of Stalingrad

On 21 October 1943 a Member asked whether MPs would have an opportunity to inspect the Sword of Stalingrad before it was sent to Russia.

WSC: "The time likely to be available for the exhibition of the sword to the public is extremely limited, and we are anxious to use it in such a way as will enable the sword to be seen as widely and by as many people as possible. This involves complicated arrangements with which I should be reluctant to interfere. As has already been announced, it is the intention that the sword should be on exhibition in Westminster Abbey on 29th, 30th and 31st of this month. I will endeavour to arrange for special facilities to be given for hon. Members to see it there."

Money vs. Valour

On 21 July 1943, a Member urged that the £10 a year grant to holders of the Victoria Cross should be increased, since £10 seemed to him to be an extremely paltry reward for achievement of such distinction.

WSC: "Further inquiries have been made, but they do not show any evidence of general complaint as to the adequacy of this special provision. I do not think any change in this well-established practice is called for. I do not think this is a matter to be settled entirely on a money basis, and I do not propose to advise the House to make any change. If we were to compute these matters by money values, I should be strongly in favour of much larger sums; but I think that would alter the character of these awards."

Basic English

Several questions were asked on 4 November 1943 regarding Basic English.

WSC: "Basic English is not intended for use among English-speaking people, but to enable a much larger body of people who do not have the good fortune to know the English language to participate more easily in our society. People are quite purblind who discuss this matter as if Basic English were a substitute for the English language."
Watching Churchill Take Command of History

IF YOU'VE SAVED YOUR COUNTRY, what do you do for an encore?

BY DAVID REYNOLDS

"What are you writing now?" asked a friend.

When I told him, he frowned: "I thought there was nothing more to say about Churchill." His words made me think hard, but I decided there were unquestionably some new things to say about one of the most celebrated figures in modern history. And that's why I wrote In Command of History.

First of all, my book exposes a neglected side of this multi-faceted man. Much has been written about Churchill the politician, from his earliest days as a fiery Liberal to the "Indian Summer" of his second premiership. We also know an enormous amount about Churchill the warrior and strategist, particularly during the two world wars; likewise about his prowess as an orator and his long career as a parliamentarian.

Yet Churchill made his living as a writer. Much of his literary output was journalism, ranging from hard-hitting political commentary to lightweight money-spinners such as "Are There Men on the Moon?" But he also produced some forty books, from the war reportage that made his name in the 1890s to his History of the English-Speaking Peoples some sixty years later.

Thanks to Richard Langworth's Connoisseur's Guide to the Books of Sir Winston Churchill I had an invaluable overview to all the various editions. Robin Prior has written a perceptive analysis of The World Crisis and James Muller's definitive edition of The River War will soon be available. But those two books represent only a fraction of Churchill's oeuvre. Moreover, virtually all his literary correspondence is now open to researchers in the superb Archives Centre at Churchill College, Cambridge, enabling us to trace how Churchill wrote his great works.

I've followed that paper trail for the six volumes of The Second World War, which were published in the United States between 1948 and 1953 (1954 in Britain because Cassell's in London were hamstrung by continued paper rationing). In the Churchill archives there's a file for almost every chapter. From them you get a good idea of the way Churchill wrote, what I call in shorthand his three D's: documents, dictation, and drafts.

By documents I mean the telegrams, minutes and directives he dictated during the war. Printed month by month at the time, these were literally cut and pasted to form the basis of a chapter. To connect the documents Churchill dictated reminiscences of crucial wartime moments, particularly his meetings with the French in 1940 and his conferences with Roosevelt and Stalin later in the war. His "Syndicate" of research assistants contributed drafts on battles such as Alamein, often drawn from confidential Whitehall archives to which they were given privileged access. The result was some "state-of-the-art" accounts of many key episodes of the war.

Each chapter went through numerous versions—maybe up to a dozen—so one can see what Churchill put in and decided to take out. In the process he sometimes toned down intemperate comments about wartime colleagues—generals who had failed to attack with sufficient gusto; or foreign leaders who had become postwar statesmen, such as Tito, Eisenhower and de Gaulle. These cuts denied readers some of his choicest epithets about the French leader, such as "symptoms of a budding Führer" or "a combination of Joan of Arc and Clemenceau."

Under pressure from Whitehall, he also removed all reference to the Ultra Secret—the work of the code-breakers at Bletchley Park in cracking the German Enigma machines. Churchill's grasp of signals intelligence and his support for Bletchley rank among his most significant achievements as a war leader. The omission of this story from his memoirs was not only to the detriment of his reputation, until rectified in the 1980s. It also subtly distorted his account of many of the major battles, implying that success or failure turned solely on the personal qualities of the commanders. That, of course, fitted Churchill's great-man theory of history.

Even from this brief summary, it is evident that what we call in shorthand "Churchill's memoirs" were complex pieces of work. All those docu-
ments and drafts made the volumes more than simply memoir; the contributions from the Syndicate also made them more than simply Churchill’s.

Some British reviewers of my book seemed to think that this demeaned him, but it wasn’t my opinion. Churchill went through the drafts remorselessly. Although he nodded through some peripheral material—the defeat of Poland in 1939, for instance, is mostly the work of his assistant, General Sir Henry Pownall—Churchill gave close attention to passages that really mattered, sharpening the language and clarifying the argument. He also had a sense of the work as a whole. Sometimes his assistants suggested further revisions to a chapter but Churchill usually wanted to push on. He alone saw the memoirs as part of his larger agenda.

This brings me to the second big reason why I wrote *In Command of History*—to illuminate what I call "Churchill’s Forgotten Years** between 1945 and 1951. In comparison with the Wilderness Years of the 1930s and his Finest Hour as Britain’s war leader against Hitler, this period has tended to fall under the dustsheets of history. Yet I came to realize, first, that one can’t understand the war memoirs without appreciating what else Churchill was trying to do at the same time; and, second, that those years after 1945 offer a fascinating insight into what made him tick.

Let me explain what I mean with an archival anecdote. Turning over page after page can sometimes become tedious but there are revelatory moments as compensation. For instance, leafing through a file of background material for Churchill’s final volume six, I found an outline chronology of 1945 prepared by his assistants. Against the entry for the election of July 1945 Churchill had scrawled, "I Was Kicked Out."

He wrote this in 1950, a reminder of how Labour’s massive victory still rankled. That election became the starting point of my book.

In July 1945 Churchill could easily have retired from public life: if you’ve saved your country, what do you do for an encore? Most men with his achievements would have accepted the fact of political defeat and bowed out gracefully. But Churchill, as we know, was not like most men.

For one thing, he had to keep going. In my book I’ve noted how his experience in the 1910s in piloting early propeller airplanes provided him with a metaphor for living. "To stop is to fall" he said repeatedly. That was one reason why he wouldn’t give up the Tory leadership after the war.

But I think he was also reluctant because the election of July 1945 was not just a defeat but a humiliation. Steeped as he was in British history, Churchill knew one had to go back to 1906, and before that 1832, to find a greater landslide against the Tories. What hurt even more was that in 1940 he was the voice of embattled Britain, the lion who gave the people’s roar; yet in 1945 he had seemed out of touch with the electorate. "I have no message for them," he murmured sadly at one point in the campaign. In May 1940 he had become Prime Minister not through election but because of a Commons revolt against Chamberlain. When he went to the people for a mandate in 1945, they gave him, it seemed, a resounding "no."

So Churchill kept going because of his nature but also, I think, in a search for vindication. He was determined to get back to Ten Downing Street as the people’s choice. This, I came to realize, was the essential backdrop to his writing of the war memoirs. Yes, Churchill was determined to get his own account of the war into print as soon as possible, as a preemptive strike on the verdict of history. He also intended to make big money from the venture, to set himself and his family on a secure financial footing. But the memoirs were only part of his postwar agenda.

Still hankering after the limelight, he accepted invitations to give major speeches. Fulton and Zurich during 1946 were perhaps the most influential orations of his career: "Iron Curtain" and "United Europe" became sound bites that echoed around the world, proving that Churchill had found his voice again. He ignored Tory pressures to resign, bamboozling Anthony Eden, his professional heir-apparent, into handling much of the daily grind in the Commons. That gave him time to concentrate on speeches and on the memoirs.

By law the next General Election had to take place within five years, in other words by July 1950. Churchill therefore felt he had to finish the memoirs, or the bulk of the work on...
WATCHING CHURCHILL...

them, before that date. But the Twenties and Thirties, which he initially expected to breeze through in five chapters, expanded to take up half of volume I as he became fascinated by the counterfactuals, the what-ifs, of appeasement. Volume II covered only May to December 1940, as Churchill revisited his finest hour in passionate detail. After three years work, in the summer of 1949 he was still trying to finish volume three, which covered only 1941. All the time, the electoral clock was ticking.

In August 1949 the pressure increased dramatically. While on a working vacation on the French Riviera, Churchill suffered a stroke. (See "Churchill's Dagger, FH 87:14. —Ed.) Compared with June 1953 this was a minor affair, but another revelation. In November 1949 Churchill dictated a reminder to his secretary: he must talk to his publishers about what to do with the memoirs in two contingencies—either a return to Downing Street or in the event of his death.

Reading this note, I realized that Churchill, never one to take long life for granted, was sobered by this new intimation of mortality. This helped to explain why he sent volume III to the publishers in what was clearly an unsatisfactory state, with too many documents and too little narrative. By the following spring he was admitting it was not his best work. From now on he cut corners in an effort to finish the race, but the combined pressures of health and politics make this understandable. To borrow his own vivid image about the servitude of authorship, Churchill had to kill the monster before the monster killed him.

Even at this new pace, Churchill would have been caught short had he won the election Attlee called in February 1950. Fortunately for him, Labour scraped back with a tiny majority, lasting another twenty months before Churchill finally won from the British voters the vindication he craved. By then, October 1951, five volumes had been published and the last was in serviceable draft.

There are many memorable passages in The Second World War. In The Gathering Storm, one of his best books, I particularly like Churchill's account of a tedious farewell dinner in 1938 for the German Ambassador which he ends, deadpan, with the words: "This was the last time I saw Herr von Ribbentrop before he was hanged."

Overall, however, the work is not Churchill's finest piece of composition. In many places the documents, dictation and drafts are not fully blended—his publishers kept complaining about too many documents and too little narrative—and the volumes are much fuller on the first half of Britain's war than the second. My book helps explain some of these flaws by showing what else was on Winston Churchill's agenda at the time.

But that varied agenda—redeeming himself politically, delivering some of the greatest speeches of his career, and generating nearly two million words to stamp his version of the war on posterity—makes him seem all the more remarkable.

I finished writing In Command of History mindful of the comment of Harry Hopkins, Franklin Roosevelt's workaholic emissary, after his first encounters with Churchill in January 1941: "Jesus Christ! What a man!"

RESEARCHERS' CORRESPONDENCE

Orwell and Germany

I am a student in Taiwan doing a mock trial. The accusation is: "Is George Orwell guilty of misanthropy?" One of our witnesses is Winston Churchill. Do you know any information about how Churchill influenced Orwell? —Kenta Lin

Dear Kenta Lin:

First, enter "Orwell" into our website search engine. You will get five references, some of which may be of use. Second, I checked for Orwell references in the official biography, Winston S. Churchill, by Martin Gilbert, vol. VIII, published London: Heinemann, 1988. There is only one, on page 801:

"On February 19 [1953] Churchill's doctor found him reading George Orwell's 1984. 'Have you read it, Charles?' he asked. 'Oh, you must. I'm reading it for a second time. It is a very remarkable book.'"

I think you might argue that Churchill would testify for the defense in your mock trial of Orwell for misanthropy. Churchill would have not seen hate for humanity, but perhaps rather despair for it, in Orwell's 1984. Also, Churchill himself was an optimist—anything but a misanthrope. He would certainly have looked upon Orwell as a prophet of things to come, if proper precautions were not taken to safeguard liberty.

***

Reading the exchange of correspondence on the thesis M. Etienne Marchal is preparing (FH 127:29), I regret that the actions of the personnel of Bomber Command of the RAF and U. S. Army Air Force continue to be called into question in isolation. Whatever the suffering of the Kriegskinder and their families, it is a fact that within three years of the end of the war in Europe former Bomber Command aircrews redeemed themselves under testing conditions by participating in the breaking of the Soviet blockade of Berlin.
In 1948-49, the sound of Merlin engines that hitherto had struck terror in Germany became music to the ears of 2.25 million Berliners. Their sole resource was drinking water; every other need—food, water, coal, fuel oil, generators, etc.—had to be carried in by air. A large proportion of the Allied contingent in the Berlin Airlift were decorated former heavy bomber and pathfinder crews.

With the same sense of duty that motivated them through the war, these men frustrated the Soviet aim to occupy the whole of Berlin by starving the Allied garrisons into submission. Had the Allies failed, and events taken a different turn, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that Europe up to the Rhine could have been under Russian occupation, with untold repercussions to the governments of Italy and France—to say nothing of the humiliation of Britain and America in the eyes of the world.

In December 1948 Churchill, as Leader of the Opposition, made a speech in which he congratulated Ernest Bevin (British Foreign Secretary) and his colleagues upon the success, surpassing expectation, of the prodigious airlift to feed the people of Berlin. The airlift taught the people of Germany on the other side of the Iron Curtain—in a way which no speeches, arguments or promises could do—that their future lay in ever closer association with the western world. (See the official biography, vol. 8, "Never Despair" by Martin Gilbert, page 448).

Unlike America and Australia, Britain has never seen fit to recognise officially the part played by her personnel in this pivotal event in the history of Europe: an air supply operation unsurpassed to this day in magnitude, duration and intensity.

Whatever Etienne’s findings, I hope he will feel able to conclude his thesis by indicating that air supremacy need not be destructive and that it can be a powerful weapon in resolving differences without resorting to arms.

---Norman H.G. Hurst, Surrey, UK

Churchill’s Reputation: The State of the Debate

continued from page 38...

back to reliable sources (Sir Martin Gilbert primarily, and the original documents), explain the meaning, and above all the historical context, and deny the outlandish accusations. Even respectable sources may get the facts wrong. For example, I was dismayed last month to hear BBC Radio Four’s “Today” programme state without correction that Churchill sent troops against striking miners in Toneypandy, using fixed bayonets.

No one can deny that there are genuine issues to be looked into, and criticisms to be made: Toneypandy and associated strikes, the Suffragettes, changing parties, the Dardanelles, the return to the Gold Standard, the General Strike, India, the Abdication and Norway, to name but a few. These are reasonable debates. Not so are the lurid conspiracy theories, detailing Churchill’s allegedly nefarious activities, which are absurdities. It is crucial for serious historians to be able to differentiate between the two.

As a Tory Nationalist myself, I have in many ways a lot of sympathy with the late Alan Clark and Professor John Charmley, with regard to their nostalgia for the empire Britain lost. Yet I fail to see how anyone can argue that Britain would have been better off if she had made an "arrangement" with Hitler in 1940-41. All Europe would have been under the Nazi sway, and there would have been no reason for the Americans to have entered the war. The Russians only just stayed in the war in 1941-42. If they had been knocked out of the war, and Hitler’s Reich had stretched from Brest to the Urals, Britain would have been in a far worse position in 1945 than she was.

What if Stalin had won? The Russian people made an astonishing sacrifice in the war, and they didn’t crack. Had they survived after that sacrifice, without even Lend-Lease to add some little good-will, the Russians would have dominated Europe, and there would have been no Western Allies in Europe in 1945: it would have been them on the Channel ports, not the Nazis. It is inconceivable that that would have left us stronger.

Of course, the Charmley/Clark thesis depends upon a belief in Hitler’s willingness to keep his word in any treaty signed with Britain. On his 50th birthday, the German Foreign Office gave Adolf Hitler a silver casket with all the treaties signed by him since he had come to power. Hitler asked how many the Nazis had kept. Amidst roars of laughter, Ribbentrop informed him that he didn’t believe they had upheld a single one. That being the case, what kind of trust could one put upon the Germans at all? Britain would have had to maintain a draining state of constant readiness.

We must recognise that by 1935, the Empire’s fate was sealed. India was moving toward independence; peace with Hitler would not have prevented that. It is inconceivable that, by the 1970s and 1980s, Britain would still have had her empire. Moreover, this thesis does not address the moral question, largely ignored by Charmley and Clark, regarding the fate of the Jews. The Nazis managed to kill six million, and had another four to five million in their power. One has to assume that, if peace had been granted to Hitler, they all would have been exterminated.

I’d like to end with a different Churchill quotation from the same speech about Neville Chamberlain, with which I started this talk:

"What is the worth of all this? The only guide to a man is his conscience; the only shield to his memory is the rectitude and sincerity of his actions. It is very imprudent to walk through life without this shield, because we are so often mocked by the failure of our hopes and the upsetting of our calculations; but with this shield, however the fates may play, we march always in the ranks of honour.”

Winston Churchill marches there still.

FINEST HOUR 131/50
1591. In 1950, who reminded Churchill that it had been fifty years since he had proposed marriage to her? (C)

1592. What newspaper magnate wrote that Bonar Law always accepted the "Pogrom" theory of the Ulster Crisis and thought Churchill its leader? (L)

1593. Christabel Pankhurst and Annie Kenny, suffragettes who interrupted WSC's pre-election meeting in North-West Manchester, were arrested and fined. When Churchill heard that they were imprisoned for refusing to pay the fine, what offer did he make? (M)

1594. Why did Churchill oppose the Government's decision to refer the Aliens Bill to a Grand Committee? (P)

1595. What longtime friend told WSC of the new German Navy Law prior to its announcement in May 1912? (S)

1596. Why did Churchill remove Sir Arthur Wilson as First Sea Lord before WW1? (W)

1597. Who was the opponent about whom Churchill wrote, in his first campaign as a Liberal: "The worst that can be said about him is that he runs the risk of being most humorous when he wishes to be most serious." (C)

1598. Who wrote to Churchill on 3Sep14: "Kitchener knows nothing about European warfare...and never will be a commander in the field"? (L)

1599. WSC's 1910 Shops Bill was strongly opposed by shop keepers. Name three of his proposals. (M)

1600. With what weapon did suffragette Theresa Garnett attack Churchill at a Bristol railway station? (P)

1601. In January 1914 Churchill instructed Rear Admiral Sir Lewis Bayley to study the possibility of what early offensive action in case of war? (S)

1602. How many Sea Lords were in Churchill's first Board of Admiralty? (W)

1603. In March 1914 Churchill, speaking in Bradford, attacked Carson, who, he said, "was engaged in a treasonable conspiracy." Who was Carson? (C)

1604. In 1915 Churchill wrote the obituary of a soldier who died on his way to the Dardanelles: "A voice had been audible, a note had been struck, more true, more thrilling, more able to do justice to the nobility of our youth in arms engaged in the present war, than any other." Who was the deceased? (L)

1605. When Churchill replaced Reginald McKenna as First Lord of the Admiralty, he escorted McKenna to his new office and introduced him. To whom was McKenna introduced? (M)

1606. What Tory MP referred to Churchill as a "Lilliput Napoleon"? (P)

1607. What was the disagreement between Churchill and King George V over the promotion of Admirals? (S)

1608. As a result of German troops disregarding a British white flag in WW1, what order did WSC issue for handling German ships hoisting a white flag? (W)

1609. Clementine Churchill said his "demand for coalition had destroyed her husband's position and shattered his career" in 1915. Who was he? (C)

1610. What famous friend later recorded her impressions of WSC in Winston Churchill As I Knew Him? (L)

1611. The Other Club had a rule which forbade any toast except to the King. But after the start of World War I they allowed one additional toast. What was it? (M)

1612. En route to Teheran, Churchill asked Capt. Pim how many miles he had travelled since September 1939. Roughly, what was the total? (P)

1613. To what island did Churchill refer when he said on 2 March 1915: "If Russia has Constantinople and the Straits, we ought to have X"? (S)

1614. Which British troop division did Kitchener promise Churchill for the Dardanelles landings? (W)

ANSWERS

1591. F. A. (H. W., A. L.)
1592. The Daily Mail (L)
1593. Bertrand Russell (P)
1594. His friendship with Winston Churchill (P)
1595. Lord Grey (S)
1596. His decision to remove Sir Arthur Wilson as First Sea Lord before WW1 (W)
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1608. As a result of German troops disregarding a British white flag in WW1, what order did WSC issue for handling German ships hoisting a white flag? (W)
1609. Clementine Churchill said his "demand for coalition had destroyed her husband's position and shattered his career" in 1915. Who was he? (C)
1610. What famous friend later recorded her impressions of WSC in Winston Churchill As I Knew Him? (L)
1611. The Other Club had a rule which forbade any toast except to the King. But after the start of World War I they allowed one additional toast. What was it? (M)
1612. En route to Teheran, Churchill asked Capt. Pim how many miles he had travelled since September 1939. Roughly, what was the total? (P)
1613. To what island did Churchill refer when he said on 2 March 1915: "If Russia has Constantinople and the Straits, we ought to have X"? (S)
1614. Which British troop division did Kitchener promise Churchill for the Dardanelles landings? (W)
It is a sudden descent which I have made upon you, and I must express my gratitude that so many members of the Assembly should have found it possible at such very short notice—excusable only by wartime conditions—to attend this meeting.

Here I come, as leader of the House of Commons, to call upon you in the second oldest Parliament in the world.... It is a long way back to 1620. Yet these ideas of parliamentary government, of the representation of the people upon franchises, which extend as time goes on, and which in our country have reached the complete limits of universal suffrage, these institutions and principles constitute at this moment one of the great causes which are being fought out in the world.

We are confronted with embattled powers not based upon the public will, allowing no freedom of discussion, or speech or even of thought, but seeking to subjugate great nations and, if they can succeed, the whole world, on the basis of a party caucus, on the basis of a military hierarchy, on the basis of tyranny, terror, and brute force. We are confronted with totalitarian States which deny as a fundamental principle the right of free debate and the expression of popular opinion.

At one time it seemed that we should be alone. We were for a long time alone. We have stood alone all through the summer and the autumn and the winter of 1940 and 1941. But we did not flinch, we did not weaken. We did not worry because we could not see our way through. We said we will do our duty, we will do our best. The rest we must leave to Providence. And what a reward has cornel

What a lesson it is never to give in—never to give in when you guard the cause of freedom. What a moral there is to be drawn from that, because now we see great Powers rising that have come to our aid...

[In the lease of bases to the United States in Bermuda and elsewhere] You have cause to be proud that it has fallen to your lot to make this important contribution to a better world.

And for your contribution to these supreme and even, if I may say so, sublime ends, I am very happy to have found myself here today, to express on behalf of the Motherland and of the British House of Commons our profound gratitude.

—WSC, HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, HAMILTON, BERMUDA, 15 JANUARY 1942