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Scottish Tour 2008

I received FH 132 this morning and had a good but not thorough look at it over lunch. The article on Iraq has a particular poignancy over here just now with the PM recently blurting out that he agreed with Sir David Frost that the current adventure there is a disaster.

It sounds like the Churchill Tour of England last year was a rousing success and enjoyed by all. I see you would like to return to the North of England and Scotland in the Spring of 2008; let me know if I can be of any assistance in regards to the Edinburgh leg of such a tour. There are many Churchill-related aspects in these parts, as members of past Churchill Tours to Scotland know.

Dr. David G. Grant, Deputy Director
Logistics Centre, Fairbairn Univ., Edinburgh

Churchill Tours is planned for early May 2008, starting and ending in Glasgow. Highlights include eight speakers, at least two five-star hotels, Edinburgh, the ancestral home of Clementine Churchill at Airlie Castle, WSC's old Dundee constituency, the Hebridean Isle of Mull, the legendary golfing resort of Gleneagles, a black tie dinner in the State Dining Room aboard the Royal Yacht Britannia, and a side trip to the Lake District. We will visit every important Churchill site in southern Scotland. Full details will be available shortly.

PROCEEDINGS AND LAST LION

I read Churchill Proceedings 2001-2003 and on the "Gathering Storm" in Iraq, delivered in 2002, before the invasion. I was disappointed that you didn't speculate what WSC would do with Iraq, but as Lady Soames says, "How do you know?" However, as with everything you write, it was interesting and easy reading.

Any news on the third volume of Manchester's The Last Lion?

Several Readers Writing Separately

The "Great Republic" is falling into a no man's land with one foot rooted in the follies of the past and the other foot afraid to step boldly into the future. Never in history have we more needed Winston Churchill's vision, courage, and determination. We have lost our way and have become more preoccupied with style than substance. When our leaders refuse to lead, and our warriors refuse to fight, then we will hear that distant trumpet play a mournful taps over what was once the greatest experiment in human liberty. Everything we hold dear is being looted by the thugs of a new dark age. Who will wear a red poppy for the USA?

Cdr. Larry Kryske, USN (Ret), Garland, Texas

There is nothing so instructive as to visit a third world country. Returning from Mexico, I realized how wonderful it is to live in America. But many of us don't realize how good we have it, and how much we take for granted. I thought about Churchill's remark, "If mortal catastrophe should ever overtake the British Nation, historians a thousand years hence will...never understand how a victorious nation suffered themselves to be brought low, and to cast away all that they had gained through measureless sacrifice." Sacrifice like Private Willie McBride.

We have 20- and 30-year-olds who don't even know who the Vice President is. Our young people have inherited the greatest nation on earth and they don't even know what they have inherited or why or how they inherited it, or for that matter, I greatly fear in some cases, what the word inherited even means.

Marcus Frost, Mexia, Texas
EDITOR'S ESSAY

Trends in Churchill Studies

Our new President and Board of Governors have asked me to implement important changes in *Finest Hour* which are immediately evident in this issue—beginning with the new subtitle on our cover: "The Journal of Winston Churchill."

What this means to signify is the shift of "institutional" articles—messages from or about officers, events coverage, affiliate news, and business matters—to an expanded *Chartwell Bulletin*, leaving *Finest Hour* with The Churchill Centre's "meat and potatoes": a dedicated exploration of Winston Spencer Churchill's life and times (warts and all); a quarterly guide to Churchill's abiding relevance, inimitably summarized by Sir Martin Gilbert: "...as I open file after file of Churchill's archive, from his entry into Government in 1905 to his retirement in 1955, I am continually surprised by the truth of his assertions, the modernity of his thought, the originality of his mind, the constructiveness of his proposals, his humanity, and, most remarkable of all, his foresight."

Thus "The Journal of Winston Churchill"—which has, in the words of our chairman of academic advisers, Professor James Muller, "the quiet dignity that is in keeping with the idea of attaining permanent scholarly respectability for *Finest Hour.*" The previous subtitle, "Published by The Churchill Centre for Churchillians Worldwide," did not define what is inside and, given page 2, is redundant.

*Finest Hour* will also be expanded in size, as this issue already is, reaching upwards of sixty pages, encompassing the important scholarly speeches and papers delivered at major Churchill meetings from conferences to teacher seminars to the increasingly significant programs developed by our local affiliates and chapters. This material, if we found room for it at all, formerly had to wait up to three years before appearing in our biennial *Churchill Proceedings*, which is now to be absorbed by *Finest Hour*.

Nor will these increased articles and papers be strictly limited to The Churchill Centre. The editors will enthusiastically seek out and arrange to publish work from many sources: lectures, theses, and material from fraternal organizations like the Churchill Museum in London or the Churchill Memorial and Library in Fulton, which they might deem suitable for these pages. Some papers may actually be published on our website in advance of their appearance here, to solicit comment and debate; President Geller has appointed a website committee to delve into all that, and it is already at work.

Finally, *Finest Hour*’s complimentary distribution list will be greatly expanded, to reach more scholars laboring in the Churchill vineyard, more students, more college and high school libraries, more national and international leaders with a serious, established Churchill interest.

The object of all this is to turn what was formerly always in part a kind of "club publication" into a true journal of Churchill studies—not a dry-as-dust academic journal, but one with the established personality that has produced its loyal following.

Professor Warren Kimball, whom we consulted on all of this, had encouraging advice: "The Churchill Centre doesn't have to conform to someone else's definition of a professional society. Professional yes—but on our terms. So what if some of our admired columns, like Around & About or Wit & Wisdom or the Quiz, aren't what you might find in more scholarly periodicals? If they get the public to read it, great; perhaps they will then also read the professional articles it contains.

"You know of course that a more 'professional' approach could limit the editor's ability to intervene and argue a different case, as in the Second Front debate (*FH* 124). I'm not sure there are many in this world, who can do that as you do. We've had our public and always pleasant disputes, and I don't think that such argumentation is by definition a bad thing. Will the editor tend more to be aloof, at least in print? Is that a good thing? Perhaps, but is it good for *Finest Hour*? That's worth some discussion."

Those are very kind words from my friend and sometime debate partner Warren Kimball; and let me reassure our readers. Don't worry—the revealing stories, the lively debates, and the reviews of new books on Churchill that readers have long enjoyed in *FH* will not disappear.  

—RML
WHEN ANYONE COULD TELEPHONE THE GOOD AND THE GREAT
LONDON, SEPTEMBER 20TH—Try to telephone your Congressman or MP today and you’ll run a gauntlet of barricades that will defeat all but the influential. Not so in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A project to upload over a century of old British telephone directories to the internet has revealed that statesmen, sporting heroes, icons of literature and stage stars were all oblivious of the term “ex-directory” (“unlisted” in the United States and Canada).

When Churchill was Chancellor of the Exchequer (1924-29) he was available to talk about the national budget on Paddington 1003, and you could also consult the phonebook for his address: 2 Sussex Square. Similarly, telephoners could dial Harry Houdini, P.G. Wodehouse, Alfred Hitchcock and John Gielgud. “I found celebrities up until the 1950s,” says Josh Hanna, managing director of the Ancestry website. The ex-directory service was introduced three years after the first telephone book, but people did not use it: “It was a status symbol to be included in the phone book.” Today, more than 50 percent of telephone numbers are ex-directory. —Jack Malvern in The Times

GILBERT AT IRVINE
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA, SEPTEMBER 28TH—The University of California at Irvine School of Humanities and the Department of History welcomed Sir Martin Gilbert CBE to campus today for the Shreiar Distinguished Lecture. Sir Martin captivated a crowd of more than 300, including members of the UC Irvine campus community and the public, with his discussion, “Was Churchill Totally Alone in the Years Leading up to the War?” The official biographer of Winston Churchill began by explaining to the audience that for Churchill between 1933 and 1939, moral issues dominated, and these same moral issues are still very much with us today.

Three questions that disturbed and divided Britain in those years, he said, were: How does one identify evil intentions of a government? Does one seek an accommodation with an evil regime? And, does one challenge an evil regime?

For the purposes of discussion, Sir Martin posed a fourth question: Was Churchill a person to listen to, or to ignore and belittle?

The lecture was a tremendous success, providing numerous southern Californians with insight into Churchill, and demonstrating how his strength of moral conviction and character might be of use in world politics today.

MILTON FRIEDMAN
SAN FRANCISCO, NOVEMBER 16TH—One of the most brilliant economic thinkers of the late 20th century, Milton Friedman was a national monument—like the Golden Gate Bridge, which he could see arching across San Francisco Bay from his apartment window. Like Churchill, he became a legend in his own lifetime. “The quantum change in economic debates towards neoclassical, anti-Keynesian assumptions was not solely his achievement,” wrote The Times. “Friedrich Hayek and Robert Lucas were also among a group who influenced the shift over several decades. But it was Friedman who by 1980 supplanted Keynes as the world’s most influential economist.”

Friedman was a quiet admirer of Sir Winston. Ten years ago we came close to getting him at a Churchill Conference, to lecture about WSC as Chancellor of the
Exchequer. (He maintained of course that Churchill had been right to restore the Gold Standard, but failed to take commensurate steps to avoid the wage and price pressures that led to the General Strike). But Friedman's health did not permit it.

Among the outpourings of tributes, we appreciated the words of a Churchill Centre honorary member, Lady Thatcher: "Milton Friedman revived the economics of liberty when it had been all but forgotten. He was an intellectual freedom fighter. Never was there a less dismal practitioner of a dismal science. I shall greatly miss my old friend's lucid wisdom and mordant humour." Dead at 94. R.I.P.

THESE RUINS ARE INHABITED
SONGJIANG, CHINA, OCTOBER 15TH (Reuters)— Often regarded as the copy-cat capital of the world, with ersatz designer bags and even counterfeit cars, the People's Republic of China has added a new imitation: an English town.

Here in this suburb, an hour from Shanghai's skyscrapers, is Thames Town, which cost £334 million to create and will house 10,000 people— complete with pub, fish-and-chip shop and a bronze statue of Winston Churchill. There is a neo-Gothic church as well as Georgian- and Victorian-style terraced houses that would not look out of place in the poshest parts of London.

"I wanted the properties to look exactly the same as those in the United Kingdom," said James Ho, the director of privately owned Shanghai Henghe Real Estate Co. Ltd., one of the town's five developers. "I think English properties are very special. When we decide to learn from others, we should not make any improvements or changes. I emphasised this policy to my staff."

All this was a shock to Gail Caddy, owner of the Rock Point Inn and Cobb Fish Gate in Lyme Regis, Dorset. Caddy got the shock of her life when she saw in a British newspaper that her properties had been cloned: "I was truly amazed. Everything is exactly the same, there is no difference at all. I would just like an explanation as to how it has all happened."

Caddy demanded an explanation from the developers but James Ho was unabashed: "I feel that there are many unique features to English architecture. There must be some reason why these buildings have existed for hundreds of years, so we will imitate or copy, we will not make any changes."

WSC'S PARACHUTISTS
LONDON, SEPTEMBER 25TH— Britain's Parachute Regiment, deployed in Afghanistan during 2006, has its origins in an elite force of commandos set up by the army at the request of Churchill. It was first deployed on 10 February 1941, jumping into Italy and blowing up an aqueduct in a raid named Operation Colossus, reports Caroline Davies in The Times:

"Almost a year later, the regiment carried out Operation Biting, the Bruneval raid, to dismantle a Wurzburg precision radar dish on the northern French coast and bring it back to England for scientific research.

"At Arnhem, the regiment won the first two of its four Victoria Crosses. Lt John Grayburn led his men across the bridge to mount counter-attacks despite heavy fire by Panzers and SS grenadiers. Though injured twice, he refused to be moved out and stayed fighting at "the bridge too far" until he was killed on 20 September 1944. Lionel Queripel, a captain with the Royal Sussex Regiment attached to 10 Para, led his badly outgunned company, despite being wounded, in a successful attack on German machine gunners. When he and his party were cut off in a ditch he ordered his men to withdraw but insisted on remaining behind, armed with hand grenades, to cover their exit. It was the last time he was seen.

"Operations in Malaya, Suez, Northern Ireland and the Falklands followed. The Falklands added two more VCs to the tally when Lt. Col. Herbert Jones and Sergeant Ian McKay were killed in action."

Cynics often scoff that Churchill had one brainless idea after another, so it is nice to have his Parachute Regiment to set down alongside the tank and the Mulberry Harbour.

ELVIS IS NOT KING
LONDON, APRIL 3RD, 2005— Will they ever finish running popularity polls in England? Surely Churchill has retired the trophy: now being voted "the person most of us would travel back in time to meet." WSC bested Elvis, Einstein and Marilyn Monroe, the runners-up. Princess Diana finished just seventh. Kind of an odd group? Perhaps the fact that the poll was among 1000 readers of The Sun explains it. They also voted the "Swinging Sixties" as the decade they would most like to be part of. Oh to be in Vietnam, now that Spring is here.

CONFERENCE POSTSCRIPT
CHICAGO, AUGUST 25TH— (Excerpts) WHEREAS Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, whose mother was American, was proud of his American heritage and stated to Congress in 1941, "Had my mother been English and my father American...I might have got here on my own," and WHEREAS Churchill was a graduate of Sandhurst, served in the military, rode in the last major charge of British cavalry, was Chancellor of the Exchequer and Prime Minister of Great Britain, and in partnership with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt fought and conquered the Axis powers in World War II, and WHEREAS Winston Churchill visited Chicago three times, from 1901 when he was twenty-one years old, through 1932, and WHEREAS in his first 1932 speech at the Union League before 1700 people, he quickly turned to his favorite theme, of the United States and Great Britain as the powers to remedy problems in the world, and »
WHEREAS, in his second 1932 speech at Orchestra Hall, Churchill gave stern warnings against Communism, which he likened as slavery to a despotic government, and

WHEREAS Churchill loved Chicago, stating, "I have never seen anything like the friendliness and sentiments toward us...there was a splendor in Chicago and a life thrust that is all its own," and

WHEREAS upon Churchill's death, Chicago demonstrated an outpouring of grief and affection, and by order of Mayor Richard J. Daley government flags were lowered to half mast for a week, and

WHEREAS President John F. Kennedy, who awarded Winston Churchill honorary American citizenship in 1963, stated that he was "The most honorable man to walk the stage of human history in the time in which we live," and

WHEREAS, The Churchill Centre, an international organization headquarted in Washington, D.C., and established in 1968 to foster leadership, statesmanship, vision and boldness among democratic and freedom-loving peoples worldwide through the thoughts, words, works and deeds of Winston Spencer Churchill, is holding its 23rd International Churchill Conference at The Drake Hotel from September 27th to October 1st, and

WHEREAS we are pleased as the city of Chicago to be the host of this conference organized to remember a man of such distinction who fought for freedom for all the world.

WE, the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim that we are honored to have The Churchill Centre here, give it a warm welcome, and urge it to continue to preserve the memory of this great man."

—PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR RICHARD M. DALEY

FIRST STATE FELLOWS
ANCHORAGE, JULY 27TH—The first class of Forty-Ninth State Fellows at the University of Alaska, Anchorage—university honors students specially

AROUND & ABOUT

Donald Rumsfeld, President Bush's former Secretary of Defense, who resigned after the November election, has been "controversial" (to put it mildly) since things in Iraq started to go bad. When things were going well, with coalition forces sweeping into Baghdad four years ago this Spring, the media doted on his every quip.

A strong admirer of Winston Churchill, Rumsfeld has quoted WSC on many occasions lately, getting only into more hot water. In late August the Secretary said that his detractors reminded him of Hitler's appeasers: "Each one hopes that if he feeds the crocodile enough, the crocodile will eat him last." New York Times critic Frank Rich shot back on September 3rd: "He can quote Churchill all he wants, but if he wants to self-righteously use [sic] that argument to smear others, the record shows that Mr. Rumsfeld cozed up to the crocodile of Baghdad as smarmily as anyone."

In his departure remarks at the White House on October 9th Rumsfeld said, "I call to mind the words of Winston Churchill, who said something like this: 'I have benefited greatly from criticism and at no time have I suffered a lack thereof.'" The Secretary quite properly admitted he was not quoting verbatim. The actual quotation is: "I have derived continued benefit from criticism at all periods of my life and I do not remember any time when I was ever short of it." (House of Commons, 27 November 1914.)

Anorak, a British website "keeping tabs on the tabloids," took that up with a Churchill reference of its own: "As another wartime leader of old might have put it, he came, he saw, he almost conquered but lacked a viable and speedy exit strategy." Anorak was paraphrasing Churchill's comment on General Charles Monro, who took command of British forces at Gallipoli in October 1915 and supervised their evacuation: "General Monro was an officer of swift decision. He came, he saw, he capitulated." (The World Crisis II, 489.)

We could have provided Mr. Rumsfeld with a much more pointed Churchillism: "We do not resent the well-meant criticism of any man who wishes to win the war. We do not shrink from any fair criticism, and that is the most dangerous of all. On the contrary, we take it earnestly to heart and seek to profit by it. Criticism in the body politic is like pain in the human body. It is not pleasant, but where would the body be without it? No health or sensibility would be possible without continued correctives and warnings of pain." (House of Commons, 27 January 1940.)

And, in tribute to the department Rumsfeld was leaving (which used to be called the War Department, and maybe should be again): "I am going to do something that has never been done before, and I hope the House will not be shocked at the breach of precedent. I am going to make public a word of praise for the War Office. In all the forty years I have served in this House I have heard that Department steadily abused before, during, and after our various wars. And if my memory serves me aright I have frequently taken part in the well-merited criticism which was their lot." (House of Commons, 2 August 1944.)
selected for achievement, character, and academic promise—took its freshman tutorial last spring with Professor James W. Muller. They studied Churchill’s autobiography, My Early Life, along with a number of his speeches from Never Give In!, the collection assembled by his grandson.

Near the end of the term the class, which had read about Churchill’s remark to Violet Asquith at their first meeting—“We are all worms; but I do believe I am a glowworm”—decided to call themselves the “Glowworms.” Having now advance to their sophomore year, the Glowworms will graduate in 2009, the year of the semi-centenary of Alaska statehood. In the meantime, the second class of Forty-Ninth State Fellows, who entered college last autumn, studied The River War in the University Honors course Enduring Books, also taught by Professor Muller.

GAS POLICY IN 1940

DOVER JUNE 1940—Britain was prepared to use mustard gas to repel German invaders after Dunkirk, but had only 450 tons, less than five percent of the amount held by the Germans. The plan would have delivered the entire supply, using squadrons of Blenheim, Battle and Wellington bombers fitted with spray tanks, in one mass attack, hoping it would work because it could not be repeated. If it failed, of course, the Germans could retaliate with their own endless gas supply.

Churchill ordered weekly reports of gas production to be submitted personally to him, generally scrawling across the bottom the terse comment, “Press on.” By autumn 1941, with the invasion threat abated, almost 6000 people were employed researching and manufacturing chemical weapons, and the following spring Britain had almost 20,000 tons of gas. But, despite shrill accusations on the internet and elsewhere, Churchill was determined not to use it first.

In March 1942 the Chiefs of Staff stated: “It has been accepted...”
that we should not initiate the use of gas unless it suited our book to do so during the invasion.” But the events of 1940-41 showed that if a nation’s survival is at stake, it is unlikely to put obligations like the Geneva Protocol ahead of military expediency.

— The Times, 12 February 2002.

MANY MORE GENEROUS SUPPORTERS

The list of supporters sent out with our 2006 Heritage Fund appeal listed—aside from members who supported the 2005 Heritage Fund—Churchill Centre Associates, supporters of the 2005 Churchill Lecture and Reves Award benefit dinner, and members of the 2004 Churchill Lecture and Churchill Centre Associates, supported the 2005 Heritage Fund—listed—aside from members who

Secretaries Reunite in London
ICS Canada Has New Website

ICS (UK)
LONDON, NOVEMBER 6TH— The Churchill Museum celebrated its receipt of the highly prestigious 2006 Council of Europe Museum Prize. Guests at a reception at the Cabinet War Rooms included Lady Soames, the Hon. Celia Sandys, Minnie Churchill and Duncan Sandys.

Two notable guests were former secretaries to Sir Winston. Honorary member Elizabeth Layton Nel was a secretary during 1941-45; after the war she married and moved to South Africa where she still lives, and she turns 90 in 2007. Her charming memoir, Mr. Churchill's Secretary, was published by Hodder & Stoughton in 1958. Lady Williams of Elvel—formerly Jane Portal—filled the same position during 1949-55; two of her uncles were R.A. Butler and Marshal of the RAF Viscount Portal of Hungerford; she was well connected with "life at the top."

OTHER UK News

Membership is currently 424, but ought to be higher; all members are again urged to try to recruit friends and other contacts. There were 99 new Churchill Fellows in 2006 (following their travels and projects sponsored by the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust); one was already a member and four others have joined.

Study Pack for Schools. Robert Courts is devoting much time and effort to devising this ambitious project, which aims to assemble a large number of writings by and about WSC, culled from books, articles, speeches etc. These will be collated in a pack and made available to schools; teachers will be able to draw on it for sources, while the comprehensive coverage of the many facets of WSC's life will be conveniently available to both teachers and students.

The 2007 Annual General Meeting will take place on Saturday 21 April at the Imperial War Museum, Duxford (on the M11, about eight miles south of Cambridge); among the attractions is the American Air Museum. Particulars will be circulated.

An Annual Dinner in London was proposed last year at a probable cost of about £50 a head, with a notable speaker. February was suggested as a suitable month, as not much else is usually in the cards at that time of year. Owing to limited support by the membership, however, this idea has been shelved.

ICS (CANADA)
winstonchurhcilicanada.ca

OCTOBER 15TH— The new ICS Canada website is up and running. We hope you find it interesting and useful.

Included is a brief history of ICS Canada as part of the Churchill Centre, and of Churchill's connection to Canada; activities past and future; important dates in Churchill's life; and a membership application, to which we ask Canadians to refer friends. We appreciate comments on improving this important method of communication to widen the interest in Churchill and his relevance in the 21st Century.

An "Evening with Sir Winston" was held in January and included the final episode of Sir Martin Gilbert's BBC Film Biography "Never Despair." This follows the very well received Volume 3 ("The Beginning of the End"), shown at our event on October 30th. Thanks to Director Peter Allen for arranging that program and providing the film. Full details were noted in a flyer to be mailed to members and included on the website. See also Chartwell Bulletin 12, April.

"From Winston to Western" was the heading in the Globe and Mail, announcing that Sir Martin Gilbert had "been lured to the University of Western Ontario as an adjunct research professor". (See Finest Hour 133:7, "Sir Martin Heads West.") ICS Canada will invite Sir Martin to join us when his schedule permits.

From the Bookshelf. One of the most controversial books about Churchill, by his doctor, Lord Moran, was recently republished (see FH 132:46). The Churchill family was critical of what they held an abuse of the doctor/patient relationship, but Moran said historians told him he would be failing the public by not writing about WSC's health, which was an important facet of his life and his actions. A discussion and excerpts appeared in our newsletter.

Comments, suggestions and articles would be much appreciated by newsletter editor Terry Reardon, 182 Burnhamthorpe Road, Toronto, ON M9A 1H6 (reardont@rogers.com), telephone (416) 231-6803.
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Bopping the Boche

AFTER "FIGHT IN THE HILLS," did Churchill suggest socking the Germans with beer bottles?

I have read somewhere that the speech in the House of Commons on 4 June 1940, was edited; and that Churchill allegedly said, after his "we shall fight in the hills" peroration, something to the effect of throwing beer bottles at the Germans, since there was no shortage of bottles. Is this true, or not? Sir Winston is my political role model; his conservative skepticism is the only sane perspective on the world, albeit depressive.

LARS BERGLUND, LJUNBY, SWEDEN

This remark has been rumored (less in regard to the House speech than Churchill's subsequent broadcast of it), but never completely proven. In fact, we can find only one reference, in a popular biography, *Winston Churchill: An Informal Study of Greatness*, by Robert Lewis Taylor (New York: Doubleday, 1952). Taylor, an itinerant biographer, wrote a good book because he managed to find and interview many people who knew Churchill far back as the Boer War. But he provided no footnotes, so his attributions are hard to pin down. (You can easily find the book, which is very common—try www.bookfinder.com).

Taylor writes (223-24):

"There has always been some dispute about the aside that Churchill tacked onto his famous speech in which he promised that 'We shall fight on the beaches,' and in other local spots. After crying out the now familiar repetitions, accenting the 'We shall fight' like hammer blows, he finished, then added a half-whispered comment as he sat down. The best authorities say that his words were: 'But God knows what we'll fight with.'"


"After the war Churchill stated he had been misled by his assistants about the considerable strength and size of the anti-Hitler Resistance... in Germany there lived an opposition which was weakened by their losses and an enervating international policy, but which belongs to the noblest and greatest that the political history of any nation has ever produced. These men fought without help from within or from abroad driven forward only by the restlessness of their conscience. As long as they lived they were invisible and unrecognisable to us, because they had to camouflage themselves. But their death made the resistance visible.'"

Lamb's footnote to this passage reads: "Churchill's remarks about the Resistance have been quoted by several German historians including Pechel in *Deutscher Wilderstand*. Doubts on whether Churchill really said these words have been cast, but Churchill wrote on 19 November 1946 to Walter Hammer of Hamburg:

"Since the receipt of your letter I have had a search made through my speeches for the passage to which you and Count Hardenburg refer; but so far no record can be found of any such pronouncement by me. But I might quite well have used the words you quote as they represent my feelings on this aspect of German affairs.'"

Churchill makes no mention of the Scholls or WeifSe Rose, nor are these words in any transcripts.

We would be very doubtful about quoting such offhand references in a film without attribution. Digital searches now enable us to search more thoroughly than ever, yet the only reference to these words, or even to partial phrases, is Richard Lamb's book—with his cautionary footnote.

We suggest you quote Lamb, not the film, and include Lamb's footnote, which shows that although Churchill may not have said these exact words, he did share the sentiments.

Thanks for a most interesting chase through the literature! RML
The Nemon Statue and Churchill Arch

BY
JAMES LANCASTER

There used to be a rule in the House of Commons, endorsed by Churchill himself, that prevented the erection of statues to statesmen in the Palace of Westminster until ten years after their death. Most Conservative MPs thought this rule should be waived in the case of Churchill and won their point after considerable debate. Oscar Nemon was given a commission of £10,000 for a large statue in bronze, which was unveiled on 2 December 1969. Replicas are in many cities, including Toronto, Halifax and Brussels.

Rubbing Churchill's left foot on the way in to the Commons Chamber has been a good luck habit for Conservative MPs for years, but its effect can be seen clearly on the cover photograph. In 2006 it was discovered that there were hairline fractures in the foot. Oscar Nemon used periodically to make the shiny foot less conspicuous by darkening it, but he died in 1985. The Speaker's advisory committee on works of art is currently looking at the problem. It is most unlikely, even in a Labour Government, that MPs will no longer be able to pay their respects by rubbing Sir Winston's foot.

The story of the Churchill Arch goes back to 10 May 1941, when bombs destroyed the Chamber of the Commons. A famous photograph shows Churchill, accompanied by his faithful Parliamentary Private Secretary Brendan Bracken, looking at the broken arch while standing on a pile of rubble.

Those were stern and trying times. On this first anniversary of his Premiership Churchill had just routed the rebels on a Vote of Censure—but Britain still stood alone. Now the birthplace of parliamentary democracy, Churchill's spiritual home, had witnessed sacrilege. The Ministry of Information wanted to down-play the disaster, but Churchill said: "Publish it to the world, and leave that arch to remind those who come after how they kept the bridge in the brave days of old."

Churchill insisted that the Chamber be rebuilt exactly as it had been before:

There are two main characteristics of the House of Commons which will command the approval and the support of reflective and experienced members. They will, I have no doubt, sound odd to foreign ears. The first is that its shape should be oblong and not semi-circular. Here is a very potent factor in our political life... It is easy [in a semi-circular assembly] for an individual to move through those insensible gradations from Left to Right, but the act of crossing the Floor is one which requires serious consideration. I am well informed on this matter, for I have accomplished that difficult process, not only once but twice....

The second characteristic of a Chamber formed on the lines of the House of Commons is that it should not be big enough to contain all its members at once without over-crowding, and that there should be no question of every member having a separate seat reserved for him. The reason for this has long been a puzzle to uninstructed outsiders, and has frequently excited the curiosity and even the criticism of new members. Yet it is not so difficult to understand if you look at it from a practical point of view.

If the House is big enough to contain all its members, nine-tenths of its debates will be conducted in the depressing atmosphere of an almost empty or half-empty Chamber. The essence of good House of Commons speaking is the conversational style, the facility for quick, informal interruptions and interchanges. Harangues from a rostrum would be a bad substitute for the conversational style in which so much of our business is done. But the conversational style requires a fairly small space, and there should be on great occasions a sense of crowd and urgency.

It was not until 26 October 1950 that the House of Commons returned to its old Chamber. Following Prime Minister Attlee's opening address, Churchill said, "I am a child of the House of Commons and have been here I believe longer than anyone. I was much upset when I was thrown out of my collective cradle." Attlee had earlier told the House that the arch, which had been faithfully restored stone by stone, was now named the Churchill Arch. That evening Churchill told his friend Lord Camrose that he had always wanted the arch to be preserved, but that he had no idea that it should be given his name. He said that "Attlee had been very nice" in naming the arch after him.
Churchill Worldwide

Finest Hour herewith begins a long-anticipated project: recording the details of all Churchill memorials all over the world. Eventually this may develop into a useful handbook, charting sites from Anchorage to Zagreb. It will also certainly be amalgamated in a section on our website. It is an ambitious project, since we want it to be comprehensive and up-to-date—a must for any Churchill traveller or explorer. By way of example, we have put together an initial list of statues and busts, which we do not pretend for a minute is complete.

Beyond just statues, we will include institutions, libraries, art galleries, colleges and schools, museums, memorials, houses (private and open to the public), busts, plaques, avenues, squares and parks.

There will be a chapter for each country, describing everything of interest in that country. We will include as much as we can find: photographs, historical background, dates, opening ceremonies, sponsors and financing, activities and services, contact details, websites, interesting stories, and information on the artist, architect and sculptor if applicable.

Help Wanted

We will be using many different sources, but we will never be able to produce a truly comprehensive guide without help from readers of Finest Hour. We are therefore asking you to contact us by email with any information on memorials, statues, schools, etc., where you live, or which you know about and have visited. We especially need photographs, and your help in talking to people on the spot. All contributions from readers will be acknowledged in these pages and in more permanent forms of the handbook, unless of course you specifically request no acknowledgment. Thank you for your help in creating a guide which will of great interest and value to Churchillians all over the world.

Email to: jimlancaster@wanadoo.fr

STATUES & BUSTS

Please send us your additions and corrections...

AUSTRALIA

Canberra: Ivor Roberts-Jones statue near Churchill House; a similar one at Australian National University.

BELGIUM

Brussels: Oscar Nemon statue.

BRUNEI

Bandar Seri Begawan: Nemon statue.

CANADA

Edmonton, AB: Nemon statue.
Halifax, NS: Nemon statue.
Fredericton NB: John Forrestall bronze statue, Legislative Building.
Quebec: Nemon bust.

FINESI HOUR 134/14

Toronto: City Hall Nemon statue; Sunnyvale Hospital Rabb bust.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Prague: Ivor Roberts-Jones statue; Belsky statue, British Embassy.

CHINA

Shanghai: Bronze statue, real estate development.

DENMARK

Copenhagen: Nemon bust.

FRANCE

Paris: Jean Cardot statue.

HUNGARY

Budapest: Innre Varga bust.

ITALY

Baveno, Lake Maggiore: Granite statue by local sculptor, Sr. Polli.

LUXEMBOURG


MALTA

Valletta: Upper Baracca Gardens.

MEXICO

Mexico City: Nemon statue.

NORWAY

Oslo: Ivor Roberts-Jones statue.

RUSSIA

Yalta: Bronze statue by Zurab Tsereteli of Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin marking 60th anniversary of Yalta conference.

UNITED KINGDOM

Bletchley Park: Nemon bust.

Cambridge: Oscar Nemon bust, Churchill College; Franta Belsky bust, Churchill Archives Centre.

Ditchley Park: Angela Connor large bronze bust.

Dover: Nemon statue looking towards Dover Patrol Memorial.

Harrow: Epstein Bust.

Hoddesdon: Franta Belsky bust, Conservative Club.
VALLETTA, MALTA: Unknown to many, this bust by an unnamed sculptor at Upper Baracca Gardens carries the Churchill Arms at its base and an inscription: "To The Rt Honourable Winston Spencer Churchill KG, The People of Malta and Gozo, MCMLV."

London: Franta Belsky bust, Churchill Hotel; Nemon seated statue, Guildhall; Nemon statue, House of Commons; Jacob Epstein bust, MacConnel-Mason Gallery; Oscar Nemon bust, National Portrait Gallery; Lawrence Holofcener seated statue of Roosevelt and Churchill on bench, New Bond Street; Ivor Roberts-Jones statue, Parliament Square; Margarita Hernandez bust, Royal College of Defence Studies.


Westerham: Nemon statue, south end of big lake, Chartwell; Nemon statue, village green.

Windsor: Nemon bust commissioned by HM The Queen in 1953, Windsor Castle.

Woodford Green: David McFall statue; small Oscar Nemon Bust, Conservative Party headquarters.

UNITED STATES

Fulton, MO: Franta Belsky statue, Churchill Memorial, Westminster College; Belsky bust in entry lobby.

Hillsdale, MI: Heather Tritchka (Hillsdale alumna) statue with Churchill’s stand-up desk, Hillsdale College.


New Orleans: Nemon statue.


LUXEMBOURG’S STATUE: RESTORATION NEEDED

A project like this offers all sorts of ancillary benefits, such as checking on the current condition of Churchill Memorials around the world.

Mark Weston, a resident of Luxembourg, wrote to us of the “desolate and degraded” Nemon statue in Luxembourg City: “There are many significant American businesses here that are fond of their heritage: the John F. Kennedy Road from Kirchberg through the city itself; the Roosevelt Road that stretches through the city. Yet the hero who said ‘Never Surrender,’ who would have fought to the death for liberty, has only a statue far from the crowd, covered in bird excrement. I would restore it myself but I have no idea where to begin.”

Mr. Weston’s letter may be of interest to other readers faced with dilapidated Churchill memorials, and inspire restoration efforts such as the one undertaken in Toronto by ICS Canada and the Parliamentary Democracy Society (FH 128:12). It is indeed a sad state of affairs when a statue, particularly of Sir Winston, is not properly maintained, as any statues in the “open air” require.

I live in a remote part of Normandy, where there are several isolated headstones and memorials to British war dead. My wife and I clean these isolated headstones regularly. The Commonwealth War Graves Commission maintains all the larger cemeteries—1.7 million headstones to British war dead— and does its job magnificently. The French office employs 450 people in the maintenance of the headstones and gardens. American cemeteries, such as the one at Hamm near Luxembourg, are maintained by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Quite obviously the situation in the City of Luxembourg is one of neglect. I suggested Mr. Weston contact the Mayor’s office, or through them the responsible department, bringing to their attention the lamentable condition of the statue of Sir Winston Churchill, urging them to have the bronze professionally cleaned.

I suggested Mr Weston remind local authorities of the ceremonies which marked the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Luxembourg on 10 September 2004. They were led by Grand Duchess Charlotte, the sovereign who best represents the struggle for the independence of the country. These ceremonies included the laying of wreaths at the statue of Winston Churchill (see the following website: http://xrl.us/luxembourg).

There may be other memorials to Churchill in the Grand Duchy. His visit to Metz and Luxembourg on 14-15 July 1946 was a major event, and a film is available from the Centre Nationale de l’Audiovisuel in Luxembourg City.
A Portrait at Churchill Junior High;  
A Teacher Seminar in Charleston

THE CHURCHILL CENTRE ensures that students at Churchill Junior High now see their school's namesake every day. The Churchill teacher seminar series travels to South Carolina.

BY SUZANNE S1GMAN

minute talk, Jim Thomas engaged the students assembled in discussing Churchill and his contributions to history.

Everyone at Churchill Junior High School was appreciative and expressed gratitude to The Churchill Centre. Every day now, a school full of young people sees a picture of the man for whom their school was named. The Centre is grateful to Scott Kominkiewicz and East Brunswick school authorities for their enthusiasm.

PROFESSORS JABLONSKY AND KIMBALL LEAD TEACHER STUDY OF "CHURCHILL AT WAR"
CHARLESTON, NOVEMBER 4TH— Through kind arrangements of Professor Warren Kimball and The Citadel, The Churchill Centre held a seminar for high school teachers here today. Both Kimball and Professor David Jablonsky, who joined him in a day-long examination of "Churchill and War," are Churchill Centre academic advisers.

The Centre is grateful to Professor Bo Moore, who chairs the History Department at The Citadel, for hosting the seminar and providing a delightful buffet lunch for all attendees. Through Susan Miles, a learning specialist at Charleston's Social Studies Curriculum Department, we were able to place eighty-one copies of Celia Sandys' biography Churchill in the Charleston County Public Schools.

Session titles were "Young Winston and the Victorian Small Wars," "Churchill, World War I and Interwar Reflections," and "Churchill and the Politics of War." In a wide-ranging discussion of the 20th century, the two professors shared their expertise and invited teachers to relate their classroom experiences.

David Jablonsky began the inquiry into Churchill's military experiences and viewpoints with a definition of "Grand Strategy," that which encompasses the economic, psychological, political and military: "Churchill subscribes to Clausewitz's 'Remarkable Trinity,' but there is no evidence that Churchill read his work." Each part of the trinity—people, military and gov-

Ms. Sigman is the Centre's Educational Programs Coordinator.
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ernment—is necessary in discussions of civil-military relations and the role of the electorate.

Jablonsky went on to describe Churchill's Victorian inheritance and his participation in several of "Queen Victoria's Little Wars." He contends that World War I was the turning point of the 20th century: empires died, democratic systems such as Weimar Germany failed, decolonization began, and "flank powers" (USA and Russia) arose. Churchill, he said, tied the two world wars together by terming them "another Thirty Years War." His discussion revealed Churchill's path to leadership during World War II, and the assertion that military commanders can have only a narrow view, and must remain dependent on statesman to provide broader perspective.

Warren Kimball shared his views on the 1920s and 1930s, examining the implications of Versailles and Wilsonian philosophy. He offered a detailed explanation of Isolationism, and the international scope of the Great Depression. In explaining the relationship between Churchill and Roosevelt and the various wartime conferences, Kimball offered that "FDR and Churchill gave us the world we have today" because from day one of the war, everyone planned for the postwar period.

An overview of the three major theatres of the Second World War preceded a closer examination of Roosevelt and Churchill. "There was a certain superficiality and artificiality to [their relationship] because interests are what matter," said Professor Kimball. "Even their 2000 exchanges didn't make a 'special interest.' There was little difference in their large goals, but many differences of opinion about strategy."

If Wendall Willkie (the Democrat turned Republican who ran against FDR in 1940 but shared his world view) and Neville Chamberlain—or U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull and British Foreign Minister Lord Halifax—had been the allied leaders, Kimball asserted, "the wartime relationship wouldn't have been any different." Any pair of leaders, he continued, would have shared an intersected history and common values. Forces outside of Roosevelt and Churchill, such as nationalism, mattered to the outcome as much as they did. That said, Kimball admitted, leadership, personality, and the ability to motivate others did matter: "It would be hard to imagine Eden, Attlee or Hull providing it."

Though this seminar drew the smallest number of teachers yet, those who attended gave it high ratings. All deemed the seminar "an appropriate professional development activity," that "expanded our understanding of the subject." As with previous seminars, teachers rated the handouts, readings, excellent lectures, free materials and the open discussions as its "best features."
WHY IN 1906 WOULD AN ENGLISHMAN be interested in a muckraking book on the abuses in the United States' meatpacking industry? Winning student essayists from Yale and Johns Hopkins Universities review Churchill's short-term goals and long-term convictions.

Churchill on the Chicago Scandals

I. Intellectual Honesty and Moral Righteousness

BY JAMES KIRCHIK, YALE UNIVERSITY

"The Chicago Scandals," Winston Churchill's essay on Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*, offers a nuanced perspective that distinguishes between Sinclair's political message and the journalistic account the book offers about the Chicago meatpacking industry. In addition to the well-deserved criticism that Churchill provides regarding Sinclair's punishing literary style, he praises the author for spearheading the uniquely American movement of "muckraking" journalism and its unapologetic mission to trumpet the truth while brushing aside institutional cowardice and cant. Churchill would later demonstrate these very same qualities as the Cassandra of the British House of Commons in the years of Nazi ascension.

Churchill's appreciation for Sinclair's moral conscience and prescience is immediately striking. Churchill does not write as a disinterested observer from overseas offering haughty takes on the state of American literature. He does not conflate Sinclair's regrettable socialist realism with the entire American canon. Rather, Churchill writes with a keen appreciation for the American experiment and as one who understood that not just Britain's fate but that of the world rested on the success of the United States as a liberal, democratic power. "It may be that in the next few years we shall be furnished with Transatlantic answers to many of the outstanding questions of economics and sociology upon whose verge British political parties stand in perplexity and hesitation," he wrote, recognizing a bond of unity that would prove crucial three decades later.

It is for this reason that Churchill declares so early in the essay that, in reference to the sordid state of the Chicago meatpacking industry, "people have no right to hold their noses and shut their eyes." A good case can be made for this statement being enshrined as Churchill's literary epitaph, so pithily does it encompass the man's worldview. The allusion obviously refers to the culinary aspect of *The Jungle*, imploring readers not to erase the sights and smells of the Chicago abattoirs from their memories. Yet the acts of holding one's nose and shutting one's eyes could be applied to anyone who chooses to ignore evil. The troubles that Sinclair documented in the United States were grave enough to threaten the future health of that nation, and thus, in Churchill's eyes, the world.

The statement also indicates Churchill's belief in the importance of engaged and active citizenship. Apathy may be the easiest response to the world's various injustices but individuals, he insists, "have no right" to ignore the grave problems confronting their society. In describing the horrors at Chicago, Sinclair has placed his readers, in "a kind of horror-struck docility." So grave is the problem of unsanitary meat production and so dominant are the great powers that stand behind its continuation that...
in the face of this scandal one is weakened to the point of inaction.

In the 1930s, Churchill faced a far greater hurdle. Even though the ethno-nationalism and territorial expansionist policies of Hitler were apparent for the world to see, national leaders denied that there was any problem at all. After *The Jungle* was published, however, the debate concerned strategies to solve a problem rather than whether one even existed.

The threat that Nazi fascism posed to the world inflicted the same sort of "docility" upon national leaders: yet this docility was more dangerous than that created by the meatpackers, because the European appeasers were hardly "horror-struck" over the Nazis. On the contrary, politicians and newspaper editors were so wedded to the policies of appeasement, their collective heads buried so deep in the sand, that they failed to recognize the existential threat moving swiftly towards them.

Some even saw in Hitler a model leader. After signing the Munich Pact, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain announced from the steps of Ten Downing Street that "peace in our time" had been achieved, and instructed members of the press to stop asking questions and "Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

For all his literary and political faults, Sinclair, like Churchill, was a canary in the coalmine. Churchill readily acknowledges Sinclair's socialism, yet separates the political message of the novel from its journalistic qualities. Ridiculing Sinclair's protagonist's political awakening after encountering Chicago's corrupt machine, Churchill writes, "There is one man more in Chicago who may be trusted to vote straight for the Socialist ticket. Hurrah!"

Upton Sinclair's stated mission was to marshal public opinion in favor of massive electoral change (he ran in California for Congress in 1920, Senator in 1923 and Governor in 1926, all on the Socialist ticket). But the primary effect of *The Jungle*—thankfully, from Churchill's view—was not to turn the country towards socialism but to compel the adoption of practical food safety laws. Churchill warns naïve readers that "no mere economic revolution" can change the behavior of the detestable men who run the Chicago political machine. "Base men will dishonor any system," whether that system be totalitarian or democratic. In a warning that predates the Russian Revolution, Churchill writes that human nature is inherently imperfect, no matter what are the grand designs of central planners.

Churchill's concern for intellectual honesty and moral righteousness in a free society answers the question, "Why in 1906 would an Englishman be interested in a muckraking book on the abuses in a foreign country's meatpacking industry?" Here, he exhibits an appreciation for the ingenuity and effort of the American people, an attitude that later influenced his policy as wartime leader when his prime concern was achieving American involvement in World War II. In this review-essay, Churchill demonstrates his virtues as a man of action, just as he would during what his biographers have referred to as "The Wilderness Years," when the soon-to-be prime minister spoke out on the Nazi threat, as a lonely backbencher in a feckless parliament.

Perhaps the greatest praise that Churchill offers Sinclair is the encomium that *The Jungle* "enables those who sometimes think to understand." That commendation is no less true of the man who bestowed it.

II. The Aristocratic Reserve: Churchill and the Muckrakers

BY SASHA G. ROUSSEAU
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

An ill-fed, ill-shod, permanent underclass cannot form the basis of an empire. Winston Churchill was a traditional patriot in the Kipling mold who, in pursuit of a stronger nation, and a parliamentary seat, attempted to mediate the perpetual battle between the haves and the have-nots.

In 1904, Winston Churchill crossed the floor of the House of Commons to join the Liberal Party in its advocacy of free trade. By joining the opposition, Churchill expanded upon the nascent liberalism of his father's "Tory Democracy" ideals and his own Tory Radical reputation. As opposed to the pro-tariff Conservatives, he argued that protective tariffs strained foreign relations and threatened buyers of all goods with higher prices and uncertainty of supply. As an opposition Member of Parliament, he campaigned to win a seat from working class Oldham in the 1906 election, entirely upon the platform of free trade.

Churchill believed that under free trade goods are cheaper, so people buy more of them. The market is thus strengthened, and everyone has greater accessibility to goods. He had crossed the floor to sit in the opposition seat once occupied by his father, and he built upon that statement by speaking only of the issue that had publicly severed him from his former party. By homing in on Free Trade, Churchill defined himself for his constituency...
as well as his new allies in government. Yet he was still very much tied to the status quo.

Churchill was a traditionalist. Despite his years as a war correspondent, the criticism of military infrastructure inherent in his novel, and his experience as a POW, he had a picturesque view of war before the Great War shattered his illusions. He was a nationalist who believed in the gallantry of man. Though he supported the English cause in the Boer War, he did not dehumanize the Boers. Maintaining a hierarchy was one thing: cruelty and oppression another.

The same might be said for Churchill's views on economics. Not a believer in squeezing the rich or subsidizing the poor, he understood that a strong state must be based on a strong economy. He supported competition-spurred commercial development, which would raise the welfare.

Nationalism throughout Europe was reaching dizzying heights, and war seemed a thrilling possibility. It was difficult to hold out against the patriotic fervor, even for those for whom the status quo did no favors. They, too, were claiming England's traditions as their own. To gain their votes, Churchill had to bridge the gap between his own class and that of his constituency. He had to learn more about the circumstances of the working man.

Luckily, there was a glut of muckraking books chronicling the condition of the lower classes. To social critics, modern industry destroyed community: the social safety net. The political backlash against industry took the form of workers' rights and anti-tariff rhetoric. Temper flared over cheap Chinese labor shipped to become miners in the Transvaal. The rights of workers were still being disregarded in favor of commercial giants, but unions were forming and politicians, including Churchill, were starting to take note.

In response to the backlash, industry leaders such as George Cadbury and William Lever built new districts for their workers. They capitalized on the nationalistic trend by designing their buildings in a quaint English style. Lever bragged that his planned industrial community was "old England reborn." The industrialists claimed that a new national myth, in which all the classes had a heroic part, had been formed by commercialization.

It was true that the poor were not being entirely shut out of the industrialists' prosperity. Fewer than ten percent of the working urban population lived in slums, and processed and imported food made staples cheaper and easier to obtain. Local bylaws governed what Parliament did not, and funded town sewers, municipally supplied water, and public bathhouses. But the muckrakers proved that more and more people were slipping through the cracks. There was a tug of war between social welfare and economic competition. Churchill focused on what the working classes could do for the empire, rather than what the empire could do for them.

Sharing the national glory meant sharing responsibility, most notably in national defense, and it was feared that stunted slum dwellers would make poor soldiers. Germany's military might was growing, and so was knowledge of her more liberal welfare legislation. The U.S. was England's ace in the hole, a country bound much more closely to England than to rest of Europe. Free Trade agreements kept America concerned for England's economic welfare. Yet in observing Spanish-American War, Churchill had discovered the dangers of an army relying on modern industrial standards: only 379 American soldiers died of combat in that war, but almost 5,000 died of sickness, much of it brought on by the army's spoiled supply of canned beef. Churchill feared that America was as vulnerable as England to the dangers of industrial efficiency run amok.

His political niche as an advocate of Free Trade, funneled through the interests of his working class constituency, led Churchill to delve into the writings of muckrakers like Upton Sinclair. The health of the workers, and the hygiene of their processed food, were of importance, because the poor would be given rights only if they took on responsibilities, especially national defense. America was a potentially strong ally in a European war, which loomed ever closer with the growing spirit of nationalism. But industrial scrimping can lead to a defense crisis, not to be overcome by the strong economy big business helps to create.
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Churchill on Washington

Q: We understand that Churchill made a speech about George Washington at Mount Vernon, and would very much appreciate having the text of what he said for possible use by the President on Washington's Birthday.


A: While we can find no references to a Churchill speech at Mount Vernon, there are several references to the first "W" in Churchill's canon. The earliest seems to have been on 16 June 1941, in a broadcast to the USA after receiving an honorary degree from the University of Rochester (New York). Churchill's mother was the former Jennie Jerome, and rumor (but not fact) had it that she was born in Rochester.

The great Burke has truly said, "People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors," and I feel it most agreeable to recall to you that the Jeromes were rooted for many generations in American soil, and fought in Washington's armies for the independence of the American Colonies and the foundation of the United States. I expect I was on both sides then. And I must say I feel on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean now.

Churchill also refers favorably several times to George Washington in The Age of Revolution, vol. 3 of his History of the English-Speaking Peoples (New York: Dodd Mead, 1957). This was probably written before World War II, although it was published years afterward. Here are some excerpts which may be useful...

Braddock was sent from England to re-establish British authority west of the Alleghenies, but his forces were cut to pieces by the French and Indians in Pennsylvania. In this campaign a young Virginian officer named George Washington learnt his first military lessons. (152)

It was now imperative for the Patriots to raise an army. Massachusetts had already appealed to Congress at Philadelphia for help against the British and for the appointment of a Commander-in-Chief...Adams's eye centred upon a figure in uniform, among the dark brown clothes of the delegates. He was Colonel George Washington, of Mount Vernon, Virginia. This prosperous planter had fought in the campaigns of the 1750s and had helped extricate the remnants of Braddock's force from their disastrous advance. He was the only man of any military experience at the Congress, and this was limited to a few minor campaigns on the frontier. He was now given command of all the forces that America could raise. Great calls were to be made on the spirit of resolution that was his by nature. (184-85)

Simply to have kept his army in existence during these years was probably Washington's greatest contribution to the Patriot cause. No other American leader could have done as much. (204)

The first step [after ratification of the Constitution] was to elect a President, and General Washington, the commander of the Revolution, was the obvious choice. Disinterested and courageous, far-sighted and patient, aloof yet direct in manner, inflexible once his mind was made up, Washington possessed the gifts of character for which the situation called. He was reluctant to accept office. Nothing would have pleased him more than to remain in equable but active retirement at Mount Vernon, improving the husbandry of his estate. But, as always, he answered the summons of duty. Gouverneur Morris was right when he emphatically wrote to him, "The exercise of authority depends on personal character. Your cool, steady temper is indispensably necessary to give firm and manly tone to the new Government". ...There was much confusion and discussion on titles and precedence, which aroused the mocking laughter of critics. But the prestige of Washington lent dignity to the new, untried office.

Q: One of our affiliates needs to have the attribution, if available, for this alleged quotation, which is ascribed to WSC in several places on the Internet: "Success is never final. Failure is never fatal. Courage is what counts."—GARY GARRISON

A: The web is full of quotations ascribed to Churchill that he never said. Some have been attached to him to make them more interesting. But this one doesn't even sound like him. Neither the whole quote, nor any of its three parts, can be found in our 50-million-word database of published words by and about WSC. We suspect it is a warped version of his famous remarks on King Alfonso XIII in Great Contemporaries: "Courage is rightly esteemed the first of human qualities because, as has been said, it is the quality which guarantees all others." Note that even this is not quite a Churchill original: "as has been said" most likely refers to Samuel Johnson's "Sir, you know courage is reckoned the greatest of all virtues; because, unless a man has that virtue, he has no security for preserving any other." But Churchill expresses this thought better than Johnson.

- Answering requests for quotation attributions is one of the tasks assigned to the editor and is most agreeable, in that it sparked a huge database and digital scans of great wads of material, including all of Churchill's 15 million words from his books, articles, speeches and correspondence in the Companion Volumes of the Official Biography. The upshot is a forthcoming book, now tentatively entitled Winston Churchill by Himself, to be published by the Ebury Press division of Random House in 2008, I feel sure that readers will enjoy using this comprehensive lexicon and reference. —RML

Send your questions to the editor
few defenders of freedom have excelled Winston Churchill in the capacity for drawing lessons from the past to overcome present dangers and survive future perils. He never lost sight of an invaluable axiom: "In the mirror of history all great events and personalities reappear in one fashion or another."

Napoleon and Hitler are classic reappearances. With Greek-tragedy certainty, their actions foreshadowed their Nemesis. At French military schools, before promotion, Napoleon's nickname was "The Little Corporal." During the First World War, Hitler was a corporal and won the Iron Cross. At the apex of power, both displayed maniacal insistence by throwing their armies into the snowy vastness of Russia, where patriotic heroism drove back the invaders.

Another dramatic resemblance is that both made and abandoned plans to invade Britain. But they had different attitudes to the sea. Hitler's dislike of it was intense, and never concealed. Napoleon's sea knowledge was nil, but to the despair of his admirals, egotistical folly convinced him he was an expert. He issued patently absurd orders which the admirals were too frightened to denounce in his presence. One man was a courageous exception.1 The Minister of the Navy, Admiral Denis Decres, warned the French Emperor of impending disaster three days or so ahead of Trafalgar. His words came too late. Nelson obliterated the French Fleet, and also any chance Napoleon had of mounting a successful invasion of Great Britain. Hitler had no such wise counsel.

When the Second World War began, on 3 September 1939, expediency impelled Prime Minister Chamberlain to appoint Churchill First Lord of the Admiralty, a portfolio he had held from 1911-1915 and was ousted from during the Dardanelles imbroglio. Britain's mishandling of the Norwegian-Narvik campaign, in April 1940, gave Churchill's lingering vindictive political enemies false hopes of a Dardanelles-style expulsion. The rising tide of public preference for Churchill to take charge foiled them.2

And the record is now completely clear: inside the British Government, there had been very tardy accep-
tance of Churchill's early warnings of Hitler's Norwegian intentions. Not until 8 April 1940 did the British mine the waters around Narvik. Unfortunately, on the next day, Hitler successfully launched his planned attack on Norway and Denmark to ensure essential Scandinavian iron ore supplies for Germany would not be cut off. Retrospectively, one can see that Hitler's seizure of Norway was achieved only by throwing into the maelstrom every German warship that happened to be in a state of sea readiness.

Facing Parliament, Churchill did not seek to evade responsibility; he stood shoulder to shoulder with Chamberlain. But the Norwegian debacle precipitated Chamberlain's removal. By May 1 Oth, Churchill had begun his lion-hearted premiership.

For Hitler the Norway sea encounters were extremely costly. He lost three cruisers and ten destroyers; two heavy cruisers and a pocket battleship were withdrawn for repairs. Germany did gain improved access via Norway to the Atlantic and the Arctic. But Britain's larger fleet had easily absorbed Norwegian battle losses. The situation later influenced Hitler's cancellation of his plan to invade Britain. It also lessened Germany's ability to frustrate the Dunkirk evacuation.

Later in 1940, when the British were confronted with the threat of a Nazi invasion, a service of intercession and prayer was held at Westminster Abbey. Churchill attended and later wrote: "The English are loth to expose their feelings, but in my small stall in the choir I could feel the pent-up, passionate emotion, and also the fear of the congregation, not of death or wounds or material loss, but of defeat and the final ruin of Britain."  

There is merit in taking a clear-eyed look at exactly why Hitler decided, on 24 May 1940, to order a halt to the advance of his forces when they were only fifteen miles from Dunkirk. Ian Kershaw, a highly esteemed historian, writes in his biography of Hitler: "Postwar suggestions that Hitler was deliberately allowing British troops to get away as an act of generosity to encourage Britain to come to the peace table with its armies intact are far-fetched...the decision not to move on Dunkirk was taken for military reasons, and on military advice."  

Hitler believed it was imperative to conserve tanks for operations in the south of France. He was also positive that delay was inevitable if a few days were needed to vanquish the British troops at Dunkirk.

Churchill summed it up precisely after the war: "Calais was the crux." Undoubtedly the epic defense there made the Dunkirk rescue feasible by winning vital time: two German divisions were caught up in the annihilation of British resistance. It is fair and just to mention that among the defenders were the last remaining regular army infantry who had been rushed to Calais from England, to fight to the last bullet and to the last man. Overhead the Royal Air Force gave the much-vaunted Luftwaffe an unpleasant foretaste of the valor that would drive them from the skies in the forthcoming Battle of Britain.

In the blackest of all hours Churchill spoke to a meeting of non-Cabinet ministers: "Of course, whatever happens at Dunkirk, we shall fight on." His colleagues jumped up from their chairs, shouted their approbation, and patted his shoulders. Years afterwards he recalled, "There is no doubt that had I at this juncture faltered at all in the leading of the nation, I should have been hurls out of office." These words did not describe the view of every Cabinet minister. There were some—there always are—who doubted the nation's will. But the words are quintessential Churchill, proving that he understood the dauntless will of the people he led.

Hitler ineptly believed he had the British completely beleaguered and almost on their knees. In fact, they were sturdy and refractory, embattled and engrossed in toughening defenses, erecting road-blocks, digging airraid shelters in their gardens, evacuating children to the countryside, and pulling down road signs to confuse the expected invaders. Just how united and embattled they were Hitler found out when he unleashed his fierce bombing of cities, and also when Britain rejected his transparently spurious "peace offer." It was abundantly evident he was playing for time to tighten his python-like grip on continental Europe.

As the months passed, Hitler remained confident that Britain could be brought down on his say-so. For a while he clung to vain hopes that there would be post-bombing panic in London and other cities, to compel Churchill's coalition government to clamour for peace. Thus invasion became an inviting prospect, despite the increasing odds against it. And, after the loan of fifty American destroyers to the Royal Navy, he had to consider that eventually the United States might intervene.

It is worth noting that as far back as 1934 a lowly-ranked German writer, Dr. Ewald Banse, published a book visualizing with infinite pleasure the destruction that "sooner or later" would overtake Britain, "a proud and seemingly invincible nation...This country, which was last conquered in 1066, will once again obey a foreign master."  

The German Embassy in London hastily put up a smoke-screen, denouncing Banse's views. But the record shows that in February 1940 the Germans began broadcasting to England through the self-proclaimed "New British Broadcasting Station," making similar blood-
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curdling threats of invasion. The sound quality was indifferent, and the accompanying music bizarre. (Its signature tune, "The Bonnie, Bonnie Banks of Loch Lomond," considerably irritated the Scots—an imprudent act in peacetime, and notoriously fatal in war.) The most frequent broadcaster in English was the gross-voiced, ex-British Union of Fascists member William Joyce (comically dubbed "Lord Haw Haw" in England). He was caught and executed for treason after the war.

On 1 August 1940, German planes dropped Nazi leaflets disingenuously entitled "A Last Appeal to Reason" over England. It is reasonably certain that Hitler never saw the English newspaper photographs showing the levity of housewives holding up his "appeal." More curious objects were dropped by German planes: empty parachutes, small amounts of high explosives, maps, and photographs, lists of well-known Britons presumably marked for extinction, fake instructions to imaginary agents. Although all this engendered smiles throughout the British Isles, it did not lessen the national preoccupation with preparedness, especially after Hitler's barbaric attacks on the Low Countries.

Shortly after the war had begun, in November 1939, Grand-Admiral Erich Raeder had looked into the possibility of a landing in England. By July 1940, Hitler had signed his Directive Number 16 to give effect to the invasion plan, named "Operation Sea Lion." But backstage, he turned out to be astoundingly double-minded, wobbling between the decision to invade or not invade. Like all tyrants, he took delight in voicing splenetic public admonitions to send shock-waves of fear through his foes. This increased rather than diminished British determination.

At one point he tried to cloak his dilatory behaviour by telling a hysterically approving Berlin crowd: "When people are very curious in Great Britain and ask 'Yes, but why doesn't he come?' we reply, 'Calm yourselves! Calm yourselves! He is coming! He is coming!'"

Churchill had said calmly in a broadcast made while bombs were falling on London: "We are waiting for the long-promised invasion. So are the fishes."

Despite being regarded as one of history's most prominent gamblers, Hitler became a prey to dubiety. Evading a fatal throw of the dice, on 17 September 1940, he finally abandoned his notions of risking all in a landing on British soil. Even failure in a botched-up preliminary probing raid could have exploded the myth of his invincibility.

FOOTNOTES
8. Ibid. 116-18.
YOUNG WINSTON'S hasty 1906 decision may return to haunt Kenya's capital.

The Time Bomb That Is Nairobi

BY JOHN KAMAU

Kenya's capital is a disaster waiting to happen. Its four million residents are living on the edge. The problem has increased over the years, though it was first brought to the attention of Winston Churchill, Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, one hundred years ago last year.

The East African Standard has unearthed archives showing that Nairobi was built on a site condemned by engineers as it emerged as a township in early 1900. Searching for open space, major institutions have recently been moving out of the Nairobi plain to the more "secure" Upper Hill, where most buildings rest on rock. But with almost half of today's mostly residential buildings constructed without standards, experts fear the possibilities suggested by January's collapse of a building in River Road. "If a major earthquake occurred," says Dr. Kamau Gachigi, a material scientist at the University of Nairobi, "it would be a major catastrophe...what we saw in River Road would be child's play." But some geologists say that the terrain poses no problems if proper advice is sought and followed from engineers.

The original city fathers wanted the place moved. Shortly after the swampy conditions induced a plague breakout out in 1901, colonial medical officer Dr. W.H. MacDonald worried that the city was in the wrong place. In May 1903 Dr. Moffat, principal medical officer of the East Africa and Uganda Protectorate, called Nairobi dangerous and defective. After another plague in 1904, he recommended relocating residents to modern-day Kikuyu Township. But Moffat left in April 1904, and his successors held the costs of relocation too high.

On 18 May 1906, Sir James Sadler, commissioner for the Protectorate, wrote to Churchill, Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, complaining about the emergence of Kenya's capital: "...at the commencement of the 1902 plague...the then-commissioner, Sir Charles Elliot, was strongly of the opinion that the site, which had been selected three years before by the manager of the Uganda Railway without consulting medical or sanitary authorities, was, with its inadequate drainage, unsuitable for a large and growing population. [It is a] depression with a very thin layer of soil or rock. The soil was water-logged during the greater part of the year."

Churchill was reminded that four years previously, it had been recommended that the town be moved "to some point on the hills." But railway engineers did not see Nairobi as becoming anything more than an Indian township—which, they argued, could "prosper in spite of unsanitary conditions and chronic plague."

Sadler told Churchill this was a critical point in Nairobi's history; that his predecessor had said: "...when the rainy season commenced, the whole town is practically transformed into a swamp." But the Board decided instead only to try to drain the swampy bazaar area.

Nairobi continued to develop quickly and Sadler finally threw in the towel: "It is, I admit, too late to consider the question of moving the town from the plains to the higher position along the line some miles to the north. We had a chance in 1902, and I think it was a pity that we did not do so then as advocated by Sir Charles Elliot." But even Sadler did not anticipate the growth, saying Nairobi would never become "a city like Johannesburg or a large commercial centre, for if there is a rapid development of industries or minerals in any of the new districts, the centres would spring up around them."

Churchill accepted this idea and made the final decision: "It is now too late to change, and thus lack of foresight and of a comprehensive view leaves its permanent imprint upon the countenance of a new country."

By the time the Nairobi Sanitary Commission was appointed in 1913, to enquire and report upon the sanitation and drainage of the township, the town had taken shape. It was now left to the engineers to build a city with the challenges that soggy ground presented. Many years later, failure to consult experts could make many buildings in the city uninhabitable in a few years' time.
"WHAT HAD the great American politician and orator ever have seen in the brash young cavalry lieutenant of 1895? Churchill smiled. More than his own father had seen—that much was certain! But if Winston had striven throughout his life to prove his father wrong about him, that wasn't the case with Cockran. Churchill had striven to prove Cockran right"

Becoming Winston Churchill

BY MICHAEL McMENAMIN AND CURT ZOLLER

Chartwell, Kent
Winter, 1954

Winston Spencer Churchill stepped away from the stand-up desk in his study and walked to the window. Cigar in one hand, a weak whisky and water in the other, the eighty-year-old Prime Minister looked out over the snow-covered Weald of Kent. To him it was the most beautiful view in the world, and he often turned to it often for inspiration, or to gather his thoughts.

He had been revising a speech to The State University of New York, which had awarded Churchill an honorary Doctorate of Law. He would accept in absentia.
After all, the only "degree" he had was from Sandhurst, which had not provided the liberal education he would have received at university. But this was an honour from America, and he rarely turned down any recognition from the land of his mother's birth: the country which helped him save the world from Hitler. It had been nearly sixty years since he had first stepped on American shores.

Churchill could see it still in his mind's eye: the incomparable New York City skyline. The Statue of Liberty. The incredible energy which seemed to rise out of Manhattan's bedrock. And then he had seen the tall, sturdy figure of Bourke Cockran on the quay—the great Irish-American politician and friend of his mother and two aunts, easily recognized from their description.

No other man looked like Bourke Cockran, Aunt Leonie had told him, and she had been right. What his mother and aunts had not prepared him for, however, was Cockran's magnetic countenance, the breadth of his knowledge, the originality of expression, the brilliance of his mind. And, of course, the voice! Difficult to describe even now, but Churchill had always wished he had a voice like Cockran's. Alas, it was not to be no matter how hard or long he practiced.

Churchill wondered. Whatever had Cockran seen in that young cavalry lieutenant all those years ago? More than his own father had seen—that much was certain! If Churchill had striven throughout his life to accomplish things that proved his father wrong about him, that wasn't the case with Cockran. No, Churchill had striven to prove Cockran right, to live up to the older man's high opinion—oft expressed—of what a glittering career he believed the young Winston would have. Churchill rarely reflected on America without thinking of his old friend.

Though he'd known the last three American presidents very well, none compared to Cockran, whom so few now remembered. Churchill could not erase from his mind a conversation he'd recently had with the Democratic Party's presidential nominee in the last American election. Decent fellow. Governor from one of those states in the middle of the country. He had asked a question many who met Churchill asked: "Upon whom did you base your oratorical style?"

Churchill had answered as he always did: "Your great American statesman, Bourke Cockran."

Adlai Stevenson had been surprised. Most were. They expected to hear him say that his father had inspired him. Lord Randolph had indeed—but not as an orator.

Thinking to give the governor a treat, Churchill began quoting at length from his two favorite Cockran speeches, which he had memorized nearly sixty years ago. The first was in 1896 at Madison Square Garden, where Bourke had opposed his own party on the issue of free sil-

ver—the inflationist proposal for unlimited silver coinage—drawing a larger crowd than his party's presidential nominee, William Jennings Bryan. Then he quoted Cockran's 1903 speech on Free Trade to the Liberal Club in London—after which the Liberals had attempted, unsuccessfully, to persuade Bourke to leave America and stand for Parliament in Great Britain.

Churchill shook his great head at the memory of Stevenson's reaction: a blank stare. Clearly he simply didn't know who Bourke Cockran was.

"America's greatest orator," they had called him from the mid-1880s until his premature death at age 69 in 1923: a close friend and adviser to Presidents Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt. It was sad, Churchill thought, that even educated Americans had such short memories.

Churchill had never possessed much regard for the Republican Party in America. For most of the 20th century it had been protectionist to its core, something the free-trader Churchill could not countenance. But if the most recent Democratic nominee did not even know the name of his party's most eloquent champion of Free Trade and individual liberty, perhaps it was not so bad that Ike had defeated him. If only Ike had chosen a more qualified Secretary of State. Churchill smiled. "Dull, duller, Dulles." One of his better lines. The cabinet certainly thought it funny. A pity he could never use it in public.

Looking out at the snow, Churchill decided it was time once more to remind his American cousins of Bourke Cockran: the man to whom, he once told his cousin, he owed the best things in his career.

Churchill took another sip of his whisky, placed the tumbler on his stand-up desk, switched on the intercom and called for one of two secretaries who were constantly on duty. When she arrived, he handed her a marked up copy of his speech.

"There and there," he said, pointing to red marks he had made on the draft. "I want you to insert what I am about to dictate." She sat on the edge of her chair, pad and pencil poised as Churchill began to speak.

"I remember when I first came over here in 1895 I was a guest of your great lawyer and orator, Mr. Bourke Cockran. I was only a young cavalry subaltern but he poured out all his wealth of mind and eloquence to me. Some of his sentences are deeply rooted in my mind. 'The earth,' he said, 'is a generous mother. She will produce in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace.' I used to repeat it so frequently on British platforms that I had to give it a holiday. But now today it seems to come back with new pregnancy and force, for never was the"
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choice between blessing and cursing more vehemently presented to the human race."

Churchill paused. "That's the first part. Did you get that all?" She nodded. Churchill began to speak again.

"There was another thing Bourke Cockran used to say to me. I cannot remember his actual words, but they amounted to this: 'In a society where there is democratic tolerance and freedom under the law, many kinds of evils will crop up, but give them a little time and they usually breed their own cure.' I do not see any reason to doubt the truth of that....

"You must not indeed think I am talking politics. I make it a rule never to meddle in internal or party politics of any friendly country. It's hard enough to understand the party politics of your own! Still, I remain, as I have said, a strong supporter of the principles which Mr. Bourke Cockran inculcated into me on my youthful visit before most of you were born.

"Pray read that back to me," Churchill went on. The young woman did. It sounded right. He dismissed her and walked back to the window. Sixty years, he thought....in that time the world had been turned upside down. Twice. Still, he could see it all as if it were yesterday...

New York City
9 November 1895

Bourke Cockran felt a chill wind whip in from the Hudson River and pulled the collar of his Chesterfield higher around his neck. The sky was gray and a light mist was falling as he watched two tugboats nudge the Cunard liner RMS Etruria aside the pier. She was a big ship, well over 500 feet long, with two stacks and three tall masts sporting no sails. A far cry from the SS England, which had brought him to America over twenty years earlier, with only a single stack and a full complement of sails.

Ten minutes later the gangplank was down, and first class passengers were beginning to disembark. He thought he would recognize Winston because Jennie had shown him a photograph of her son when they were in Paris.

Jennie...Paris. Had their love affair really been six months ago? He shook his head. In May, after their mother's death, he had agreed to accompany the three Jerome sisters back to America along with their mother's body; Clara's husband was already there, and John Leslie could not spare the time to accompany his wife Leonie.

HISTORY HAS LOST WHAT THEY DID FOR ONE ANOTHER: Bourke Cockran (left, circa 1904) was the single most influential person in Churchill's life until he married Clementine. Churchill (at Cowes, 1899) was unformed clay before Cockran lit the spark that in Robert Pilpel's words "illuminated the long and arduous road that would take him through triumphs and tragedies to his rendezvous with greatness". Jennie (right, 1885) was the luminous mother and lover who united them. (Photos: Tarka King and the authors.)
Cockran had been surprised when Jennie, at the last minute, begged off. It had surprised her sisters as well when she told them she was not returning to America.

At first, Cockran had feared that it was because of him, but Leonie had assured him this was not true. She said he had done wonders to revive Jennie's spirits after the death of Randolph, and that returning to America on such a sad occasion might undo all the good Cockran had done. Cockran had been encouraged, and had continued to hope that he still had a chance with Jennie, notwithstanding some of the spirited arguments between them.

Cockran had never met a woman like Jennie Churchill. In fact, the only one to compare was his own Rhoda; but she had known little of politics, and could not have cared less. Jennie professed not to care about politics, but her familiarity with all the issues of the day, and the personalities behind them, belied that notion.

Upon returning to America, Cockran had spent some time researching the career and reading the speeches of Jennie's late husband, for whatever insight that might afford him in wooing her. Randolph had been quick enough in debate, and had possessed a withering tongue; but he appeared to Cockran to be more of an opportunist than a principled statesman.

Lord Randolph's speeches on Ireland alone convinced Cockran of that. In the late 1870s, Randolph had showed remarkable empathy for the situation in Ireland when he attacked Gladstone's proposal to suspend Irish civil liberties, including habeas corpus. In doing so, Randolph had isolated himself from his own Conservative Party, and Cockran had admired what he thought was Randolph's political courage.

But once he read that infamous incitement to resistance in 1886—"Ulster will fight, Ulster will be right"—when Lord Randolph had opposed any Home Rule for Ireland that included Protestant Ulster, Bourke found he had less respect for him. Pure politics. Opportunism. An election was coming, and Randolph had played the "Orange card" to attract the Liberal Unionists who opposed Home Rule. To Cockran, he was no better than a Tammany Hall hack dancing to Boss Croker's music—something Cockran had never done.

But Cockran was looking forward to meeting Jennie's son. If he had half the ambition and brains of his mother, then he might have a bright future in politics, brighter even than his father's. The question was, what kind of politician would he be? Jennie's son would have political courage, of that he was certain. But what about Lord Randolph's son? He didn't know.

The Irish statesman had often wished for a son but the Good Lord obviously had other plans. In time, he knew, they would be revealed. Cockran hoped that Winston would be amused and entertained by what he had planned for him during his time in New York. He was determined to do everything in his power to insure that Winston made a favorable report to his mother of his hospitality. A dinner party tonight was only the beginning: an assembly of the leading lawyers of the New York City Bar and Judiciary.

At Cockran's suggestion, Judge Ingraham had agreed to invite Churchill to attend a sensational society murder trial over which he was presiding. On Wednesday, Cockran had arranged with the Commandant of West Point for Churchill and his traveling companion to visit the American equivalent of Sandhurst.

Cockran watched the first passengers walk down the Etrurids gangplank. Standing a good head taller than most of the people around him, he spotted his two charges, Lieutenants Churchill and Barnes, when they were halfway down the gangplank. He recognized Winston from the photograph: a trim, good-looking, sandy-haired youth, maybe five and a half feet, give or take an inch or two. The dark-haired lad beside him must be Reggie Barnes.

"Winston Churchill! Over here!" Cockran's voice easily carried over the crowd and Churchill acknowledged it with a wave. Moments later, the three were together.

"Delighted to meet you, Mr. Cockran," Churchill said, as he introduced Reggie Barnes.

"Please, call me Bourke," Cockran said as he directed a porter to follow them with the Englishmen's baggage. "I have a carriage waiting for us."

Winston Churchill pushed back from his writing desk, where he had been drafting a new article, and lit one of the succulent Havana cigars he had brought back with him from his adventure in Cuba. He and Barnes had enjoyed a ripping good time, both in New York and in roaming "the Pearl of the Antilles." It was a shame he had not been able to come up with enough to write a book about his Cuban adventure, but there simply wasn't a story there. One needed a beginning, a middle, and an end, with a dashing young hero—himself of course—in the thick of things.

Still, Winston was pleased with the initial literary output afforded him by Cuba. Five letters from the field for the Daily Graphic had been well received. And £5 for each of the five reports was equal to a month's allowance from his Mamma—a tidy sum. Upon his return to England, the Saturday Review had commissioned three »
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articles, further advancing the cause of the Churchill name and bank account. The first two articles had been well received, and now he was working on the third.

Churchill's current dilemma was to find a way to repeat his journalistic success. He was scheduled to leave for India at the end of the summer. India... No thing was happening there! No newspaper would hire him to file dispatches from such a tranquil land where trouble did not loom on the horizon.

But Egypt? South Africa? Trouble did loom there. He and Bourke had talked about it earlier in the year, when the older man had called to his attention the fact that the majority of the British population in the Transvaal paid 90 percent of the taxes yet had no representation in the Boer Parliament. Bourke had reminded Churchill that the American as well as the French Revolution had arisen from just such unfair and inequitable taxation.

Cockran's conversations with Churchill, initially in New York and then in London, had opened a new world: Economics. It moved everything. Cockran had brought to life what Winston had only read about in Fawcett and Lecky. It certainly explained Cuba. As he wrote for the Daily Graphic, "There is no doubt the island has been overtaxed in a monstrous manner for a considerable period. So much money is drawn from the country every year that industries are paralyzed and development is impossible."

Churchill again picked up Cockran's letter, impressed by the man's prophecy. It was the economic condition of Cuba, not the passions on either side, that would dictate the outcome of the rebellion. Sugar and tobacco were all the wealth which Cuba possessed, and those industries had been destroyed by the rebels. Soon, famine would follow and when that happened, Cockran had written, America would have to act. Cockran would be pleased by what Churchill had written about Cuba in his final Saturday Review article.

As for Ireland, however, nothing Winston could say or write would meet with his friend's approval. Cockran's case was persuasive and Churchill had imagined the rich timbre of the older man's voice as he read the copy of the speech Cockran had sent him on Irish Home Rule. He was rather pleased with the reply he had posted to Cockran earlier today. He'd used Cockran's own logic: Economics.

How would Cockran reply to his having used the example of Scotland as a country whose wealth increased after its union with England? Why should Ireland be any different, now that England has recognized the sins of the past and has done its best to correct them?

"Everything that can be done to alleviate distress and heal the wounds of the past is done—and done in spite of rhetorical attempts to keep them open" was how he had phrased it in his letter to Cockran. Let him reply to that, he thought.

Churchill hoped Cockran would return soon to England. There were more things than Ireland that he wanted to discuss, especially Bourke's view that Churchill "would take a commanding position in public life at the first opportunity which arose." Churchill already knew he would. But he couldn't wait to hear why Cockran thought so as well.

FINEST HOUR 13/4 '30
"Like Goldfish in a Bowl":
The Alcohol Quotient

"DINNER AT THE WHITE HOUSE (DRY, ALAS!); with the Sultan....
After dinner, recovery from the effects of the above."
—WSC to Harry Hopkins, Casablanca, 21 January 1943
(The Prime Minister always referred to FDR's Casablanca villa as "the White House;")

BY
WARREN F.
KIMBALL

No talk or story about Churchill is complete without anecdotes about his drinking—tales he himself often repeated and embroidered. His Classic retort was: "I have taken more out of alcohol than alcohol has taken out of me."

A frequent tableau was when Churchill would ask his science adviser and crony Frederick Lindemann, Lord Cherwell, to estimate how much champagne and spirits, which he drank every day, he had consumed in his life, and what level it would reach to in the railroad car or room where they were seated. "The Prof" would duly take out his slide rule and then announce that it would fill only a small fraction of the space. Churchill, visibly disappointed by this attack on his lusty Elizabethan self-image, would usually remark, "How much to achieve, how little time remains."

Dean Acheson, President Truman's Secretary of State, who was present on one of these occasions, quipped that the Old Man "had expected we would all be swimming like goldfish in a bowl." Late in World War II, during a discussion of health, Churchill vigorously asserted that he "could still always sleep well, eat well and especially drink well." Describing a meeting with the Sultan of Morocco, Churchill wrote:
"Dinner....(Dry, alas!)...After dinner, recovery from the effects of the above."

Many of his close aides labeled tales of his heavy drinking as exaggerations, noting (correctly according to Roosevelt aide Harry Hopkins) that Churchill watered his whisky—a weak "mouthwash" according to his personal secretary, Jock Colville, despite the occasional "stiff whisky and soda, at 8:45 a.m.," as reported by Anthony Eden. But Colville did not deny that Churchill drank steadily, and more than just whisky.

Champagne was a ritual at dinner, as was brandy afterwards. As White House speechwriter Robert Sherwood put it, Churchill's "consumption of alcohol....continued at quite regular intervals through most of his waking hours without visible effect."

Offered tea for breakfast at 7:30 a.m. at the Cairo Embassy after an eleven hour flight from Marrakesh, the Prime Minister declined, asking instead for some white wine—which he drained in a gulp. He then remarked (perhaps in jest, perhaps not): "Ah! that is good, but you know I have already had two whiskies and soda and two cigars this morning." A British diplomat observed him at Yalta "drinking buckets of Caucasian champagne which would undermine the health of any ordinary man."

Even before Churchill and Roosevelt held their first conference, at Argentia Bay in August 1941, the President expressed reservations about the Englishman's antiquated, "Victorian" views, and his excessive drinking—hardly expressions of confidence or closeness. When Roosevelt and Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King met in April 1940, they spent much of the time gossiping about Churchill's alcohol consumption. FDR later groused about what he called "the Winston hours," which called for drinking and talking until the "wee hours of the morning." When Churchill became Prime Minister, Roosevelt commented ungenerously that he "supposed Churchill was the best man that England had, even if he was drunk half of his time." Roosevelt's colleagues were worse. "A drunken sot" was the phrase of one close FDR adviser.

Wendell Willkie, who ran for President against FDR in 1940 but supported Roosevelt in the war, later visited London, and was asked by Roosevelt if Churchill was a drunk. Willkie replied that he had as much to drink as Churchill did when they met, "and no one has ever called me a drunk"—which may tell us more about Willkie than it does about Churchill.

The sharpest accusation of Churchill as drunk came from Field Marshal Alamein, who wrote in his diary that Churchill tried to recover with drink after a tiring speech in the House of Commons: "As a result he was in a maudlin, bad tempered, drunken mood..."
"LIKE GOLDFISH IN A BOWL..."

Brooke later admitted that he too had lost his temper and that they had "one of the heaviest thunderstorms that we had." But that is the only such entry found in his extensive and critical diaries.

To be fair, Churchill expressed concern—horror might be a better word—about Roosevelt's drinking habits. In this case it was the President's late afternoon ritual of concocting what he called martinis: gin mixed with both dry and sweet vermouth and stirred vigorously by FDR himself. Not even Churchill, who loathed mixed drinks, could turn down a martini constructed by the President's own hand, but the Englishman apparently became adept at using the nearest bathroom or flower pot as a disposal. He had no such compunctions with others, reputedly once going so far as to spit out a mouthful of what FDR's cousin, Polly Delano, labeled a Tom Collins.2

I have found only one reference to Churchill drinking a martini other than in FDR's presence. It is in the official biography, Winston S. Churchill, vol. 8, "Never Despair," by Sir Martin Gilbert (London: Heinemann, 1988, 1298), concerning Churchill's 1958 cruise on the Onassis yacht Christina:

[They sailed through the] Dardanelles, past the Gallipoli peninsula to the Sea of Marmara and Istanbul, where the Patriarch Athenagoras was invited on board to meet Churchill. The passage of the Dardanelles had been made after Churchill had gone to bed "because," as Nonie Montague Browne later recalled, "they knew it would upset him." For this part of the cruise, Churchill was joined by his daughter Diana. "He liked to sit on deck," Nonie Montague Browne later recalled. "He would come on deck at about noon. He would have a dry martini and spoonfuls of caviar. We would be a long time over lunch—cigar, brandy, coffee. Then he would sit in the sun."

The Montague Brownes (Anthony was his personal private secretary) were close to Sir Winston from 1952 to the end in 1965. Many habits changed in his old age but I do not think he enjoyed martinis, dry or otherwise, in earlier years.

It's always possible that WSC finally changed his habits and drank martinis. But I doubt it—since he was devoted to those habits (sometimes to Clemmie's despair). I wonder if Nonie Montague Browne mistook a glass of white wine for a martini? The long lunch with a caviar, a cigar, brandy, and coffee resonates.

The Prime Minister won a small victory for his preferred habits when he met King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia in 1945. Noting that the King's religion required that he abstain from alcohol and tobacco, Churchill announced that "my religion prescribed as an absolute sacred rite smoking cigars and drinking alcohol before, after, and if need be during, all meals and the intervals between them." Churchill reported Ibn Saud's "complete surrender," although the King had his unwitting revenge when he gave the Englishman a drink that Churchill described as "a very nasty cocktail." Turns out it was an aphrodisiac.3

The potentially darker side of Churchill's use of alcohol has been presented, but only in caustic and irresponsible fashion. Neither those accusations, nor the argument that Churchill watered and nursed his drinks, are persuasive to this writer, but such is the fate of iconoclasm. All that said, there is little testimony of Churchill being drunk, in the falling-down, non-compos mentis sense, while he was Prime Minister, whatever the occasional reports of slurred words. Perhaps, as C. P. Snow quipped, Churchill was no alcoholic, for "no alcoholic could drink that much."4

"Alcohol-dependent" may be the appropriate phrase. Whatever Churchill's prodigious consumption of alcohol, it was a lifetime habit, not a temporary response to the pressure and tension of wartime leadership. There is no evidence, factual or anecdotal, to indicate that Churchill's drinking affected his policies during the war or, for that matter, his policies before the war.

President Abraham Lincoln is alleged to have responded to complaints about General U.S. Grant's drinking by challenging the questioner to "find out what brand of whisky he drinks so I can send a case to my other generals"—generals who were notoriously cautious and indecisive. Britain's King George had no need to send a case to Churchill.

NOTES

1. This is hardly a new topic, nor is this new information to those interested in the matter. I am indebted to the editor for adding some "wet" anecdotes to my draft. I have focused on the Second World War years. Finest Hour has, in various issues, addressed stories about Churchill's drinking, with material now also posted on the Churchill Centre website, including an essay questioning the notion that Churchill was an "Alcohol Abuser." That piece that includes the delightful story of his presumably persuading a doctor attending him after he was hit by a car in New York in early December 1931 (during Prohibition in the USA), to prescribe "the use of alcoholic spirits especially at mealtimes," with 250 cc per day as the minimum. The original note is in the Churchill Papers, CHAR 1/400A/46, 26 January 1932 (Churchill Archives Centre, Cambridge).

Perhaps the doctor's order had good medical reasons. As Lady Soames observed of the traffic accident, her father "suffered severe shock and bruising, and developed pleurisy; but for the fact that he had been wearing a heavy fur-lined overcoat, he might well have been killed." Winston and Clementine: The Personal Letters of the Churchills, Mary Soames, ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1999), 357.


4. The C. P. Snow remark is from Raymond O'Connor to W. F. Kimball, 21Dec87 (personal correspondence). All the references to Churchill's drinking in Martin Gilbert, *In Search of Churchill* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1994) take the "weak mouthwash" position.

At the 2006 Churchill Conference in Chicago, Danny Mander, a bodyguard at the Teheran Conference in 1943, announced that he had helped a dead-drunk Churchill and Eden home after a long dinner with the Russians. This was, said Churchill health authority Dr. John Mather, the first primary source testimony to Churchill ever being the worse for drink that he ever heard.

**AUTHOR'S NOTE**


Finally there is the dubious tale told by Paula Fox, *The Coldest Winter* (New York: Henry Holt, 2005), a "memoir" about the winter of 1945-46 in war-torn Europe. In England, Fox wrote, she caught a glimpse of "a clump of men...carrying and pushing a drunken Winston Churchill. Not only was he weeping but mascara was puddling under his eyes before it ran down his plump cheeks." All that from a glimpse? The plump cheeks are correct, the weeping plausible; but the mascara is just plain silly.
Drink and Food at Yalta

ABSTRACT BY ROBERT A. COURTS


Winston Churchill was not a delicate diner: he slurped soup, spilled wine, bolted food, shouted at guests. Even during wartime, it was said that he ate enough for two men and three diplomats, his breakfast typically including lamb chops and bacon, washed down with something, often alcoholic. Churchill claimed to have drunk an Imperial pint of champagne (modern writers have exaggerated it to two bottles) every day since he was 23, but he was seldom if ever drunk. He had a formidable constitution, and the whisky that was always by his side was often largely soda: "I have taken more out of alcohol than alcohol has taken out of me," was his best-known summary.

Churchill's awesome output of work, often extending until the early morning, needed a very large intake of energy, and this he found in food and drink. But the true resilience of his constitution was put to the test during one meal in one of the most defining moments of world history: Yalta, February 1945.

Here in the Crimea, laid almost derelict by the Germans, the Big Three met to hammer out the details of what Churchill was coming to see as a gloomy peace, dominated by Russian communism.

The three leaders were aging. Churchill was seventy, Stalin and Roosevelt only slightly younger. They had only ever been united by their hatred of Hitler, and now all were ground down by the pressures of war. And Roosevelt was critically ill. Already crippled by polio, by the time of the Yalta conference he was dying, and it showed. His skin looked like a parchment and he suffered from a hacking cough.

Able to concentrate for only minutes at a time, Roosevelt with his weakness provided Stalin with a golden opportunity. For at this conference the Big Three would jostle for their position in the postwar world. Would it be a capitalist or communist one? Would the British Empire still exist? The leaders were jealous and suspicious of each other, and each was determined to make his mark on history.

At the Russian-hosted dinner, Stalin took his opportunity. When Roosevelt and Churchill arrived for the late start at 9 p.m., they were met by waiters thrusting wine, vodka, and local champagne into their hands. The air may have been jolly, but many of the waiters were secret police, for the dictator-host trusted no one.

Once seated, the diners were beset by swarms of vicious insects that began biting their ankles. No sooner had they sat than they were on their feet again, as Stalin began toasting everyone present. Through twenty courses the interminable toasts proceeded: nearly fifty in all. Some guests dozed, others were openly drunk.

Churchill was in his element, but it was midnight before he realised the purpose of this supposed Russian largess. For there was Roosevelt, at the far end of the table: an exhausted, waxen figure, the only head of state present on the occasion.

Churchill immediately rose to give a final toast of farewell, but it was too late. Franklin Roosevelt sat buried in Russian hospitality, his resistance at an end. Over the next few days, Stalin got everything he wanted, and more besides: Poland crushed, Germany dismembered, huge reparations. Winston Churchill fought against them, but with an enfeebled President, he was powerless to stop them being waved through.

Meant to secure the peace, the Yalta conference let the world slide straight from hot to cold war. It was to be another forty-four years before the world would recover from the wreckage of that dinner table in the Crimea.
"I WAS OFTEN UNCERTAIN whether the Ablative Absolute should end in 'e' or 'i' or 'o' or 'is' or 'ibus'....Dr. Welldon seemed to be physically pained by a mistake being made in any of these letters. I remember that later on, Mr. Asquith used to have just the same sort of look on his face when I sometimes adorned a Cabinet discussion by bringing out one of my few but faithful Latin quotations." —WSC, *My Early Life*, 1930

**Spencer Churchill (p)**

**at Harrow School 1888-1892**

**BY GEOFFREY J. FLETCHER • PART II**

**W**inston was a keen member of the Harrow School Rifle Corps, which was a Company of the 18th Middlesex Volunteer Corps. The uniform was grey with blue facings, the badge being crossed arrows, which later became that of the School. He thoroughly enjoyed the field days against other schools, and the mock battles. He was part of a guard of honour for Princess Louise, Marchioness of Lorne, who had come to open an exhibition. An outstanding fencer, Winston won the Public School Championship, beating Johnson of Bradfield and Ticehurst in Tonbridge. In addition he was an expert swimmer, representing his House in competitions. (He remained a swimmer all his life. See back cover! —Ed.)

Scholastically his main achievement was to pass the preliminary exam for Sandhurst which, he was the first to admit, was owed to a colossal piece of luck. He knew he would be required to draw a map. He put the names of principal countries into a hat, and pulled out "New Zealand" memorizing its topography. The first question in the exam paper was, "Draw a map of New Zealand"! He failed the main exam twice and after leaving Harrow he had to go to a "crammer" in London in order to satisfy the Civil Service Commissioners.

As Winston's son wrote in the official biography, his father's time at Harrow was not entirely wasted. He was compelled to stand on his own feet, and to make his way in the world by his own exertions. He acquired an intense power of concentration. And thanks to Mr. Somervell, he left Harrow with a deep love of the English language, and its command.

Even as a schoolboy, Winston's talent was recognised by his peers. Possibly his dislike of Latin spurred...
his devotion to English. This led to his unusual partnership with a classics sixth former (believed to have been Leopold Amery). The latter reeled off the English translations of the Latin, while the former produced impeccable English essays. One essay was of such a high standard that it was passed up to the Head Master, who summoned Amery, or whoever it was, to his study, engaging the boy in lively discussion: "I was interested in this point you make here. You might I think have gone further. Tell me exactly what you had in mind." Welldon continued in this manner for some time, receiving chilling and evasive comments. He concluded, "You seem to be better at written work." Winston received instructions to write more mediocre essays in future.

Churchill's passion against the classics disappeared in later life. Without occasional references to Latin quotations, his writings and speeches would lack lustre by the standards of his generation. And, by judicious use of Latin, his weak education could be camouflaged, except to his Harrow masters. Accordingly he immersed himself in a dictionary of Latin quotations which his superb memory was able to retain. His "few but faithful" Latin quotations were really more plentiful than he declared.

In his first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force, published when he was relatively fresh from Harrow, three of the chapters are embellished by Latin quotations—untranslated, presumably, to impress the outside world of the author's classic erudition:

Chapter III: "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum" (Such evil deeds could religion prompt), Lucretius, De Rerum Natura i: 101, Bailey translation. Chapter XV: "Quadrupedante putrem sonita quatit ungula campum" (The sound of galloping hooves shook the crumbling plain), Virgil, Aenid v: 596, Jackson translation.

Chapter VII: "Arma virumque cano" (Arms I sing and the man), Virgil, Aenid i, 1, Jackson translation.

In 1908, Churchill's wedding present from the Prime Minister was a ten-volume edition of Jane Austen's collected works. Volume III, containing the first part of Pride and Prejudice, was inscribed "Winston Churchill—H.H. Asquith 12 September 1908 nee aspera terrent" (nor do difficulties deter). Churchill would have recognised this as the motto of the King's and West Yorkshire Regiments, among others.

In Parliament, Churchill did not hesitate to deploy his Latin. "Ecce signum" (Look at the proof), he would cry; and "Fas est ab hoste docere" (It is right to be even taught by the enemy). In 1936 Churchill became worried by the three-year delay in starting a rearmament programme. He urged the Prime Minister to allow a two-day debate on defence, there now being anxiety on both sides of the House. Baldwin agreed.

A Ministry for the Coordination of Defence had just been set up under Sir Thomas Inskip, previously the Attorney General. Inskip opened the debate on November 11th, during which he said that nothing could restore the years that were past. On the 12th Churchill moved an amendment that the country's defences were inadequate. His speech was a sustained attack on the Government's procrastination in the matter of rearmament. He resorted to Latin to upstage Inskip by quoting Horace's Ode to his Roman friend Postumus: "Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, labuntur anni" (Alas Postumus, Postumus the flying years fall past us), from Horace's Odes II xiv 1. Churchill may have had in mind the epigram "eheu fugaces" in The Ingoldsby Legends.

Latin flowed even in wartime. On 30 April 1941 The Times reported: "[Mr Churchill] gave them facile princeps and primus inter pares and with traditional Harrovian courtesy offered to translate the phrases 'for the benefit of any Old Etonians present.'

The days of learning "Mensa" were long past.

Winston's first significant contribution to a periodical (Cohen G2, Woods Cl) was on 19 December 1891 in the Harrovian, concerning the state of the gymnasium, where he spent many hours fencing.

Great as the School undoubtedly is, it cannot afford to allow any of its mechanism to fall out of gear. When a public school possesses a Gymnasium, and especially one as fine as ours, it becomes the duty of every one of us to see that it does not go to rack and ruin. I am far from asserting that the Gymnasium has gone completely down the hill, but it is no secret that it is going that way. This being so, it is for each and all to see that it goes no further in that direction.

We have lately been startled by an imposing announcement that the "School Display" would take place in the Gymnasium on Saturday, 12th December. Whether those who went to see this "Display" were satisfied is more than I can say, but every one will assent when I state that the notice would have been much more correct, had it proclaimed that the Aldershot Staff would give a Display in the Gymnasium on Saturday, December 12th.

A School Assault-at-Arms* is intended to bring out our own talent. The Aldershot Staff can be seen elsewhere, but untold gold could not purchase the services of the School. Among the performers the School was conspicuous by its absence. The endeavour to prove that four

* An attack made upon each other by two fencers as an exercise or trial of skill.
equalled eight failed signal. Picture the "Display" without the assistance of the Aldershot Sergeants—it would indeed have been a "show." Now what, I ask, and what the School ought to ask, and will ask—Why did so few boys do anything?..."The School," it might be said, "were asked and wouldn't, the boxer has been approached and has refused, the members of the Eight have been ex-horted, but they have declined with thanks."

If that is so, there must surely be some reason for this spontaneous refusal, and to find this reason I turn to the Editors of the Harrovian. There is another excuse that may be set forth. It may be urged that no one else was good enough to perform. In that case no further question is necessary. If, out of all who go to the Gymnasium, only five per annum are fit to perform before the School at Assault, there is obviously a hitch somewhere.

All these things I have enumerated serve to suggest diat there is "something rotten in the State of Denmark." I have merely stated facts—it is not for me to offer an explanation of them. To you, sirs, as directors of public opinion, it belongs to lay bare the weakness. Could I not propose that some of your unemployed special correspondents might be set to work to unravel the mystery, and to collect material wherewith these questions may be answered?

The School itself has an ancient history; even the Gymnasium dates back to a Tudor. In those days they were not wont to "Risk"—the success of the School Assault-at-Arms in the manner in which it was done on Saturday last. For three years the Assaults have been getting worse and worse. First the Midgets, then the Board School, and, finally, the Aldershot Staff have been called in to supplement the scanty programme. It is time there should be a change, and I rely on your influential columns to work that change. Yours truly,
JUNIUS JUNIOR"
and wealth, though senior members of his family doubted he would recover either. Writing Winston from Johannesburg, he showed a trace of affection, while pointedly reminding Winston that he was an "expensive article" and minding him to keep his nose clean:

You cannot think how pleased I was to receive your interesting & well written letter & to learn that you were getting on well. I understand that Mr Welldon thinks you will be able to pass your examination into the army when the time comes. I hope it may be so, as it will be a tremendous pull for you ultimately....Here I have been examining gold mines & investing money in what I hope will be fortunate undertakings for I expect you and Jack will be a couple of expensive articles to keep as you grow older....I suppose this will just reach you as you are going home for the holidays. I hope you will have a good time at Banstead & that you and Jack will amuse yourself well. Give him my vy best love & tell him how glad I am to hear of his good place in the school. Perhaps he will write to me before long. Goodbye, take care of yourself and don't give Mama any trouble. Ever yr most affte father

RANDOLPH S. CHURCHILL

Lord Randolph made £7,000 from investments in South Africa, which he later spent touring the Far East.

His father wrote only four other letters: One refused Winston's request for an extra week's holiday; one to congratulate him on winning the fencing championship, and enclosed £2 to buy a present for his fencing instructor; one responded to a request for cash, £1 being grudgingly granted against an admonition to avoid bankruptcy through extravagance; and one advised of Lady Randolph's recovery from peritonitis.

Winston's mother, the second daughter of Leonard Jerome of New York, married Randolph in Paris on 15 April 1874. Churchill was probably thinking of his mother when he described Lucile, the wife of President Molara, in his only novel, Savrola:

...her life was a busy one. Receptions, balls and parties had filled the winter season with the unremitting labour of entertaining. Foreign princes had paid her homage, not only as the loveliest woman in Europe, but as a great political figure. Her salon was crowded with the most famous men from every country.

The marriage started off happily but the couple became estranged in the 1880s. Jennie probably had several lovers, but their numbers have been exaggerated and no historian really knows how many there were. The greatest was certainly Count Kinsky, an Austro-Hungarian diplomat who arrived in London in 1881. He rode to victory in the Grand National of 1883 on his own horse, Zoedone. (See "Becoming Winston Churchill," page 26; also Finest Hour98, "Lady Randolph in Winston's Boyhood." —Ed.)

In July 1891, Winston had an exeat from Harrow for the traditional cricket match against Eton. At his mother's request he arrived at 18 Aldford Street, the house of his aunt Clara Frewen, to find Lady Randolph having breakfast with Kinsky, who then took him to a reception for Germany's Emperor, Kaiser Wilhelm II, at the Crystal Palace.

"BLAME THE PARENTS?" Some of their neglect is exaggerated, and Jennie at least loved her sons dearly, but Winston's sensitive nature was hurt by their limited interest in him at Harrow. By 1891 Lord Randolph (left) was already showing signs of the illness that would kill him. Jennie's diaries are full of Jack and Winston when very young (center about 1881), but not much when they were at Harrow. Jennie had several devoted admirers, notably Count Kinsky and Lord Dudley (right).
Winston had the time of his life. No grown-up except Mrs. Everest had ever taken him out for a treat. All the fire brigades in London paraded and drilled before the Emperor. There was a huge fireworks display. Winston was most impressed by the Count's driving 10-year-old, Elisabeth, Countess Wolff Metternich. In lorn, illness-ridden tour of the East, she received a telegram from the Count, announcing his engagement. "I hate it," she wrote to her sister Clara from the Bay of Bengal. "I shall return without a friend in the world & too old to make any more now...."

Winston's Harrow career was second rate. Success at recitals and sport aside, his scholastic ability was rudimentary: he was uninterested in the subjects taught, except for English. It took him three attempts to enter Sandhurst, the final success owed to being coached by a "crammer." The "Army Class," at Harrow and at other public schools, was for the "thick ones." Winston did not have a learning disability, nor was he obtuse. He simply refused to study what did not interest him.

In later life he began to appreciate his Harrow connection. Welldon, Amery, Trevelyan, Hicks, Meinerzhagen, Moore-Brabazon, Margesson and Lloyd, to name a few, were important at later stages of his career. He was fond of the School Songs, which he sang heartily during his visit to the School on 18 December 1940, and he returned for these into the 1960s.

Winston had little support from home. His father, until the Johannesburg letter, ignored him except for one visit. His mother was engrossed in a hectic social life and did not become his ardent ally until after he left Sandhurst. She gave no outward signs of distress and maintaining a stiff upper lip. Perhaps this grounding at a tender age forged his legendary courage, enabling him to survive Gallipoli, Dunkirk, Singapore, and other disasters and disappointments.

**SOURCES**


Churchill's Shoulder: What If...?

BY JOHN V. BANTA M.D.

On 2 October 1896, Lt. Winston S. Churchill arrived in India near the Sassoon Dock in Bombay. It was not an auspicious landing.

"The identity of the designer of Bombay's Sassoon Dock has not survived, luckily for his reputation," wrote biographer William Manchester. "It is a triumph of incompetence, so ill-suited to disembarkation that impatient immigrants often chose to come ashore in skiffs, a risky procedure which could cripple a man before he set foot on Indian soil."

This is precisely what happened to young Winston Churchill. As he described the accident in his autobiography, "We came alongside of a great stone wall with dripping steps and iron rings for hand-holds. The boat rose and fell four or five feet with the surges. I put out my hand and grasped at a ring; but before I could get my feet on the steps the boat swung away, giving my right shoulder a sharp and peculiar wrench."

Churchill had torn the capsular attachments of his shoulder joint. Although his shoulder did not "go out" at that time, he later noted its persistent instability, with dislocations at various times: when sleeping with his arm beneath a pillow, reaching for a book on a high shelf, or slipping on a staircase. From then on, he experienced repeated subluxations, causing him pain, instability and, by current medical accounts of similar injuries, the awareness that his shoulder would "go out."

Churchill wrote that this injury was to last him all his life. It would "cripple me at polo...prevent me from ever playing tennis, and [prove] a grave embarrassment in moments of peril, violence and effort." In fact, as he noted in November 1897, he suffered a total dislocation as he "slipped on a stone stairs" prior to competing in the Inter-Regimental Polo Tournament in Meerut, India in 1899. Despite this handicap, his regimental team won the tournament, Churchill scoring two goals with his right elbow strapped to his torso with a leather harness!

The next three paragraphs contain some fairly technical terms which some readers may wish to skim....

Dr. Banta is a pediatric orthopaedic surgeon and professor of Orthopaedics at the University of Connecticut School of Medicine, and a member of the Churchill Centre's Board of Governors.

The shoulder joint is inherently less stable that the hip joint, because the latter is a ball and socket joint. In medical terms, the proximal end of the humerus has a semicircular articular head, which articulates with the lateral side of the scapula. The lateral portion of the scapula forms a circular enlargement called the glenoid, which has a small concave fossa forming the other side of the shoulder joint. The depth of the glenoid fossa is increased by a circular rim of cartilage: the glenoid labrum, to which is attached the capsule which together with the muscles and tendons, maintains the humeral head in close contact with the glenoid as the arm is moved throughout its great arc of motion.

The shoulder joint is somewhat analogous to a golf ball perched upon a tee whose diameter is approximately two-thirds that of the humeral articular head. When the arm is forcibly raised into a fully flexed overhead position, with the humerus externally rotated, the cartilagi-
nnous glenoid labrum is torn, resulting in the humeral head often being forced out of the joint—a frank dislocation.

In the past fifty years our knowledge of shoulder joint instability has been greatly enhanced by improvements in the care of athletic injuries. It is now recognized that many people sustaining the above-described labral and capsular tearing develop shoulder instability, with partial subluxation, the humerus partially riding out of the glenoid. When an affected individual attempts to move his arm into an overhead position or externally rotate the limb, he experiences sudden instability, pain and muscle spasm that disable the upper extremity from further voluntary movements. Athletes with such shoulder instability note sudden pain and loss of control when attempting to reach high overhead, or to the side with their affected arm externally rotated (such as when attempting to block a pass or tackle an opponent).

From a close reading both of Churchill’s descriptions and the accounts by William Manchester and Douglas Russell, it would appear that Churchill had sustained injury to the capsular attachments, rendering the shoulder prone to recurrent instability. Obviously, a cavalry officer with chronic instability of his dominant shoulder joint was precluded from effectively wielding his sword in combat.

The history of treatment of recurrent shoulder dislocation is first mentioned in the writings of Hippocrates (ca. 430 B.C.), who advocated creating a restrictive scarring of the front of the E I ^ H shoulder by applying a red hot cautery iron to the anterior axillary fold, and then dressing the resultant burn and binding the extremity across the chest for several weeks for the resultant scarring to limit any significant flexion or external rotation. By the end of the 19th century, various European surgeons recommended either shoulder fusion or resection of the humeral head to relieve symptoms. In 1906, Perthes, a German surgeon, first described reattachment of the separated glenoid labrum to the bony rim with sutures.

It was, however, the British surgeon A.S. Blundell Bankhart who, in 1923, perfected the surgical approach and the procedure which is now recognized by his name as the most appropriate repair for this deformity? Bankhart noted that a purely fibrous tear of the capsule would heal; however, there was no tendency for a detached capsule to heal to fibro cartilage at the edge of the bony glenoid unless it were reattached with sutures directly to the edge of the glenoid. As Bankhart’s biographer described, the surgeon was “determined to try it on the next suitable patient. Being a man of integrity, it did not concern him if the patient happened to be a duke or a dustman—it chanced to be one who had recently been his house-surgeon (and incidentally a very nervous type). The operation was a great success.” Bankhart’s procedure remains the standard operative repair for recurrent shoulder dislocation, today often performed by minimally invasive arthroscopic surgical repair.

The options open to Churchill in those days were indeed very limited. The field of elective reconstructive surgery for the shoulder was not at all well understood at the close of the 19th century. The leading textbook, by the English surgeon William Johnson Walsham in 1903, recommended for chronic dislocations to “inject drops of chloride of zinc 10% into the joint”; should that fail, “an excision of the head of the bone holds the best prospect of relief.” Furthermore, infection was a horrible possibility in the pre-antibiotic era, when wound treatment to prevent septic inflammation consisted of “carbolic acid, perchlorate of mercury, boric acid, permanganate of potash and iodoform.” Finally, military surgeons of the day were often required to treat fractures and penetrating wounds sustained during combat. Many of the modern advances in reconstructive orthopaedic surgery evolved with the experience gained by the allied surgeons during World War I.

At the dawn of the 20th century, the accepted surgical techniques were undergoing rigorous reexamination. The world famous neurosurgeon Harvey Cushing, in his address to the International Medical Congress in London in 1913, said: “Observers no longer expect to be thrilled in an operating room; the spectacular public performances of the past, no longer condoned, are replaced by the quiet, rather tedious procedures. The patient on the table, like the passenger in a car, runs greater risks if he have a loquacious driver or one who takes close corners, exceeds the speed limit, or rides to admiration.”

After publication of his experiences in northern India, The Story of the Malakand Field Force, Churchill was most anxious to join Kitchner’s army in the Sudan campaign. He vigorously pursued his numerous contacts, both in the army and through family connections; in London, resulting in the following July 1898 wire from the War Office: “You have been attached as a supernumerary Lieutenant to the 21st Lancers. It is understood that you will proceed at your own expense and that in the event of your being killed or wounded in the impending operations, or for any other reason, no charge of any kind will fall on British Army funds.”

Cavalry officer equipment in those days included the Mark I Lee-Enfield carbine, revolvers, and the traditional sabre. Douglas Russell describes two models of the latter: the light and heavy cavalry swords. The latter weighed two pounds two ounces, was 35 1/4 inches long, »
and 1/8th inch wide. The standard pistol was an Webley-Wilkinson .455 calibre revolver. This weapon is a six-shot, double action revolver with a four-inch barrel, and a top-breaking, hinged frame, allowing the shooter to extract spent shells and reload.

Russell writes that Churchill purchased his Webley-Wilkinson from Wilkinson in London. Manchester states that Churchill forgot his "regular one, with its lucky silk lanyard, and had to buy a new Mauser pistol." Churchill stated that he purchased "in London a Mauser automatic pistol, then the newest and latest design."

The Mauser C96—which Churchill admiringly dubbed a "ripper"—was the first efficient self-loading pistol. It was very reliable, since the frame was manufactured from a single solid forging with a ten-cartridge magazine of 7.63 mm ammunition, loaded from in front of the trigger guard. Upon discharge of its ten shells, one had only to reload by inserting a new clip.

On 2 September 1898, Kitchener’s forces were outside Omdurman and Churchill and the 21st Lancers were positioned along a nearby ridge. Ahead of them was a dry wash or khor, which later measured to be about twenty-five feet wide and four feet deep. As the Lancers slowly advanced on orders to "annoy them as far as possible on their flank and head them off if possible from Omdurman," the regiment came upon what were thought to be a Dervish force of perhaps 150 warriors. Unbeknown to the Lancers, there were in reality nearly 2600 warriors concealed in the deep ravine. The British cavalry advanced at a walk, Churchill in command of the next-to-last troop. As he described the charge:

Before we wheeled and began to gallop the officers had been marching with drawn swords. On account of my shoulder I had always decided that if I were involved in hand-to-hand fighting I must use a pistol and not a sword—I had practiced carefully with [the Mauser] during our march and journey up the river. This then was the weapon with which I determined to fight. I had first of all to return my sword into its scabbard, which is not the easiest thing to do at a gallop. I had then to draw my pistol from its wooden holster and bring it to full cock....

The scene appeared to be suddenly transformed. The blue-black men were still firing but behind them there now came into view a depression like a shallow, sunken road. This was crowded with men rising up from the ground where they had hidden. Bright flags appeared as if by magic and I saw arriving from nowhere Emirs on horseback among and around the mass of the enemy. The Dervishes appeared to be ten feet deep at the thickest, a great grey mass gleaming with steel, filling the dry watercourse.

Straight before me a man threw himself on the ground.... simultaneously I saw the gleaming of his sword as he drew back for a hamstringing cut. I had room and time enough to turn my pony out of his reach, and leaning over on the off side I fired two shots into him at about three yards. As I straightened myself in the saddle I saw before me another figure with uplifted sword. I raised my pistol and fired; so close were we that the pistol actually struck him....

Suddenly in the midst of the troop up sprung a Dervish. How he got there I do not know. He must have leaped out of some scrub or hole. All the troopers turned upon him thrusting with their lances: but he darted to and fro, causing for the moment a frantic commotion. Wounded several times, he staggered toward me, raising his spear. I shot him at less than a yard. He fell on the sand and lay there dead....I found I had fired the whole magazine of my Mauser pistol so I put in a new clip of cartridges before thinking of anything else.

As Churchill wrote later to a friend: "It was I suppose the most dangerous 2 minutes I shall live to see. Out of 310 officers & men we lost 1 officer and 20 men
Churchill had just delivered his face-saving speech on Iraq (FH 132:31), hailed as a great triumph—but there was no way that the condition of his shoulder would ever permit such a free-swinging shot at the polo ball as this. (Frank Reynolds in Punch, 15 June 1921.)

killed—4 officers and 45 men wounded, and 119 horses of which 56 were bullet wounds. All this in 120 seconds."

In fact, Manchester noted, the casualties suffered by the 21st Lancers were over 22 percent, while the overall losses sustained by Kitchener were less than three percent of his total army. 18

The Battle of Omdurman, Churchill, recalled in My Early Life, was full of "fascinating thrills. It was not like the Great War. Nobody expected to be killed. Here and there in every regiment or battalion, half a dozen, a score, at the worst thirty or forty, would pay the forfeit but to the great mass of those who took part in the little wars of Britain in those vanished light-hearted days, this was only a sporting element in a splendid game."

It is interesting to consider what good fortune Churchill experienced throughout these episodes. In combat he was obviously aware of his shoulder disability, and realized the need to use firearms instead of the usual sword. What is remarkable is his pre-science in choosing the Mauser pistol. Did he, as Manchester wrote, "Forget his regular one"? Or was he blessed with the foresight to obtain the latest semi-automatic then available? Had he entered the charge with only his six-shot Webley-Wilkinson, it is entirely likely that he would not have had time to reload in the heat of that brief, intense conflict.

Lord Deedes summarized the historical impact of Omdurman when describing his own visit to the battlefield during a visit a few years ago, with the British ambassador in Khartoum. He described the battlefield memorial, "In memory of the officers, NCOs and the men of the 21st Lancers who fell here." Then he added: "The first name is that of Lt. Robert Grenfell, one of nine sons, five of whom died in the country's service, and the cousin of Julian and Billy, who were killed in the First World War. I have speculated since on how far our history might have turned out differently had Churchill's name been on that memorial."
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125 YEARS AGO:
Spring 1882 • Age 7
"Give it 'em hot, Randy."

Lord Randolph was now a rising star and the most popular speaker in the Conservative Party. Churchill wrote in his father’s biography: “Before the end of 1882 a speech from Lord Randolph Churchill had become an event to the newspaper reader.” Churchill went on to describe the political impact his father’s speeches.

At a time when Liberal orators and statesmen, “careering about the country,” as Lord Randolph described them, “calling themselves the people of England,” were looking forward to an election which should relegate the Conservative Party to the limbo of obsolete ideas, they were disconcerted by the spectacle, repeatedly presented, of multitudes of working men hanging upon the words of a young aristocrat..."Give it 'em hot, Randy," cried the crowds in the streets and at the meetings, till he himself was forced to complain that he was expected to salute his opponents with every species of vituperation. But, to tell the truth, he responded to the public demand with inexhaustible generosity. He spared no one. Neither persons nor principles escaped an all-embracing ridicule.

Churchill described his father’s preparation and delivery:

His style was essentially rhetorical, and much more spontaneous than his peculiar methods of preparation would imply. He seems to have written with scarcely a single correction and without hesitation of any kind, as fast as he could set pen to paper. Indeed, I fancy that he wrote his speeches chiefly for an exercise of memory and to fix them clearly in his mind and did not by any means make them up with a pen in his hand.

Above all, they were entirely fresh and original. Wit, abuse, epigrams, imagery, argument—all were "Randolphian." No one could guess beforehand what he was going to say nor how he would say it. No one else said the same kind of things, or said them in the same kind of way. Every word he spoke was studied with interest and apprehension. Each step he took was greeted with a gathering chorus of astonished cries....

100 YEARS AGO:
Spring 1907 • Age 32
"I hear you are engaged to Miss Botha."

The Colonial Conference took place in April 1907 and was attended by the Prime Ministers of Great Britain’s self-governing colonies. Among those in attendance was Louis Botha, Premier of the Transvaal, accompanied by his pretty 19-year-old daughter Helen. As Undersecretary for the Colonies, Churchill was actively involved in the Conference and rumors began spreading of a romance between Churchill and Helen. The rumors were widespread and eventually reached the South of France, evidenced by a letter to Winston from Muriel Wilson in early May. She had turned down his marriage proposal in 1896 but had remained a good friend:

My dear Winston, I hear you are engaged to Miss Botha — is this true?...I look forward to a peaceful old age here in the sun & surrounded by the blue sea, & you I hope—and Miss Botha, & all the little Bothas will come & see me & my garden.

If there were a romance with Miss Botha, nothing came of it; but Churchill was exceptionally generous in his praise of her father at the Conference:

He was the first man into the war and he was the last man out of it. Nothing in the Conference is more dramatic and impressive than his presence amongst us. His visits and the speeches he has made have strangely touched the imagination of the British people, and I will tell him on their behalf that while we are slow to make a friend, yet once when we have made a friend we are slower still to throw him over. To those who, like my honourable and gallant friend and myself, fought during the war such an event comes home.

During the Conference, some of the colonies, including Australia, asked that preferential treatment be granted to their exports, i.e., that tariffs be imposed by Great Britain on other countries’ exports but not on the colonies’ exports. The Liberal government had been elected on the issue of Free Trade, so that proposal went nowhere. Churchill explained why in a speech in Edinburgh on 18 May:

We are told the Government has banged the door [on preferential tariffs]. Well, upon what have they banged the door? They have banged the door upon Imperial taxation of food. Yes, they have banged it, barred it, and bolted it. It is a good stout door of British oak, the largest Liberal, Radical, and Labour majority ever seen in the House of Commons have their backs firmly against it. That door shall never be opened....The Liberal Party stands like a rock between the hard-working masses, and all who would exploit their food supply and squeeze some shameful little profit out of the scanty pittance of the weak and poor.

In April, Churchill visited with his great American friend Bourke Cockran and Bourke’s wife Anne, who were on their honeymoon. Cockran had written to Churchill from Paris where the couple was staying at the Hotel Bristol:

FINESTHOUR 134/44
My dear Winston, Your Mother whom I met at Monte Carlo said you would be at Biarritz near the end of last week — which explains my telegram. Since I received your answer I have been busy making arrangements to spend a day or two in London before our return to America...I won't weary you now with any discussion of perplexing problems further than to repeat I am still an optimist. There is nothing among all the evils which men are condemning as vehemently in both hemispheres that does not show conclusively the inexorable faces of progress, moral and material, steadily at work and moving inevitably to success. But of all this we have much to say at the meeting to which I look forward with eagerness.

This very policy of crushing Gandhi and the Indian Congress.

During this same period, Churchill began to speak out against further disarmament proposed by British Foreign Secretary Sir John Simon. On 13 May he told the House of Commons:

I should very much regret to see any approximation in military strength between Germany and France. I would say to those who would like to see Germany and France on an equal footing in armaments: "Do you wish for war?" For my part, I earnestly hope that no such approximation will take place during my lifetime or that of my children.

A month earlier, Hitler had received 40 percent of the votes for President in a campaign against Field Marshal Hindenburg. In less than a year, he would be Germany’s Chancellor.

75 YEARS AGO:
Spring 1932 • Age 57
"Do you wish for war?"

Churchill returned to England from his American speaking tour, still feeling the after-effects of his near-fatal injuries in New York in December, when he was hit by an automobile. He wrote Lord Salisbury on 2 April 1932:

I get tired more easily than I did; and of course eight nights out often in the train and twenty-five harangues in a month were a rough kind of convalescence.

On 29 April, Churchill spoke approvingly of emergency legislation to give the Government substantial new powers of search and seizure in India to combat increased violence and terror in India, where Hindu-Muslim riots killed and wounded thousands:

This decision, so courageously and soberly carried out, makes a great difference in my attitude towards the Indian policy of His Majesty's Government. When I spoke at a meeting at the Cannon Street Hotel in January, 1930, I said: "Sooner or later you will have to crush Gandhi and the Indian Congress and all they stand for." That statement of mine was more censured than any other that I made and more condemned by those politicians who were at that time controlling Indian affairs. It was thought to be a shocking thing to say, but see what happened?...The Government of India, and the National Government at home, have adopted

50 YEARS AGO:
Spring 1957 • Age 82
"What we desire is freedom."

Churchill’s former private secretary Jock Colville lunched with Churchill’s physician Lord Moran in the spring of 1957, who dutifully recorded the following in his diary:

I asked Jock which of Winston's gifts had been of most value to the country in the war. He said at once: "Winston's capacity for picking out essential things and concentrating on them." What next? "I think his great moral courage. If something went wrong he would patiently start again at the beginning. And his vivid imagination. It was always coming to his help in the war. His magnanimity of course, and his power of inspiring everyone he met."

On 3 May 1957, Churchill addressed the Primrose League, founded by his father in the later 19th century, on the current political situation. He suggested that what his second premiership had accomplished since 1951 vindicated the position he took opposing the Labor Party which had defeated him so soundly in 1945:

It is nearly six years now since the Socialist Government were removed from office, and I was entrusted with the formation of a Conservative administration. Those six years have witnessed a remarkable improvement in the condition of all the people. All the people. The Tory Party is not and will never become the vehicle or instrument of any one class or section. Look back to 1951, and look around to-day. We are better fed. There is more to buy in the shops, and the nation is earning more with which to buy it. The burden of taxation, though still heavy, has begun to be relieved. We are better housed. To have built 10 million new houses in our first five years is a striking vindication of the programme we placed before the electors. And just as the new houses are going up, those blots on our great cities—the slums—are coming down...Back in 1945, when our arms had achieved victory and we were thinking again of the tasks and problems of peace, I ventured to give the newly formed Socialist Government a word of advice on the opening day of the new Parliament. "What we desire is freedom," I said. "What we need is abundance." "Freedom and abundance—these must be our aims." That was nearly twelve years ago. My advice—as has sometimes been the case before in the course of my public life—was little heeded at the time; but I have been spared to see the policy adopted and some of its advantages reaped.

Things were not going as well with his wife, however as they were with the British economy, judging from this 21 May letter by Churchill to Clementine:

Your visit to me die night before I left was very precious. Do not let the idea that I am "mean" to you tear your mind. As a matter of fact I take every lawful opportunity of passing money to you in a way which will avoid the 67% toll which die State will almost certainly take at my death & will continue to do so as long as I am able. Your life of devotion & kindness to me has made my own one both happy & successful.

My only wish is to live peacefully out the remaining years—if years they be. But you, dearest one, have the twilight of a glorious spell upon you in all probability. So be happy & do not let misconceptions of me darken & distort your mind.
Here are two books that appear on the surface similar. Both explore, through different channels and methods, what made Churchill the unique and important individual so many still study and venerate. Martin Gilbert’s *The Will of the People* looks at Churchill’s views on and activities within the British Parliament—and somehow, among the flood of books published about Churchill every year, manages to say something interesting and even new. Deborah Davis Brezina argues in *The Spirit of Churchill* that by better understanding Churchill, Americans (the book is clearly aimed towards Americans) will support their leaders in the war on terror.

Unfortunately, it is ultimately unclear whether Brezina really understands Churchill, or the principles he was fighting for in 1940 and beyond.

Brezina’s book has the merit of being completely up front about what it is trying to accomplish. Allen Packwood, in his generous introduction, frankly admits that it is a “political book.” The first line of the text, with depressing inevitability, starts with the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. Within a few pages, the author has favorably compared the Presidency of George W. Bush to the war leadership of Winston Churchill. At the end of the first chapter she tells us that “many today are naïve about human nature”; clearly, this book is here to set us strait. Er, straight....

Most of *The Spirit of Churchill* is potted biography of Churchill’s heroic years; roughly from his time fighting appeasement in the 1930s through the end of his wartime premiership. Brezina also touches on Churchill’s anti-communist speeches and activities, with particular focus on the “Iron Curtain” speech. Much of the rest of Churchill’s rich and varied career, which might have greatly informed her work, receives scant attention.

Brezina argues that Churchill was a great man because he relentlessly fought, without hesitancy or compromise, the forces of evil. He fought the Nazis as they rose to dominate Europe, fought them as a lone voice across the Channel as they dominated the continent while America and Russia watched. She argues that Churchill also recognized the evil inherent in Stalin’s communism, spreading like a cancer across Eastern Europe, and he spoke out with courage and conviction against that evil as well. History has judged that Churchill was largely correct in his decision to fight these evils, and in most of the methods he used; thus his veneration today.

Deborah Brezina is correct, then, in assessing Churchill’s greatness, although she does so in a way as unimaginative and unoriginal as possible. This is truly Churchill biography by rote; there is nothing new here in either analysis or insight; nor is there anything mildly critical about our hero. There are no complexities, no areas of gray that might complicate her simple story. She tells the tale as we might tell schoolchildren when they are very young, to assure them that there is good and justice in the world, and that the good and just fight only the monstrous and evil. Churchill himself might say, “Take away this pudding. It has no theme.”

Adults should demand a story set in the world they live in, and don’t get it here. If that criticism alone makes Brezina’s book completely unnecessary for anyone interested in the “real” Winston Churchill (and it does), Brezina can still perhaps be forgiven of the sin, for her purpose is not just to venerate Churchill but to let George W. Bush bask in the light of good-

**Books of Note**


ness that she believes he shares with Winston Churchill.

I have long believed that *Finest Hour* is not the place to debate current events, and do not believe a "biography" of Churchill is a particularly useful place to do it either. Brezina disagrees. Her book makes the implicit claim (and at times she is very direct) that George W. Bush should be understood as the ideological/intellectual descendant of Sir Winston, using a simple line of reasoning: The Nazis were evil, Churchill recognized this, Churchill helped defeat the Nazis. Terrorists are evil, George Bush recognizes this, Bush will defeat the terrorists. Ergo, like WSC, Bush should be supported by his people and celebrated by history.

By being correct in her first set of assertions, Brezina argues implicitly that she must be right in her second. Here her work truly breaks down. I agree with her that terrorists are evil; but where is the evidence that Bush's leadership is Churchillian? We are told only that we ought to admire it because he is fighting something that we all abhor.

To her credit, Brezina makes no credible claim that Churchill would have acted in a similar manner to Bush had he been placed by history in the same circumstances. In fact the evidence suggests just the opposite; to take just a few of many possible examples, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Churchill would have taken a different line on the invasion of Iraq,* interrogation techniques that many observers call torture, and the building of international coalitions. These observations are debatable, of course. But they are out of Brezina's grasp. It is far easier for her to call the President "Churchillian," and anyone who doesn't support his policies naive.

Sir Martin Gilbert's *The Will of the People* is cut from a wholly different cloth. Like all good works of history, it makes no obvious comment about the present. Only in the implicit echoes of the past can we find potentially useful instruction that informs our current thoughts and adventures.

Gilbert's slim volume is a powerful 136 pages, and argues succinctly that from the moment he entered Parliament until the day he died, Churchill was "first and foremost a parliamentarian; a supporter, practitioner and upholder of parliamentary democracy" (4). He believed, in other words, in the rule of law, and that law must be freely debated both in public and in Parliament; that all voices have a right to be heard, and that the decisions of the majority must be respected. These basic values, Gilbert continues, were what informed Churchill throughout his career, and gave him strength from the difficult times of the 1930s through the Second World War.

For those familiar with Martin Gilbert's enormous corpus of work on Winston Churchill (perhaps the most complete and most impressive biographical canon ever compiled by one human being about another), these basic ideas and concepts are familiar. In the eight-volume narrative of the official biography, for instance, one is struck again and again by the enormous faith Churchill placed in parliamentary democracy, and how that belief sustained him in his most difficult moments.

But here Gilbert presents the theme (originally a 2003 lecture to the Churchill Society for the Advancement of Parliamentary Democracy in Toronto) in a single compact volume. By offering Churchill's thoughts about democracy in a chronological way—and explaining how his views changed, yet how remarkably consistent they were—they are given an even greater power. One is left with the impression that before Churchill was able to save democracy, democracy had somehow saved him.

Gilbert cites one example of Churchill's belief in independent thought which I found especially striking, particularly because this simple fact alone would probably render Churchill unelectable to high office in America today. Gilbert describes, in impressive detail, Churchill's belief in prisoners rights—beliefs he held and stood by his whole life, but acted on with particular effectiveness when he held the post of Home Secretary in the early 20th century.

In a nutshell, Churchill believed that prison should be regarded as an institution of reform as well as punishment; and that facilities should be provided to help prisoners improve their lives and reenter society. At a more basic level, Churchill believed that prisoners were human beings, and that as human beings they deserved to be treated with a minimum level of decency regardless of the crimes they may have committed. He did not believe that prisoners should be punished simply because the punishers had the means to do so.

Without diving too far into speculation, it is easy to imagine Churchill having much to say about the treatment of prisoners today, and particularly those labeled "enemy combatants." It is even clearer that these views would render Churchill unelectable; his opponent would have to do little more than murmur the phrase "soft on crime" at anyone who dared to suggest prison conditions could be improved. Churchill, who comes from a different time, would surely be puzzled by die lack of respect given to honest thought today.

We are left with a book that is essential to Churchillians—or anyone interested in Churchill's political ideology. We are also left with a book that stands as a polar opposite to Brezina's *The Spirit of Churchill*. The latter asks "why some stand resolved in the face of terror and others don't," and concludes that all should "stand resolved" and support a leader who seems to her much like Churchill—but perhaps not to think about it too carefully.

---

Defining the Churchill Philosophy

WARREN F. KIMBALL

Churchill and War, by Geoffrey Best.

Are war and politics two halves of the same walnut? Or is war as Clausewitz described it—a mere extension of politics by other means? More important for readers of Finest Hour: which way did Winston Churchill view war? In this case, that's not an either/or fallacy but rather a trick question, for the answer according to Geoffrey Best seems to be "both."

One reviewer called this book a "profound tribute." Were it that, I would already be warning of the dangers of hagiography. If it is a tribute, it is to Churchill's overall impact on history—warts and all.

The illustrations include some "new chestnuts," like Churchill firing a Tommy Gun, his eyes tightly shut. (If so, it had to be one of the few instances in any war when he did.)

This is not a book for those unfamiliar with Churchill. The uninitiated should start with the author's whole-man portrait in his earlier biography, Churchill: A Study in Greatness. This study of Churchill and War builds on that biography, but is more than just warmed-over ideas, or a way to use leftover notes from that larger work.

Best generally takes a chronological, life-and-times approach. The story of his wars sometimes overpowers Churchill, which was true in real life as well. Understanding his tactics and strategies requires context, and context can be boiled down only so much. How, for example, to understand the one thought them wrong, denounce acts of evil even in one's own country—and still be a good citizen. He even seemed to extend these thoughts about democracy to the people he was, theoretically, fighting against. If asked, his advice to the terrorists of our time might perhaps be similar to the advice he gave to Sinn Fein in the 1920s (a remark wonderfully recalled by Gilbert): "Quit murdering, and start arguing" (56).

The above brief quotations illustrate the real difference between these two books; Gilbert recognizes that Churchill saw it as the right and duty of citizens everywhere to argue and express their independent ideas. Brezina sees Churchill and other leaders she admires so fine as to make argument and opinion unnecessary. But as Gilbert proves, that was just the sort of thing that Churchill spent his life fighting against.

DEFINING THE PHILOSOPHY...

(in) famous "percentages" agreement in 1944 with Stalin without a careful explanation of how and why Churchill thought it necessary?

Yet, for the most part, Best avoids extensive dissection of major and controversial episodes in Winston Churchill's life. This is not the place to revisit Gallipoli in extenso (thankfully). But it is the place to come to an understanding of why Churchill made his proposals for that fatal operation, and how they fit in with his overall style and thinking.

Best does not dwell on Churchill's blunders (real and exaggerated), though he addresses them. The carpet-bombing of Germany, the stubborn support for Bomber Harris, Gallipoli (of course), WSC's consistent underestimation of how long military campaigns would take, "ignorance and complacency" about Japan in general and Singapore in particular (though no mention of Australian complaints), his disturbing fascination with mustard gas (see "Gas Policy in 1940," page 9) coupled with his distaste for anthrax as a weapon.

These and most other controversies come in for succinct analysis and trenchant agreement or persuasive dismissal. (Best believes that "in both wars Churchill's interest was fundamentally anti-German, not anti-Russian." But Churchill had curious consistencies. During the Great War, he (as well as naval planners, whose forces could not join the fray on the Western Front) was obsessed with the notion of attacking Germany somewhere on its periphery—the Baltic islands, Pomerania, or the Dardanelles—just as in World War II. His interest in the Balkans during WW1 continued into WW2 when its military feasibility was even more dubious: FDR rhetorically asked him in October 1943, "if we get the Aegean Islands, I ask myself where do we go from there—" (See our review of Aegean Adventures and the End of Churchill's Dream, FH82:30. —Ed.)
But it is Churchill's strengths and accomplishments that stand out. Two top the list. First and most famous: his inspirational leadership during the Second World War. He was a one-man morale-boost. Second, and equally important (if less recognized): his ability to marshal the logistics and finances of a nation. Honed by experience in World War I, and again during the 1920s, that organizational talent perhaps contributed more to British success during World War II than any other of Churchill's accomplishments—and there were many.

This is more than just a useful book, though it is that. It could have been shorter, although that is true for almost all books published in these times. Good editors are an endangered breed. Its perspective is very English, but then Churchill was above all else an Englishman. I would have liked a good deal more on Churchill and the Second World War, for without that conflict, he likely would be remembered by just a handful of historians.

Those very minor cavils aside, this book is well worth the read. Even better, it is an honest book, that offers Winston Churchill to us more than just a fascinating person—which he was; as more than just someone who was a player in the history of the first half of the 20th Century—though that is true; as more than just someone who was fascinated and excited by war—which he was.

Always the national leader, Churchill believed in personal diplomacy and negotiating from strength. War, however challenging and exhilarating, was always the less desirable alternative—though never an alternative to be avoided at all costs. Not everyone realizes this about him.*

But what is best about this book (no word-play intended) is that it sets forth what Churchill never took the time to do for himself—it gives him a philosophy. Some of that philosophy was style—"Action This Day" was more than just an injunction to subordinates, it was a way of life for him. Some of that philosophy was an accretion of history—history that he experienced, that he read about, and that he wrote about. Much of his philosophy was developed by experience in a non-systematic way. The necessity of acting, the transcendent significance for him of British institutions and accomplishments, the "lessons" of history, all provided a structure.

But Churchill adjusted, modified and changed his thinking as his experiences dictated. The boy who played with toy soldiers, the subaltern who famously rode in one of the British Army's last great cavalry charges, was not the same man who led Britain to victory against Hitler. Nor was that the same man who later expressed fear and horror at the notion of nuclear war, who proposed the "twin-tracks" approach on nuclear weapons thirty years before Ronald Reagan, and who bravely called for talks at the "Summit" after Stalin's death.

But to get the real impact of the book, don't cheat—read it all. M

*This parallels Klaus Larres' typology for Churchill's approach to international affairs. Churchill's Cold War (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2002). Larres is not cited, but Best did not indulge in extensive and summary endnotes.

---

English-Speaking Continuation

PAUL H. COURTENAY

BY ITS TITLE ONE MIGHT SUPPOSE THAT THIS BOOK TAKES OVER AND UPDATES Sir Winston Churchill's four-volume history, which was published just fifty years ago and which ends at the turn of the 19th/20th centuries. But apart from the chronological historical narrative, covering 106 years, this would be a misappreciation. There is no broad sweep nor any romantic undertone; instead, Andrew Roberts covers an immense range of topics in a highly readable style, and does so with almost surgical precision.

For example, how many know about the 1905 murder of a British sub-commissioner in Uganda? How many have heard of Michael Ventris, an English architect, who in 1953 successfully deciphered Minoan Linear B, Europe's oldest language?

Who are the English-Speaking Peoples (ESPs)? Andrew Roberts defines them as those for whom English is their first language. Thus, for example, India, South Africa and many other places where English is very widely spoken are excluded from this study. Those who qualify are from the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the British West Indies and the Republic of Ireland; however, the last-named of these is clearly shown to have different aims and policies from the remainder, which are in many ways a coherent whole.

Roberts cleverly identifies four external assaults on the ESPs in the past century. Three of these have been successfully and principally overcome by the ESPs acting in unity: Imperial Germany, Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union. The fourth, Islamic terrorism, is still being confronted; it falls to the ESPs to see the struggle through to a successful conclusion.

There are seventeen chapters; >>

---

ANDREW ROBERTS

here is a random sample of the contents of two. Chapter V (American Energy, 1920-1929) embraces Prohibition, the partition of Ireland, the Soviet Comintern, the "unknown prime minister" (Bonar Law), Australia's Northern Territory, Nazi geography, Japanese espionage in Australia, Jewish immigration into the United States, President Calvin Coolidge, the evolution of the British Commonwealth of Nations, Disarmament, Adolf Hitler's "other book," air conditioning, and the great inventors, such as Logie Baird, Percy Shaw and Alexander Fleming.

A quarter century later, Chapter XI (The Third Assault: Soviet Communism, 1945-1949) covers the human and financial cost of Hitlerism, the Nuremberg Trials, George Kennan's "Long Telegram," Cold War planning, the United Nations, the Keynes loan, the Commonwealth builds a bomb, the Marshall Plan, the end of empire in India, the creation of the State of Israel, the Berlin airlift, McCarthyism, and the foundations of NATO. These examples are very typical of the way each of the seventeen chapters is constructed.

Roberts makes the controversial assertion that the Protestant concept of exploration for mercantile profit, as opposed to national prestige or grand strategy—let alone for the propagation of Christianity—was the engine that colonised most of the English-speaking world. Those who think that the British Empire was a "bad thing" will find no comfort here, and it is refreshing to find an author who is skilful enough to fly in the face of modern liberal (and be it said American) orthodoxy on this issue.

References to Winston Churchill are numerous throughout the book and, with one or two exceptions, the general thrust is what we would all expect to see. The author makes an interesting distinction between Chamberlain and Churchill by referring to the former, with his policy of appeasement, as the crown prince of the "Respectable Tendency," prewar perceptions of Churchill being entirely the opposite.

Andrew Roberts is not slow to make his own political convictions clear to all and does not shrink from castigating those American and British heads of government of whom he strongly disapproves—opinions which (whether or not valid) are a little surprising to find in a work of history.

There are inevitably a number of trivial glitches in the first edition of such a long and detailed work, but these are being corrected before the North American American edition is published in February 2007, and before the Australian/New Zealand and paperback editions appear. This can be seen as a magnum opus (it took four years to write) and an absorbing, worthy follow-up to Sir Winston's own four volumes.

The Most Sombre of All Battles

GARY GARRISON

Not only a vivid and authoritative account of one of the most devastating battles of World War I, this latest book by the official biographer is a powerful and draining experience for readers. Though it is not about Churchill (there are several references to Churchill's criticisms of the battle, and also to his American volunteer friend, whose Somme grave Sir Martin visited), it is a book of historical significance which any Churchillian should read to acquire a true understanding of the battle that claimed more than 300,000 lives in only five months.

Sir Martin follows the battle through the experiences of the foot soldiers, the PBI (Poor Bloody Infantry), generals, artillerymen, aviators and nurses. Interlaced throughout are poems and songs written by those in battle—words everyone should hear and read, now and in the future:

_Better far to pass away_
_While the limbs are strong and young_
_Ere Youths lusty song be sung._

Included is one of Churchill's favorites, the words of Harry Lauder, whose 25-year-old son was killed by a sniper:

"Keep Right on to the End of the Road."

The book ends with a song, "No-Man's Land," written by Scottish song-writer Eric Bogle, which carries an important message for current and future generations. Bogle was so moved by the war cemeteries that he picked a name, Willie McBride, completely at random to represent all who had fallen in the Battle of the Somme. The words are not only dynamic and powerful, but contain a message of permanent value (see overleaf).

On their second visit to the sombre battlefield of the Somme and its cemeteries, Sir Martin and Lady Gilbert discovered the grave of Private William McBride, Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers. He had been killed in April 1916, two months before the Somme. They sat down next to his grave, and
Sir Martin read aloud the soft, sad words of the song by Eric Bogle, reprinted herewith. >>

THE SOMME: THE AVOIDABLE BATTLE
Winston S. Churchill
Note to the Dardanelles Commission, February 1917. (From Martin Gilbert, Winston S. Churchill TV, 10.)

With the attack of the 1st of July on the German positions North of the Somme nearly 70,000 British troops were killed and wounded, and of these nearly half were killed or missing and of the missing—nearly 20,000—all except a few hundreds perished miserably and by inches where they fell. Except at the Southern end of the line the whole plan of attack failed, and after five months continuous fighting, sustained by unprecedented supplies of men and ammunition, scarcely any of the original objectives assigned to the first day's operations had been attained. The sanguine expectations which led on three or four occasions to many thousands of Cavalry being brought up to gallop through some gap in the enemy's line were shown to be utterly out of contact with reality at any point. For the sake of a few miles of ground, devoid of strategic significance, nearly 600,000 British casualties have been sustained and the efficiency of our Army in the West sensibly and permanently diminished....

Nevertheless with a good Press sedulously manipulated and employed and the effective support of the governing forces, these operations have been represented as a long series of famous and memorable victories, and the initial disaster of the 1st of July established in the public mind as a brilliant triumph. A fifth of the resources, the effort, the loyalty, the resolution, the perseverance vainly employed in the battle of the Somme, to gain a few shattered villages and a few square miles of devastated ground, would, in the Gallipoli Peninsula, used in time, have united the Balkans on our side, joined hands with Russia, and cut Turkey out of the war. The choice was open to us; we have built our own misfortune and no one can tell what its limits will be.

"No-Man's Land"
ERIC BOGLE, 1976

Well, how do you do,
Private William McBride.
Do you mind if I sit here
down by your graveside?
I'll rest for a while
in the warm summer sun
I've been walking all day,
and I'm nearly done.

I see by your gravestone,
you were only nineteen
When you joined the fallen
in 1916.
And I hope you died quick,
and I hope you died clean.
Or, Willie McBride,
was it slow and obscene?

Did they beat the drum slowly;
did they play the pipes lowly;
Did the rifles fire o'er you
as they lowered you down?
Did the bugles sound
The Last Post in chorus:
Did the pipes play
The Flow'rs of the Forest!

And did you leave a wife
or sweetheart behind;
In some loyal heart
is your memory enshrined?
And though you died back
in 1916,
To that loyal heart
are you always nineteen?

Or are you a stranger
without even a name,
Forever enshrined
behind a glass frame,
In an old photograph,
torn and tattered and stained,
And fading to yellow
in a bound leather frame?

The sun's shining down on
these green fields of France,
The warm wind blows gently,
and the red poppies dance.
The trenches have vanished,
long under the plough.
No gas, no barbed wire,
no guns firing now.

But here is this graveyard;
it's still No-Man's Land.
The countless white crosses
in mute witness stand
To man's blind indifference
to his fellow man,
And a whole generation
who were butchered
and damned.

And I can't help but wonder now,
Willie McBride,
Do all those who lie here
know why they died?
Did you really believe them
when they told you
The Cause'?
Did you really believe
this war would end wars?

Well, the suffering,
the sorrow, the glory,
the shame,
The killing, the dying,
it was all done in vain.
For Willie McBride,
it all happened again,
And again, and again,
and again, and again.

FINEST HOUR 134/51
THE UNEXPECTED DISCOVERY of a soldier's letters home led his son to track his father's experiences in World War II—which, like most veterans, he never spoke of. They include a then-classified encounter with Churchill in the field...

"AINTI SOME PUNKINS?"

BY ROBERT S. PETTENGILL

Until just a few years ago I knew nothing of my father's military experience. I knew only that he was in the U.S. Army in World War II and was stationed in England.

My parents were divorced shortly before the war, when I was three years old. I saw my father only occasionally over the years as I was growing up, and like many veterans, he never mentioned the war and his service.

When my Dad became ill and died, just as I was becoming an adult, I resigned myself never to learning about his early life and his military experience. My discovery just a few years ago of his letters to his mother—263 in all, totaling about 600 pages—and my own research have filled in that major blank.

Wartime censorship of letters home prohibited discussion of sensitive subjects. Anything having to do with military activity in a specific area was banned. Indeed, while a soldier could mention the country where he was, he could not name the city or district. Fortunately my father kept contemporaneously a daily log of where he was and his movements. This was also found packed away with the letters.

Mr. Pettengill (bobandpris@msn.com) is a retired financial executive who served in General Motors' international operations. He lives near Detroit, Michigan.

and matching dates between the two enabled me to determine exactly from where each letter was written. World War II histories and the Internet have enabled me further to determine what actions were going on around him. In the process I discovered a soldier's-eye view of Winston Churchill.

On 25 May 1945 my father, Joseph K. Pettengill, Jr., wrote to his mother from Paris to describe a ceremony he saw at the Arc de Triomphe, in which Field Marshal Montgomery and General Charles de Gaulle placed a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. He added a really interesting anecdote which at the time it happened could not be told due to wartime censorship:

"In connection with Monty and de Gaulle, I can tell you a story that I have not been able to tell before. When I went to Northern Italy—to AAI Headquarters (Allied Armies in Italy, or 15th Army Group Hq.), which was General Alexander's headquarters, Winston Churchill was there. He was on his way to the eastern part of the front. He was there to see the results of the plan of General Alexander to break through the German defenses.

"It was a well formed and executed plan. Thousands of troops and many tanks and all equipment that goes with them had been moved from the west to the east without the Germans finding it out. That was the time of the initial break-through, which was made on the line that then ran through Florence.

"We were introduced to Mr. Churchill and he said (through his cigar) that he was happy that we were there to study air-ground liaison work, and that the British were complimented that we wanted to learn the methods they had developed. He suggested to General Alexander that we be given free rein and that everything possible be put at our disposal. Ain't I some punkins?"

Curious about his service in Northern Italy, and what "free rein" Churchill had suggested be given, I pursued further research. My father arrived in Italy, at "Purple Heart Valley," on 13 August 1944. (Monte Cassino had been taken in May.) He was in Caserta and Siena from 24 August to 7 September, attached to AAI HQ—Advance Detachment G-3. He then departed for St. Tropez, France, landing by Higgins boat. (Operation Anvil, aka Operation Dragoon—the invasion of the south of France—had been launched on 15 August.) He was assigned to Sixth Army Group HQ G-3 Air Ground Liaison. A letter written 21 August mentions an "excursion" which he can't write about owing to censorship.

According to the official biography, vol. VII (906-13) Churchill flew from Naples to Rome on 21 August, where he spent two nights at the British Embassy. On August 23rd he flew to Alexander's headquarters near Siena. Sir Martin Gilbert, in The Second World War: A Complete History, writes: "Churchill was in Italy on August 23, when, near Siena, he visited the troops who, despite the considerable diversion of forces and weaponry to southern France, were planning a new offensive in three days' time."

Churchill spent August 24th visiting his old friend General Freyberg and the New Zealand Division, and the 25th working at Alexander's headquarters. On the 26th Churchill accompanied Alexander to observe the start of his new offensive. From all this
it would appear that my father's meeting with Churchill occurred at Alexander's headquarters on 23 August, or, at the outside, on the 25th, when he spent the day working there.

Churchill had noted in his comments, recorded by my father in his letter, that the American visitors were there to study the air-ground liaison work. A study of Air-Ground Support in World War II states: "The British air-ground system was the first successful Allied adoption of close air support for ground forces. As such it became the early model for the U.S. Army Air Force in World War II."*

The last chapter of the "Final Report, G-3 Section, Headquarters, 6th Army Group," a sort of unit history dated 1 July 1945, discusses the maturing and effectiveness of air coop-

* LTC Kenneth A. Steadman, "A Comparative Look at Air-Ground Support Doctrine and Practice in World War II." (Combat Studies Institute, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, 1982).

eration with ground forces:
"In use within the Army Group was an air-ground coordination system brought over from Italy, which initially was not the approved standard operating procedure of either Air or Ground Forces. Because it worked so smoothly and brought closer cooperation, however, details of the plan have since been incorporated in the approved regulations on the subject."

One can reasonably surmise the system "brought over from Italy" for the Southern France campaign had its origins at that August meeting at General Alexander's HQ, and that had the endorsement of Churchill.

The content of my father's letters has been a revelation to me. The Internet has been a wonderful tool in my research, bringing to life his experiences. The 6th Army Group G-3 history was found during such a search. As it turns out, my father helped write this history, while stationed in Heidelberg just after VE Day. More specifically, he compiled the information and drew each of the forty-one maps included in the final report, the original of which is filed away in the United States Army Military History Institute in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

Another result of my Internet research was the picture shown here: "August 1944, somewhere in Italy, reviewing plans, General Alexander." This of course must have been taken at the time my father met Winston Churchill. WSC is studying something just outside a caravan; perhaps it was the breakthrough plan referred to in my father's letter.

What about his time in England—one of the two facts I had been carrying around with me all these years? As it turned out, my father was there only waiting to be sent to the Pacific Theatre—or home. Two atomic bombs later, after more waiting, he boarded the Queen Mary on 9 December 1945, and returned home.
JAMES LANCASTER'S

CHURCHILL QUIZ

Each column includes four questions in each of six categories: Churchill contemporaries (C), literary (L), miscellaneous (M), personal (P), statesmanship (S) and war (W), easier questions first. How far can you get?

Level 4:
1. How many children did Winston and Clementine have? (P)
2. When was the last volume of WSC's The World Crisis published? (L)
3. Why did Churchill refuse Gen. Weygand's Jun 40 request that every British fighter squadron should be thrown into the battle for France? (W)
4. Churchill's "One of the heaviest blows I can recall during the war" referred to what June 1942 event? (S)
5. When did Winston Churchill first meet Clementine Hozier? (P)
6. "How the Great Democracies triumphed and so were able to resume the follies which had so nearly cost them their life" is the theme of which volume of The Second World War? (L)

Level 3:
7. Whom was Churchill quoting in Ottawa on 30 December 1941: "In three weeks England will have her neck wrung like a chicken."? (S)
8. Who wrote about Churchill: "At the rate he goes there will hardly be room for him in Parliament at thirty or in England at forty"? (P)
9. Who received this Churchill directive: "Your prime and main duty will be to take or destroy at the earliest opportunity the German-Italian Army commanded by Field-Marshal Rommel, together with all its supplies and establishments in Egypt and Libya"? (W)
10. What incident at the end of 1910 got Churchill into trouble? (M)
11. "This Chamber must be rebuilt—just as it was"—what was Churchill referring to? (W)
12. Churchill told Boothby: "It took Armageddon to make me Prime Minister. But now that I am there, I am determined that Power shall be in no other hands but mine. There will be no more Kitchener's, Fishers or Haigs." What was WSC referring to? (C)

Level 2:
13. How many elections did Churchill lose in his political career? (M)
14. Who wrote the preface for Churchill's Thoughts and Adventures (Amid These Storms in the U.S.)? (L)
15. Who was Laura Ormiston Chant? (P)
16. "I have made more than St. Augustine" referred to what? (C)
17. When did Churchill first conceive of the idea of Mulberry Harbours, which played an important role in the invasion of Normandy? (W)
18. "Might it not be thought rather cynical if it seemed we had disposed of these issues, so fateful to millions of people, in such an offhand manner?" What was Churchill referring to? (S)

Level 1:
19. Who was in charge of the planning for Winston Churchill's funeral? (C)
20. Name the five prime ministers Churchill served under as a member of the Government. (C)
21. Whom did Churchill defend vigorously in the crucial Norway debate during 7-8 May 1940? (S)
22. When did Churchill first read Hitler's Mein Kampf? (M)
23. Who finally beat Churchill at Dundee after his sixth attempt to unseat him? (M)
24. Which book by Randolph convinced Winston, in December 1960, to authorize his son to write his official biography? (L)

ANSWERS

1. 2 (P)
2. 1960 (L)
3. (C)
4. (W)
5. (P)
6. (L)
7. (S)
8. (P)
9. (W)
10. (M)
11. (W)
12. (C)
13. (M)
14. (L)
15. (P)
16. (C)
17. (W)
18. (S)
19. (C)
20. (C)
21. (S)
22. (M)
23. (M)
24. (L)
Finest Hour Back Issue Sale

BUILD YOUR COLLECTION OF A CHURCHILLIAN CLASSIC.

We are stuffed with back issues which cost us money to store. Build your Churchill Library while helping us clear them out. Postpaid prices in USA: Single copies $5, six for $24. Postage extra outside USA. Please make cheques payable to The Churchill Centre, 1150 17th Street NW Suite 307, Washington DC 20036 USA. Phone (888) WSC-1874 or email info@winstonchurchill.org. Visa, Mastercard, Amex accepted.

AVAILABLE ISSUES:


#58 We are lampooned by The New Republic (and dish it back), Lord Soames '87 Dallas conference, Pamela Harriman. Cover: "Retirement" cartoon.

#59 AUSTRALIA NUMBER. Six articles on Churchill & Australia. Also: Securing the "Strire," painting Canada, revisionists & The Hinge of Fate, collecting WW2 postcards. Cover: Australian flag.


#66 India by WSC back in print, Robert Hardy, H.L. Mencken and WSC, Australia's changing foreign policy, Denis Kelly. Cover: the new India.

FULL COLOR COVERS FROM HERE ON...

#67 Dunkirk 50th anniversary, WSC and Lloyd's, Britain & Europe, Churchill and the Navy, Sir William Stephenson, Cover: Carter star & budge.

#69 Churchill the Creator: five articles on style, broadcasting, disabilities, language. 1999 prediction he will be Prime Minister, Call to Canadians » revitalize Canada. Cover: WSC Spy cartoon.

#75 Jack Kemp, Dorothy Rabinowitz on WSC, The People's Rights, La Pausa display in Dallas, Lady Soames on Churchill organizations, two 1945 encounters with WSC by James Heinemann. Cover: smashing Cooper portrait of WSC 1945.


#88 WSC's Durban speech after escape, Chartwell, new website, Britain's VE-Day; James Muller, array of Churchilliana. Cover: Churchill in Dublin aged 4, the earliest known painting of WSC.

#99 CENTENARY OF OMDURMAN: three articles including Churchill's on the cavalry charge. Lady Soames on her parents, Weidhorn on Winston, Hayward on Leadership, WSC as Coalition war leader, Neville Chamberlain. Covers: Lady Soames and 4th Hussars statuary.


#114 WSC on George VI, Gilbert on Churchillhips, Bletchley Park, Queen Mum obituary, Churchill on Daylight Savings Time, Queen Mary Fellows program, Myths: He let Coventry burn. Cover: Oil painting of WSC by Martin Driscoll commissioned for the Queen Mary WSC suite.


#123 Fabulous full wrap cover painting by WSC of Katonbia Mosque, Marrakech (only WW2 painting). Manchester Vol 3 excerpt, Churchill and the Second Front, WSC and America, Speech on the outbreak of war.
A Punch cartoon from mid-1912 recalls magnificoes now mostly forgotten (except of course our man). Matters of moment at this time in Parliament were the Third Irish Home Rule Bill; Welsh Disestablishment; the Marconi scandal that threatened to engulf Lloyd George; Women's Suffrage (Christabel Pankhurst was now Suffragette leader, replacing her mother, Sylvia); Germany's naval challenge to Britain; and the Balkan Alliance of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and Macedonia (which did not survive the outbreak of war two years later).

Paul Courtenay, James Lancaster and the editor offer these tentative identifications, and welcome comments from readers. Proceeding generally from left to right:


Walkers in background: Foreign minister Sir Edward Grey is leading a group which look like Foreign Office mandarins. (JL notes that in 1912 there were only 76 persons in the Foreign Office—plus a few secretaries and servants! Staffing levels since have been in inverse proportion to Britain's influence on world affairs.)

Center with MAJORITY javelin: Prime Minister Herbert Asquith.

Wrestling over Ireland: Sir Edward Carson (Ulster Unionist) and John Redmond (Home Ruler). On floor watching them: Augustine Birrell (Secretary of State for Ireland 1907-16).

Behind Birrell, with the BY-ELECTIONS javelin: Leader of the Opposition Andrew Bonar Law. Bald man left of Bonar Law: Unidentified, though singular looking...

Wig and robe: Viscount [Richard Burdon] Haldane (Lord Chancellor 1912-15). With Indian clubs: The Marquess of Crewe (Secretary of State for India, grandfather of Jock Colville, Churchill's private secretary, 1940-55.)

Discus thrower with 3d coin: David Lloyd George (Chancellor of the Exchequer), who was asking employers to contribute 3d weekly toward national insurance, together with employees (4d) and the government (2d). Strong man with mirror: Radical independent socialist John Burns, renowned for his physical strength.

With longbow: Possibly a pun on the Tory Ulster Unionist Walter Long; his bandana ("URE") must refer to some cause relating to Ulster.

Swimming in pool: First Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill (whom Lloyd George had recently referred to as a "sea creature"); WSC made several trips that summer, on the Admiralty yacht Enchantress, to the Irish ports and Spithead. With telescope: Churchill's First Sea Lord, Admiral Sir Francis Bridgeman.

Observing the swimmers: Churchill's longtime friend and Tory stalwart, F.E. Smith, Lord Birkenhead.