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Oscar Nemon's statue of Winston Churchill in the Guildhall, London, was the first statue of WSC, commissioned by the Corporation of the City of London, and unveiled in his presence by the Lord Mayor on 21 June 1955. The statue was photo-graphed for Finest Hour by Terry Moore.

Right: Testing a Tommy gun, 1940.
FORT JACKSON, S.C., JUNE 1942: General George C. Marshall, Churchill and General Bill Lee, observing Fort Bragg's 503D Parachute Infantry Division making a mass jump. William Caray Lee (1895-1948), "Father of the Airborne," organized the first platoon of paratroopers to explore the feasibility of an airborne division. As the 101st Airborne parachuted into France on D-Day 1944, they honored their former commanders by shouting, "Bill Lee!"

CHURCHILL AND MARSHALL

Finest Hour continues to outdo itself every issue in terms of both design and content. In "Around and About" (FH 136:9) you relate General Marshall's wonderful quote, mention that he left no diaries, and wonder aloud about his opinion of WSC. First and foremost, the General would not have presumed to express his opinion of such an august figure, and he was similarly reticent about FDR. It's clear, however, that his opinion of both men was finely nuanced.

In Forrest Pogue's invaluable George C. Marshall: Interviews and Reminiscences (Marshall Foundation/Johns Hopkins, 1991) there are a couple of priceless anecdotes that illuminate Churchill and the General. On page 551 et seq., Marshall tells the laugh-out-loud story about his efforts to keep WSC off the subject of Mediterranean strategy when the two of them met for dinner in Algiers in May 1943. Marshall's strategy, every time there was a pause in their conversation, was to raise questions about subjects Marshall hoped would inspire the PM to expatiate.

He started by raising the impeachment of Warren Hastings (Governor-General of India, 1772-85; he was ultimately acquitted). The strategy worked like a charm. When WSC showed signs of slowing down some twenty minutes later, Marshall raised the subject of Hess's parachute jump into Scotland and, bingo! The PM launched into another disquisition. About half an hour later, WSC seemed to be flagging slightly so Marshall raised the subject of the Abdication of Edward VIII. This prompted another flood of oratory. Marshall recalled: "It was a marvelous lecture, just marvelous. Then the steward announced dinner, thank God, and it was all over."

On page 463 et seq., Marshall tells an even funnier and more illuminating story about Clementine Churchill's indiscretion during the 1942 visit to Washington. Marshall had let her view a rough cut of Frank Capra's "Why We Fight" series. She was so enthused about it that she asked him to show it to the Prime Minister. Rightfully fearful that White House involvement would delay
for months the release of the series for
general G.I. viewing, Marshall swore
Clemmie to absolute secrecy. "Well, she
promised me. Then she went over to
the White House, got to talking to
Harry Hopkins, and they told the
Prime Minister," who of course insisted
on viewing the series (which FDR
barely knew about).

The clash of titanic wills that fol-
lowed between the General and the
PM had me laughing out loud. I won't
spoil it for you except to report
Marshall's final and unalterable termi-
nation of their argument: "I am very
very fond of Mrs. Churchill, and I
admire her greatly, but I will never for-
give her for telling you." This last was
of course hyperbole, but WSC did not
give her for telling you." This last was
admired for people

On page 51, Warren Kimball says
he's paraphrasing FDR, but the correct
reference is to WSC's speech to the
Canadian Parliament in December
1941, when he memorably exclaimed,
"Some chicken!...Some neck!"

You will kick yourself when I tell
you that the front-bencher in the som-
brero on page 31 is none other than
our good friend Arthur Balfour, who
was given to headgear even more exotic
than Winston Churchill's.

ROBERT PILPEL, WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.

• Editor's response: Mr. Pilpel is
the author of Churchill in America
1895-1961 (New York, 1976). His arti-
cle, "What Churchill Owed the Great
Republic" (FH 125) won our Journal
Award as our best article in 2005.

Professor Kimball has already
upbraided me for the wrong paraphrase
in the article title "Some Kewpie!"
(mines). I was thinking about FDR's
response to Churchill, when WSC told
him that he had first visited America
not as an infant (as someone had told
FDR) but as a young man of 20.
Roosevelt replied: "Some baby!" Alas I
forgot all about the far more apposite
"Some Chicken!" line to the Canadian
Parliament in December 1941.

However, the character in the
illustration on page 31 is not Arthur
Balfour, headgear collection or not,
first because in 1912, Balfour would
have been on the Opposition bench;
second because "Dear Arthur" never
looked like the Cisco Kid! —RML

CANADA'S ROLE

In Christopher Harmon's fine
article in Finest Hour 135, "The Fulton
Speech and Today's War," I am baffled
by his comment on Page 28:
"Countries such as Germany and
Britain have done a great deal, actually
and symbolically. I am disappointed in
Canada....But for such ills there are
tonics. Australia has been a most vigor-
ous and impressive ally."

My facts are that at present there
are approximately 1000 Australian
troops in Afghanistan compared to
2300 Canadians. Australian troop
deaths total one; Canadians total 70
(just behind British of 76 and ahead
of Germans of 24). I don't have any
statistics on Australians wounded but
Canadians wounded total 270 com-
pared to 131 British and 52 Germans.
Surely Prof. Harmon's "disappoint-
ment" cannot be due to Canada's
refusal to join in the war in Iraq?
TERRY REARDON, ETOBICOKE, ONTARIO

MOSQUITO NOT THE
QUICKEST WW2 FIGHTER

The autumn edition of Finest
Hour, a favorite publication of mine,
takes (page 11) that the Mosquito
fighter aircraft was the fastest piston
engine plane of World War II.
Following my suspicion, research
showed the maximum cruise at 407
mph, while the P51 Mustang tops out
at 437, and the P38 Lightning comes
in at 414. The new look of the
"Journal of Winston Churchill" is
greatly appreciated.

GENE LASHERS, LAKEMART, CALIF.

• Editor's response: Many thanks.
Perhaps our source meant the fastest
British fighter?

LANDSLIDE

Ronald Cohen's excellent "Play-
ing with Words" (FH 136:50) discusses
WSC's use of the word "landslide" in
The World Crisis, vol. 1: "The result of
the polls in January, 1906, was a
Conservative landslide."

The Tories fell to a crushing
defeat. Surely this was a Liberal land-
slide? Not so. The word is a derivation
of "landslip"—"a mass of land sliding
down a mountain," a good way in
WSC's view to describe the Tory
debacle in 1906.

Webster's English Dictionary
in 1880 defined landslide as synonymous
with landslip: "land which slips or
slides down," but does not mention it
in relation to elections. But Barbara
Langworth unearthed "landslide" being
used to describe great electoral victories
in The Washington Post in 1888
(http://xrl.us/bbrrs) and in The New

Lexicographers are cautious souls;
the Oxford English Dictionary did not
define "landslide" until 1992: land-
slide=LANDSLIP; also fig. (cf ava-
lanche), esp. with reference to a sweep-
ing electoral victory. While the Post and
the Times thought "landslide" meant a
great electoral victory, WSC viewed the
image of Tory voters slipping and slid-
ing in the mud as synonymous with
inglorious defeat.

I agree with Mr. Cohen:
Churchill wins again. His definition
was right; you cannot win elections
when the land beneath your feet gives
way as in a biblical flood! Received
opinion among the English-speaking
popular peoples, including all today's lexicogra-
phers, plus all foolish folk who say that
elections are won by sliding helplessly
down a mountain, are wrong.

JAMES LANCASTER, NORMANDY, FRANCE M>
EDITOR'S ESSAY

Churchill and People

A well-known member of the "punditsphere" recently sent me research questions involving his forthcoming book: one of those iconoclastic best-sellers about why it was wrong to fight World War II—why Churchill's bulldog stubbornness, however admirable and heroic, bankrupted Britain, lost the Empire and gave us the Cold War. Think back. Haven't you heard something like this before?

"As of March 1939," my friend said with unimpeachable hindsight, "the dead attributed to Stalin were in the millions: barbarism at its worst. Hitler was responsible for 150 dead in the Night of the Long Knives and 100 dead in Kristallnacht, which was not his doing but Goebbels'...I quote four different sources proving that Hitler wanted to end the war—was desperate for a deal." (Aside from the 30,000 Jews sent to concentration camps following Kristallnacht, and the round-ups and murders in Austria and the Sudetenland, it seems quite possible that by the Battle of Britain, Hitler, anxious to invade Russia, was indeed desperate for a deal with Britain.)

We are equal-opportunity researchers so I provided the references requested. In the process we talked about Churchill's relationships with people. "Gratitude was not the Great Man's long suit," my critical friend declared. "Churchill suggested that poor Robert Boothby, who went to the wall for him, be put on a bomb disposal unit."

"What's your source?" I asked. One can always take isolated remarks made in heat or in haste, in unguarded or private moments, and read all sorts of distortions into them. WSC's remarks about Bob Boothby (and that's not precisely what he said) are in my forthcoming book of quotations.* I think most readers will conclude that Churchill's standards of integrity were such that he reacted violently toward anyone who fell short—even his friends.

The idea that Churchill cared nothing for other people, so frequently inferred by his critics, resounds oddly to students of his words. That doesn't mean that a spontaneous outburst is no clue to his thoughts. But in reviewing what Churchill said about people, what we mainly find, in the end, is understanding and magnanimity.

As I worked on the "People" chapter of my book (the largest chapter of all) I was struck by how often Churchill's final view of someone ended on a generous note—even toward those he had severely criticized. Indeed I found only two people about whom Churchill was ultimately censorious. (No, they are not Hitler and Mussolini.)

Churchill knew an amazing array of characters: presidents from McKinley to Eisenhower, sovereigns from Victoria to Elizabeth II, magnificoes, potentates, heroes, villains, dictators, democrats, literati, entertainers, generals, admirals. In his many appraisals, one is hardpressed to find shafts of pure hatred. About "guttersnipes" like Hitler he was vituperative; yet even here here we find traces of an effort to find something worthwhile, somewhere.

When the German radio announced that Hitler had died "fighting with his last breath against Bolshevism," Churchill murmured: "Well, I must say I think he was perfectly right to die like that." In 1985 WSC's former private secretary Sir John Colville told me, "I had the impression that somehow he grudgingly approved." (Churchill did not know when he said this that Hitler had committed ignominious suicide. And he too had expected to die "fighting with his last breath," had the Germans invaded and hewn their way to Downing Street.)

The people Churchill knew would fill volumes, and he himself wrote a good one: Great Contemporaries. Yet many he admired—like Bracken, Beaverbrook and Birkenhead, his wife's "three terrible B's"—rarely received his public encomiums. Privately, it was another story. Even toward strident adversaries in Parliament, there was a measure of affection characteristic of Churchill—an aspect of politics that has almost vanished today. (See for example page 19.)

Christopher Matthews, the Churchill Centre Trustee honored with our Emery Reves Award last October, recalled in his remarks an amazing sight. It was 1981, after President Reagan had been shot and nearly killed. The first outsider allowed into the President's hospital room was Matthews' then-boss, Speaker of the House Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill. A doctor entering the room was startled to find O'Neill on his knees in prayer, holding the unconscious President's hand—this partisan Democrat who had opposed Reagan, and would again. It is scarcely surprising to know that Reagan and O'Neill were both admirers of Winston Churchill.

One of my favorite stories along these lines is from 1960, when Sir Winston learned of the death of his great Labour nemesis, Aneurin Bevan. To the astonishment of listeners, WSC launched into an impromptu valedictory—about the man he had once called the "Minister of Disease." Then, suddenly, half-way through and in mid-sentence, Churchill paused and inquired, sotto voce: "Are you sure he's dead?" —RML

* Churchill By Himself, a lexicon of 4000 quotations with dates, attributions and annotations, will be published in 2008 by Ebury Press Division of Random House in London and Public Affairs in New York.
UK CURRICULUM (AGAIN)
LONDON, NOVEMBER 17TH— Our last issue (7-8) doubted that the freed-up UK curriculum, no longer recommending coverage of figures like Churchill, Hitler, Gandhi and Stalin, could cause Churchill to be edited out of the Second World War. Not buying it is Chris McGovern of the History Curriculum Association (the group protesting the curriculum changes) who wrote as follows in a letter to the editor of the London Daily Telegraph:

"A government spokesman claims that nobody 'with any sense could teach the Second World War without covering Winston Churchill.' Why then did the government's video packs on the 50th anniversary of VE Day, sent to every school in the country, confine Churchill's role in the Second World War to that of losing the election?" Good question! Perhaps we assumed too much "sense" among teachers.

Professor Paul Addison writes: "The national curriculum website is fairly baffling, but offers two videos about Churchill listed as valuable resources for teachers on world history from 1900. I think these and other related materials show that there is no Whitehall attempt to marginalise or belittle Churchill. But I have to admit that the whole question is complicated. Suppose the curriculum compels teachers to give prominence to Churchill. They cannot be ordered what to think about him, or what line to take—that would be Stalinism in a new guise. So there is no way of ensuring that a prominent place in the curriculum translates into a just appraisal for WSC in the classroom.

"My own concern lies elsewhere, in the fact that history is no longer a compulsory element in the national curriculum for children over the age of 14. I feel that the older they are, the more they are likely to benefit from the study of history, and of course the more likely to pursue it at University and beyond.'"

WORLD WAR WHO?
LONDON, AUGUST 18TH—Possibly apropos the above, it was announced today in the Daily Mirror that 38 percent of British children are not aware that Britain and Churchill were involved in a fight to crush Hitler's Nazi Germany.

Ordinarily this would pass our desk with a large ho-hum, on the presumption that history isn't seriously being taught very much anymore. Not so! Most students "were aware of major events such as the Gunpowder Plot, the Viking invasion, Henry VII's wives, and the Egyptian pyramids. And many said history was their favourite subject." Hmm.

There's more. Would you believe that 87 percent of the students know the Roman Legions were from Italy? (Well, duh!) Or that 90 percent perceive that the Vikings were Scandinavian?

Some 97 percent are aware that the plague was spread by rats in the 17th century, and 92 percent know the Egyptians built the pyramids.

Better still: a rollicking 95 percent agree that Margaret Thatcher was once Prime Minister. A similar number have heard of Guy Fawkes, and know that he failed, though one percent thought—wished?—that his target was the Millennium Dome.

Seventy-two percent say they "love" history. They are just a little fuzzy on World War II. And whose side the Germans were on.

BAMBI AND THUMPER AT CHEQUERS
LONDON, NOVEMBER 18TH—Churchill Centre director David Boler bumped into a Sunday Times reporter and told him about the diary he had uncovered, listing all the films that were shown to Churchill at Chequers, the PM's official residence, during the war. "They wanted to do an article, and I sent them the diary on disc (which Royal Mail lost), then emailed the full contents from my own photocopy, along with quotes from Phil Reed (Churchill Museum) and Allen Packwood (Churchill Archives Centre). The disappointing result is attached. They even misquoted me."

FINEST HOUR 137/7
The Sunday Times article, by Richard Brooks, solemnly announced that WSC enjoyed "Bambi, the tear-jerking Disney cartoon." It did mention WSC's more serious favorites: "Lady Hamilton," with Vivien Leigh as Lord Nelson's lady; "The Young Mr. Pitt," "Across the Pacific," "In Old Chicago" and "Goodbye, Mr. Chips."

In America "The People's Radio" (NPR) read the Sunday Times and lurched into action. We are advised that they interviewed an academic on the subject a week later. The media run in packs—do these people ever say anything original?

CHURCHILL'S OFFICES: THE OFFICIAL TALLY

Finest Hour 114:46 contained a comprehensive list of the government offices Churchill held, but some of the dates were later corrected. Other sources, such as Wikipedia.com and Leslie Frewen's Immortal Jester, give differing dates. Our editors have reviewed the entire subject anew and offer the following revise.

Sources on precise dates of office disagree because there are no consistent parameters. Dates cited include when the job was offered (or when he was sacked); when he "kissed hands" with the Sovereign; when it was announced in the press, etc. To be as consistent as possible, we assign preference to: (1) the date formally appointed; (2) the date the King approved; (3) the date announced in Parliament; (4) the date announced in the press (the "quality press" considered this the only sure indication). We have to avoid dates when he was offered a job (or sacked), or when his name was sent to the King, both of which would precede the dates he actually took office (or left).

An additional complication is that Churchill sometimes stayed on awaiting his replacement for several days after the change was official. For example, he was appointed to the Duchy of Lancaster on 27 May 1915, but his first letter from Duchy of Lancaster Office is on 1 June (Gilbert, Winston S. Churchill, Companion Volume III, Part 2, 976), followed by a detailed note on the situation the same day. The next day, 2 June, WSC wrote privately to Lieutenant-Colonel Hankey, datelined Admiralty and on Admiralty notepaper. From the above, it is fair to assume that WSC did not leave the Admiralty for the Duchy of Lancaster until 31 May.

Churchill's only non-Cabinet office was Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies; he held no other offices which lacked Cabinet rank. In all, he held eleven Cabinet posts counting the Premierships and sixteen distinct terms of office. He was First Lord of the Admiralty twice. He was Prime Minister (First Lord of the Treasury) and Minister of Defence technically three times each: in the wartime Coalition, the Conservative caretaker government of May-July 1945, and the 1951-55 premiership. Of his sixteen posts, seven were in national or coalition governments, five Conservative, and four Liberal.

"Minister of Defence" requires its own explanation. Churchill created and took the position, without trying to define it too precisely, in 1940, in order to preside over all the fighting departments. The post was not formalised until the Ministry of Defence Act of 1946. From that point on, the Minister of Defence attended Cabinet meetings in place of the Secretaries of State for War and Air and the First Lord of the Admiralty, who remained in operational control of their respective services. In 1952, Churchill was succeeded as Minister of Defence by the Earl Alexander of Tunis.

Our thanks for their kind assistance in research to Ronald Cohen, James Lancaster, Paul Courtenay, and Allen Packwood.

NON-CABINET OFFICE

CABINET OFFICES
1. President of the Board of Trade, 12 April 1908 to 14 February 1910.* Government: Liberal (H.H. Asquith).


7. Secretary of State for Air,* 9 January 1919 to 1 April 1921. Government: Coalition (David Lloyd George).
Although sometimes rendered as "War and Air," these were separate ministries. Note that WSC held the Air six weeks longer than the War Office pending appointment of his successor, which may also have happened with other offices.

8. Secretary of State for the Colonies, 14 February 1921 to 19 October 1922.* Government: Coalition (David Lloyd George).

*Date Lloyd George resigned. Offices automatically lapse on the date a Prime Minister resigns, although Ministers may attend to transitional matters.


*Date Baldwin resigned.


10b. Third Term, 26 October 1951 to 5 April 1955. Government: Conservative (WSC).


ELIZABETH NEL, 1917-2007

One of Winston Churchill's few surviving secretaries, Churchill Centre Honorary Member Elizabeth Layton Nel, 90, died in her sleep in October at her cottage in Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

Elizabeth Layton was born in England but grew up in Canada. She returned to London to involve herself in the war effort. She was party to numerous key gatherings, including the Yalta Conference with Franklin Roosevelt, Churchill and Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union in February 1945. At a banquet in Yalta, toasts were drunk to the various dignitaries and to the countries represented. Churchill then rose and proposed a toast to "Miss Layton," the only woman present.

In recent years Nel received numerous invitations, including one in 1990 to 10 Downing Street, on the 50th anniversary of Churchill's assuming office as Prime Minister. In interviews with The Herald, Nel had said that working for Churchill was "an incredible privilege—it was hard work and not easy, but it meant such a lot to me."

Nel described Churchill as demanding. His staff had to be on hand at all times to attend to his needs: "He awoke late, stayed in bed until lunch whilst attending to urgent Red Box matters, then dressed and worked till 5pm, then took a nap. Dinner followed at 8pm and then he worked through until the early hours. At any one time a secretary was at his side prepared to take any notes."

At the time of her death Nel had just had her book, Mr. Churchill's Secretary, a record of her years with Churchill, republished. After the war she married South African soldier Frans Nel and settled in Port Elizabeth. (FH readers who cannot obtain the original should order this outstanding memoir from the Churchill Centre Book Club.)

Elizabeth is survived by three children and seven grandchildren. One daughter, Debbie Schlosser, said she had died peacefully: "It's not nice for anybody to lose a mother, but after 90 years one knows that it's time to go. I am glad that she lived her life out."

—Dineo Matomela, The Herald, Port Elizabeth, South Africa

Elizabeth Nel, like Grace Hamblin, had only good words for her former boss—whatever the strains, and they were considerable, of "sterner days" when imminent extinction flickered. Grace used to say that the hardest thing about working for WSC was "getting used to being shouted at." The first day he shouted, Elizabeth burst into tears. "Good heavens, you mustn't mind me," said WSC, immediately contrite. "We're all toads beneath the harrow....We must go on like gun horses, till we drop." Notified that she was marrying Frans Nel and emigrating to South Africa, Winston and Clemotine recited in unison: "You must have four children. One for Mother, one for Father, one for Accidents, and one for Increase." She had only just written us, pledging her support (FH 136: 58). We will never forget her. Rest in peace. —RML &
MARRAKESH (Coombs 434) is almost the same view of the city and Atlas Mountains that Churchill presented to Roosevelt during World War II (produced in color on the cover of Finest Hour MA, Autumn 2004). WSC (at right painting in Miami before the Fulton speech in 1946) regarded himself strictly as an amateur painter, but many experts thought he had real talent. He painted from 1915 to 1958.

TRUMAN PAINTING...

unbroken provenance to an important historical figure, its appearance on the open market was expected to attract strong interest, and buyers may well ignore the £500,000 estimate, just as they ignored the £200,000 estimate in July when Sotheby’s auctioned “Chartwell Landscape with Sheep” for a record price, nearly double the previous figure for a Churchill painting.

Frances Christie, Sotheby’s specialist in the 20th Century British Art department, said that such prices had emerged recently. “It is only in the past two years that he’s broken the £100,000 barrier,” she said.

Although “Marrakesh” is comparable in colours and tones to another Morocco painting, “View of Tinerhir,” which sold in December 2006 for £612,800, this work is arguably superior in both composition and provenance.

Winston Churchill spoke modestly of what he called “my daubs,” but his friend Sir John Lavery, an official artist in the First World War, said: “Had he chosen painting instead of statesmanship, I believe he would have been a great master with the brush.”

Churchill gave his most prized paintings to people he admired and wanted to honour with the most personal of gifts. Presidents Roosevelt and Eisenhower, Viscount Montgomery and General George C. Marshall were among those who received such tokens of friendship and respect.

With his gift to Truman, Churchill enclosed a note: “This picture was hung in the Academy last year and is about as presentable as anything I can produce. It shows the beautiful panorama of the snow-capped Atlas mountains in Marrakesh. This is the view I persuaded your predecessor [Roosevelt] to see before he left North Africa after the Casablanca Conference [in 1943]. He was carried to the top of a high tower, and a magnificent sunset was duly in attendance.”

Truman wrote back: “I can’t find words adequate to express my appreciation of the beautiful picture...I shall treasure the picture as long as I live and it will be one of the most valued possessions I will be able to leave to Margaret when I pass on.” He hung the painting in his living-room, where it remained until his death in 1972. Since then, it has been in the New York apartment of his daughter, who was 27 when Churchill gave the painting to her father. Her son, Clifton Daniel, told The Times: “It’s hard for her to give up something of his, but she always has the memories. She loved Sir Winston, not only as a politician and world leader, but being around him.” —DALYA ALBERGE, THE TIMES

NO SMOKING AT NO. 10

LONDON, JULY 1ST—From this date the entrance of 10 Downing Street will display a No Smoking sign. All visitors to the Prime Minister’s residence will be warned that smoking inside is banned. Similar signs will be at Buckingham Palace, ”but not on entrances which are used by members of the Royal Family only.” (Aha! Feet of clay!)

Really it is too silly. The ordinary public can no longer get close enough to Number 10 to blow a puff of second-hand smoke anywhere near it. Is there a camera trained on the famous black door, like there is on everything else in Britain? “It’s doubtful whether [the sign] would have made Winston Churchill stub out his cigar or Harold Wilson extinguish his pipe,” writes Andrew Buckwell, presumably straight-faced, in The Mail on Sunday.

TECHNION CARRIES ON

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 6TH—Winston Churchill said that his grandfather would have been delighted at a new project to revamp the Churchill Auditorium at Israel’s Technion Institute. Members of the Churchill family helped launch a fundraising drive to support the £1.5 million renovation, underscoring their longstanding association with the institution.

In 1958, the auditorium was opened by Randolph and Sarah Churchill, and WSC wrote: “I have been a Zionist for many years, and I view with admiration the maturing of the State of Israel. So to increase the technical aptitude of your people is...”
indeed commendable."

Mr. Churchill also launched a scathing attack on those behind boycott moves: "I cannot condemn too strongly this new fascism in the academic world in the UK and among the student body. I think they have a very tenuous understanding of history. We are seeing a creeping revival of fascism in Europe, and to see it coming here is appalling even though those who are responsible for it would be horrified at the idea that they are being tainted...But that is precisely what they're doing. They seem to be much more eager to condemn Israel than the suicide bombers who murder innocents."

Glimpses: Oxygen-dependent? Whitelaw Reid on Young Winston
Daun van Ee

In the Theodore Roosevelt Papers at the Library of Congress (Series 1, box 119, folder 1) is a letter dated 27 February 1906, from U.S. Ambassador to Britain Whitelaw Reid to President Roosevelt's wife Edith, containing "a little installment of London gossip." The letter followed the marriage of Alice Roosevelt and the King's address to Parliament: "A day or two later...Winston Churchill really made an unqualified success, surprising his opponents and confounding some of his supporters by the moderate and quite statesmanlike tone he took on the Chinese question. Since that speech there is a general belief that Winston is very likely to go at least as far as his father did.

"Against this belief, however, are to be set several facts. One is bad temper and bad manners; another is instability of opinion and a somewhat common belief that he has no particular convictions, but only prejudices and a determination to believe anything that may help him to rise; and still another is that he is thought to be in wretched health. A lady quite in the way of knowing about such things (Lady Tweeddale) told me last night that he was only put into condition for speaking by having oxygen gas brought to a room in the House where he could inhale it for some little time before he took the floor! I doubt if she could have had the medical facts quite right, but there seems to be no question that he has burnt the candle at both ends at a tremendous rate, and he looks pasty and unhealthy.

"It is a curious thing, however, that this half American boy is at the moment absolutely one of the most prominent figures in this huge majority on the Liberal side. His cousin tells me today that the oxygen story is true, but exaggerated."

Such, I suppose, are the perils of having a close family friend as Ambassador! I think that the President read the twenty-page, typewritten letter, and that his well-known negative opinions of Winston Churchill were in all likelihood solidified. (See "As Others Saw Him: Theodore Roosevelt," FH 100.)

Editor's note: Churchill's speech, on 22 February 1906, containing his famous line, "terminological inexactitude," was a brilliant rebuttal to the Tory Opposition's amendment to the King's Speech, accusing the Liberal government of keeping Chinese coolies in the Transvaal coalfields in a state of slavery. As Under-secretary for the Colonies it fell to Churchill to rebut the amendment:

I took occasion during the election to say, and I repeat it now, that the conditions of the Transvaal Ordinance under which Chinese Labour is now being carried on do not, in my opinion, constitute a state of slavery. A labour contract into which men enter voluntarily for a limited and for a brief period, under which they are paid wages which they consider adequate, under which they are not bought or sold and from which they can obtain relief on payment of seventeen pounds ten shillings, the cost of their passage, may not be a healthy or proper contract, but it cannot in the opinion of His Majesty's Government be classified as slavery in the extreme acceptance of the word without some risk of terminological inexactitude.

In *Winston S. Churchill*, vol. II *Young Statesman 1901-1911* (London: Heinemann, 1967, 167), Randolph Churchill wrote: "This celebrated example of polysyllabic humour was always to be misunderstood and to be regarded as a mere substitute for 'lie,' which it plainly was not intended to be." $
125 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1882-83 • Age 8

"Teaching me to be naughty"

Lady Randolph's report on Winston's first term performance at St. George's School, sent to her husband on 26 December, was not inspiring: "As to Winston's improvement I am sorry to say I see none. Perhaps there has not been time enough. He can read very well, but that is all, and the first two days he came home he was terribly slangy and loud. Altogether I am disappointed. But Everest was told down there that next term they meant to be more strict with him."

Winston also fell short of his mother's expectations at home. She reported that "he teases [his brother Jack] more than ever" and promised Lord Randolph: "When I get well I shall take him in hand. It appears that he is afraid of me."

His brother Jack, however, did not appear to be bothered by Winston's attentions. When asked by Lord Randolph's fellow Fourth Party colleague, Sir Henry Drummond, if he was being good, Jack replied: "Yes, but brother is teaching me to be naughty."

100 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1907-08 • Age 33

Britain's African Responsibility

Upon his return from his African journey on 17 January 1908, Churchill began a series of speeches recounting his observations. Uganda, he told the National Liberal Club on 18 January, was a country which from end to end is a garden—inexhaustible, irrepressible, and exuberant fertility upon every side, and I cannot doubt that the great system of lakes and waterways, which you cannot fail to observe if you look at the large map of Africa, must one day become the great centre of tropical production, and play a most important part in the economic development of the whole world.

We must bear in mind about these countries—the protectorates on each side of Africa which we have acquired so easily—that they will increasingly supply the working and industrial populations of this country with the raw materials so indispensable to them. Cotton, rubber, fibre, hemp, and many other commodities will come in an increasing stream.

Churchill had more in mind than raw materials. He reminded his audience—in words that modern critics of the Empire have probably never read—that Britain's first obligation was to the native populations of her protectorates:

But the real argument I would urge upon the Liberal party, as a cause of our not relaxing our efforts to develop these countries is the interest of the native races who dwell there. [Cheers.] Of course from time to time in the administration of large affairs detached incidents occur which everybody regrets, and which scarcely anybody defends. But I must say that I was most pleasantly surprised—no, I won't say surprised; I was pleasantly impressed with the manner in which a great number of our civil and military officers who I met construed their duty towards the native populations among whom they lived. I found them resolved to protect these populations against the mere exploiter and the speculator, and those who merely wished to use them for some financial advantage.

Three days later, Churchill spoke at the Free Trade Hall in Manchester:

I believe as a Free-trader that all legitimate interests are in harmony, that there is no permanent antagonism between capital and labour, and that every one of us by setting up general interests before our eyes can best advance our own interests and can most highly elevate the interests of the whole community. But it is the inherent vice of the Protectionist philosophy that it always prefers selfish, special interests to large general interests; it is always preferring the interest of this or that class of producers to the large general interests of the community or the consumer.

Later that same day in Manchester, he spoke on a variety of subjects, including naval armaments:

You well know I have always advocated retrenchment in public expenditure, particularly upon armaments, and certainly I think we of the Liberal party are bound to make continual and persistent efforts to fight against that tendency to raise the cost of our military and naval preparations year by year. I deny that there is the slightest reason for a scare about our navy. I deny that there is the slightest reason for supposing our naval preparations are not in every respect adequate and capable of dealing with any developments that may take place.

In February, Churchill took a break from politics and addressed the Authors' Club in London:

The fortunate people in the world—the only really fortunate people in the world, in my mind—are those whose work is also their pleasure. The class is not a large one, not nearly so large as it is often represented to be; and authors are perhaps one of the most important elements in its composition. To sit at one's table on a sunny morning, with four clear hours of uninterruptible security, plenty of nice white paper, and a Squeezor pen [laughter]—that is true happiness. The complete absorption of the mind upon an agreeable occupation—what more is there than that to
75 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1932-33 • Age 58
"The Curl of Contempt"

On 14 December, 1932, Churchill spoke in the House on the government's folly in letting France forget her war debts to Britain, while encouraging France to pay the United States in full. This was in contradiction of Churchill's own policy as Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he repeated for the House's benefit:

A communique was issued on the same point from which I may read one extract: It is a very good communique I may say—I wrote it myself: His Majesty's Government have from the outset made it perfectly clear that any arrangements which they can come to with France must be governed by the principle so often declared that they must receive from France proportionate and pari passu payments to any she may eventually make to the United States in settlement of her war debt. It would be no service to Europe already so grievously stricken, if the sacrifices of one creditor of France merely conduced to the advantage of another.

Why did the Government whistle all this down the wind so lightly and so easily? When I read on Friday that the Government were actually urging France to pay the United States, having cheerfully let them off the obligation to pay us, I was profoundly shocked and distressed. It seemed to me that it was hardly possible that such an inversion of good sense could have been put forward. We were actually urging the French to pay the United States at our expense.

On 30 January, 1933, Adolf Hitler became the Weimar Republic’s last chancellor. On 17 February, Churchill spoke at Queen’s Hall in London where he condemned the recent Oxford debate where die resolution “That this House refuses in any circumstances to fight for King and Country,” had been carried by a 2-1 margin. Churchill wondered aloud what the Nazis would make of this:

My mind turns across the narrow waters of the Channel and the North Sea, where great nations stand determined to defend their national glory or national existence with their lives. I think of Germany, with its splendid clear-eyed youth marching forward on all the roads of the Reich singing their ancient songs, demanding to be conscripted into an army; eagerly seeking the most terrible weapons of war; burning to suffer and die for their fatherland. I think of Italy, with her ardent Fascist, her renowned Chief, and stern sense of national duty. I think of France, anxious, peace-loving, pacifist to the core, but armed to the teeth and determined to survive as a great nation in the world.

One can almost feel the curl of contempt upon the lips of the manhood of all these peoples when they read this message sent out by Oxford University in the name of young England.

Churchill was not done with the subject. While often criticized during the 1930s as a warmonger, on 24 February, 1933, he seemed avowedly isolationist in his sentiments:

Young people argue a great deal about whether they would fight or no if a war came. But there is no likelihood of a war in which Great Britain would be involved. Even if foreign countries go to war with one another, I know of no reason why a wise and honourable foreign policy should not enable us to stand aside and prevent the fire from spreading. The Government has very rightly refused to extend our obligation in Europe or elsewhere.

Under the present constitution of the League of Nations, we cannot be forced into war against our better judgment of what is right or wrong. I think the first duty of British statesmen is to make sure that we are not drawn into any war, and only their second duty is to try to prevent others from fighting, or to try to bring their quarrels to an end. The supreme interest of Great Britain is peace in our time. With that object our foreign policy should encourage France to keep a strong army, so that there is no danger of her being attacked by her neighbours.

50 YEARS AGO:
Winter 1957-58 • Age 83
"I hope they will be considered worthy..."

In January, at the suggestion of President Eisenhower, Markle Cards of Kansas City arranged in that city the first exhibition devoted solely to Churchill’s paintings. (See page 20.) Churchill personally supervised the selection of thirty-five paintings for the exhibition. In a letter to her husband on 25 January, Clementine wrote: "according to the Daily Mail, '1,221 persons' visited your Exhibition in one day at Kansas City and this is a record.' Earlier, Churchill had written Eisenhower: "I do hope they will be considered worthy of the honour you have done them."

Later that week, he received an invitation from Eisenhower to visit the United States. Churchill told his wife it would be a short visit, "only a week, of which three and a half days will be spent at the White House and the rest with Bernie [Baruch], either in New York or at his countiy place. I do hope you will be able to come with me, but I shall quite understand if you feel that a double flight across the Atlantic is more than the experience will be worth."
The dedication of the Sir Winston Churchill Pavilion at the New York World's Fair, on the morning of 28 April 1965, was a grand occasion. Presiding was the Hon. Robert Moses, President of the New York World's Fair. The Carillon—*God Save the Queen* and *The Star Spangled Banner*—was followed by an address by the Hon. Averell Harriman. Then came a message from the President of the United States: "I join all of you here today in this dedication of spirit both to the man and to the meaning which his life exemplified." The Pavilion had been funded by Joyce C. Hall of Hallmark cards (see next article).

Sarah Churchill, Lady Audley, then reached for the cord to reveal the statue of Sir Winston Spencer Churchill, while *Pomp and Circumstance* rang out from the Carillon. This was followed by a Retreat of muffled drums by the Bahamas Police Band, flown up from Nassau for the ceremonies.

Mr. Lancaster is a *FH* senior editor who lives in Normandy, France.

The sculptor of the statue, Oscar Nemon, was also on hand. He said later that he created the statue—with the same bulldog expression as the statue in the House of Commons—in less than three weeks: "I knew Sir Winston well. You know, he did a sculpture of me, too. Out of vengeance." This bronze head of Nemon by sculptor Winston Churchill was also on exhibit in the pavilion rotunda.

"I knew Sir Winston well." This is the key to the extraordinary story of Churchill and Nemon.

At last count more than forty-five people have sculpted Churchill in the last half century, from Vincent Apap to Astrid Zydower. Their busts and statues are many and varied. But Nemon was the only sculptor to establish an enduring personal friendship, not only with Sir Winston but with the whole Churchill family.

Oscar Nemon was born in Croatia in 1906. He started experimenting with sculpture when he was fourteen. In 1923, when he was only seventeen, he left for the wider horizons of Vienna. There he sculpted Sigmund Freud from life, the only person ever to have
been granted this honour. In the 1930s he moved briefly to Paris, then to Brussels. In 1939, the storm clouds gathering, he moved to England, which became his home for the rest of his life. He died in Oxford in 1985, having sculpted the Queen, Eisenhower, Truman, Montgomery and many others from his Boars Hill studio. The first Churchill Centre tour party were treated to tea by the Nemons in 1983, their garden a kind of "Easter Island" of Churchill heads and statues.

Although Nemon had several opportunities of seeing Churchill during the war, albeit at a distance, his break came in Marrakesh in December 1950, when the Churchill party descended on the Hotel de la Mamounia for a working holiday. From 17 December 1950 to their departure on 20 January 1951 they took six rooms on the verandah.

One of Nemon's friends, the French psychoanalyst Rene Laforgue, had booked a couple of rooms in the hotel for his family. A few days before Christmas, Laforgue cabled Nemon to say that one of the rooms was available because his sons had decided to stay in France for the season's festivities. Nemon left immediately for the Mamounia, where Laforgue reserved a table near the Churchills.

As the days went by Nemon made mental notes, from which he made a small sculpture of Churchill's head in his room. It so happened that another friend of Nemon's, Sylvia Henley, arrived at the hotel a few days later. Sylvia was President of the Allies Club in London, where Nemon had often lunched during the war. She was also a cousin and close friend of Clementine. When Nemon told her about the bust in his hotel room, she asked to see it. She was most enthusiastic about it, taking it away to show to Clementine. A few hours later Nemon received the following note:

```
Dear Mr Nénon,
I should much like to possess the little bust you have made of my husband in terra cotta. Would you be kind and let me know your fee? Would you allow me to say that I like it so much just as it is, and I think there is an element of risk in altering it. I have seen so many portraits and busts spoilt by attempting to get an exact likeness. Your bust represents to me my husband as I see him and as I think of him, and I would like to have it just as it is. It will be a great joy for me to possess it.
Yours sincerely,
Clementine S. Churchill
```

Upon receipt of this note Nemon was moved to present the bust to Clementine Churchill, asking if he could do other studies of her husband, perhaps while WSC was painting. She agreed, sending him her thanks on 15 January: "I had no time before leaving for Tin Herr to reply to your letter. It is indeed generous of you to wish to give me that beautiful little bust of my husband. I shall always treasure it."

Thus began the Nemon-Churchill friendship—despite WSC reminding him of the American portrait painter John Singer Sargent's advice, "If you want to lose a friend, do his portrait."

Nemon knew that Churchill would be a reluctant sitter, and he may possibly have known about WSC's riposte when a statue of him was proposed in 1944. As recounted in Martin Gilbert's recently published Churchill and the Jews, the idea had come from Harold Laski, son of Nathan Laski, whom Churchill had first met in 1904 when considering standing for Manchester North-West (which he won in January 1906).

In September 1944 Harold Laski wanted the nation to erect a statue in Churchill's honour after the war. Churchill thanked him for the kind thought, but felt that a park in one of the heavily bombed areas of south London would be a more fitting memorial.

The breakthrough came in 1952. The Queen >>
saw she wanted to have a marble bust of Churchill, who was now Prime Minister again, for Windsor Castle. She wanted the white marble bust to be placed in the Armoury, alongside the bust of the Duke of Marlborough, Churchill's famous ancestor.

Although Nemon was not a member of the Royal Academy, it was Churchill's express wish that Nemon should be given the commission. There followed several sittings, at Chequers and at 10 Downing Street. The sitter was "bellicose, challenging and deliberately provocative." Nemon made three heads at the same time, each one representing a different aspect of Churchill's character. Nemon recounts what happened next in his unpublished memoirs:

Churchill rarely made appointments with me, but one day he did so, and he was obviously in a tense mood. My heart sank as he entered the room and strode over to the three shrouded heads. He pointed to the nearest and roared "Show it to me."

I uncovered it—the most dramatic of the three. I could see his anger rising and I waited for the outburst. It soon came "You think I look like a crafty shifty warmonger do you? Is that what you think?" I hurriedly said that I had not intended to give that impression but had tried to bring out his determination and purpose. He gave further vent to his wrath with some explanatory remarks about his "bulldog" image, an attitude he struck for the morale of the nation, saying that he was not just a ferocious watchdog but a man compounded of many qualities including about fifty percent humour.

He demanded to be shown the second head. This satisfied him no better. He found the expression too "intimate" for his taste and said that he wanted a portrait that would convey his features but make no statement; in short, a "well mannered and civilized portrait in the style of the Old Masters."

Fortunately, the third head was satisfactory. He conceded it to be "civilized" and that is the one I carved; it stands in Windsor Castle today.

After he had stormed out, I was sitting in an armchair in a thoroughly depressed state, wondering whether the best course would be for me to destroy the three models, when the door opened and Churchill came back in. His temper had evaporated completely and he apologized at once. He was extravagant in praise of my work. "Why, man, you're a genius!" he said. He told me later that he felt it a greater honour that she [the Queen] should want to have this bust in Windsor Castle than that she should confer on him the Order of the Garter.

Contemporary press reports, cut out and saved by Nemon, and now held within the Nemon Archive at Churchill Archives Centre, demonstrate how the process of sculpting Churchill immediately became part of the mythology surrounding the former war leader. A story in the Daily Telegraph circa 1953 reads:

Oscar Nemon does not know exactly how many [busts] he will have to sculpt before he achieves his aim: a sculpture of Sir Winston Churchill which is not merely a likeness but a biography of his life. He admits that the Prime Minister is one of the most difficult subjects he has ever had. He has had to work swiftly, for few of the sittings in the private room at 10 Downing Street have been for as long as 15 minutes. Sculptor Nemon thinks that the Prime Minister has many moods, all clearly defined because he is a man of such powerful character. Rarely has he seen the same mood twice. Nor can he sit for too long. He is too active, too dynamic. And he will not surrender his personality to the artist, as a subject should.

The ongoing collaboration between Nemon and Churchill was, in Nemon's words, "The unique opportunity I have had of studying the very complex character of one of the most remarkable personalities of all time."

As Nemon continued to work on the Windsor bust, encouragement came from many quarters. For
example, Owen Morshead, the Librarian at Windsor Castle, wrote to Nemon on 8 May 1954: "How good that you have made another entry into the lion's cage. I hope you did not get mauled by either the lion or the lioness. The former will be here for the great Garter Ceremony on June 14. Is it too much, I fear, to hope that we may have the bust here by then?"

It was too much to hope, but finally, in July 1956, the bust was delivered to Windsor Castle. Owen Morshead wrote to Nemon on 21 July 1956: "Her Majesty instantly exclaimed 'But I think it is excellent, don't you?' It was evident that she really does regard it as a success and a desirable acquisition."

In 1954, while sitting for the Guildhall statue, Churchill was persuaded by Nemon to try his hand at sculpture. In a press cutting at the time, Nemon said, "I think he would be much happier if he could sculpt himself while I am working."

We agreed that we should model each other at work. He felt he would be getting his own back at me in this way, and so our duel began. We had not been at work long when he became excited about the difficulties in which he found himself.

His cigar began to come to pieces in his mouth, and soon he was roaring like a lion over its prey. He shouted at me, "How can I work when you keep moving?"

Nemon had Churchill's image of him cast in bronze, writing to him, "I beg you not to underrate the artistic value of this work which would be considered by any expert as outstanding for the first attempt." The original plaster cast of Winston's head of Nemon is in the Studio at Chartwell. An excellent colour plate can be found on page 193 of Lady Soames's book Winston Churchill: His Life as a Painter.

Sir Winston not only sculpted Nemon, he also sketched him. Nemon recounted the occasion in a letter to Bart Watt, founder of the Toronto-based Churchill Society for the Advancement of Parliamentary Democracy in 1984:

"Later on, the list was shown to Churchill who told them that he did not know any sculptors but, when he was persuaded to go through the list, he stopped at my name. Excited that the choice had been made, they brought me the great news (to my dismay) and tried to convince me that there would be many benefits from obtaining such a commission.

"Alas! From experience, I know that there are no such advantages when one is asked to make a memorial of someone. But I accepted their conditions and hoped for the best. My first difficulty was that Churchill was depressed because his political colleagues wanted him to retire. It was practically impossible to get him to come to my Studio but he came a few weeks before it was finished and he seemed satisfied with it.

"When Churchill heard about the derisory fee, he summoned the Lord Mayor to No. 10 and said, 'I hear that you have commissioned my sculpture and you are making the artist pay for it. If you need money, I'll lend it to you.'"
The Guildhall statue was commissioned by the Corporation of London in 1954 to mark WSC’s eightieth birthday. At the unveiling ceremony on 21 June 1955 he said: "I greatly admire the art of Oscar Nemon… it seems to me to be such a very good likeness… but on this point I cannot claim to be either impersonal or impartial."

Nemon’s relationship with Churchill started as one between sculptor and sitter, but soon developed into a real friendship between two remarkable men, evidenced by the trust shown in Nemon by Churchill in this extract from Nemon’s unpublished memoirs:

I was a guest one day at Chequers with Field Marshal Sir William Slim, an impressive figure in full military uniform and with a record of outstanding achievement in the Far East.

I had had the privilege of being present on other occasions when matters of world importance were under discussion, and this was certainly one of them. As the discussion became more political I began to feel an intruder, and I said as much, asking to be excused. I was told “If you are a friend, stay!” Then Sir Winston said: “Field Marshal, I’m sending you to Egypt, and I want to make one point clear. I am a Zionist and I want to act accordingly.” I was flabbergasted—that Churchill should be so brave, saying that he was a Zionist at a time when no other world politician would have dared.

Nemon’s enduring relationship with Winston Churchill produced over fifty busts and statues, located today around the world, from Kansas City to Monaco, from Edmonton to Copenhagen. It was a relationship which was doubly providential. It helped Nemon to become one of the most renowned portrait sculptors of the twentieth century. It also allowed him to grant Winston Churchill, whose "monumental" spirit he so admired, a multi-dimensional immortality—in plaster, bronze and marble.
MUTUAL TEARS

"I was reduced to the position of a messenger between [my wife] and Winston Churchill, each of whom burst into tears on receipt of a message from the other." —HAROLD WILSON

In 1951, when Harold Wilson, then a junior member of the Labour government, resigned on a point of principle, the first person to express his sympathy was Churchill—to Wilson's wife:

"[His] message was that whereas I, as an experienced politician, had taken a step of which he felt free to take such party advantage as was appropriate, his concern was with my wife, an innocent party in these affairs, who would undoubtedly suffer in consequence; he recalled the number of occasions his wife had suffered as a result of his own political decisions. Would I therefore convey to her his personal sympathy and understanding?"

Wilson went home and repeated the conversation to his wife, who burst into tears. The next day in the House Wilson related her reaction to Churchill—who also burst into tears!

Wilson added: "Two days earlier, I had been a minister of the Crown, red box and all. Now I was reduced to the position of a messenger between [my wife] and Winston Churchill, each of whom burst into tears on receipt of a message from the other."

Picnic Etiquette

Walter Graebner, Churchill's Life magazine editor during the writing of his war memoirs, wrote the following in his charming book, My Dear Mr. Churchill (Boston, 1965). We do not understand why Churchill Centre affiliates do not mandate these ceremonies whenever they hold summer picnics.—Ed.

The picnics were as gay and easy as those of any ordinary large and good-humoured family. There were no guests and polite attendants: with the exception of Mr. Churchill, who painted busily away with sublime disregard for the bustle going on behind him, everyone, from Mrs. Churchill and assorted elderly peers and generals down, pitched in to help the detectives and Norman the valet, get things in readiness, and everyone hopped up and down from the table as often as he pleased to get what he wanted of food and drink. Everyone laughed, everyone was unbraced.

If the sun got hot, you put your napkin on your head, turban style, and the others would follow suit, joking inordinately at the strange effects produced. If you got even hotter, you could take off your shirt, for all anybody would care.

Gayest and most unbraced of the company was always Churchill, who on picnics became more roguish and ebullient than ever, and delighted in singing old songs, telling slightly risque stories, and pressing drink ("It's white port, you know. All the ladies must have some because it's only white port") on everyone round him.

At Marrakesh he took special delight in a couple of picnic customs which he quickly elevated to the rank of formal ceremonies. One was the drinking of old Indian Army toasts, which he had learned from his friend and assistant, General Sir Henry Pownall; and at the end of every picnic we would solemnly rise and drink the Toast for the Day. On Sundays it was "To Absent Friends," on Mondays, "To Men," and so on through "To Women," "To Religion," "To Our Swords," "To Ourselves," "To Wives and Sweethearts," to the end of the week.

The other was a verse from Thomas Gray's "Ode on the Spring," which he gravely recited at each picnic:

Beside some water's rushy brink
With me the Muse shall sit and think
(At ease reclined in rustic state)
How vain the ardour of the Crowd,
How low, how little are the Proud,
How indigent the great.

One night at dinner my wife asked him to repeat the verse to her. "Oh, no, I couldn't, he replied firmly. "I can only say it at picnics."

—WALTER GRAEBNER

Brandy by the Cupful

A couple of weeks ago my wife and I lunched with Christian and Danielle Pol-Roger. At the end of the meal, Christian Pol-Roger brought out a 30-year old bottle of armagnac, explaining that it came from a vineyard which he owns with a friend of his in Armagnac. They have had the vineyard for some years.

This gave rise to a Churchill story with which I was not familiar. Apparently WSC frequently poured brandy (or cognac or armagnac) into coffee cups at the end of a meal. He did this for two reasons: 1) the warm coffee cups warmed the brandy, and 2) coffee cups do not reveal how much brandy one pours in! —JRL
"When You Care Enough": Joyce Hall and Hallmark's Churchill Connection

The unassuming Midwesterner who first presented the art of Winston Churchill to the American people was Joyce C. Hall of Kansas City, who with his brothers built the internationally renowned Hallmark Greeting Card Company, known by one of the most famous slogans in advertising: "When you care enough to send the very best." Hall, who preferred to be known as "J.C.,”

exposed Americans to a new side of the statesman he so respected—a side few previously knew existed—through greeting cards, books, exhibitions and television.

J.C. Hall was a graduate Churchillian. His appreciation for Sir Winston was summarized on the jacket of Hallmark's book *Never Give In!*: "He was the unquenchable voice of freedom... [his] wisdom extended beyond the pressing problems of peace and war."

Hall's efforts earned him a CBE (Commander of the Most Noble Order of the British Empire) in 1961, for contributions to Anglo-American good will...and specifically for his part in bringing an exhibit of paint-
ings by Sir Winston Churchill to the United States. WSC, who considered his accomplishments "a remarkable success," enjoyed a close personal friendship with J.C. Hall and his family for nearly twenty years.

J.C. built his company from scratch, believing that "selling ideas is the most critical of all jobs." Here he related to Churchill, who, Hall said, "was one of the greatest salesmen who ever lived. He sold the free world on arming itself—probably the most important selling job ever accomplished."

"CHURCHILL expressed great curiosity about the whole project—reproduction, distribution, shipping, sales—and what would happen if the product didn’t sell. Hall said he’d not have to worry about that."

Hall believed that a greeting card is a social custom, which "must be on a high level." He emphasized quality art, believing "that one of Hallmark's responsibilities was to the elevation of American taste." The New York Times recognized that Hallmark had "done more than anything else to make America art conscious. It has brought art to a popular level."

Hall’s association with Churchill began when he attended the famous "Sinews of Peace" speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, on 5 March 1946. With his son Donald, he and other Kansas City civic leaders had been invited to the reception. Donald remembers Churchill’s "firm handshake and direct eye contact."

Shortly after Fulton, Churchill published his essay, Painting as a Pastime, in book form, and J.C. Hall immediately thought about publishing WSC's paintings on Hallmark cards. Churchill had never sold his work commercially, merely presenting paintings to friends and family. Only one painting had been sold, and that for charity. But when WSC was contacted and heard the company name, he gave his approval: "That's a good firm. Make a deal with them—I am delighted at the opportunity of having my paintings exhibited."

---

Above, standing, l-r: Donald Hall, WSC’s solicitor Anthony Moir, Joyce C. Hall; Seated, Elizabeth Hall, Rufus II and Sir Winston. Right: J.C. Hall in the Chartwell studio.
HALMARK AND CHURCHILL...
through the medium of Christmas cards." Hallmark selected twelve paintings for use on cards.8 The New York Times of 13 August 1950 called this "the Churchill Coup."

When the original paintings arrived in Kansas City to be photographed for reproduction, the National Association of Art Directors was meeting locally. J.C. offered them a private showing at his home, not revealing the artist's identity. The reception was remarkable, one prominent director saying, "Whoever the artist is, he's more than a Sunday painter."

At Churchill's invitation, Hall, his wife Elizabeth and son Donald visited Chartwell in June 1950. Churchill "greeted us rather brusquely," J.C. recalled, wearing his "siren suit." Solicitous of Mrs. Hall, "he escorted Elizabeth to the dining room as we tagged along." WSC also observed that Donald, who had just graduated from Dartmouth, "would not need whiskey for energy, like older men."

Later, as they toured the grounds, the Halls observed the "maggot moment," when WSC flung a handful of maggots to his golden orfe. Suddenly he asked Elizabeth, "with the mischievous grin of a small boy," if she would like to do the same. Not squeamish, "she held out her hand, and he plopped about a dozen maggots in it." The fish dined royally that day.

On his perambulations, Hall wrote later, Churchill showed "affection for his 'darlings' as he called them"—wild pets, like birds and swans. "This was the man who had dared Hitler to cross the Channel when Britain had little to fight with but courage." It was remarkable to see such a man "so gentle with a little wild bird." The Halls found Churchill "amazingly vigorous" at 75, walking briskly up and down Chartwell's sloping lawns.

Churchill asked Hall if he was happy with sales of the greeting cards. J.C. replied that he was delighted: "Sales had exceeded our highest forecast [A£k million the first year]...[Churchill's] only criticism was that they flattered his paintings." He expressed great curiosity about the project—reproduction, distribution, shipping, sales—and what would happen if the product didn't sell. Hall said he'd not have to worry about that.

Joyce Hall was impressed by Churchill's human side, as when he was told of the comments of the art directors back in Kansas City. WSC's daughter Sarah, who was also present, said compliments about his paintings pleased her father "more than anything said about his writing and statesmanship." Hall had brought along a presentation album "dedicated to Winston Churchill," which his art department had designed: the twelve paintings along with a sixteen-line poem. WSC was impressed, saying, "You have quite an organization."

With that, Hall observed, "his voice cracked and tears came to his eyes. I think he hoped we hadn't noticed them...the tears disappeared and he slammed the album shut. His moods changed abruptly, but it was easy to see he was a deeply sentimental man."10

In 1962 Hall and his 12-year-old granddaughter Libby experienced another touching moment when visiting Sir Winston in a London hospital, where he was after a fall. When he heard Libby had been left in the car he was irritable, saying to his private secretary, Anthony Montague Browne: "Why didn't you bring her up?" Libby duly appeared, somewhat shy in front of this 87-year-old stranger in a wheelchair. With a smile WSC extended his hands, and Libby put her hands in his. "For about fifteen minutes, Libby and Sir Winston had a much freer conversation than I had..."11

Following the success of the Christmas cards, Hall wished to produce a special television show on "Churchill the Artist," and a traveling exhibit of his paintings. He had been involved in TV since the Forties, believing that its programs were not providing enough
Starting Sunday, October 7 - HALLMARK CARDS PRESENT

Miss Sarah Churchill

Every Sunday—over CBS—Television Network
5:45 p.m. Eastern Standard Time

Miss Churchill, brilliant young star of the stage, will be gracious hostess of your favorite celebrities in the theatre, fashion, science, sports and the arts. She combines the charm and magnetism of the theater with the dignity and purpose of a world personality.
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HALLMARK AND CHURCHILL...

Sarah Churchill cemented the arrangement by convincing her father and family, "that the world should know this brilliant aspect of himself. ...I believed art must travel and I was tired of the people who still thought of him as only a war leader." 18

The exhibit, "Winston Churchill The Painter," was opened by the British Ambassador at the Nelson Gallery in Kansas City on 22 January 1958, with thirty-five Churchill paintings on display. Joyce Hall conceived and sponsored the entire show. Later it traveled to the Detroit Institute of Art, the Dallas Museum of Art, New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Smithsonian Institution, the Art Gallery of Toronto and, by special request, museums in Australia and London. Viewers numbered over half a million.

Former President Harry Truman previewed the Kansas City exhibit: "Damn good," he said of his old friend's oils. "At least you can tell what they are and that is more than you can say for a lot of these modern painters." Hall asked Truman if he would like to paint. "Hell, no," said Give-'Em-Hell Harry, "but I could beat these moderns." 19 In Washington, headlines read: "The Joyce Halls accompany the Eisenhewers on exhibit tour, which the President sums up as 'wonderful.'" 20 At last Truman and Eisenhower had found something to agree about!

Joyce Hall's bold vision did stir a "seething debate" among the cognoscenti. "Is it really art?" wondered Time magazine. One museum director suggested that it was a "public relations hoax." A representative of the Carnegie Institute said, "I understand Mr. Churchill is a terrific bricklayer too, but nobody is exhibiting bricks this year." The Art Museum in Cincinnati, one of Churchill's favorite American cities, quipped: 'This is 'Churchill art,' not just art.' 21 The Chicago Art Institute director sniffed, "We have certain professional standards; we do not show the work of amateurs." Public reaction was so strong that he was out of office within a week. 22

Avoiding pointless discussions among art critics, the Nelson Gallery honestly maintained that "we are representing another side of one of the greatest personalities of our time." Equally open-minded, the Metropolitan in New York declared, "Think how eager we would be to see the paintings of an Alfred the Great, were they to be discovered tomorrow." 23

British historian John Ramsden made an insightful observation: "...the importance of the art exhibition of 1958 was precisely as a substitute for the real presence of Churchill, who was clearly now never going to visit, but whose creative art could be both a symbol of his greatness and an almost transcendental presence, much as his broadcast words had been in 1940." 24

Private secretary Anthony Montague Browne, who knew Sir Winston was grateful for Hall's bringing this new adventure into his life at such an advanced age, had a unique perspective and appreciation for J.C.: "He was the only major tycoon I have met of whom no-one spoke anything but good." Montague Browne "stayed with J.C. on a number of occasions in Kansas City and grew very fond of him. One had to be careful not to admire an object because it would be promptly given to you __Joyce really was remarkable." 25

Interestingly, Montague Browne believed that J.C. Hall "was too awed in [WSC's] presence to do himself justice." His son Donald says that his father was express-
ing respect rather than awe. He felt they appreciated one another from a level of friendship and a sense of accomplishment. And J.C. was a thoroughly unpretentious man. Until he was 84, he drove his vintage Buick to work, and at home wore a jumpsuit reminiscent of his old friend Sir Winston.

Beyond his affection for the man, Hall's unselfish promotion of WSC's paintings embodied a higher vision: an appreciation for an unseen side of Churchill's character, the hobby that had given him much solace in sterner days. Like everyone, he appreciated what Churchill had done for liberty; but he had the wherewithal to express his respect.

J.C. was a prime organizer of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library in Fulton, Missouri, co-chairing the project with Henry Luce of Time-Life and honorary co-chairmen Presidents Johnson, Eisenhower and Truman. In 1964, when he opened the Hallmark Gallery on Fifth Avenue in New York, Hall made Churchill the subject of one of its first exhibits: "a monumental figure whose public life spanned the reigns of six sovereigns." The following year, Hall was honorary president of People-to-People International, which sponsored the Churchill Pavilion at the New York World's Fair, replete with artifacts and Churchill oils, a replica of the Chartwell study and a model of Blenheim Palace. Hall financed the entire exhibit, insisting there be no advertising. Proceeds were devoted to "teaching Churchill's philosophy of individual freedom." It was the largest collection of memorabilia assembled up to that time.

Hall's long and warm relationship with Churchill (he even sent a sympathy note when WSC lost his poodle, Rufus II) assured that the Earl Marshal of England would invite him to the Churchill funeral in 1965. Former President Eisenhower stopped in Kansas City specifically to pick him up in a White House aircraft, and they flew to London together.

In 1984, when sculptor Oscar Nemon created the famous "Married Love" sculpture of Winston and Clementine at Chartwell, he placed a copy in Kansas City's Country Club Plaza in part as a tribute to Joyce Hall. Sir Winston's granddaughter Edwina Sandys and the Duke of Marlborough attended the unveiling.

Joyce Hall and Winston Churchill were drawn together out of strong sense of achievement. Each in his own way strove to be the best at what he did. Each had a strong respect for the arts. For Churchill, painting was an escape from the stark reality of his high-powered life. For Hall, the arts were a payback to the humble folk from whom he rose to enormous success. With his great entrepreneurial skill, Hall found a way to mate his personal interests, with passion and affection, to those of his great friend across the Atlantic.
Aviation, air power and bombing were part of Churchill's life for half a century. As a thirty-four-year-old member of the British Government's Committee of Imperial Defence, he urged his colleagues—all older and more senior than he—to make contact with the Wright Brothers in the United States, in order to be at the cutting edge of the new science of aviation—in its military implications. Churchill told the committee, on 25 February 1909: "The problem of the use of aeroplanes was a most important one, and we should place ourselves in communication with Mr. Wright, and avail ourselves of his knowledge."

This was not just a passing interest. In 1913, while First Lord of the Admiralty, Churchill learned to fly. He also formed an air arm of the Royal Navy, the Royal Naval Air Service, which was in action, as a bombing force, from the outbreak of war in 1914. On 22 September 1914, at Dunkirk, he inspected his Royal Naval Air Service pilots. Three squadrons, of four aircraft each, were ready to attack. Three of the pilots were men who, a year earlier, had taught him to fly. The head of the RNAS squadrons, Commander Samson, noted in his log that Churchill was "very insistent on attacking German lines of communication."

This was done: German vehicles, troops and stores were bombed from the air as they attempted to advance on the Channel ports and cut off the British Expeditionary Force, then seeking to halt the German advance on Belgian soil. The German Zeppelin sheds at Dusseldorf and Cologne were also bombed, although many of the bombs failed to explode.

On 24 September 1914 German Zeppelins dropped bombs on Ostend, then an open town of no military significance. Churchill proposed as a reprisal dropping an equal number of bombs on the German city of Aachen, or possibly dropping bombs in a ratio of 16 to 10. Churchill explained to the Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey: "After this had been done, I should explain the reason and announce that this course will be invariably followed in the future. This is the only effective way of protecting civilians and non-combatants. Care will of course be taken to aim at barracks and military property."

Grey turned down Churchill's suggestions. His argument was two-fold: "They have more aircraft than we have, and it will only put us on the same plane morally as they are." Grey's authority was considerable, and no reprisal raids took place.
On Christmas Day 1914, while for a few hours the guns fell silent on the Western Front and British and German forces fraternized, Churchill's Royal Naval Air Service experimental seaplane carrier Engadine (a converted Channel packet steamer) launched four seaplanes on a bombing raid on the German naval base at Cuxhaven. (Renamed Corregidor and sold to the United States Navy, Engadine survived until December 1941 when she was mined by the Japanese in Manila Bay.)

Minister of Munitions

From July 1917 to September 1919, as Minister of Munitions—with German bombers striking at London, killing 800 civilians and sending 300,000 in panic to shelter in the underground—Churchill regarded the bombing of Germany, and hence the production of bombs and bombing aircraft, as a priority. As he explained to his Director of Aircraft Supplies, General Barnes, on 15 November 1917: "Hitherto both the Naval and Military Authorities have altogether underrated bombing possibilities, and steadily discouraged the construction of bombing machines."

Under Churchill at the Ministry of Munitions, all that changed. As he told the War Cabinet on 5 March 1918, at a crisis time on the Western Front: The results of the conflict would be decisive if either side "possessed the power to drop not five tons but five hundred tons of bombs each night on the cities and manufacturing establishments of its opponents."

Churchill undertook, in the summer and autumn of 1918, while the outcome of the struggle on the battlefield was still far from certain, to make the munitions plans needed for the war of 1919. To do this, 3,000 American aircraft engines were to be bought, as he explained to the War Cabinet: "particularly for the bombing of Germany."

On 18 August 1918, Churchill sent his French opposite number, Louis Loucheur, a written appeal for closer Anglo-French cooperation in the design and manufacture of long-distance bombing planes. It was essential, Churchill wrote, to draw up plans in such a way as to ensure that, during the autumn, Britain and France would be able "to discharge the maximum quantity of bombs upon the enemy." Churchill reminded Loucheur of "...all these months of immense preparations to bomb Germany—not only the Rhine but Westphalia—and having our organization and plant perfected___"

Churchill added: "This is the moment to attack the enemy, to carry the war into his own country, to make him feel in his own towns and in his own person something of the havoc he has wrought in France and Belgium. This is the moment, just before the winter begins, to affect his morale, and to harry his hungry and dispirited cities without pause or stay. While the new heavy French machines...will strike by night at all the nearer objectives, the British, who alone at the moment have the experience, apparatus and plans already made to bomb not only by night but in broad daylight far into Germany, must be assured of the means to carry out their role."

Some of the bombers that Churchill bought, built and armed were already in action in October 1918, attacking German railway junctions, steel works, chemical factories and aerodromes. Among the cities reached were Metz, Frankfurt, Coblenz, Bonn, Mainz and Karlsruhe.

Between the Wars

As Secretary of State for War and Air from 1919 to 1921, and then as Colonial Secretary in 1921 and 1922, Churchill authorized the use of aerial bombardment on three occasions, first in 1920, against the IRA. Repelled by Sinn Fein's acts of terror, Churchill suggested on 1 July 1920 to his advisers at the War Office that if a large number of Sinn Feiners were drilling, with or without arms, and could be located and identified from the air, "I see no objection from a military point of view, and subject of course to the discretion of the Irish government and of the authorities on the spot, to aeroplanes being dispatched with definite orders in each particular case to disperse them by machine-gun fire or bombs, using of course no more force than is necessary to scatter and stampede them."

Secondly, Churchill authorized bombing against insurgents in Iraq, when, as he reported to the Cabinet, "The enemy were bombed and machine gunned (from the air) with effect by aeroplanes which cooperated with our troops." Continuing to use the Royal Air Force in Iraq would entail, as Churchill explained to Air Marshal Trenchard, "the provision of some kind of asphyxiating bombs calculated to cause disablement of some kind but not death...for use in preliminary operations against turbulent tribes."

Churchill was in no doubt that gas could be successfully employed against the Kurds and Iraqis, using gas bombs, he explained to his advisers on 29 August 1920, "which would inflict punishment upon recalcitrant natives without inflicting grave injury upon them."

During the debate within the War Office, Churchill minuted: "I do not understand this squeamishness about the use of gas. I am strongly in favour of using poison gas against uncivilised tribes." Churchill argued that gas, fired from ground-based guns or dropped from aircraft, would cause "only discomfort or illness, but not death" to dissident tribesmen.

Warned that the gas might "kill children and sickly persons, more especially as the people against whom we intend to use it have no medical knowledge with which to supply antidotes," Churchill remained unimpressed, stating that the use of gas, a "scientific expedient," should not be prevented "by the prejudices of those who do not think clearly." In the event, gas shells were not dropped from aircraft because of technical difficulties. Regular bombs were dropped, however.
CHURCHILL PROCEEDINGS

CHURCHILL AND BOMBING POLICY...
The third use of bombs under Churchill's immediate postwar authority was in Palestine. On 5 May 1921, following an Arab attack on the Jewish town of Petah Tikvah, Churchill authorized the dropping of bombs to drive away the attackers.

Advent of World War II
On 14 September 1939, eleven days after Britain declared war on Germany, Churchill—once more First Lord of the Admiralty—argued in favour of making "the fullest possible use of the offensive power of our air Force" by bombing what he called "strictly military objectives," such as the synthetic petrol plants in Germany that were vital to her prosecution of the war, and which, at the same time, were, at his insistence, "isolated from the civil population." The Secretary of State for Air, Sir Kingsley Wood, opposed this because of Britain's "small and inferior air force": something Churchill had fought against in vain for the previous six years.

In April 1940, it was the failure to embark on any sustained bombing raids against Germany since September 1939 that was one of the main criticisms of the Watching Committee of Peers and Members of Parliament that was to play a major part in the growing demand for the resignation of the Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain.

On 12 May 1940, two days after Churchill became Prime Minister—and as German bombers struck at the Dutch port of Rotterdam—the War Cabinet discussed whether it was right "on moral grounds" to bomb targets in Germany. Summing up the general tenor of the discussion, Churchill told his colleagues: "... we were no longer bound by our previously held scruples as to initiating 'unrestricted' air warfare. The enemy had already given us ample justification for retaliation on his country." But the balance of opinion was against him on the following day, when Neville Chamberlain—a member of Churchill's War Cabinet—opposed bombing military targets in the Ruhr, as it might lead to German retaliation in Britain.

The other argument made on 13 May against action was Britain's air weakness, stressed by the new Secretary of State for Air, Sir Archibald Sinclair, and the Chief of the Air Staff, Air Chief Marshal Sir Cyril Newall. To address this weakness, of which he had warned so strongly in the previous years, Churchill had to devote considerable efforts throughout the summer and autumn of 1940.

The day-to-day course of the war, so often disadvantageous to Britain in the first two years of Churchill's premiership, and Germany's military predominance, determined Churchill's—and the Air Ministry's—bombing policies. At the beginning of July 1940, when invasion seemed imminent, the continuous bombing then taking place against German oil refineries, aerodromes, and railway marshalling yards had to be curtailed in order to switch bombing resources to avert invasion. The urgent need then, Churchill wrote to Sinclair on 3 July, was for "bombing the ships and barges in all the ports under German control."

If invasion could be prevented, the next question was: What would be the best means of taking the war to Germany? To Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Aircraft Production, Churchill wrote on 8 July 1940—in urging him to increase the resources being put into bomber as opposed to fighter production: "When I look round to see how we can win the war, I see that there is only one sure path. We have no continental ally which can defeat the German military power.... Should [Hitler] be repulsed here or not try invasion, he will recoil eastward, and we have nothing to stop him. But there is one thing that will bring him back and bring him down, and that is an absolutely devastating, exterminating attack by very heavy bombers from this country upon the Nazi homeland."

Sir Arthur Harris commented to me (on 21 October 1982) about this letter: "It was the origin of the idea of bombing the enemy out of the war. I should have been proud of it. But it originated with Winston."

Norway, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg and France had just surrendered. The United States was neutral. Churchill was trying to imagine a way that might one day destroy the Nazi juggernaut. Unless the Germans could be overwhelmed by aerial bombardment, he explained in this letter to Beaverbrook, "I do not see a way through."
Churchill also felt that it was important for British morale that if German bombers struck at London, British bombers should be able to strike at Berlin—and to do so "next day," he wrote to Sinclair on 20 July 1940. Sinclair replied with the encouraging news that this could be done with even less than twenty-four hours notice. The raids possible then, in the summer of 1940, using the whole of Britain's bomber force, would enable the dropping of 65-70 tons of bombs each night for a week, rising to 150 tons of bombs on alternate nights.

**Blitz and Counter-Blitz**

On 24 August 1940 the first German bombs fell in central London; several had already fallen in suburban areas. On the following night, 25/26 August, more than eighty British bombers struck, for the first time, at Berlin. There were few casualties on either side, but a deadly confrontation had begun.

The next German air raid on London was by day on 26 August. Learning of a British bombing raid on Leipzig that same day, Churchill wrote to Sinclair: "Now that they have begun to molest the capital, I want you to hit them hard, and Berlin is the place to hit them." While London was being pounded almost every night by German bombers, these smaller raids against Berlin helped raise British morale.

President Roosevelt also contributed to the bombing debate. On 27 September 1940, his advice was passed on to Churchill by Sir Walter Layton, head of one of the British missions in Washington. The President, wrote Layton, "had always urged that we should bomb Germany everywhere, not merely at a few points."

Roosevelt's advice was already being taken. As a counter to the continuing German bomber raids on British cities, Churchill had suggested on 6 October what he called "minor, unexpected, widespread" attacks on "the smaller German centres" on two or three nights a week, explaining to Sinclair: "You must remember that these people are never told the truth, and that wherever the Air Force has not been, they are probably told that the German defences are impregnable."

That September, as German bombers wreaked death and destruction on London and on many other British cities, and with as many as 2000 British civilians being killed each week, Churchill reiterated to his advisers his view of four months earlier: "The fighters are our salvation but die bombers alone provide the means of victory. We must therefore develop the power to carry an ever-increasing volume of explosives to Germany, so as to pulverise their entire industry and scientific structure on which the war effort and economic life of the enemy depends, whilst holding him at arm's length from our island."

To ensure keeping the Germans "at arm's length," Churchill kept a careful watch on the build-up of German invasion barges in the Channel ports, and faced criticism when bombing raids upon Germany were curtailed in order to bomb the barges. Churchill was also warned by the War Cabinet of criticism that Britain was not "hitting back hard enough at Germany in our bombing," and that this was having an adverse effect on the war effort.

In reply, Churchill pointed out to the War Cabinet that Britain did not have the resources for the scale of bombing that the public wanted, and that British bombers had to take far longer flights to reach their targets. As he pointed out, the German bombers could fly from bases in France across the Channel, whereas, for the British bombers, the industrial cities even of the west of Germany were ten times further away. The people of Britain, Churchill said, "must stick it out."

Each week, Churchill studied the successes of Bomber Command. There were always some. In the week ending 17 October 1940, Bomber Command flew 764 sorties against Channel port barges, naval units assembled in German ports as part of an invasion fleet, and German cities. At Essen, the Krupp works had been bombed on three nights. At Gelsenkirchen the gasometer, the largest in Europe, had been destroyed.

Against Berlin, where the Soviet Foreign Minister, Vyacheslav Molotov, was negotiating with his German opposite number, vonRibbentrop, Churchill authorized a special raid. Two years later, when Churchill was in Moscow, Stalin told him of how Ribbentrop was telling Molotov that "the British empire was now finished" and that the time had come to work out the partition of those lands between Germany and Russia.

"At this moment," Stalin recounted, "the bombers arrived, and Ribbentrop decided to continue the discussion in the dugout." When safely established underground Ribbentrop continued his harangue, saying that, as he had already mentioned, the British Empire need no longer be taken account of. Molotov interrupted at this point with the awkward question: "Then why are we down here now?"
**CHURCHILL AND BOMBING POLICY...**

Bombing the enemy involved many problems. The expansion of British bomber strength from 1940 faced the difficulties of supply and productive capacity. On 20 October 1940 Churchill wrote critically to Sinclair: "I am deeply concerned with the non-expansion, and indeed contraction, of our Bomber Force...according to our present policy. Surely an effort should be made to increase our bomb-dropping capacity...."

Churchill's minute continued with a series of suggestions for action: "...is it not possible to organize a Second Line Bomber Force which, especially in the dark of the moon, would discharge bombs from a considerable and safe height upon the nearest large built-up areas of Germany, which contain military targets in abundance. The Ruhr of course is obviously indicated. The object would be to find easy targets, short runs and safe conditions. How is such a second Line or auxiliary Bomber Force to be improvised during the winter months? Could not crews from the Training Schools do occasional runs? Are none of the Lysander and Reconnaissance pilots capable of doing some of this simpler bombing, observing that the Army is not likely to be in action unless invasion occurs?"

Churchill's minute ended: "I ask that a whole-hearted effort shall be made to cart a large number of bombs into Germany by a Second Line organization such as I have suggested, and under conditions in which admittedly no special accuracy would be obtained. Pray let me have die best suggestions possible, and we can then see whether they are practical or not."

Churchill and his advisers were repeatedly forced to consider the urgent needs of war that arose unexpectedly and required new bombing priorities. Throughout April, May and June 1941, the main resources of Bomber Command were needed for the Battle of the Atlantic.

In the late summer of 1941, voices were raised against the intensification of the bombing of German cities, and the increasingly heavy German civilian deaths. Churchill defended what was being done. In July 1941, in a speech in London's County Hall, he declared: "If tonight the people of London were asked to cast their vote whether a convention should be entered into to stop the bombing of all cities...the people of London with one voice would say to Hitler: 'You have committed every crime under the sun. 'Where you have been the least resisted there you have been the most brutal.... We will have no truce or parley with you, or the grisly gang who work your wicked will. You do your worst—and we will do our best. Perhaps it may be our turn soon; perhaps it may be our turn now."

Reluctance to Bomb Civilians

The renewed bomber offensive against Germany continued. It was not aimed at civilians. There were two main targets: industrial cities and railway centres. Setbacks were frequent. In a daylight raid on German merchant shipping in Rotterdam at the end of August 1941, seven out of seventeen British bombers were lost. Churchill wrote to the Chief of the Air Staff, "While I greatly admire the bravery of the pilots. I do not want them to be pressed too hard. Easier targets giving a high damage return compared to casualties may be more often selected."

Churchill recognized the bravery of these pilots. "The devotion and gallantry of these attacks on Rotterdam..." he wrote, "are beyond all praise. The Charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava is eclipsed in brightness by these almost daily deeds of fame."

Which way to go? In 1941, Sir Charles Portal, Chief of the Air Staff, advocated that entire German cities and towns should be bombed. Portal believed this would quickly bring about the collapse of civilian morale in Germany. Arthur Harris, who became head of Bomber Command in February 1942, agreed. It was he who introduced a policy of area bombing (known in Germany as terror bombing) where entire cities and towns were targeted.

Churchill was critical. On 13 January 1942 he told the Defence Committee he was "sceptical of these cut and dried calculations which showed infallibly how the war could be won" by bombing.

Churchill continued: "In the early days of the war it had been said that if the Royal Air Force were allowed to launch an attack upon the Ruhr, they would, with preciseness and certitude, shatter the German industry. Careful calculations had been made to show that this could be done. After anxious thought, the attack was eventually made when the Germans invaded the Low Countries, but there had only been a fractional interruption of work in the industries of the Ruhr."

**Anglo-American Policy**

The entry of the United States into the war in December 1941 created a new dimension for British bombing policy. Churchill understood this at once. Nine days after Pearl Harbor, and five days after Germany declared war on the United States, Churchill noted for his advisers that the arrival in Britain of, say, twenty American bomber squadrons, "...would be the most direct and effective reply to the Declaration of War by Germany upon the United States." This was one of Churchill's main proposals when he met Roosevelt in Washington a week later.

Anglo-American policy, for such it had become, included the Far East, where two British possessions, Malaya and Hong Kong, had been attacked simultaneously with Pearl Harbor. On 20 December, as Churchill approached the shores of the United States for the first time in his premiership, he noted for his advisers that Allied sea and air power must be built up until it made..."
possible bombing raids on Japan itself. "The burning of Japanese cities by incendiary bombs," he wrote, "will bring home in a most effective way to the people of Japan the dangers of the course to which they have committed themselves and nothing is more likely to cramp the reinforcing of their overseas adventures."

The newly created Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff had bombing policy as a high imperative. On Christmas Day 1941 in Washington, Churchill and Roosevelt agreed that American bombing squadrons could come over from the United States to Britain "and attack Germany from the British Isles." British bombers were also being manufactured in the United States in substantial quantities. New technical devices were leading to new tactical and new strategic possibilities. "Gee," the new position finder, came into use in February 1942.

The First "Second Front"

Throughout 1942 the Anglo-American political imperative that dominated Allied thinking was the fear that Germany, which had attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, might overwhelm her, and then turn her increased capacity, including the oil of the Caucasus and the raw materials of the Ukraine, against Britain in the West. To take the pressure off the Eastern front, Stalin called repeatedly for an Anglo-American landing in Northwest Europe—the Second Front. Given the lack of American manpower in Britain, however, and the considerable shortage of landing craft, this was judged not to be realistic until 1943 or even 1944.

In place of a Second Front on land, Stalin was offered a Second Front in the air: an Anglo-American bombing offensive so heavy that it would weaken the German offensive power in the East.

This was done despite the Prime Minister's doubts about the effectiveness of such bombing. As he wrote to Sinclair on 13 March 1942: "You need not argue the value of bombing Germany, because I have my own opinion about that, namely, that it is not decisive, but better than doing nothing, and a formidable method of injuring the enemy." Sixteen days later, Churchill wrote to Roosevelt: "We must not let our summer air attacks on Germany decline into a second-rate affair. Everything is ready for your people here, and there are targets of all kinds, from easy to hard, to work up in contact with the enemy."

At that time a priority target was the German submarine construction sites and U-boat bases. On the night before Churchill's message to Roosevelt, 250 British bombers had struck at the U-boat pens in Liibeck, on the Baltic Sea.

The Second Front in the air was extraordinarily effective. By June 1942, British bombing efforts were keeping one half of all German fighter strength away from the Eastern Front. Between July and September 1942 the Royal Air Force dropped 11,500 tons of bombs on Germany: 2500 tons were on the Ruhr industrial city of Duisburg. Some of these were the new four-ton bomb.

One of Churchill's main tasks as Prime Minister and Minister of Defence was to look ahead, to plan for what lay in the future. Determined to see an even more powerful bomber offensive by the end of 1942, he pressed the Air Ministry—as early as 14 April 1942—for detailed plans to be made "to make sure that the maximum weight of the best type of bombs is dropped on the German cities by the aircraft placed at their disposal." Crews must be practised in the use of the new "blind bombing" apparatus. Navigators must master new methods of navigation "to get them within twelve and fifteen miles of the target," before the blind bombing equipment came into play. In order to prevent the bombers being immobilized by bad weather, preparations had to be made for "adequate >>
runways, homing devices, fog-clearing gear on the aerodromes, and de-icing and blind-landing equipment on the planes."

In the early summer of 1942, when the Ruhr became the "primary goal" of British bombing policy, the Prime Minister noted that "dramatic results were achieved" in the fire-raising attacks on Liibeck and Rostock. 30 May 1942 saw the 1000-plane bombing raid on Cologne.

Churchill telegraphed to Roosevelt: "I hope you were pleased. There is plenty more to come." There was: on 1 June, 1036 British bombers attacked Essen and the Ruhr; thirty-five bombers were lost. In August 1942 the Pathfinder Force was formed; by using the latest radar devices to find the target for the bombers, the Pathfinders made night bombing more accurate. But the effect on German war production and civilian morale was far from what had been hoped. As Churchill later recalled: "the strength of her economy had been underestimated."

In August 1942 Churchill flew to Moscow for his first meeting with Stalin. Bombing policy was much on the agenda. Churchill told Stalin that Britain looked upon German morale "as a military target." Churchill added: "We sought no mercy and would show no mercy. We hoped to shatter twenty German cities as we had shattered Cologne, Liibeck, Düsseldorf and so on…. If need be, as the war went on, we hoped to shatter almost every dwelling in almost every German city."

This sustained and intensifying Anglo-American Second Front bombing offensive led to more than 100,000 German civilian deaths. On 12 September 1942, Churchill telegraphed to Stalin from London: "I thought you might like to know the weight of bombs dropped by the Royal Air Force on Germany since 1st July this year. The total amount from 1st July to 6th September was 11,500 tons. The tonnage dropped on the more important targets was Duisburg 2500 tons, Düsseldorf 1250 tons, Saarbrucken 1150 tons, Bremen and Hamburg 1000 tons each, Osnabrück 700 tons, Kassel, Wilhelmshaven, Mainz, Frankfurt, all about 500 tons; Nuremberg received 300 tons and there were many lesser tonnages. Included in the bombs dropped were six 8000-pound bombs and 1400 4000-pound bombs. We have found that by using these with instantaneous fuses the bombs do not break up but explode most effectively, so that parachutes are not required."

The weakening of German morale remained a priority. On 22 October 1942 Churchill told the Chiefs of Staff Committee, which was then planning for the coming bombing offensive, that he was "most anxious that there should be no slackening of the bomber effort during the rest of the year, but rather it should be built up." The Germans were going to have "a very trying winter" and it would "ease their minds a great deal if they thought the bombing was easing off."

Yet Churchill's doubts about bombing policy remained. On 3 December 1942 he told the Chiefs of Staff that great efforts must be made in 1943 to engage the enemy militarily, on land. "The idea that all we need to do was to drop bombs on Germany was not enough." One long-term effect of Britain's bombing of German cities was to force the German air force on the defensive, turning German aircraft production increasingly from manufacturing bombers to manufacturing fighters. Churchill later noted: "This was the beginning of the defeat of the Luftwaffe, and our turning point in the struggle for air supremacy which we gained in 1944, and without which we could not have won the war."
The Casablanca Directive

The Casablanca Conference at the beginning of 1943 raised the whole scale of the Anglo-American bombing offensive. Churchill wanted the American bomber supremo, General Ira C. Eaker, to join Harris in night bombing, in order to reduce the high rate of American daytime casualties, but Eaker told Churchill, at Casablanca on 20 January 1943: "If the British bombed by night and the Americans by day, bombing them thus around the clock will give the devils no rest. And it will prevent the night watchers from going to the factories in the daytime. There are a million men now standing on the west wall to stop our tiny bomber offensive of 100 planes. If it were not for this they would be marshalled into divisions and sent to the Eastern Front."

In explaining what had been decided at Casablanca, Churchill and Roosevelt wrote jointly to Stalin from Marrakesh on 25 January 1943: "We believe an increased tempo and weight of daylight and night attacks will lead to greatly increased material and morale damage in Germany and rapidly deplete German fighter strength. As you are aware, we are already containing more than half the German air force in Western Europe and the Mediterranean. We have no doubt our intensified and diversified bombing offensive, together with the other operations which we are undertaking, will compel further withdrawals of German air and other forces from the Russian front."

The Casablanca directive set out the aims of the Anglo-American bombing of Germany, and the crucial importance of that bombing for the forthcoming amphibious cross-Channel landing. The aim of the joint Anglo-American bomber offensive, it stated, was to disrupt German military and industrial production, and create a decline in German morale, as a prerequisite to a cross-Channel landing.

The success of the Casablanca bombing directive was an integral part of the planning of the amphibious landing, one of several conditions without which that landing would not be able to take place. As part of these conditions Casablanca also set the priority of "the destruction by air bombardment" of the oil refineries at Ploesti in Romania.

Under the Casablanca Directive, which was issued on 4 February 1943, Britain and the United States would carry out a joint bombing policy: the United States by day, Britain by night. On 11 February 1943, Churchill told the House of Commons that the "dominant aim" of this Anglo-American bombing policy was "to make the enemy burn and bleed in every way that is physically and reasonably possible, in the same way as he is being made to bleed and burn along the vast Russian front."

In March 1943, acting within the Casablanca Directive, and as an essential preliminary to the cross-Channel landing, a four-and-a-half month series of British bombing raids were launched on German industrial targets, principally in the Ruhr. On 4 March 1943 Churchill informed Stalin that 800 tons of bombs had been dropped on Hamburg during the previous night. These, Churchill explained, were "very heavy discharges" compressed "into such short periods," and he added: "I expect the Nazi experiences will be very severe, and make them less keen about the war than they used to be."

Goebbels' diary confirms that this was so. These raids were continuous. On the night of 5/6 March, 986 tons of bombs were dropped on Essen, in an area of two square miles. The Essen raid introduced a new technique: it began with eight Mosquitoes dropping target indicators using the blind bombing device "Oboe," followed by twenty-two Pathfinder Force heavy bombers illuminating the target with flares.

The raids on the Ruhr created serious loss for Germany of coal, iron, and crankshafts needed for tanks and armoured vehicles. 100,000 men had to be drafted for repair duties and the German anti-aircraft defences doubled, draining men and anti-aircraft units from the Eastern Front. On the night of 27/28 March, 1050 tons of bombs were dropped on Berlin in fifty minutes, by 395 heavy bombers, for the loss of nine. On the night of 3/4 April, 900 tons of bombs were dropped on the Krupp Essen works. On the night of 5/6 April, 1400 tons were dropped on Kiel—one of the heaviest discharges of bombs thus far. April 5th saw an American daylight raid on the Renault tank factory in Paris.

Not all the raids went well. After the night raid on Stuttgart on 19/20 April, Churchill informed Stalin that eighty-one bombers and 500 "highly trained personnel" had been lost. But there was to be no let-up. On the 1/2 May night raid on Duisburg, with 1450 tons of bombs dropped, was the heaviest blow yet.

Not only German war production, but also German civilian morale remained a factor in Anglo-American strategic thought. At an Anglo-American conference in Washington in the last week of May 1943, Roosevelt asked for "occasional raids" on smaller German towns with factories, telling Churchill that it would "greatly depress the Germans if they felt even the smaller towns could not escape."

On the afternoon of 25 May 1943, in Washington, Roosevelt and Churchill held a joint press conference. When Roosevelt told the assembled newspapermen that the combination of the day and night bombing of Germany by the United States and British aircraft was achieving "a more and more satisfactory result," Churchill remarked, amid laughter: "It's like running a twenty-four-hour service."

The air weapon, Churchill added, "was the weapon these people chose to subjugate the world. This was the weapon with which they struck at Pearl Harbor. This was the weapon with which they boasted—the Germans »
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I boasted they would terrorise all the countries of the world. And it is an example of poetic justice that this should be the weapon in which they should find themselves most out-matched and first out-matched in the ensuing struggle.

In June 1943, Churchill was in dispute with "Bomber" Harris. During discussions about the need to bomb German strong points before an amphibious landing—as had just happened on the Mediterranean island of Pantelleria—Harris opposed any diversion of the existing bombing effort on German cities. Churchill understood, however, the importance of bombing the blockhouses and shore fortifications before any amphibious landing: such landings were then in prospect both in southern Italy and northern Europe.

Churchill minuted on 14 June 1943: "It is essential that full consideration should be given to this newly emerging and important factor. The opinion of C-in-C Bomber Command is influenced by the fact that he wishes everything concentrated on the bombing of Germany, and he would consider the opening of large-scale military operations in Europe a disaster. This may be natural from his point of view, but we must not allow such localized opinions to obstruct our thoughts."

"Are We Beasts?"

There was always the moral aspect of bombing German cities to be considered. Bishop Bell of Chichester had spoken publicly against such bombing. At Chequers on 27 June 1943, after watching a Royal Air Force film of the bombing of the German city of Wuppertal, Churchill was distressed, turning to the Australian representative, Richard Casey, and asking: "Are we beasts? Are we taking this too far?"

Terror bombing as such had in fact already been abandoned. Less than three weeks before Churchill's comment, the Point-Blank Directive of 10 June 1943 had been issued. This amended the Casablanca Directive in order to give first emphasis to the attack on German fighter forces and the German aircraft industry. The Point Blank targets included, from 29 June 1943, the Peenemiinde rocket bomb experimental station on the Baltic, which was bombed with 571 heavy bombers on 17 August 1943, setting back German progress.

Within the final remit of the Casablanca Directive, the first heavy British attack on Hamburg took place on the night of 24/25 July 1943. These raids continued until 3 August. The first Hamburg raid saw what Churchill later described as "...greater destruction than had ever been suffered by so large a city in so short a time."

The Germans called it "the great catastrophe." The German armaments minister, Albert Speer, later said that if six more cities had suffered the fate of Hamburg, German war production would have broken down.

On 6 November 1943 Churchill was given the figures for the percentage destruction of German cities thus far: Hamburg 7A, Cologne 54, Hanover 41, Dusseldorf 39 and Essen 39. Berlin had 480 acres devastated, as against London's 600.

That November, as the battle raged in Italy, Churchill again took issue with the priority of bombing Germany, including bombing raids using the new route from Allied air bases recently secured in Southern Italy. In Churchill's view, the land battle had to take first place in bombing priorities. "It is surely altogether wrong," he wrote to the Chief of the Air Staff, "to build up the Strategic Air Force in Italy at the expense of the battle for Rome. The strategic bombing of Germany, however important, cannot take precedence over the battle, which must ever rank first in our thoughts. Major tactical needs must always have priority over strategic policy."

Churchill added: "I was not aware until recently that the build-up of the Army had been obstructed by the forward move of a mass of strategic air not connected with the battle. This is in fact a departure from all orthodox military doctrine, as well as seeming wrong from the point of view of common sense." A week later he minuted: "The monstrous block of air, in its eagerness to get ahead, has definitely hampered the operations of the army."

At the end of 1943, the Cairo Conference reviewed Anglo-American bombing policy. The first fruits of the conference were seen in "Big Week," which began on 23 February 1944: a series of American daylight raids on German aircraft industry production centres. There was also the Schweinfurt raid of 24 February 1944, a joint Anglo-American night-and-day raid, with 266 American daylight bombers followed by 734 British bombers that night. Churchill wrote of the Schweinfurt raid: "Unfortunately the discussion had lasted so long that this tremendous attack was robbed of much of its effectiveness. Warned by the American daylight attack four months earlier, Speer had dispersed the industry."

There were always special—and urgent—bombing targets, first and foremost the German rocket bomb installations (Ski sites) and German heavy-water plants and storage. But even strategic bombing, during which there were always some civilian victims, was rousing the concern of the moralists. This criticism threatened to affect the morale of Bomber Command.

To defend the pilots and air crew, Churchill told those who still questioned the moral basis of bombing the enemy, speaking in the House of Commons on 22 February 1944: "This air power was the weapon which both the marauding States selected as their main tool of conquest. This was the sphere in which they were to triumph. This was the method by which the nations were to be subjugated to their rule. I shall not moralise further than to say that there is a strange stern justice in the long swing of events."
The last of the Casablanca Directive bombing raids took place against Nuremberg on the night of 30/31 March 1944. Of the 795 British aircraft on the raid, ninety-four failed return. It was the heaviest Bomber Command loss in a single raid, and, in Churchill's words after the war, "...caused Bomber Command to re-examine its tactics before launching deep penetration attacks by night into Germany."

Tributes to the Flight Crews

In his war memoirs, having described the bomber offensive in detail, Churchill wrote: "...it would be wrong to end without paying our tribute of respect and admiration to the officers and men who fought and died in this fearful battle of the air, the like of which had never before been known. Here chance was carried to its most extreme and violent degree... There was a rule that no one should go on more than thirty raids without a break. But many who entered on their last dozen wild adventures felt that the odds against them were increasing. How can one be lucky thirty times running in a world of averages and machinery?"

Churchill also recounted in his memoirs the story of Detective-Constable McSweeney, "one of the Scotland Yard officers who looked after me in the early days of the war, [who] was determined to fight in a bomber. I saw him several times during his training and his fighting. One day... jaunty as ever, but with a thoughtful look, he said, 'My next will be my 29th.' It was his last. Not only our hearts and admiration but our minds in strong comprehension of these ordeals must go out to these heroic men, whose duty to their country and their cause sustained them in superhuman trials."

Flight Lieutenant Conal McSweeney DFC was killed in action over Germany on 4 October 1943. His grave is in the Commonwealth War Cemetery at Durnbach, thirty miles south of Munich. Churchillians who are in Munich might want to make a journey to see it.

"An Awful Load of Hatred"

Bombing policy was again under scrutiny as the Normandy Landings were being prepared. As the bombing of railway yards in northwest France began, Churchill was concerned by the high French civilian losses that were expected. At the 4 April 1944 War Cabinet, Portal advised that between 20,000 and 40,000 French civilians might be killed. Churchill told his colleagues he "felt some doubts as to the wisdom of this policy." To Portal he wrote: "You are piling up an awful load of hatred."

Churchill asked Eisenhower set a limit for each raid, of, say, a hundred estimated dead. Eisenhower declined. Churchill then put the matter to Roosevelt. This "slaughter," he warned the President, "may easily bring about a great revulsion in French feeling towards their approaching United States and British liberators. They may leave a legacy of hate behind them."

Roosevelt supported Eisenhower, telling WSC: "I am not prepared to impose from this distance any restriction on military action by the responsible commanders that in their opinion might militate against the success of Overlord or cause additional loss of life to our Allied forces of invasion." The bombing went ahead. The casualties were high, more 4000 civilian dead, but far fewer than feared, and the railway disruptions were effective.

Auschwitz and Dresden

Towards the end of June 1944 a plea to bomb the railway lines leading to Auschwitz was made by the Jewish Agency to Anthony Eden, who passed it to Churchill, who replied in writing: "Get anything out of the Air Force you can, and invoke me if necessary."

Bombing of such a precise target would have to be done by day: that is, by the Americans. The American air supremo in London, General Ira C. Eaker, was willing to try, but the War Department in Washington decided against it.

If the non-bombing of Auschwitz has become controversial, the bombing of Dresden is in many ways even more so. In 1995 the Russians denounced it as an Anglo-American war crime. On learning of the effect of the »

**LITTLE KNOWN IRONY: Dresden in February 1945—a bombing requested by the Soviets, whose successors forty years later called it an Anglo-American war crime.**
"It is my belief that we may live to see—or you may live to see—the awful secrets which science has wrung from nature serve mankind instead of destroying it, and put an end to the wars they were called forth to wage."

—WSC, 27 MAY 1954
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Anglo-American raid on Dresden on 13/14 February 1945, Churchill minuted: "It seems to me that the moment has come when the question of bombing of German cities simply for the sake of increasing the terror, though under other pretexts, should be reviewed. The destruction of Dresden remains a serious query against the conduct of Allied bombing."

It was not the Anglo-American Allies, however, but the Soviet Union that had been the catalyst for the Dresden bombing. Alerted by Bletchley Park to intercepts of substantial German troop movements towards Breslau, the Soviet High Command had asked for an Anglo-American bombing raid to stem the flow of these troops, whom the intercepts showed were coming from central Germany, Norway and even Italy. This Soviet request was approved—in the absence of Churchill and Portal en route to Yalta—by Clement Attlee and the Vice Chief of the Air Staff.

Churchill's minute critical of the bombing of Dresden was issued on 28 March 1945. Three days later the Air Staff agreed that "at this advanced stage of the war" there was "no great or immediate additional advantage" to be expected from air attack on "the remaining industrial centres of Germany."

Churchill assumed that this policy would be strictly followed. He was therefore puzzled, two and a half weeks later, to read that aircraft had been sent on the night of April 14 to bomb Potsdam. He wrote at once to Sinclair and Portal: "What was the point of going and blowing down Potsdam?"

In reply, Portal pointed out that this attack had come about following a report of the Joint Intelligence Committee, describing the evacuation of the German Air Force operational headquarters from Berlin to Potsdam. Another object of the raid, Portal explained, was to destroy "communications leading west from Berlin through Potsdam."

Portal's reply ended, with reference to Churchill's earlier protest of 28 March: "In accordance with your decision on the recommendation of the Chiefs of Staff we have already issued instructions to Bomber Command that area bombing designed solely with the object of destroying industrial areas is to be discontinued."

The attack on Potsdam, however, Portal explained, "was calculated to hasten the disintegration of enemy resistance." Every bombing raid has a specific reason, an urgent imperative. No qualms, even those of Churchill, could be allowed to deflect from the clamant strategic needs of total war.

The Atomic Bomb

At the same Potsdam that Churchill had not wanted bombed in April 1945, three months later, on the morning of 22 July 1945, Churchill was given a full account of the first atom bomb test in New Mexico. Inside a one-mile circle, devastation had been total. Churchill then went to see Truman. "Up to this moment," Churchill recalled, "we had shaped our ideas towards an assault upon the homeland of Japan by terrific air bombing and by the invasion of very large armies. We had contemplated the desperate resistance of the Japanese fighting to the death with Samurai devotion, not only in pitched battles, but in every cave and dugout. To overcome Japanese resistance 'man by man' and conquer Japan 'yard by yard' might require the loss of a million American soldiers and half a million British—or more if we could get them there: for we were resolved to share the agony."

With the news that the atomic bomb was a reality, Churchill reflected, "all this nightmare picture had vanished. In its place was the vision—fine and bright indeed it seemed—of the end of the whole war in one or two violent shocks."

On 18 August 1946, a year after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Churchill wrote to George Bernard Shaw: "Do you think that the atomic bomb means that the architect of the universe has got tired of writing his non-stop scenario. There was a lot to be said for his stopping with the Panda. The release of the bomb seems to be his next turning point." Churchill was then Leader of the Opposition. The British atomic bomb was built during the premiership of his successor, Clement Attlee. Churchill was neither consulted nor informed.

Churchill became peacetime Prime Minister in October 1951. Studying Attlee's commitment to a British atomic bomb, he saw the link between the nuclear deterrent and detente. On 27 May 1954 he declared, at the Royal Albert Hall: "It is my belief that we may live to see—or you may live to see—the awful secrets which science has wrung from nature to serve mankind instead of destroying it, and put an end to the wars they were called forth to wage."

Asked in his final retirement to look back over his life and reflect on it, Churchill felt that in the main it had been a period of great progress; but he added: "My only regret is that mankind ever learned to fly."

It would seem that the "beasts" had prevailed.
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The Bomb and the Special Relationship

BY WARREN F. KIMBALL

In 1941, amidst the gloom created by uncertainty on the Russian front, the stalemate in North Africa, and the deteriorating Pacific situation, there was no reason to imagine that what seemed a small footnote in the 1941 Churchill-Roosevelt correspondence would develop into potential for geopolitical leverage beyond their wildest dreams.

It began with a "Most Secret" paper by two German scientists who had fled to England to escape Hitler. That paper—labeled MAUD after a nurse who had cared for atomic scientist Niels Bohr's family—was quickly studied by British government scientists. The result was the MAUD report which concluded that a nuclear fission bomb made from uranium was practical, would "likely lead to decisive results in the war, and could be built by the end of 1943."

The British passed the MAUD report to FDR’s science advisors, who were galvanized by it. Finally awakened to the possibility that the Germans were also working on a nuclear device, the President proposed on 11 October 1941, in a letter addressed "Dear Winston," that they "correspond or converse concerning the subject which is under study by your MAUD committee..." In December 1941, before Pearl Harbor, Churchill agreed.

The subject "under study" was the atomic bomb. Time, strategic bombing, and sabotage ultimately ensured that the Germans would not succeed in developing the weapon before their defeat. Anglo-American scientific success came too late for the atom bomb to be used against Germany, but two were dropped on Japan, which Churchill thought hastened peace. But before that weapon could make its dark appearance over Nagasaki and Hiroshima, a war had to be fought.

With the United States finally in the war, Churchill came for his third meeting with Roosevelt, their second the U.S.A., in June 1942. Those talks, appropriately codenamed ARGONAUT since Churchill chose to cross the Atlantic by flying-boat (seaplane) >>
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—quicker than by warship but still a dangerous twenty-six hour trip—began on 19 June at the President's home in Hyde Park, New York, overlooking the Hudson River. Roosevelt's cousin, Daisy Suckley, described tea for FDR, Churchill, and others at Top Cottage:

At 4, we drove over to the cottage. George [staff] soon came with supplies for tea. He brought out a card table & put iced tea, sandwiches & some cookies on it. On another table he had scotch & soda. Conversation was a little slow. Everyone sits around waiting for the P. & Mr. C. to speak—it must be quite a strain on them both—The P. said I could take some pictures... The P.M. turned right around in his chair & smiled for me!

These two men faced a horrible problem: of deciding where the United Nations should attack - the different heads of the army and navies disagree about it....

Tea talk aside, their discussions focused on Anglo-American cooperation over "Tube Alloys", as the atomic bomb project was now known. Churchill expressed concern about significant German progress on atomic research at a time when British research was disrupted by German bombings. The Manhattan Project began two months later. They concurred on unrestricted sharing of information, but that agreement was not reduced to writing. As the British ruefully learned, it allowed the Americans in charge of the project to be, or pretend to be, ignorant of the sharing policy.

Neither Churchill nor Roosevelt could plug into their strategic or political equations what happened at the University of Chicago six months later on 2 December 1942: scientists induced a chain reaction. The atomic bomb had become a practical possibility.

Not so Anglo-American sharing. From the outset British officials complained that the Americans were keeping them in the dark. Through Hopkins, Churchill raised the matter at the 1943 Casablanca and Washington conferences. In February 1943 he wrote:

Do you remember our conversation about that very secret matter we called "tube alloys" which you told me would be put right as soon as the president got home? I should be grateful for some news about this, as at present the American War Department is asking us to keep them informed of our "experiments" while refusing altogether any information about theirs.

Five months and no changes later, Churchill would repeat the same complaint to the President.

When Roosevelt and Churchill met in Washington for the TRIDENT conference (12-25 May 1943), the two leaders continued an increasingly vigorous debate that had begun at Casablanca, when Churchill protested American failure to share information about the Manhattan Project. Ready to put pressure on FDR, the Prime Minister arrived in Washington with studies on the feasibility of an independent British atomic bomb project. That came in response to a number of Roosevelt's advisers who opposed revealing atomic secrets to the British, despite early promises and the initial benefits of British cooperation. Hopkins told Halifax that U.S. government officials who would return to jobs in big business after the war were eager to maintain con-
to only reluctantly to live up to earlier promises to advance the war effort.
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By the time of their next meeting, at Quebec in August, they got together at the Roosevelt family home in Hyde Park. Once again, Daisy Suckley described the scene:

Mr. C ate 1 & V2 [hot dogs] and had a special little ice pail for his Scotch. He is a strange looking man. Fat & round, his clothes bunched up on him. Practically no hair on his head, he wore a huge 10-gallon hat....[Later they went to the swimming pool.] Mrs. R came & made a dive and a splash or two. The P.M. decided to go in too. In a pair of shorts, he looked exactly like a kewpie. He made a good dive in, soon came out, wrapped a large wool blanket around himself & sat down to talk to F.D.R.

Amidst hot dogs at Mrs. Roosevelt's cottage and swimming expeditions, Churchill and Roosevelt agreed, for the third time, that the United States would share its atomic research with Great Britain—and no one else.

This Quebec/Hyde Park agreement of 19 August required "mutual consent" to use an atomic bomb or to pass on "any information about tube alloys to third parties," while Britain and the United States would have "full and effective collaboration." (Whether or not Stalin knew of the agreement is uncertain—the U.S. Congress did not learn of it until 1947. Roosevelt did not know that Stalin had actually found out about the British atomic bomb research program—the MAUD project—back in September 1941, but no later than September 1943, the President knew that Soviet espionage had penetrated the Manhattan project.)

In the words of British historian-diplomat Robin Edmonds, "...There was much fog on all sides. But the essence of the transatlantic difference...was that, whereas the Americans perceived the British as seeking to cash in cheaply on an immense American enterprise, the British perceived the Americans as seeking to establish military and industrial monopoly in the atomic field."

But the atom bomb was more than economics. Churchill's personal science advisor, Lord Cherwell, had told the Americans that Britain viewed the bomb primarily as a means of restraining the Soviet Union after the war. When Vannevar Bush told Roosevelt of Cherwell's remarks, Bush interpreted FDR's anodyne comments and nods to mean that the President was "amazed," and that he found Cherwell's attitude "astounding." Perhaps. But Eleanor Roosevelt always warned that FDR left visitors thinking he had agreed with them—and that was often a mistake.

The 1943 Quebec/Hyde Park agreement ended the quarrelling over Anglo-American collaboration for the remainder of the war. (It included the Canadians in a pro forma way, since they had uranium.) But some Americans continued to drag their feet and, moreover, other issues cropped up. Perhaps most revealing of all is Churchill's minute to Lord Cherwell of 27 May 1944 about the Quebec/Hyde Park agreement:

I am absolutely sure we cannot get any better terms by ourselves than are set forth in my secret agreement with the President. It may be that in after years this may be judged to have been too confiding on our part. Only those who know the circumstances and moods prevailing beneath the presidential level will be able to understand why I have made this agreement. There is nothing more to do now but to carry on with it, and give the utmost possible aid. Our association with the United States must be permanent, and I have no fear that they will maltreat us or cheat us.

Just before Churchill and Roosevelt met again in Quebec that autumn, they got together beginning on 18 September 1944 for two days again at the President's home in Hyde Park. In that comfortable, casual surrounding, the two again agreed to maintain the Anglo-American monopoly over the "Tube Alloys" project. The meeting followed an appeal from Niels Bohr, the Danish physicist and atomic scientist, who had pleaded with both the President and the P.M. to disclose the atomic secret to the world lest it poison postwar relationships. Although Bohr's proposal fell afoul of now discredited suspicions that he had leaked information to the Soviet Union, there were advisers in both the British and American governments (Henry Stimson and Lord Cherwell for example) who found merit in some sort of internationalization of the bomb. But FDR and Churchill were having none of it.

et why keep the atomic bomb project secret from the USSR? Roosevelt knew at least by September 1943 that Soviet espionage had penetrated the Manhattan Project. He knew the Russians knew about the bomb, but did not bring up die subject. Why not? (Perhaps comedians Abbott and Costello—or was it die Marx Brothers?—asked an equally important question: did he know tiat they knew tiat he knew that they knew?)
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Churchill in his war memoir claimed to be "certain" that Stalin did not have "special knowledge" about the "vast process of research" for the bomb. Those carefully chosen words—"special knowledge" suggest that Stalin had some knowledge—may well have been chosen at the prompting of British intelligence services which, as David Reynolds has pointed out, did "sanitize" the war memoir to protect the ULTRA secret.\(^1\)

Possibly Roosevelt wished to maintain the image of secrecy, lest Stalin demand access. Perhaps the President was reluctant to brag about something that had not yet been tested, and about which unsophisticated advisers remained skeptical. After all, in a world where the USA was jockeying with the USSR for position, false bravado could weaken his bargaining strength.

Another part of the answer may be that Roosevelt, like most non-scientists, did not comprehend the revolutionary potential of nuclear weapons. His key scientific adviser on atomic energy, James B. Conant, believed FDR had "only fleeting interest in the atom, and that the program never got very far past the threshold of his consciousness." He "really had no idea of the enormous importance of our [atomic] secrets." A number of military "experts" tended to see the bomb as nothing more than just a bigger bang, and it appears that Churchill and Stalin were similarly ignorant. Churchill told Niels Bohr to stop worrying: "After all this new bomb is just going to be bigger than our present bombs and it involves no difference in the principles of war."\(^12\)

As for Stalin, though he took a personal interest in Soviet atomic bomb research, his scientists assured him that development of such a weapon would take ten to twenty years.\(^13\) And there is a vast difference between knowledge of a research project, and a working weapon! Whatever the varying weight of the contributing factors, Churchill and Roosevelt agreed to an aide-mém\(\text{oire}\) that flatly rejected any "international agreement regarding... control and use" of "Tube Alloys."

The ethical-moral issues attached to using the atomic bomb never received the "mature consideration" called for in that aide-mém\(\text{oire}\). Churchill and Roosevelt agreed to use the bomb on Japan, but only after "mature consideration," a phrase that suggests they had some perception that it was not just a "bigger bang." Certainly both demonstrated the ability to think beyond the simplistic notion that weapons had no ethical or moral questions attached. But there was no reason to do so until the weapon was tested, and FDR never crossed bridges until he came to them. There is some evidence that he mused about dropping a "demonstration" bomb to convince the enemy to surrender, but at no time before Roosevelt's death did top-level American leaders seek to avoid the use of the A-bomb. Churchill did not discuss the decision with his cabinet or chiefs of staff, writing in his war memoirs that "there was never a moment's discussion as to whether the atomic bomb should be used or not." After Roosevelt's death, Churchill casually initialed a minute telling British officials to go along with what the Americans decided.\(^14\)

The easy answer is that the President was waiting for the right moment—when he could confront the Soviet Union with the new super weapon and gain effective political leverage. Was Roosevelt the first practitioner of atomic diplomacy? Do we have here FDR—Cold Warrior? But how do we reconcile that with his consistent and persistent policy of trusting the Soviets in the hope of convincing them that the United States could likewise be relied upon? The likely answer is that the atomic bomb might work, and might not—but Franklin Roosevelt was firmly rooted in the practical present. Roosevelt knew that Stalin had intelligence on the atom bomb, so there was no secret. To tell the Soviets, and then refuse to share the information, would not quiet any of Stalin's suspicions and could lead to an open argument. Why make a decision until the decision had to be made? And there were so many other decisions to be made about the postwar world.

Churchill remained enigmatic. Rarely did he
express any compunctions about their having used the bomb. In his second ministry he expressed deep concern and fear about the hydrogen bomb, saying "that mankind was as far from the atomic age as the atom bomb was from the bow and arrow," fears that then-president Dwight Eisenhower firmly dismissed. His expressed horror about the effects of H-bomb radiation lends credence to the argument that, in 1945, he also saw the atomic bomb as just a "bigger bang."5

On 15 February 1945, after the Yalta conference, Churchill and Roosevelt (and Harry Hopkins) met briefly aboard the USS Quincy in the harbor at Alexandria, Egypt. FDR had just concluded a meeting with Ibn Saud and other middle eastern potentates. Churchill had come back from a quick visit to Greece to wave the flag lest Middle East leaders think Britain was abdicating its role in that part of the world. According to Churchill's own record, he read the Americans a proposal for Britain to develop its own atom bomb after the war, and FDR "made no objection of any kind," though he did comment that thoughts about using atomic energy "for commercial purposes had receded." The President also pointed to September 1945 for "the first important trials" of the weapon. It was their last discussion about the bomb.16

The special relationship, after reaching its apogee during the Second World War, seemed to have disintegrated in the immediate postwar years. While the American refusal to share atomic research and the McMahon act (an attempt to make the American atomic monopoly perpetual) contributed to that decline, they were more a symptom than a cause. As Robin Edmonds observed, the common denominator in American records for the 1945-50 period "is the absence of any recognition of the concept of a shared Anglo-American world leadership."17

Britain's parlous economic situation following the war and its military withdrawal from Greece (stimulating the Truman Doctrine) generated American disinterest bordering on fond contempt for any notion of shared world leadership—though that would soon change under the pressures of the Cold War and of Britain's own successful atomic bomb program. Whether for better or for worse is another story.

The impossible dream of an Anglo-American and then American atomic monopoly, was, perhaps, Churchill's and Roosevelt's most ambiguous, even hubristic geopolitical legacy. In 1946, the Americans proposed the so-called Baruch Plan for international control of atomic energy through a United Nations commission—one historian called it "emasculated internationalism" as it allowed the United States to remain the only nation capable of making an atomic bomb. Moreover, the proposals eliminated the Security Council veto on atomic matters which would allow the United States to control the very process of atomic energy research in other countries. The Soviet Union opposed the Baruch Plan, Churchill argued against it in his Fulton speech, and the Attlee government was unenthusiastic. "Let's forget the Baroosh and get on with the Fissle" (Britain's own atomic energy project) was Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's alleged quip.18 The message was clear. Great power "equality" and status now seemed to depend on developing an atomic bomb.

When the Soviet Union refused to accept the inspection requirements of the Baruch Plan (which actually passed in the United Nations, but quickly became dormant), the U.S. Congress and President Truman, either ignorant or dismissive of the Roosevelt-Churchill agreements jointly to share the atomic secret, passed the McMahon Act, which ended their wartime cooperation. The Anglo-American "special relationship" wobbled on its axis, though shared Cold War fears kept it alive. More significant, an extensive U.S. nuclear development and testing program quickly followed. The nuclear arms race was on.

So here we are in 2007, scrambling in vain to hold on to the atomic secret even as membership in the nuclear "club" (one of those "soft" words that seem to legitimize nuclear weapons) continues to grow. The Soviet Union joined in 1949. The British and French soon followed. China, India, Pakistan and Israel have all come on board. North Korea agreed to close down its bomb producing facilities, but only after it developed the ability to make one. Iran, which is knocking on the door, is likely to do the same. We are told there are still nuclear devices (bombs?) scattered around in the former Soviet empire. We are losing count of how many members of the club there are now, but what is certain is that trying to keep that genie in a bottle is just a variation on the ostrich's head-in-the-sand reaction to things it doesn't want to see.

POSTSCRIPT

he reader may ask (as did your editor), "Right, what should they have done so that the world would remember them better in this matter?"

Perhaps the reality that the Bomb would be an unusable weapon after Hiroshima and Nagasaki was not apparent before both Churchill and Roosevelt were gone from their leadership positions. After all, both seemed at times to view the Bomb as a "bigger bang," not a technological revolution. Yet Churchill, with his understanding of the historical past, knew well that past "super-weapons," like the dreadnought or the V-2 rocket, had not brought the possessor geopolitical security. Neither of them feared a Soviet military attack in the immediate aftermath of the war in »
The Bomb and the Special Relationship...

Europe. Both knew full well that Stalin would make a major effort to develop a Soviet A-bomb; logic and their intelligence reports (however inadequate those were) made that clear.

So they were playing for the short term. But why? There was no short-term threat. Hubris seems the only answer. Niels Bohr was not the only one who expressed fears that an attempt to create and hold an atomic monopoly was doomed to failure, and that nationalism would create a new and potentially more dangerous arms race. Bohr suggested internationalization of atomic secrets; others apparently thought in terms of sharing. But Churchill and Roosevelt slammed the door shut on such thoughts, and did so in great secrecy.

The ineffectiveness of nuclear leverage in geopolitics appeared even before the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan. At the Potsdam conference late in July 1945, the newly-minted American president, Harry Truman, told Stalin of the atomic bomb (though apparently without using those specific words). Stalin, who already knew about the weapon, seemed to brush it off, showing "no special interest." It was a calculated response. In the words of Henry Kissinger: "By the end of the conference, it was clear that the atom bomb had not made the Soviets more cooperative." 19

So then, what was the danger in pursuing schemes for the internationalization and control of nuclear power and weapons? Had that become a reality, we might not face the very real threat on non-state actors (terrorists and such) possessing nuclear weapons.

It was neither Mr. Churchill's nor Mr. Roosevelt's finest hour.

ENDNOTES


2. Churchill in 1924 had written: "Might not a bomb no bigger than an orange be found to possess a secret power to destroy a whole block of buildings—nay, to concentrate the force of a thousand tons of cordite and blast a township at a stroke?" Churchill, "Shall We All Commit Suicide?" Pall Mall, 1924, reprinted in Thoughts and Adventures, 1932 et seq.

15 years later, in 1939, Albert Einstein, supported by other European scientists, wrote Roosevelt to suggest that atomic bombs were scientifically feasible, ending his letter with a warning that Nazi Germany had stopped the sale of uranium from the Czech mines it had taken over. FDR took it under advisement, but little came of it. In the aftermath of the atomic bombing of Japan, Einstein called that advice a mistake, noting that "there was some justification—the danger that the Germans would make them." Martin J. Sherwin, A World Destroyed: The Atomic Bomb and the Grand Alliance (New York: Knopf, 1975), 27.

Whether or not the atom bombs dropped on Japan shortened that war, and the motives for dropping them are, of course, the subjects of ongoing, endless debates. For extensive references, see American Foreign Relations since 1600: A Guide to the Literature, Robert Beissner, ed. (2 vols; Santa Barbara, Calif: ABC Cho, 2003), 1, 1068-78.


7. Suckley, Closest Companion, 14 August 1943, 228-30.


18. Ibid., 83. Bevin's remark apparently alluded to "fissile," defined as materials that are fissionable by neutrons with zero kinetic energy. Fissile materials are necessary in some cases to sustain a chain reaction.

ady Soames, distinguished guests, as my American friend and colleague has pointed out, today is a particularly fitting day to remember our shared history and our shared willingness to stand up and be counted in the defence of freedom and defiance of tyranny. Sir Winston Churchill never harboured the slightest doubt that Britain should be unshakeably bound to its alliance with the United States, and with Canada and Australia. The great alliance that defeated Nazi Germany and Japan is as relevant today as it was then.

The threat that we now face from global terrorism is grave, complex and growing—a Gathering Storm if you will—but I am deeply troubled by the culture of self-blame and anti-Americanism that has become so rampant in the countries that must stand up to meet the challenge. Too many people have conveniently forgotten the huge sacrifices that have been made to give us the good life that we enjoy today, and they have forgotten who made those sacrifices. They labour under the illusion that we can make ourselves safe by retreating from the defence of our interests and values or the defence of our friends. It is incumbent on all of us who have a sense of history, and a sense of what it is that we have fought to defend over the years, to challenge these corrosive notions.

This conference is an opportunity to dissect the great tactical and strategic decisions of a time when both leaders and public alike understood that there were no easy decisions, no magic bullets; just finely balanced judgements on how best to secure the defence of our
Churchill's Turn in Canadian Politics

BY CHRIS GAINOR

Although Churchill visited Canada on his 1900-01 lecture trip, he did not travel farther west than Winnipeg, Manitoba. He came only once to the City of Vancouver and the Province of British Columbia, in 1929. Yet a century before the Vancouver Churchill Conference, young Winston was involved in Canadian and B.C. politics.

A century ago Churchill was Under-secretary of State for the Colonies in the Liberal government of Henry Campbell-Bannerman. Because the Secretary of State, Lord Elgin, sat in the Lords, the twenty-three-year-old Churchill was spokesman on colonial matters in the House of Commons.

In 1906, the Dominion Government of Canada reached agreement with the provincial governments on a new system of payments between the two levels of government. The issue of payments between the federal and provincial governments has animated Canadian politics since Confederation in 1867, and it excites controversy in Canada to this very day, when three provinces are quarrelling with Ottawa about payments.

Mr. Gainor is a member of the board of the Churchill Society of Vancouver Island, and a Ph.D. student in history. The author would like to thank Jim Hume, a longtime writer for the Victoria Times Colonist, who discovered Churchill’s 1907 speech in old newspaper files, setting the author on the trail of this story.
In 1907, this new system of subventions required an amendment of the British North America Act in the British House of Commons. It fell to Churchill to introduce the bill, and to pilot it through the Commons. As always happens in matters of this sort, approval amongst the provinces for the new financial arrangement was not unanimous. The dissenter in this case was British Columbia.

The Province in 1907 was not highly populated, nor was it the economic powerhouse it is today. But its premier was Richard McBride, a feisty figure who stood out even among the many colourful characters who have held that office since. McBride, a Conservative, had introduced party politics to B.C. after three decades of government by faction.

That February, McBride had fought and won re-election on this issue of better terms for B.C. in Confederation. In this quarrel, with the Liberal Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he had won a resolution of the provincial legislature and traveled to London to press his case. As Churchill told the House of Commons on 13 June 1907, when he introduced the bill, McBride "has with great frankness and much force placed us in possession of the views and grievances of British Columbia...."

"It was said that die special circumstances of British Columbia arising out of her great area of territory which was thinly populated, constituted a claim on the part of the province for a more lavish grant than was offered other provinces," Churchill continued. "This claim was recognized by other members of the conference, and by the federal government to this extent, that an additional subvention of $100,000 was accorded to British Columbia for ten years."

The Province objected to the fact that proposed legislation stated that this arrangement would be "final and unalterable." So while Churchill said that he and Lord Elgin could not entirely accommodate McBride's wishes, the words "final and unalterable" were removed from the bill.

"I should be very sorry," Churchill said, "if it were thought that the action which H. M. Government had decided to take meant that we desire to establish a precedent that whenever there is a difference upon a constitutional amendment between the federal government and one of the provinces that H. M. government will always be prepared necessarily to accept the federal point of view as against the provincial point of view."

The Bill passed the Commons without a division, but Laurier was determined to try and bury the argument over payments to provinces once and for all. In July the bill was amended in a committee of the Lords to include as a schedule to the Act the address from the Canadian Parliament that contained the objectionable words, and passed in this form.

So who won the fight, McBride or Laurier? In the words of McBride's biographer Brian Smith: "In the past such clauses had never prevented provinces from extracting new terms from the Dominion, even when the province had originally agreed to the insertion of the finality clause."

Smith was right. While the funding arrangement contained in this bill has long since been superseded, and while the British gave up their power to amend Canada's constitution in 1982, arguments over funding arrangements have dogged succeeding Liberal and Conservative governments in Ottawa to the present day. As for McBride, Smith wrote, what did matter to him "was the political interpretation he could thrust upon the facts." In the eyes of Conservatives across Canada, McBride had bested Laurier, and he returned home to a hero's welcome in British Columbia, with an estimated 20,000 people greeting his train in Vancouver. Many touted McBride for national leadership of the Conservative Party.

McBride's trip marked the beginning of a friendship and correspondence with Churchill, and McBride gave support to Churchill as First Lord of the Admiralty when controversy dogged the Conservative federal government of Sir Robert Borden in its effort to provide financial aid to the Royal Navy on the eve of the First World War.

McBride, who in 1912 became the only B.C. premier to be knighted, also famously purchased three submarines from an American builder just as war broke out, and for three days British Columbia had its own navy! Finally the premier turned the submarines over to the Canadian military.

Although Sir Richard McBride made an indelible mark on the politics of his province, he never moved to the national stage. His political fortunes and health began to fail and he resigned as premier in 1915 after 12 years in office. He became the province's agent general in London, where he died in 1917.

As for Churchill, he would finally pay his one and only visit to British Columbia twelve years later. He arrived as someone who already knew something of the province, and had left his mark on it. $3
The Summer of 1940

BATTLE OF BRITAIN MEMORIAL SERVICE, 16 SEPTEMBER 2007.

BY MARTIN CRONIN

Growing up in Great Britain, there are few stories as iconic as that of "The Few"—Churchill's term for the pilots who stood between a rampart, all-conquering Nazi Germany and the invasion of the United Kingdom. The Battle of Britain is for the people of our island one of those nation-shaping events that acquired legendary status and defined the national consciousness. The carefully chosen words of the Prime Minister who rallied the nation in her "darkest hour" have themselves become legends of oratory.

Sadly we live in frightening and uncertain times today, with the relentless threat of terrorism, but we can draw inspiration from the summer of 1940. Then, with Hitler victorious on mainland Europe, the people of Britain waited for the expected invasion.

Hitler hoped for a negotiated agreement, where Britain's Empire and sea power would be left intact while Germany was allowed to dominate mainland Europe. He hoped, in effect, that the people of Britain might say "this is not our fight," and walk away. He underestimated, of course, the steadfast nature of the British people in adversity and their willingness to face up to a threat, rather than simply postponing it. Terms were rejected out of hand and Churchill warned: "The whole fury and might of the enemy must soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this Island or lose the war." In doing so, he braced the people of London for the difficult task that would be "their finest hour," a task that in the space of a few months, took the lives of over 27,000 civilians and 498 pilots.

But Britain was not alone. Our Canadian friends were by our side. In the summer of 1940 British land forces, having evacuated from Dunkirk, were unready to face invasion, and the First Canadian Division was a vitally important part of our defences. Before Hitler could risk exposing an invasion force to the might of the Royal Navy, he needed air superiority, and in the air, again, the Royal Air Force was not alone. The 2440 British pilots of fighter, bomber and coastal commands were joined by 510 overseas pilots, including 300 Canadians as well as Australians, Americans, New Zealanders, South Africans, French, Czechs and Poles.

For Canada, the leadership provided by these pilots, experienced in air combat, was critical to the development of the Royal Canadian Air Force. The Battle of Britain was the first occasion that Canadian airmen flew in Canadian units in a sustained battle. The brave men of No. 1 and No. 242 Squadrons, among others, excelled themselves in Britain's time of need.

In May 1940, the German High Command's battle plan envisaged four days to defeat the RAF's Fighter Command in Southern England, given their three to one numerical superiority of aircraft. Four months later, having lost over 2600 aircraft, Hitler postponed the invasion plan indefinitely. It was the first military defeat of the Third Reich and a blow from which their air force never recovered.

The survival of Britain was also, of course, critical to the future course of the war. Alongside the defeat of the German Africa Corps by the British at Alamein, the American defeat of the Japanese Navy at Midway, and the Russian defeat of the German 6th Army at Stalingrad, the tide turned and the stage was set for ultimate victory.

A key component of the German tactics from September 1940 was to try to terrorise the people of Britain into submission with the mass bombing of London and other cities. In all, 18,000 tons of high explosive were dropped on England during the eight months of the Blitz. Over 18,000 men, 16,000 women, and 5,000 children were killed. There are those today who believe that they can bomb their way to victory, whatever that may be for them, through indiscriminate terror in the streets of London, New York, Washington, Bali, Baghdad, Kabul or Toronto. Once again, they have underestimated our determination and as friends and allies, united in our resolve, we will prevail.

September 15th is celebrated in the United Kingdom as Battle of Britain Day. A day of celebration and remembrance. A day to thank those who made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom, a day for the people of Britain to thank our Canadian and other friends who stood by our side, and a day to inspire us as we face the threats of today.

Valet Frank Sawyers

**Q** Whatever happened to Winston Churchill's loyal valet, Frank Sawyers, after he left Churchill's service in 1947?

**A** This is of particular interest to us because our friend Michael Dobbs, author of four Churchill novels reviewed in past issues, wants to weave Sawyers into a new novel and has found his niece Doreen Jones in Kent. In August 2006 she wrote the Daily Mail: "Frank Sawyers was my father's youngest brother. After he left Mr. Churchill's service, he went to Rhodesia and was valet to the assistant Governor General. In the Fifties he was with Lord Astor at Hever Castle. Upon the death of Sir Winston in 1965 my uncle, then valet to Col. Leon Mandel in Chicago, was flown home for the funeral, together with General Eisenhow and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. When he retired, he returned to his home town of Carlisle (Cumberland) where he died in July 1972, aged 69. My uncle was one of the old school of employees and never told tales about the people he served."

**Q** How was British Petroleum booted from Iran, losing control over the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, and what was Churchill's response to this loss? Can you incorporate into your answer the relationship between Churchill, Truman and Eisenhower that brought about a covert operation to overthrow the government of Iran in 1953? Could you expound upon Churchill's role as leader or cohort in suing Iran, amassing a naval armada, requesting U.S. assistance in going to war against Iran, etc.?

**A** That sounds like a term paper assignment, and from a fairly one-sided angle. We know nil about "suing" Iran, but the business about naval armadas and requesting U.S. aid is correct. Consult either of two books for further details, both by Martin Gilbert: *Churchill: A Life* (London, Heinemann, 1991), 895-, or *Winston S. Churchill*, vol. 8 "Never Despair" (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988) starting at page 617- Check at any good library.

Before World War I, Churchill helped organize Anglo-Persian (later Anglo-Iranian) Oil Co. (AIOC) with the Iranians, to keep the Royal Navy supplied with oil after he had converted it from coal. AIOC was ejected by Iranian Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadeq in 1952. Kermit Roosevelt (1916-2000), grandson of Theodore, headed the CIA's "Operation Ajax" to oust Mossadeq. In 1954 AIOC was restored to ownership but lost its monopoly. It later became British Petroleum (BP), which now runs adverts featuring people asking silly questions about alternative energy.

Churchill's involvement with the leader he called "Mussy Duck" was peripheral, but he closely queried Kermit Roosevelt about the coup. From Boyle, ed., *The Churchill-Eisenhower Correspondence* (Chapel Hill; University of N.C. Press, 1991): "Growing Iranian resentment against Britain reached a climax with the exile of the Shah and the coming to power of Prime Minister Mohammed Mossadeq, who in May 1952 nationalized the AIOC concession. Britain organized a boycott of Iranian oil and...British intelligence planned a covert operation to overthrow Mossadeq...The CIA favored cooperation with the British covert operation, but Truman and his secretary of state, Dean Acheson, sought a negotiated settlement, involving acquisition by American oil companies of part of the AIOC concession in Iran. This was unacceptable to Britain...Eisenhower increasingly viewed Mossadeq as a tool of radical elements dependent for support on the Iranian Tudeh (communist) party. He therefore gave his blessing to a covert operation...which was accomplished on 19 August 1953. The Shah was restored to power and an oil agreement was reached."

**Q** What is the truth behind the assertion (most recently in *The Times* of 22 March 2007) that Churchill was Jewish through his mother, "Jennie Jacobson Jerome...as was pointed out by Moshe Kohn in a 1993 article in the *Jerusalem Post*"?

**A** David Watson wrote *The Times* four days later: "Jennie could trace her American roots back to around 1717, when Timothy Jerome, of Huguenot descent, emigrated to Meriden, Connecticut. Timothy Jerome's male descendants, from whom Jennie and Sir Winston were descended, were (son) Samuel; (grandson) Aaron; (great grandson) Isaac; (great great grandson and Jennie's father) Leonard Walter. All were Jeromes; none was registered as a Jacobson. The Old Testament names in the family are in keeping both with their French Calvinist antecedents and with the times and place in which they lived. See *An Historic Record and Pictorial Description of the Town of Meriden, Connecticut* by C. Bancroft Gillespie (1906)."

**Q** FFH 101 (51) says that in 1932, Dr. Otto C. Pickhardt issued a medical note that Churchill's convalescence "necessitates the use of alcoholic spirits, especially at mealtimes," specifying "250 cc per day as the minimum." Was the "medical note" a prescription?

**A** It was almost certainly a "dodge" to enable WSC's use of his refreshment. If Dr. Pickhardt thought that WSC was a serious alcoholic, he theoretically might have prescribed alcohol to avoid the DTs (delirium tremens) of the chronic alcoholic who suddenly is removed from his or her usual alcoholic intake. I don't believe that WSC was a chronic alcoholic in the clinical sense. He was a regular imbiber of a whiskey and soda, and he had champagne and other alcoholic beverages (brandy and port), mostly over meals or during a long smoke of his cigar. —JOHN H. MATHER MD
Who was "My Hon. Friend Below the Gangway"?

PAUL H. COURTENAY

"To form an Administration of this scale and complexity is a serious undertaking in itself, but it must be remembered that we are in the preliminary stage of one of the greatest battles in history, that we are in action at many other points in Norway and in Holland, that we have to be prepared in the Mediterranean, that the air battle is continuous and that many preparations, such as have been indicated by my Hon. Friend below the Gangway, have to be made here at home."

—WSC, House of Commons, 13 May 1940

Susanne McIntire writes: "In Churchill's first speech as Prime Minister, in which he had 'nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat,' who is he referring to by "my Hon. Friend below the Gangway"? I'm working on a collection of speeches for high-schoolers for Facts on File, and I think I should explain it. Can you also explain the meaning of the term "gangway"?

On 13 May 1940, the House of Commons met at 2:45 pm for Questions to the Secretary of State for War (Anthony Eden, who had been in the job for only two days); it was the first time the House had met since 9 May, and the first appearance of Churchill as Prime Minister.

Questions to Eden lasted for only nine minutes, and Churchill rose at 2:54 pm to make his famous speech, which included the quotation referred to above.

It follows that Churchill's reference must have been made in respect of one of the six MPs who spoke during the nine minutes of Questions. Of these, I feel sure that our quarry was the first MP to speak: the person who raised a matter on which the other five then briefly elaborated.

He was, at the time, Mr. Henderson Stewart (1897-1961), a Liberal Unionist MP for East Fife. (In 1957 he was made a baronet and adjusted his name to Sir James Henderson-Stewart, Bt.)

On 13 May 1940, Stewart urged the creation of local forces to meet enemy parachute landings, avoiding displacement of regular troops. These, he said, would form a volunteer corps of older responsible men who should be armed and trained for action. He added that public demand was insistent. Eden replied to the effect that such matters were being addressed.

The other five MPs then all spoke very briefly, backing the point being made. They were: Sir Percy Harris, Bt. (1876-1952), Liberal MP for South-West Bethnal Green; Brigadier General Sir Henry Croft, Bt. (1881-1947), Conservative MP for Bournemouth, who was raised to the peerage fifteen days later as Lord Croft and joined the Government as Joint Under-Secretary of State for War; Commander Sir Archibald Southby, Bt. (1886-1969), Conservative MP for Epsom; Will Thome (1857-1946), Labour MP for West Ham; and a Mr. Stephen (unidentified).

The Gangway (Aisle)

Government ministers occupy seats in the House of Commons in the block of seats nearest to the Speaker (on his right). Members of the Opposition party, forming the shadow cabinet, occupy similar benches opposite the Government members. There is an aisle next to these benches on both sides of the House (i.e., farther from the Speaker). "Below the gangway" means the benches on both sides of the House, occupied by members of the respective Government and opposition parties who are not themselves in the Government or shadow cabinet.

That is the normal situation. But when Churchill became head of a coalition government on 10 May 1940, the distinction between Government and Opposition almost completely disappeared. So, although the new Government occupied its traditional benches, many other MPs sat opposite even though not in opposition.

Nevertheless, "below the gangway" metaphorically meant that the MP concerned was not a member of the Government. Stewart might have sat on either side, and even opposite, the Prime Minister.
A Fine Double Helping of Churchillian Judaica

RONALD I. COHEN

It is perhaps a reflection of the logic and importance of the subject that two, not one, works on Sir Winston Churchill's relationship with the Jews have been published in a year that represents no particular anniversary in Churchill's relationship with that community. Indeed, Sir Martin Gilbert acknowledges that he began his work on the subject nearly forty years before. For Michael Makovsky, this was the culmination of his Harvard doctoral dissertation of 2000.


Gilbert traces Churchill's relationship with the Jews, both individually and from a community perspective, with major attention to WSC's commitment to Zionism. Makovsky, on the other hand, focuses primarily on the Zionist issue, while ensuring the essential backdrop of Churchill's relationships with individual Jews.

The historical thread begins with Churchill's representation of areas of Manchester in Parliament from 1900 to 1908. Although he had known several Jewish figures earlier, it was there that he made the acquaintance of Manchester constituents such as Nathan Laski, Chaim Weizmann and Joseph Dulberg. There too his first community-related political involvement with the Jews arose when he was called upon to respond to the Aliens Bill proposed by the Tory Government.

As Home Secretary, Churchill responded to the vandalizing of Jewish homes and shops in South Wales. While Minister of Munitions, he was a part of the Government that assumed responsibility for the November 1917 letter regarding a Jewish National Home that achieved fame as the Balfour Declaration. As Colonial Secretary, he visited Palestine in March 1921, and, after a brilliant speech in the House on 4 July 1922, he was responsible for the White Paper which solidified Britain's support for a Jewish National Home in Palestine.

The 1937 Peel Commission followed. Then the rise of Nazism, with the persecution and expulsion of Europe's Jews, and a new White Paper (which some Jews called the Black Paper) was issued by the Colonial Secretary in May 1939. The Holocaust and the postwar devolution of the British Mandate finally led to the creation of Israel on 14 May 1948. Although complicated by the Suez crisis in 1956, the Churchill-supported Zionist cause had become a reality.

Both books are excellent contributions to the subject; however, Churchill's biographer has delivered extraordinary "grub" that reflects his research and documentation of his subject for more than forty years. Critically, when Gilbert began his research, many of the people who are the backbone of the Zionist story were still alive for him to talk to and correspond with. They include Randolph Churchill (and the entire Churchill family), Emery Reves, Dorothy de Rothschild, Oscar Nemon, President Yitzhak Navon, even David Ben-Gurion, among many others. We benefit from that richness.

What other historian would be in a position to quote a private Churchill family anecdote amply illustrating Lord Randolph Churchill's uncompromising support for his Jewish friends? And how could we better understand Churchill's relationship with Sir Ernest Cassel? 

Mr. Cohen's three-volume Bibliography of the Writings of Sir Winston Churchill was published last year by Continuum.
The Right Parent Survived

BARBARA F. LANGWORTH


This may seem a new story to many readers, since the previous biographies of Lady Randolph Churchill are up to forty-eight years old, and her memoirs were published a century ago. Finest Hour readers, cognizant of the amount of Jennie material extant (see sidebar opposite), will want to know if this book offers anything which adds to our knowledge. Well...yes and no.

Jennie’s influence in Winston’s life is well known. She educated him, spent more time with him than most realize, and advanced his career as a writer and war correspondent. Much beloved, she died in 1921.

In the 1990s the editor and I twice visited Sir Winston’s nephew, Peregrine Churchill, and his wife Yvonne, at their home in Hampshire, where we discussed the current raft of Jennie gossip. There was a good deal of “neglected Winston” chatter going round, so Peregrine pulled out a box of Jennie’s diaries and letters to Winston and began reading aloud. It was touching to hear her own words—hardly those of an uncaring, distant mother.

Anne Sebba’s book pulls together facts, discussions and controversy from the previous books, adds new letters, and discusses recent Jennie historiography, producing no particularly new conclusions about this ethereal and alluring being. But there is none of the slapdash sloppiness that condemned the previous Jennie effort (Dark Lady, reviewed in FH 135), and her well-written book is worth a read.

We have a rounded mural of Jennie and her sisters: American girls in search of titles, who met British aristocrats in search of money. She was one of the most stunning women of her time, known as a “Professional Beauty” (Victorians would buy photographs of lovely women), educated in France,

Barbara Langworth has served as publisher (business manager) of Finest Hour since 1982. She wrote “Churchill and Polo” in FH 72, and has contributed to two departments, “Recipes from Number 10” and “Churchillivia” (now Churchill Quiz).
with a wit and gaiety renowned in London society. I had erroneously supposed that a famous sketch of Jennie by John Singer Sargent was for a later portrait. Apparently it was done for the cover of a benefit piano concert program she gave for charity.

Here is the Jennie of legend: sexy, innovative, literate, her flirting persona irresistible to younger (and some older) men. A concert pianist, accomplished artist, editor, playwright, interior decorator, author, devoted sister and daughter, she was the stuff that inspired a seven-hour television biography.

The book mentions the controversies, skirting conclusions: because there aren't any.

In spite of the well-grounded likelihood that Lord Randolph Churchill died of something besides syphilis—a brain tumor is the leading possibility (see John Mather, "Maladies et Mort," FH 93)—he was indisputably diagnosed with syphilis. So Mrs. Sebba's take is simple: He was told he had it. He believed he had it. His wife and son thought he had it. And all their actions were based on the supposition that he did have it. Ergo, he might as well have had it. This avoids a conclusion but does not challenge the truth in the way that vindictive or ignorant writers do, by referring, say, to "Winston's syphilitic father" and moving on. As Dr. Mather has shown, Randolph's malady was misdiagnosed from the start. Sebba's thesis is undaring, and her medical evidence inconclusive; but it is a safe position to take.

Imagine what young Jennie must have felt at the time! You meet this fantastic fellow, and after three days the sparks are so bright that marriage is certain, however resisted by both sets of parents—and despite their financial gyrations. Your first-born comes quickly. Then you find out that your husband is a "nut"—brilliant and respected, an up-and-coming orator who excels at baiting the Opposition, but self-willed, vindictive, and withal not a very nice man. He quarrels with the Prince of Wales, and a few years into your marriage, he (with you) is ostracized from polite society. You end up in Ireland in a kind of luxurious exile.

Back in England finally, you're told that Randolph has a sexually transmitted disease. You do much of his campaigning, since he is perpetually ill. A few years pass and (diseased or not) he reaches one of the highest offices in the land, a step below Prime Minister—only to cast himself from the ladder in an ill-considered resignation, never to rise again, and to spend the rest of his life "dying by inches in public." Not only that, he is hardly ever home, and when he is has a violent temper. Is this fun for you?

* * *

Another son was born in Ireland, on which speculation is rife. Was he Randolph's? Only a DNA test could tell and the essential male line has withered. Arguing strongly in favor of Jack's legitimacy is his son Peregrine's resemblance to the 7th Duke of Marlborough; arguing against is that he looked and acted nothing like WSC as an adult. Why is this important? Surely what matters is that Winston and Jack were devoted to each other and enjoyed a close-knit family life.

Unsurprisingly Jennie had numerous admirers—and lovers, whose number is hotly disputed by historians, buffs, and seekers of the prurient. The author discusses Jennie's serious romance, while she was still married, with Count Charles Kinsky. Whilst on her last journey with Randolph she learned that Kinsky had become engaged—he needed the finances and progeny Jennie could not provide. Perhaps she had hoped he would wait until Randolph had died (though there had been talk of divorce). But what, Mrs. Sebba asks, would have been the consequences for Winston if Jennie had married Count Kinsky and put her energies into that relationship, instead of devoting herself to his son?

Given the literature extant, it is encouraging to find some new material. One "find" to me was that Jennie had a serious illness and almost died. In October 1892 she had severe abdominal pains and was diagnosed with peritonitis and perhaps a tumor or cyst, which miraculously healed on its own. Think of the aftermath if Jennie had not been there for Winston.

What did surprise me was the publicity-rumor that Jennie had a tattoo of a snake on her wrist. There is a well-known photo of Jennie holding Peregrine. Her arms are bare and there is no sign of a tattoo—there or on any other photo I have examined. The author duly displayed a snake on her arm in at least one of her book signings. I'm sure she meant it as a tribute, but it strikes me rather as it would if Sir Martin Gilbert showed up wearing a blue velvet siren suit.

It is too bad that the publicity surrounding this biography was so devoted to the salacious: how many men Jennie slept with, whatler Lord Randolph died of syphilis, and who Jack Churchill's father was. Fastening onto flyspeck issues while ignoring what really matters is a feature of our age. What really matters is that Jennie Churchill was a notable person at a time when woman were mainly considered to be trophies, concubines or breeders.

She may have slept with many men (the number is vastly exaggerated). But while others of her class...
Adviser Paul Addison of the University (FH print 127). The result was Churchill: The Professor Freeman teaches history at California University. The entry into a full-length biography. The subtitle Rivals for Greatness would indicate that this book is a comparative study of two Great Britons spanning eventful times, from 1863 to 1965. How do they measure up, as war leaders, as peacemakers, as social reformers, as politicians, as statesmen? How do their lives compare? What are their respective strengths and weaknesses? In the judgment of history, who wins this "rivalry"?

But this is not what the book is about. Instead, it is an exhaustive study of the personal and professional relationship between Lloyd George and Churchill—"the longest friendship in politics," as they both liked to assert. Dr. Toye, a young academic from Homerton College, Cambridge, says that this is a myth. To lend significant weight to his argument, he has toiled

The Perfect Churchill Primer

DAVID FREEMAN

Published as part of an Oxford series called "Very Interesting People" (VIP), this small book and its companions are offprints drawn from the 2004 edition of the Dictionary of National Biography. The entry for Churchill, written by Churchill Centre Academic Adviser Paul Addison of the University of Edinburgh, naturally was one of the longest in the new DNB—so long in fact that Professor Addison suggested to the Oxford University Press that he expand the entry into a full-length biography. The result was Churchill: The Unexpected Hero, published in 2005, one of the finest brief biographies in print (FH 127).

This splendid little volume, containing the original essay, may thus be described as the perfect Churchill primer. Addison has also used this new opportunity to correct some small errors in the text and, in my opinion, there exists no finer concise biography.

Addison gets through all the major facts and episodes in Churchill's oft-told life with a fresh and thoughtful narrative style that reveals the author's deep knowledge of the vast literature about his subject. Major controversies and long-standing legends are quickly set straight by the author's mastery of facts and references to supporting texts and documents. All of this learning reflects the product both of Addison's previous books, Churchill on the Home Front (1992) and The Road to 1945 (1975), and his decade of service as Director of the Centre for the Study of the Two World Wars in Edinburgh.

Inevitably, the book contains several familiar quotations, but the author also turns up less well-known but highly telling ones. The best may be one drawn from the diary of Alexander MacCallum Scott, Churchill's first biographer and a Liberal MP Leaving a darkened House of Commons one night during the First World War, Churchill remarked, "This little place is what makes the difference between us and Germany. It is in virtue of this that we shall muddle through to success and for lack of this Germany's brilliant efficiency leads her to final disaster. This little room is the shrine of the world's liberties." And so it proved.

Readers of this new book enjoy a confident sense that they have been guided through the basics of Churchill's life by a learned master whom they can trust. This past autumn I used the book both as an assigned text for undergraduate students majoring in history and as an introduction for high-school teachers attending a seminar sponsored by the Churchill Centre. Oxford is to be commended for producing this useful and inexpensive volume.

Toying with Myths

JAMES R. LANCASTER


Good front cover: two well-dressed gentlemen in top hats, the younger one looking respectfully at the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is Budget Day 1910.

For the young Winston, the right parent survived. •
Another example of selectivity is the attitude of Lloyd George and Churchill to Hitler. On one page we are told that Lloyd George met Hitler "only briefly." On another page a little more light is shed on his notorious four-day visit to Berchtesgaden in 1936. When he returned to England Lloyd George wrote gushing articles in praise of Hitler in the Daily Express and the News Chronicle. As late as August 1944, Lloyd George told A.J. Sylvestor that he was pleased that Hitler had strengthened his position after the purge following the attempted assassination on 20 July.

The author acknowledges that Lloyd George misjudged Hitler, not only in 1936 but also in June 1940, when he described him as "the greatest figure in Europe since Napoleon, and possibly greater than him." But Churchill's judgment of Hitler, not altogether without significance, is hardly mentioned, let alone analysed.

Despite calling him the "Artful Dodger," Churchill clearly admired Lloyd George in the early years, from 1901 to 1922. He came to his rescue over the Marconi scandal in 1912. This good turn was reciprocated when Lloyd

George brought him into the Cabinet as Minister of Munitions in 1917. But the fateful election of 1922 left Lloyd George a bitter man, one who was never to see office again.

When he became Prime Minister in 1940, Churchill tried on several occasions to bring Lloyd George out of the wilderness. He was rebuffed each time, while the man whom he was asking to join the team confided many disparaging remarks in private about the "old fool." One of these remarks was "I shall wait until Winston is bust," which Dr. Toye uses as the title for the penultimate chapter of his book.

Lloyd George emerges badly from this chapter, not only for his lack of moral courage, but for the extremity of his language towards his "friend" of forty years. Churchill had ignored him since May 1941, but in December 1944 he offered him an Earldom, which Lloyd George accepted, much to the chagrin of his friends.

So although Dr. Toye has not attempted a comparative study of two Rivals for Greatness, by the end of the book Churchill emerges as incomparably the greater man.

Penetrating Analysis

CHRISTOPHER H. STERLING

From World War to Cold War: Churchill, Roosevelt and the International History of the 1940s, by David Reynolds. Oxford University Press, 364 pp., hardbound, $60. Member price $48.

Good history requires strong narrative and insightful analysis. David Reynolds, author of the superb In Command of History among numerous other books, provides both in this anthology of nearly twenty of his jour-

Professor Sterling teaches Media and Public Affairs at The George Washington University.
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May 1940 on whether to fight on or seek terms from Hitler. Reynolds argues that the decision to fight on, hardly preordained, was the right decision for the wrong reasons (a presumption of strong American support and early entry into the war, for one thing). As he concludes, "A not unskilful politician, handling the same issues in different ways for domestic and foreign audiences, privately wrestling with his own doubts and fears, yet transcending them to offer inspiring national and international leadership—that is surely a more impressive as well as a more accurate figure than the gutsy bulldog of popular mythology" (page 97).

A paper entitled "Churchill the Appeaser?" argues that WSC backed the wrong horse—RAF bombing—as the chief means of bringing down Hitler. "Only military victory would force a German collapse—not blockade, bombing, subversion or peripheral operations" (119). Of course it could be argued that bombing, pre-1944, was the only weapon Britain had available.

Part three is on Roosevelt, beginning with an interesting take on the Royal visit to America in June 1939, going on to some of the political background of the appointment of John "Gil" Winant as American ambassador to the Court of St. James's in 1941, and concluding with a chapter on "the wheelchair president and his special relationships" that assesses FDR's relations with advisers like Bullitt, Welles, and Hopkins.

"Mixed Up Together," the fourth part, turns to the British-American partnership, considering 1941-43 American studies in Britain by the Ministry of Information and the Board of Education, growing out of government concern for misperceptions about the U.S. ally. Next Reynolds assesses the touchy question of how Britain dealt with the influx of black GIs: both British sympathy for blacks who were often poorly treated by American southern whites, and simultaneous fears over white British women dating black soldiers. A third paper looks into British and American troop interactions given the higher pay of the latter.

Part five, "Cold War," reviews Churchill, Roosevelt and the "Stalin Enigma," the efforts to "read" the Soviet dictator and his motives, a process that moved from faith to distrust. Reynolds states that Soviet postwar dominance of Eastern Europe was not owed to Yalta, but to the long debate and delay of the second front in Western Europe. Next is Churchill's 1946 "Iron Curtain" speech, and the roles of the Big Three in the postwar division of Europe. A final chapter discusses how and why the Cold War began, and who lit the fuse. Reynolds provides an insightful assessment of what happened—and what have might happened. Churchill plays an important part throughout all three chapters.

The final section, "Perspectives," turns to the impact of the war on American international policy, and how much Roosevelt learned from Wilson's failings in 1919-20. The penultimate chapter tackles the postwar Anglo-American "special relationship," rather more upbeat than John Charmley's more dismal take in his Churchill's Grand Alliance. This chapter, extended and revised since its 1986 appearance, is a sad account of British decline and the dilemma over whether to work more closely with Europe or America. A final chapter sums up the methodological issues in the writing of international history, including the growth of intelligence studies, and the role of personalities.

This is a sparkling book, filled with insight and penetrating ideas. David Reynolds deals with complex matters but never in a complex style. His writing is as clear as his thinking. With a deep understanding of the scholarly literature, he guides us through a thicket of issues and events to a better understanding of what happened and why.

WW2 Derring Do

Did you know that "Churchill was undoubtedly the architect of the modern armoured division" (pp 27-28)? Neither did I, nor, I suspect, did Heinz Guderian or George Patton. And that is but an example of the basic problem with this volume—it seeks to tell one story (the subtitle) while rather falsely promoting another in the main title...not that Churchill's name hasn't been misused before.

At its core, this is the story of how Britain's overstretched army made use of a variety of technical devices and weapons to expand its role in the war in Western Europe, especially in 1944-45. "Hobart" in the subtitle is Major General Percy (what a name for a military figure—indeed he was widely known as "Hobo") Hobart. Often disliked by his peers for being acerbic, the irascible tank authority was in charge of what some dubbed "Churchill's Toy Factory." And this is primarily the tale of the British Army's 79th Armoured Division which Hobart commanded, and how it trained, went ashore on D-Day, and then moved across Europe until VE-Day. Put another way, this is more a unit history than another book about how Churchill ran the war.

And it's not a very well-written one at that. Suffering the problem of too many military books of bogging down under the weight of a tattoo of abbreviations and military unit designations, it is a hard slog for all but the most committed reader. Further, Delaforce often raises issues only to drop them and move on, leading to a choppy style of disconnected parts.
was the tank that carried a scissor field with heavy chains being waved helped to extend the reach and power encouraged new ideas—the "funnies" of maps (sometimes a mite hard to read) of too-few British and Canadian troops (the U.S. command generally shunned use of the innovations). Perhaps the best known was the "crab flail," where a tank would drive ahead into a mine field with heavy chains being waved ahead of it to blow up hidden mines. This was both quicker and far safer than individual mine detecting, especially under fire. Another innovation was the tank that carried a scissor bridge for crossing small streams. The DD tank or "schwim-panzer" allowed a heavy tank to proceed to a beachhead for crossing small streams. The CDL (canal defence light) tank carried a huge searchlight for night operations while others carried flame-throwers useful in attacking deeply entrenched enemy forces. Others, called AVREs (Armoured Vehicle Royal Engineers) carried sappers and other engineers and their equipment close to enemy fortifications to assure their destruction.

Most of the book consists of British small-unit actions, relating how the "funnies" worked under battlefield conditions, some of them better than others. Making good use of first-person quotes of men who were there, Delaforce illustrates how the various tank technologies helped to save Allied lives while punching through German defenses. The result is a book focused on almost the individual soldiers level, with all the confusion that limited line-of-sight provides.

The "secret" weapons were nothing of the sort, though they did provide an element of surprise when first utilized. Their story is of interest to those who were there (and their offspring), and to those concerned more with tactics than strategy. But don't let the Churchill references in the index fool you—this is largely Hobo Hobart's story of planning and perseverance.

--CHS

Older Titles Recalled: 
**HESP on a Grand Scale**

**JAMES R. LANCASTER**


In April 1956 Winston Churchill sent President Eisenhower the first volume of _A History of the English-Speaking Peoples_, writing, "I am afraid the Americans do not come into this volume because it was only in fourteen hundred and ninety-two, Columbus over the ocean flew." The fourth and final volume was published in 1958, to be followed by many different editions, abridgements, excerpted works and translations.

One variant of _HESP_ that stands out is the Purnell edition, published in 1968. It is neither an excerpt nor an abridgement. It is instead an expanded edition of _HESP_ where all the chapters in the original edition are supplemented, each one in turn, by additional chapters from other writers. Originally serialized in magazine format (seven large, clumsy binders were provided to house the collection), it appeared later as a complete set in red leatherette, with a rampant lion in gold on the cover. This is the edition which is reviewed here. If you are lucky you might find a set in a second-hand bookshop, and prices have not been forbidding. If you see a copy and have a foot of shelf space, do not pass it by.

Everything about this edition is on a grand scale, starting with the format: 8V2 by 12 inches. The 101 chapters from other writers. On die American Civil War, for example, Churchill's "Victory of the Union" chapter (Book XI, Chapter VII in the Cassell edition) is followed by Bruce Catton on "Atlanta to the Sea," John Terraine on the "Collapse of the Confederacy," Peter Young on "The First Modern War?," David Mason on "The Southern Conspiracy," and James P. Shenton "Damage and Reparations." This is a very thorough work.

All volumes follow a simple and effective pattern. Each of Churchill's 101 chapters is followed by four or five chapters from other writers. On the American Civil War, for example, Churchill's "Victory of the Union" chapter (Book XI, Chapter VII in the Cassell edition) is followed by Bruce Catton on "Atlanta to the Sea," John Terraine on the "Collapse of the Confederacy," Peter Young on "The First Modern War?," David Mason on "The Southern Conspiracy," and James P. Shenton "Damage and Reparations." This is a very thorough work.

Many of these added chapters are outstanding. For example, Churchill's chapter on "Washington, Adams and Jefferson" (Book IX, Chapter VIII in the Cassell edition) is followed by Marshall Smelser on the "Louisiana Purchase," which must be one of the
Not we the conquered! Not to us the blame
Of them that flee, of them that basely yield;
Nor ours the shout of victory, the fame
Of them that vanquish in a stricken field.

That day of battle in the dusty heat
We lay and heard the bullets swish and sing
Like scythes amid the over-ripened wheat,
And we the harvest of their garnering.

Some yielded, No, not we! Not we, we swear
By these our wounds; this trench upon the hill
Where all the shell-strewn earth is seamed and bare,
Was ours to keep; and lo! we have it still.

We might have yielded, even we, but death
Came for our helper; like a sudden flood
The crashing darkness fell; our painful breath
We drew with gasps amid the choking blood.

The roar fell faint and farther off, and soon
Sank to a foolish humming in our ears,
Like crickets in the long, hot afternoon
Among the wheat fields of the olden years.

Before our eyes a boundless wall of red
Shot through by sudden streaks of jagged pain!
Then a slow-gathering darkness overhead
And rest came on us like a quiet rain.

Not we the conquered! Not to us the shame,
Who hold our earthen ramparts, nor shall cease
To hold them ever; victors we, who came
In that fierce moment to our honoured peace.

PURNELL EDITION...
best short accounts of an extraordinary
story—how America doubled in size at
a cost of only $15 million, "the finest
bargain in American history," as
Churchill puts it.

Smelser supplies fascinating
details to the story, complete with
maps and illustrations, concluding with
one of its long-term implications:
"Ominous portents passed unnoticed:
the habitants of Louisiana had a guar-
antee of slave property, and more
Southerners than Northerners, in
1804, were interested in settling West
of the Mississippi. The question of
slavery in the Louisiana Purchase was
to provoke the Civil War."

Many chapters by other writers
cover social and economic aspects of
the history of the English-speaking peoples—a good editorial decision,
since one of the criticisms of Churchill's
original was that he neglected these
areas. Thus we are able to read, in the
appropriate place, chapters such as
"The March of Science," "Industrial
England," "Art in America," "The
Great Missionaries," "The Meaning of
Reform," "The Impact of Dickens,
"Victorian Education," "The English
Romantics," "Religious Emancipation,
"Handel and his Music" and
"Language from Shakespeare to
Johnson."

In this last article, those of us who
are orthographically challenged are re-
minded of those glorious days when
spelling was not important. For exam-
ple there are twice as many instances of
"honor" than "honour" in
Shakespeare's first folio edition of
1623. Norman Davis describes
admirably how the English language—
"copious without order, and energetic
without review," to use Dr. Johnson's
words—was put into shape and form
with the publication of the great
doclor's Dictionary of the English
Language in 1755.

Having started with Churchill's
comment about Columbus, let us go
back to an earlier comment of his
about Edward the Confessor. One of
Churchill's literary assistants, Bill
Deakin, is describing a scene at
Admiralty House in April 1940:

"Comes down to us faint, misty, frail": these are simple, well-ordered
words from a master craftsman. In the
Purnell edition of A History of the
English-Speaking Peoples, Churchill's
inimitable prose stands alongside that
of many other talented writers, each
with their own way of telling the
remarkable story of the English-speak-
ing peoples. The eminent editorial
board set the bar high. None of these
chapters will let you down.
by John McRae, 1895

Lt. Col. John McRae MD RCAMC became immortal for his World War I poem "In Flanders Fields," another Churchill favorite (FH121: 6). Born in Guelph, Ontario, he studied medicine on a scholarship at the University of Toronto, where he joined The Queen’s Own Rifles of Canada, and served in the artillery in the Second Boer War. Returning to North America, McRae was appointed professor of pathology at the University of Vermont. He taught there, and at McGill University in Montreal, until 1911, during which time he accompanied Lord Grey, the Governor General of Canada, on a canoe trip to Hudson’s Bay.

At the opening of World War I, McRae volunteered and fought on the Western Front. He was soon transferred to the medical corps and assigned to a hospital in France. He died of pneumonia while on active duty in 1918. His volume of poetry, In Flanders Fields and Other Poems, was published a year later.

McRae did not coin that favorite Churchill phrase, "stricken field," in stanza 1. Macaulay and Walter Scott preceded him. But it is more likely that WSC recalled it from this poem, written after the Jameson Raid, an unsuccessful attempt to spark an uprising by British expatriates (Uitlanders) against Boer authorities in the Transvaal, which led a few years later to the Second Boer War (1899-1902).

Churchill’s most memorable use of the "stricken field" was in his bravura second speech in the House of Commons, on 13 May 1901: "I am very glad the House has allowed me, after an interval of fifteen years, to raise the tattered flag I found lying on a stricken field." The "tattered flag" was his father Lord Randolph’s call in 1886 for economy: the issue over which Lord Randolph resigned. WSC’s first use, however, dates to two years earlier, when he wrote in The River War (1899) of the Dervish Emir Ahmed Fedil, receiving the news of "the stricken field" at Omdurman.¹

Churchill used the phrase again in Ian Hamilton’s March (1900), concerning the 1881 British defeat at Majuba: "...it was accepted as a stricken field,..."² Then he deployed it in My African Journey (1908), recalling the Sudanese domain whose downfall he had witnessed: "The Dervish empire, stretching from Wady Haifa or Abu Hamed to Wadelai, interposed a harsh barrier which nothing but a stricken field could sweep away."³

Years later, in 1939, Churchill’s steel trap memory brought forth the phrase twice. In April, on the 21st anniversary of Foch’s assuming command of the Allied Armies in World War I, he spoke of "a moment when the battle seemed a stricken field."⁴ A month later he added: "...the illustrious Marshal took command of the stricken field, and after a critical and even agonizing month, restored the fortunes of the war."⁵

Finally, in his History of the English-Speaking Peoples, recalling the Battle of Worcester, which Charles II lost to Cromwell, Churchill wrote: "To Charles II it afforded the most romantic adventure of his life. He escaped with difficulty from the stricken field; a thousand pounds was set upon his head."⁶

FH Senior Editor James Lancaster reminds us of an agreeable aside to all this in a letter from Pamela Plowden, Winston’s first love, to Lady Randolph Churchill towards the end of 1900: "Someone sent me an extract yesterday out of a Regimental Paper about Winston," Pamela wrote. "It is rather funny."

Churchill’s failed first attempt at Parliament, his early books chiding generals for their management of wars, and his account of escaping from Boer captivity, had made him famous, or at least notorious. In London to Ladysmith via Pretoria, Churchill had described hiding in the wilderness: "My sole companion was a gigantic vulture, who manifested an extravagant interest in my condition, and made hideous and ominous gurglings from time to time.

The words Pamela found, by a wag whose name is lost to history, provide an amusing finale to our charting of Churchill’s famous phrase

1. The River War, abridged and revised edition (London: Longmans, Green, 1902), 419.
2. Ian Hamilton’s March (London: Longmans Green, 1900), 113.
7. Pamela Plowden to Lady Randolph Churchill, 1900 (no other date). Randolph S. Churchill, ed., Winston S. Churchill, Companion Volume I, Part II (London: Heinemann, 1966), 1153. The Tugela is the principal river of Natal and Pamela seems to refer to a regimental newspaper called "Tugela Twaddle," although she was not quite sure, hence the question mark.

―RICHARD M. LANGWORTHY
THE UNTRODDEN FIELD IN POLITICS

BY WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, 1908

As spokesman for the reforming Liberal Government of 1906, Churchill made the case for the "Minimum Standard" and the Welfare State: "Science, physical and political alike, revolts at the disorganisation which glares at us in so many aspects of modern life. It is false and base to say that these evils, and others like them, too many here to set forth, are inherent in the nature of things...."

A student, Ryan Walsh, wrote us for Churchill’s essay "The Untrodden Field in Politics," published 7 March 1908 in The Nation. Ryan could not find it in the official biography and numerous other works he consulted. There is a reason.

As we learned, the piece never subsequently appeared, not even in The Collected Essays of Sir Winston Churchill. The Woods Bibliography had it as C34 and Ronald Cohen's Bibliography of the Writings of Sir Winston Churchill has it under "letters to the editor" as G109, explaining that it appeared in the column "Politics and Affairs." We appealed to Mr. Cohen for assistance and in due course he sent us the complete text, reproduced with care and accuracy from the 1908 original. He wrote: "You may have confidence in the capitalization and punctuation, both of which may appear odd from time to time."

We publish this unusual piece for the first time in 100 years, exactly as transcribed from pages 812-13 of The Nation of 7 March 1908, with thanks to Ronald Cohen and with grateful acknowledgement to the Churchill Literary estate and to Winston S. Churchill for permission to reproduce it in these pages. —EDITOR

SIR,—It is a year ago since your enterprise was launched. During the weeks that are gone, THE NATION has maintained a position of sober but unflinching Radicalism, and has steadily acquired a true political significance. The period has been highly favourable to the discussion of large basic questions, and not unfavourable to the progress of social thought. When a Liberal and Radical administration is actually in being, when adventurous and extensive legislative proposals are being canvassed and debated in the country and in Parliament, when any proposal for reform, however Utopian, is received with a measure of sympathy and interest, all parties and all persons are forced to turn their minds to these dominant domestic topics. Even the most conservative of mankind are compelled to address themselves to purely social issues. The more active, earnest, or embittered the opponents of Liberal and reconstructive ideas become, the more they are constrained to descend into an arena which we have smoothed and sanded, and engage with weapons and upon ground of which we have made the choice. The consequences of this concentration of many different and conflicting forces upon home questions, far reaching and to some extent incalculable, as they would in any case be, become all the more striking in contrast with the period of foreign and colonial activity to which they have succeeded. They comprise a complete change in political values, in the point of view from which public men judge and are themselves judged, and in the style and language of Parliamentary debate and party tactics.

This considerable revolution has been intimately connected with Mr. Chamberlain’s Fiscal propaganda. Until the year 1903, the whole enormous force of the Conservative Party had been continuously exerted in allaying discontent among the masses of the people, in counselling patience, and in extolling the established system of society. Conservative working-men were exhorted to contrast the good conditions prevailing in Great Britain with the evils of foreign lands, to compare...
the standards of wages and comfort with those of forty or fifty years ago, and to seek relief from any hardships and restrictions incidental to their daily life in the contemplation of the glittering spectacle of Imperial power beyond the seas. The Liberal Party, on the other hand, had been accustomed to dwell on the reverse of the medal, and to urge with varying success the sufferings and the injustices of the poor. The irruption of the Tariff Campaign produced automatically a violent shifting, amounting relatively almost to a reversal of these positions. The Conservative Party, through all its organs and from all its platforms, began to raise the cry of discontent and fundamental change. The very forces which had previously restrained, now became a vehement forward impulse. The poor were reminded of their sufferings. The mass of the nation were urged into active protest. On all sides we heard it proclaimed by persons of high rank or substantial wealth, that England was being ruined, that the rewards of industry were unevenly and unfairly distributed, that unemployment was rife and increasing, and that nothing short of an economic revolution would repair the social balance.

In its first beginnings, the defence of Free Trade naturally took the form of correcting extravagant assertions made with the object of showing that British trade was actually or relatively in decline; and Liberal speakers were everywhere occupied in presenting long files of reassuring statistics to anxious and inquiring crowds. In the upshot, a good many people have made up their minds, among other things, that British producers have no difficulty, in spite of hostile tariffs, in placing their exports; that British consumers and producers alike enjoy the advantage of a rich and varied home market, over which a moderate range of prices prevails; that fluctuations of enterprise and employment are less frequent and less violent than in the great Protected States; and that, after making all conceivable allowances for dissimilarity in conditions, the general standards of life and labour in the British Isles are improving and not inferior. But although the imminent danger, as it seemed, of a reversion to a Protective Tariff imposed this task, and although the facts established are true and salutary, the defensive role of moderator was not congenial to a democratic and Radical Party, and cannot but be out of harmony with its essential character. This discordance, inevitable though it was, transient as it has been, was in itself sufficient to carry Socialism from the regions of obscure philosophy to a permanent place in actual politics.

In proportion as the peril of reaction into a capitalist tariff became more remote, the progressive forces were able again to resume their forward march. The strange perversion of Tory politics still continues, and the influence of wealth is daily exerted to prove—and with great success—how uneven is its distribution. But Radicalism is back again in the collar. The forces grouped around the present Administration, and upon which it depends, are now strong enough, if boldly commanded, not only to ward off the dangers of Protection, but at the same time to urge forward the social march. And no one who serves the cause of progress need regret the assistance which its traditional opponents, from whatever motives, are now giving it. Unexpected and unnatural as the pressure of Tory-voiced discontent may be, it is susceptible of a useful and effective application to the purposes of social reconstruction. The blow which was aimed to throw, and nearly threw, the democratic engine off the line, has in glancing become itself a contributory impulse, and never before was the available driving power so great, and the available resisting power so inert. Now, if ever, is the time.

While these curious changes have been occupying the attention of the party world, a not less important modification has been consummated in the internal conception of the Liberal Party. It has not abandoned in any respect its historic championship of Liberty, in all its forms under every sky; but it has become acutely conscious of the fact that political freedom, however precious, is utterly incomplete without a measure at least of social and economic independence. This realisation is not confined to our islands. It is taking hold of men's minds as it never has before, in every popularly governed State. All over the world the lines of cleavage are ceasing to be purely political, and are becoming social and economic. The present majority in the House of Commons is pervaded by a social spirit, which is all the more lively and earnest because it has yet to find clear-cut and logical formulae of particular expression. A great body of opinion is slowly moving forward, conscious of possessing in its midst a vital truth, conscious, too, of the almost superhuman difficulty of affording to it any definition at once sufficiently comprehensive and precise. It is for this reason that no hard and fast line can be drawn between the varied elements which constitute the strength of the present Government upon any ground of political theory. No true classification can be made in the abstract between Liberals and Radicals, or between Radicals and Labour representatives. It is only when confronted with some concrete fact that clear decisions can be taken. And hitherto most of the issues that have arisen have only served to demonstrate the general solidarity.

It is in such a situation, party and national, that the movement towards a Minimum Standard may well take conscious form. It is a mood rather than a policy; but it is a mood which makes it easy to perceive the correlation of many various sets of ideas, and to refer all sorts of isolated acts of legislation to one central and common test. Two clear lines of advance open before us: corrective, by asserting the just precedence of public >>
THE UNTRODDEN FIELD IN POLITICS...

interests over private interests; and constructive, by supplying the patent inadequacy of existing social machinery. It is this latter work which has lately attracted an increasing measure of attention throughout the country.

Science, physical and political alike, revolts at the disorganisation which glares at us in so many aspects of modern life. We see the curse of unregulated casual employment steadily roting the under side of the labour market. We see the riddles of employment and underemployment quite unsolved. There are mighty trades which openly assert the necessity of a labour surplus—"on hand" in the streets and round the dock gates—for the ordinary commercial convenience of their business. And they practise what they preach. There are political philosophers who complacently resigned themselves to the doctrine of the residuum. There are other industries which prey upon the future. Swarms of youths, snatched from school at the period in life when training should be most careful and discipline most exacting, are flung into a precocious manhood, and squander their most precious years in erratic occupations, which not only afford no career for them in after life, but sap and demoralise that character without which no career can be discovered or pursued. Thousands of children grow up not nourished sufficiently to make them effective citizens, or even to derive benefit from die existing educational arrangements. Thousands of boys are exploited in depressing men's wages, and are discharged when they demand such wages for themselves. The military obligations of foreign nations take two or three years from the life of every man, and ought thereby to give the dwellers in this island a mastery in peaceful craftsmanship over the whole world. All this inestimable advantage runs thriftlessly to waste. The army system is itself to a very large extent a pauperising machine, nicely calculated to take the best years from the lives of its servants with the minimum obligation to the State.

It is false and base to say that these evils, and others like them, too many here to set forth, are inherent in the nature of things, that their remedy is beyond the wit of man, that experiment is foolhardy, that all is for the best in "Merrie England." No one will believe it any more. That incredulity is one of the most noteworthy features in the evolution of public opinion to-day. The nation, which is greater than either party, demands the application of drastic corrective and curative processes, and will crown with confidence and honour any party which has the strength and wisdom necessary for that noble crusade.

We are already in battle on more than one point in this large field. The Licensing Bill comes to grips not only with the excessive consumption of strong drink, but with the unwarranted assertions of private interest. The Trade Disputes Act is a charter to Trades Unionism, and to all the social insurance that Trades Unionism involves. The Land Acts, some past, others on the anvil, open to the people a new sphere for enterprise and exertion, and tend to afford a healthy stability to the Commonwealth.

But the future offers larger hopes and sterner labours. We have to contemplate the serious undertaking by the State of the elimination of casual employment through the agency of Labour Exchanges, and the scientific treatment, in every conceivable classification, of any unabsorbed residuum that may exist. The House of Commons has unanimously approved the institution of Wages Boards in certain notoriously "sweated" industries. [extra closing quotation marks are as printed] and this principle may be found capable of almost indefinite extension in those industries which employ parasitically underpaid labour. We have to seek, whether through the acquisition of the railways or canals, or by the development of certain national industries like Afforestation, the means of counterbalancing the natural fluctuations of world trade. We have by an altogether unprecedented expansion in technical colleges and continuation schools, to train our youth in the skill of the hand, as well as in arts and letters, and to give them a far greater degree of discipline in mind and body. We have to make that provision for the aged which compassion demands and policy approves.

It is certain that as we enter upon these untrodden fields of British politics we shall need the aid of every moral and religious force which is alive in England to-day. Sacrifices will be required from every class in the population; the rich must contribute in money and the poor in service, if their children are to tread a gentler path towards a fairer goal. A fiscal system which prudently but increasingly imposes the necessary burdens of the State upon unearned wealth will not only be found capable of providing the funds which will be needed, but will also stimulate enterprise in production. And thus from many quarters we may work towards the establishment of that Minimum Standard below which competition cannot be allowed, but above which it may continue healthy and free, to vivify and fertilise the world.

It is because the influence of THE NATION may be powerful to aid and further these causes, that I send you my good wishes and congratulations to-day.—I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully,

Winston S. Churchill

"The nation, which is greater than either party, will crown with confidence and honour any party which has the strength and wisdom necessary for that noble crusade."
JAMES LANCASTER'S
Jim Lancaster welcomes reader input and comments: jimlancaster@wanadoo.fr

Each quiz includes four questions in each of six categories: Churchill contemporaries (C), literary matters (L), miscellaneous (M), personal details (P), statesmanship (S) and war (W), with the easier questions first. Can you reach Level 1?

Level 4:
1. How old was Churchill when he died? (P)
2. What is the name of Churchill's country home in Kent? (M)
3. Who was Winston's nanny? (C)
4. What Churchill novel appeared in 1900? (L)
5. What was the name of the nuclear submarine which Lady Soames launched at Barrow-in-Furness on 20 December 1968? (W)
6. What is the title of Volume IV of The Second World War? (L)

Level 3:
7. Over eighty cartoonists have depicted Churchill at various times. Six were prolific. Name one of them. (L)
8. Where did Churchill spend his twenty-fifth birthday? (W)
9. Which two respected British media organisations were consistently hostile to Churchill in the 1930s? (M)
10. In 1953 Churchill told his doctor Lord Moran, "I shall lay an egg a year." What did he mean? (L)
11. Whom did Churchill call "UJ"? (C)
12. In 1929, Churchill wrote to his wife: "Only one goal still attracts me, and if that were barred I shd quit the dreary field for pastures new." Where were the new pastures? (P)

Level 2:
13. While Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, to where did Churchill travel in 1907? (S)
14. When did Churchill write to his mother: "What an extraordinary people the Americans are. Their hospitality is a revelation to me"? (M)
15. Which American President did Churchill meet on 19 October 1929? (C)
16. Which was Churchill's favourite American hymn? (M)
17. In which famous speech in 1946 did Churchill say "One by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."? (S)

Level 1:
18. In 1918 Churchill wrote of a notable French statesman: "His spirit and energy were indomitable." To whom did he refer? (C)
19. Of which war did Churchill write: "Ah, horrible war, amazing medley of the glorious and the squalid, the pitiful and the sublime. If modern men of light and leading saw your face closer, simple folk would see it hardly ever"? (W)
20. On 4 April 1955 Jock Colville said that Churchill suddenly stared at him and said with vehemence: "I don't believe Anthony can do it." Who was Anthony, and what was "it"? (S)
21. "If Hitler invaded Hell I would at least make a favourable reference to the Devil in the House of Commons." To what event did Churchill refer? (W)
22. When did Churchill describe the essentials of life as "Hot baths, cold champagne, new peas & old brandy"? (P)
23. Where was Winston Churchill staying when he wrote to his wife (17 October 1909): "Yesterday morning I had half eaten a kipper when a huge maggot crept out & flashed his teeth at me"? (P)
24. Who was probably the first Member of Parliament to use the word "appeasement" in a political context? (S)

Answers
1. Winston Churchill (C)
2. Winston Churchill (S)
3. Winston Churchill (W)
4. Winston Churchill (P)
5. Winston Churchill (L)
6. Winston Churchill (M)
7. Winston Churchill (S)
8. Winston Churchill (W)
9. Winston Churchill (P)
10. Winston Churchill (L)
11. Winston Churchill (S)
12. Winston Churchill (W)
13. Winston Churchill (P)
14. Winston Churchill (L)
15. Winston Churchill (W)
16. Winston Churchill (P)
17. Winston Churchill (M)
18. Winston Churchill (C)
19. Winston Churchill (C)
20. Winston Churchill (C)
21. Winston Churchill (S)
22. Winston Churchill (W)
23. Winston Churchill (P)
24. Winston Churchill (M)

FINESHT HOUR 137/61
The 1995 Touchstone paperback edition of My Early Life (for long the only edition in print in the USA) contains a somewhat problematic introduction by the late William Manchester. Some professors advise students not to read it—but of course, who can resist?

(Before you send us an email, yes! Defender of the Realm, Volume III of Manchester's The Last Lion continues to develop, under the hand of his friend Paul Reid, who tells us he hopes to have it completed by mid-2008.)

Errors in the Manchester introduction to the Touchstone My Early Life should be noted. The repetition of George Moore's salacious assertion that Churchill's mother "slept with two hundred men" is regrettable. Though Manchester states, "That figure is far too high," the seeds of aspersion are cast...and recast. (See also our review of American Jennie, page 50.)

On page xi, “fl.000,000” should read “£1,000,000,” and on page xv, "Land of Hope and Glory" should be in italics.

Manchester notes (pg. ix) research on Jennie's mothering by FH editor Richard Langworth, who was asked to vet his introduction: "I suggested he tone down the point that Winston was ignored by his parents. I believe his situation was little worse than it was for most middle- and upper-class Victorian children, though young Winston's sensitive nature probably reacted more strongly to it than most of his fellows. WSC's nephew Peregrine showed me numerous entries recording how she read to, played with, took walks with, and was concerned about, Winston and Jack." Some of this appeared in Finest Hour #98. The dates of the diary entries are however revealing, as it seems certain his parents visited him little, if at all, during his years away at school when his youthful letters poignantly plead for his mother and father to "...try and come down." Equally frequent were his pleas for extra allowance and other indulgences.

Modern historians have soundly established that Churchill took certain liberties with episodes in his autobiography. Young Winston was scarcely the school dunce he suggests he was; Peregrine Churchill said "he was a very naughty boy, and his parents were most concerned about him." His entry into Sandhurst, and in due course into the cavalry, were rather less than personal triumphs. Nonetheless, Churchill found he could learn quickly enough if the material interested him.

Professor James Muller advises readers to consider the state of the world in the last years of the 1920s as Churchill recalls his youth and writes this book. Muller describes Britain in 1930 in a state of exhaustion from the Great War. Average people were still struggling to put their private lives back together. Britons were looking inward, into themselves, and not outward to the world and to the future. Muller believes that Churchill found this disagreeable, particularly as a model for the young. He wanted to encourage youth to look ahead to opportunity, and, above all, to action.

Perhaps the most egregious omission from the Touchstone Edition is Churchill's original dedication, "To a new generation." When he was 23 years old, Finest Hour contributor Robert Courts wrote: "I have read My Early Life at least ten times, and am still astounded by its wit and charm, its breadth of thinking, and above all by how much Churchill managed to pack into his life—the early years in particular. As he says: 'Twenty to twenty-five! These are the years! Don't be content with things as they are.' There can be no better example and inspiration to young people of how to go out and get what you want."
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"Going to the Country?"

"I think it would be a calamity if we did anything to prevent the economic use of charabancs. *"
—Sir Eric Geddes, Minister of Transport 1919-21

*An early form of autobus, used chiefly for pleasure trips. The first entry in the Oxford English Dictionary is in 1832: "Tourists bound for Chamouny...hire a char-à-banc, which resembles an outsize jaunting-car bisected lengthwise."

First "Bane." Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Churchill.

Second "Bane." Sir Eric Geddes, Mr. Shortt, Mr. Long, Sir Robert Home, Col. Leopold Amery.

Third "Bane." Mr. Illingworth, Lord E. Talbot, Mr. Fisher, Dr. Addison, Sir Gordon Hewart.

Fourth "Bane." Mr. Kellaway, Sir M. Barlow, Sir L. Worthington Evans, Sir A.G. Boscowen, Mr. Towyn Jones.

Fifth "Bane." Sir Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Baldwin, Sir James Craig, Mr. Denis Henry, Mr. Neal.

Sixth "Bane." Mr. Montagu, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. McCurdy, Mr. Ian Macpherson, Sir A. Mond?

Only the best scholars among our readers will be able to identify the positions, roles and deeds of all the magnificoes here depicted. The first "bane" is easy—but they get harder from there on.

Sir Eric Geddes (1875-1937) was a Conservative MP, famous for the words, "we shall squeeze the German lemon until the pips squeak," spoken during a rally before the Versailles Peace Conference in an effort to stir up support for harsh restitution.