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FROM THE EDITOR

“Churchill, Judaism, and Islam”

The Middle East is never not in the news. Winston Churchill’s involvement with the Jewish and Moslem worlds, however, began well before his first extended travels in the region and continued throughout his long life. His association with both cultures greatly influenced him, and his own impact upon the Middle East remains strong today.

The upheaval of the First World War destroyed the centuries-old Ottoman Empire. Churchill emerged as the key figure in the reconfiguration of the Middle East following the end of Turkish colonial rule. Warren Dockter describes how the counsel of T.E. Lawrence influenced Churchill’s decision making.

Churchill’s fulfillment of the pledge made in the Balfour Declaration opened the way for the establishment of a new nation for the Jewish people in their ancient homeland. Progress towards this goal became inextricably linked with the rise of Nazi Germany and the ensuing tragedy of the Holocaust. David Patterson illustrates these developments and Churchill’s reactions to them. Trying, and with much success, to influence Churchill along the way was Chaim Weizmann. Fred Glueckstein describes the relationship between Britain’s self-proclaimed “Zionist” prime minister and the first President of Israel.

Many people have seen the dramatization of *The Diary of Anne Frank* on stage or film. Not so many people have read the diary itself although it has been translated into many languages and millions of copies are in print. Thus readers may be surprised to learn that one of the people whom *Anne Frank* most admired was Winston Churchill, as we show with the relevant passages. Churchill’s Philo-Semitism undoubtedly came in part from his father Lord Randolph. David Lough describes the investment scheme the elder Churchill developed with the support of the Rothschilds that provided something of a family nest egg.

Probably the highlight of this year’s thirty-second annual Churchill conference was the speech delivered by the Imam Ahmed Abdel Rahman El Mahdi, the grandson of the same Mahdi whose rebellion in Sudan precipitated the River War of 1898 involving a young Lieutenant Churchill. The call of the Imam for a peaceful understanding and relationship between Islam and other faiths was followed by a standing ovation.

Our review section includes two television documentaries and a strategy board game as well as thirteen books.

Finally, we began this year marking the fiftieth anniversary of Churchill’s death. We end with the reflections of the Reverend Canon Adrian Daffern, Rector at St. Martin’s, Bladon, the final resting place of Churchill and his family.

David Freeman, October 2015
Finest Hour 169

Remarkable Work
PALOS VERDES, CA—I am glad to see Jeremy Wilson’s explanation of Churchill’s prefatory note for the 1954 Home Letters of T. E. Lawrence and His Brothers. This is an interesting and rare episode because, unlike so many politicians then and now, Churchill was inclined to write his own letters and speeches. I took down from its shelf my copy of the Home Letters, read its prefatory note again, and am struck by what an excellent imitation it is of Churchill’s style. And what a coup to have Jeremy Wilson aboard Finest Hour! In addition to his biography of Lawrence, his publications for Castle Hill Press are also major contributions to Lawrence scholarship. I expect many readers will want to get the forthcoming edition of Lawrence’s correspondence with political elites, which I believe will include pretty much all of Churchill’s correspondence with Lawrence.

—Paul Alkon

High Ground
INDIAN WELLS, CA—Charles Edward Dixon’s depiction of Australian and New Zealand soldiers landing at Anzac Cove, which accompanies Harry Atkinson’s admirable article about the Dardanelles on pages 10–11, shows how close the high ground was to the landing beaches. I noticed this striking similarity of the terrain at Anzac with that at Omaha Beach while on recent visits to both.

In each case a steep hill lays directly behind the beach providing an ideal defensive position. The assault at Omaha was supported by a massive and effective naval bombardment provided by eleven American and British destroyers firing from close inshore. This enabled the US V Corps to reach high ground and advance inland, albeit with heavy casualties. Dixon depicts a heavy bombardment by accompanying warships. I would be interested to learn more details about the bombardment at Anzac.

—David Ramsay

Readers who may be able to provide information about David Ramsay’s inquiry are encouraged to contact the editor.

Russian Tribute
NABEREZHNYE CHELNY—Hello. I am a Russian artist living in Tatarstan. I have created the enclosed illustration [below] of Sir Winston Churchill and would be happy to have it published by The Churchill Centre in Finest Hour. Yours faithfully—Farit Rassam
Sir Winston Churchill was known for his foresight. Just as he saw the gathering storm over Europe long before the Second World War broke out, so he understood early on the singularity of what we now call the Holocaust, Shoah, Churban, Final Solution, Judenvernichtung, or simply, in Paul Celan’s words, “that which happened.” In his radio broadcast of 24 August 1941, just two months after the Einsatzgruppen killing units began the systematic murder of the Jewish people, Churchill announced that Jews in “whole districts are being exterminated,” adding, “We are in the presence of a crime without a name.”

Well before the Nazis were gassing and burning Jews in the six extermination camps a year later, Churchill understood that what was to be called the Holocaust was something more than mass murder, something more than the annihilation of a people. Unlike most others, he had some sense of just what the Nazis set out to exterminate in their total extermination of the Jews, from Tromsø to Tunis, namely, the millennial teaching and testimony that the Jewish people represent by their very presence in the world.

Churchill’s insight into this aspect of the nameless crime can be seen in his view of the Zionists’ effort to seek a haven for the Jews in the Land of the Covenant. When as First Lord of the Admiralty he first met with Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann on 19 September 1914, he compared Weizmann to “an Old Testament prophet.” On 8 November 1931 the Sunday Chronicle published his piece “Moses: The Leader of a People.” Moses, said Churchill, was “the greatest of the prophets, who spoke in person to the God of Israel” and “received from God that remarkable code upon which the religious, moral, and social life of the nation was so securely fastened.”

Drawing a parallel between the Exodus and the Zionist movement of his contemporary world, “Churchill drew a further, yet more chilling, analogy,” notes Jonathan Rose: “Ultimately, he concluded, the Pharaoh resorted to genocide: the murder of Hebrew male infants. At this time the British press was aware of, and generally repelled by, Hitler’s anti-Semitism, but it is difficult to think of anyone else who foresaw that it would end in Holocaust….Churchill may have been the first to make that connection, consciously or unconsciously.” Even then he knew that the conflict to come was of metaphysical proportions, one in which good was to collide with evil.

Sacred History

Churchill’s sense of sacred history informed his view of Zionist history, as well as his understanding of the implications of the Holocaust. His undying support for the Balfour Declaration of 2 November 1917, in which Arthur Balfour assured the Zionists of Britain’s commitment to the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, was based on his realization that from such a haven, the Jewish people might once again emanate the light of the “remarkable code” of Moses unto the nations. Thus in his speech of March 1921 on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem he declared to the Jews, “The hope of your race for so many centuries will be gradually realized here, not only for your own good but for the good of all the world.”

Years later, standing before the House of Commons in January 1949, Churchill averred, “The coming into being of a Jewish State in Palestine is an event in world history to be viewed in the perspective not of a generation or a century, but in the perspective of a thousand, two thousand, or even three thousand years.” In the words of Martin Gilbert, “no petty calculation of ephemeral diplomatic loss or gain drew him to Zionism; for him it belonged to the great tide of history.” For Churchill, the great tide of history was the tide of sacred history. This understanding of Zionism shaped Churchill’s understanding of the Holocaust.

The German Pogrom

On 13 April 1933, right after Hitler’s Nazi government had passed a law barring Jews from political office, Churchill warned the House of Commons that all hope for a German democracy “has been swept away. You have a dictatorship—a most
grim dictatorship.” In the course of 1933 the Nazis passed a series of anti-Semitic laws designed ultimately to legislate the Jews out of existence. By the end of 1933 approximately 37,000 of Germany’s 523,000 Jews had left; by September 1939 the number of German Jews fleeing their homeland rose to 282,000. Most of them, however, were unable to get out of Europe; when thirty-two countries convened the Evian Conference on 6 July 1938 to address the Jewish refugee problem, they decided to table that item of discussion. The world had closed its doors to the Jews even as steps toward the extermination of European Jewry proceeded apace.

The infamous Nuremberg Laws were passed on 15 September 1935, thirty thousand Jews were arrested on Kristallnacht on 9–10 November 1938, and, following the invasion of Poland on 1 September 1939, the first ghetto was established in Piotrków on 28 October. Such was the context in which the British, holding the League of Nations Mandate in Palestine, dealt with their own Jewish Question.

Britain’s Jewish Question

Arab unrest in Palestine was also part of the conundrum in which the British found themselves as the Nazis moved steadily towards war. It began when Haj Amin al-Husseini incited the first riots against the Jews in April 1920 and again in May 1921, just after he had been appointed Mufti of Jerusalem. When Churchill received an Arab delegation in 1921 asking him to repudiate the Balfour Declaration, he refused. A year later he issued the White Paper of 1922 reassuring the Arabs that the Balfour Declaration would deprive them of nothing, saying that the Jews had a place in their ancestral lands “as of right not of sufferance….For the fulfillment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration.” Riots broke out again in 1929 and culminated in the Mufti’s Arab Revolt of 1936–39, as the Jewish refugee crisis continued to intensify.

On 11 November 1936 the Peel Commission arrived in Palestine to explore causes and solutions to the Arab unrest. On 25 November Chaim Weizmann testified before the Commission, saying, “Today almost six million Jews…are doomed to be pent up in places where they are not wanted, for whom the world is divided into places where they cannot live and places where they cannot enter.” Quick to perceive the urgency of the situation, on 24 March 1936 Churchill urged Parliament to allow as many Jews into Palestine as necessary. Addressing the Peel Commission on 12 March 1937, he insisted, “We did not adopt Zionism entirely out of altruistic love of starting a Zionist colony: it was a matter of great importance to this country [Britain].”

Heeding Churchill’s admonition, on 7 July 1937 the Peel Commission published its report; the commissioners recognized the threat posed to the Jews who were desperate to leave Europe and asserted that “restrictions on Jewish immigration will not solve the Palestine problem.” Although at the time Churchill opposed it, the Commission recommended partition as the only viable solution to the tensions between the Jews and the Arabs. Desperate for a safe haven, the Jews reluctantly favored the recommendation, and the Arabs refused it with a vehemence that led to Malcolm MacDonald’s White Paper of 1939.
Shutting the Door

The House of Commons approved the White Paper on 23 May by a vote of 268 to 179. It allowed 75,000 Jewish immigrants to enter Palestine over a period of five years—the years of the extermination of European Jewry—after which Jewish immigration would require Arab consent. In the halls of Parliament, “Churchill spoke with force and bitterness against what he believed was both a betrayal of the Balfour Declaration and a shameful act of appeasement.”

Al-Husseini’s instigation of the Arab Revolt of 1936–39 is well known; what is not so well known and what Churchill knew is that without funding from Germany, the Mufti could never have engineered the uprising, as he himself later asserted. The bond between the Muslims of Palestine and Nazi propaganda can also be seen in the fact that during the Arab revolt they distributed Arabic language leaflets decorated with the swastika. This intimate bond between National Socialism and the Jihadist revolt was rooted in their mutual hatred of the Jews. The Nazi-Jihadist bond of Jew hatred ran so deep that on 18 June 1936 Vicco von Bülow-Schwante of the German Foreign...

Winston Churchill (right), Sir Herbert Samuel (middle), and Emir Abdullah (left of Samuel) at Government House reception on 28 March 1921, Jerusalem
Ministry informed the German Embassy in Cairo that “the Nuremberg race laws are aimed only at the Jews,” something of which Churchill was well aware.22

Equally aware of Nazi intentions to exterminate the Jews, Churchill insisted that throughout the war “no permanent restriction on Jewish immigration should be imposed” and that “the future of Palestine should be determined at a peace conference after the war.”23 Just days following his speech before Parliament opposing the MacDonald White Paper, on 27 May, the MS St. Louis, carrying 915 Jewish refugees from Germany, arrived in Havana, only to be refused entry; the United States also turned the refugees away, and Britain allowed only 288 to disembark. Of those that remained, 227 were murdered by the Nazis.24 The Jews were trapped, and, to his dismay, Churchill knew it.

Britain’s Zionist Prime Minister

At a meeting of the War Cabinet on 12 February 1940 Churchill pushed for arming the Jews of Palestine and enlisting them in the war effort, but to no avail.25 His urging that the Jews should possess arms to protect themselves from Arabs sympathetic to the Nazi project of extermination also fell on deaf ears.26 “In Churchill’s mind, the Jewish fate in Europe and the Jewish future in Palestine were inextricably linked…. At no point during his wartime premiership were Churchill’s sympathies to Zionist aspirations shared by the majority of his Cabinet.”27

Once again Churchill stood alone on the right side of history. This time, however, he was able to do something about it: in 1943 he managed to effect a change in British policy that enabled several thousand Jews to enter Palestine from the Balkans, irrespective of quotas.28 Further, in 1944 Churchill promoted the establishment of a military contingent of Jews from Palestine.29 On 3 July of that year the British government consented, and on 20 September the formation of such a unit was announced. Wearing the yellow star as their insignia, the soldiers of the Jewish Brigade took part in the Spring Offensive of 1945. They searched for Holocaust survivors, provided them with aid, and assisted in their immigration to Palestine. They played a key role in the efforts to help Jews escape Europe for British Mandated Palestine, an effort many of its members were to continue after the Brigade disbanded.

Meanwhile the Warsaw Ghetto was sealed on 15 November 1940. On 1 March 1941 SS head Heinrich Himmler ordered the construction of Birkenau. On 31 July Hermann Göring ordered Reinhard Heydrich to proceed with the implementation of the Final Solution. On 28 November 1941 Haj Amin al-Husseini had his first meeting with Adolf Hitler to discuss the extermination of the Jews. On 8 December Chelmno extermination camp went into operation. Then came the Wannsee Conference on 20 January 1942, where Heydrich convened fourteen ministers of the Reich to discuss the logistics of the extermination of the Jews of Europe. And so the other extermination camps carried out the directive from Berlin: Sobibor, Belzec, and Birkenau in March, Majdanek in April, and Treblinka in June. Whereas the Jews of Palestine longed to join the fight, and Churchill was their advocate, the Jews did not wait but staged their own uprisings: the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising on 19 April 1943, the uprising in Treblinka on 2 August, in Sobibor on 14 October, in Birkenau on 7 October 1944, and in Chelmno on 17 January 1945.

The Prophet of Truth

Throughout the war years Churchill’s voice was the loudest in sounding the alarm and raising the outcry over the Nazis’ systematic annihilation of the Jewish people. On 14 November 1941, after reports on the actions of the Einsatzgruppen had been released, he wrote to the Jewish Chronicle: “None has suffered more cruelly than the Jews the unspeakable evils wrought on the bodies and spirits of men by Hitler and his vile regime. The Jew bore the brunt of the Nazis’ first onslaught upon the citadels of freedom and human dignity. He has borne and continues to bear a burden that might have seemed to be beyond endurance.”30 Yes, bodies and spirits: Churchill understood, when very few others could fathom it, the targeting not only of the body but also of the soul of Israel—that is what was at stake in the Zionists’ cause: not just the lives of human beings but the very meaning and sanctity of the life of the human being, as affirmed by the millennial testimony of the Jewish people to all of humanity.

Soon after the mass deportations to the extermination camps were underway, Churchill declared before the House of Commons on 8 September 1942 that the Nazis were engaged in “the most bestial, the most squalid and the most senseless of all their offences…. This tragedy fills me with astonishment as well as with indignation, and it illustrates as nothing else can the utter degradation of the Nazi nature and theme.”31 Churchill followed this speech with a letter dated 29 October 1942 to William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: “The systematic cruelties to which the Jewish people—men, women, and children—have been exposed under the Nazi regime are amongst the most terrible events in history, and place an indelible stain upon all who perpetrate and instigate them. Free men and women denounce these vile crimes, and when this world struggle ends with the enthronement of
human rights, racial persecution will be ended.”

At a time when few among the leaders of the world raised their voices specifically on behalf of the Jews, Churchill made it clear that the Jews were singled out as victims.

**Supporting the Promised Land**

Once the war had come to an end, notes Martin Gilbert, “the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine would be one of Churchill’s main post-war tasks and challenges, and...he had the historical justification as well as the determination and skill to bring the State into being.” By that time Churchill had become the Leader of the Opposition to the new Prime Minister Clement Attlee. The Jews of Palestine declared statehood on 14 May 1948. However, Gilbert points out, “after six months of Jewish statehood Britain’s Labour Government still refused to recognize the State of Israel. On 3 October 1948, during a speech at a Conservative Party rally in North Wales, Churchill declared, ‘The Socialists, more than any other Party in the State, have broken their word in Palestine and by indescribable mis-management have brought us into widespread hatred and disrepute there and in many parts of the world.’”

While the United Kingdom’s de facto recognition of the Jewish State came on 13 May 1949, its de jure recognition was delayed until 28 April 1950. In that same year, notes Jonathan Rose, “Israel’s ambassador to Britain, would report that Churchill spoke warmly of how the Jews organized their survival for millennia around the Old Testament. Churchill urged the new state to ‘preserve close association with the book’—speaking as someone whose statecraft had always been closely associated with books.”

Sir Winston Churchill’s sense of history was informed by a sense of sacred history grounded not only in books but also in the Book. Not only was he a friend to the Jewish people in the Zionists’ effort to escape the horrors of the Holocaust, but he joined them in their centuries-old testimony to the very human sanctity and human dignity that the Nazis targeted for extermination. Far more profoundly than any other leader among the Allies, Churchill fought a war not only against the German army but also against the Nazis’ systematic extermination of the Jews. While he may not have been able to put a stop to the murder of the Six Million, he never ceased to affirm the unfathomable significance of the emergence of the Jewish State from the ashes. In 1961, thirty years after he had penned his piece “Moses: The Leader of a People,” he gave a copy of the article to Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion.

---

**Endnotes**

3. The six camps designed specifically for the extermination of the Jews were Chelmno, Majdanek, Sobibor, Belzec, Treblinka, and Auschwitz-Birkenau; all of them were located in Poland.
5. Ibid.
10. Ibid., p. 99.
15. Ibid., p. 112.
17. Ibid., pp. 78–79.
27. Ibid., pp. 188–89.
31. Ibid., pp. 450–51.
32. Ibid., p. 485.
34. Ibid., p. 278.
On 9 December 1905, Winston Churchill, was given his first government post by Prime Minister Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman as the new Under-Secretary for the Colonies. As then required by law, an MP taking a government position had to contest his parliamentary seat in a by-election. The next day, 10 December 1905, Churchill was electioneering as the key speaker at a Manchester North West public protest meeting on the ill treatment of Jews in Russia.

As a third of the Manchester North West electorate was Jewish, a gathering of Jewish residents was present to hear Churchill speak. On the meeting's podium when Churchill spoke was a Jewish chemist and Zionist named Dr. Chaim Weizmann.1

With the general election of January 1906 close at hand, Churchill later approached Weizmann through his representative to help swing the Jewish vote in his favour in Manchester. Weizmann, although he recognized Churchill's authority, was disinclined to intervene so overtly in British politics, and he just referred the matter to David Wolffsohn, President of the Zionist Organization. Shortly afterwards, Weizmann met with Churchill “for a brief, introductory and uneventful talk.”2

“Can You Make It?”

During the First World War, Winston Churchill and Chaim Weizmann again crossed paths in Manchester. As the war intensified, Churchill, as First Lord of the Admiralty, faced an increased shortage of acetone, the solvent used in making cordite, which was the essential naval explosive. The head of the Admiralty’s powder department, a Jewish chemical engineer named Sir Frederick Nathan, suggested that Churchill approach Weizmann at Manchester University. Churchill agreed and Nathan set up a meeting.

In his memoirs, Weizmann remembered their meeting. “Mr. Churchill, then a much younger man, was brisk, fascinating, charming and energetic. Almost his first words were: ‘Well, Dr. Weizmann, we need thirty thousand tons of acetone. Can you make it?’ I was so terrified by this lordly request that I almost turned tail,” wrote Weizmann. But he did answer. Weizmann told Churchill: “So far I have succeeded in making a few hundred cubic centimeters of acetone at a time by the fermentation process. I do my work in a laboratory. I am not a technician. I am only a research chemist,” said Weizmann.3

Weizmann continued: “But, if I was somehow able to produce a ton of acetone, I would be able to multiply that by any factor you choose. Once the bacteriology of the process is established, it is only a question of brewing. I must get hold of a brewing engineer from one of the big distilleries, and we will set about the preliminary task.” Finally, Weizmann told Churchill: “I

Weizmann’s Early Life

Chaim Azriel Weizmann was born in Motol, Russia on 27 November 1874. Three days later, on 30 November 1874, Winston Churchill was born at Blenheim Palace in England.

Knowing that the pursuit of his love of chemistry in Russia was not possible due to the barriers placed before Jews aspiring to higher education, Weizmann left Russia in 1894 and spent the next four years in Germany. He attended Technische Hochschule of Darmstadt and Charlottenburg Technical University at Berlin. When a favorite professor joined the staff of the University of Freiburg in Switzerland, Weizmann went there to study and earn a doctorate in Biochemistry.

While in Switzerland, Weizmann took a position as a lecturer in organic chemistry at the University of Geneva, where he taught and continued his research. In Geneva, Weizmann became active in Zionism, a nationalist and political movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supported the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the historic land of Israel.

In 1905, Weizmann went to England and resided in Manchester, where he lectured in the Chemistry department at the University of Manchester. In 1910, Weizmann became a naturalized British subject.
shall naturally need the support of the Government to obtain the people, the equipment, the emplacements and the rest of it. I myself can’t even determine what will be required."

In May 1915, after Weizmann had demonstrated to Churchill and the Admiralty that he could convert 100 tonnes of grain to twelve tonnes of acetone, the government commandeered brewing and distillery equipment. Factories were built to utilize the new process at Holton Heath in Dorset and King’s Lynn in Norfolk. The factories together produced more than 90,000 gallons of acetone a year, enough to feed the war’s seemingly ravenous demand for Cordite. From 1914 to 1918, Churchill’s Royal Navy and the British Army fired 248 million shells.

The Balfour Declaration

It is believed Weizmann was rewarded for his vital contribution to Britain’s war effort when the Cabinet, prompted by Prime Minister Lloyd George, approved the signing of the Balfour Declaration on 2 November 1917. Taking the form of a letter from Arthur Balfour, the foreign secretary, to Lord Rothschild, a leader of the British Jewish community, for transmission to the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland. The Balfour Declaration asserted:

His Majesty’s Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

The Balfour Declaration was universally recognized as a personal triumph of Weizmann. In his memoirs, Lloyd George wrote that Weizmann’s name “will rank with that of Nehemiah [responsible for the fifth-century BC rebuilding and restoration of Jerusalem] in the fascinating and inspiring story of the children of Israel.” History has recognized that the Balfour Declaration was the first step on the road to Israeli statehood.

Defending the Settlement

Churchill expressed his view of Judaism, the Jews, and their role in history on 8 February 1920 in the Illustrated Sunday Herald: “No thoughtful man can doubt the fact they are the most formidable and the most remarkable race which has ever appeared in the world.”

Weizmann became president of the World Zionist Organization in 1921. Churchill’s son Randolph remembered Weizmann visiting the Churchill home at Chartwell at the time of the 1930 White Paper discussions. Randolph told Martin Gilbert that his father had been fascinated by Weizmann’s talk and appearance: “Just like an Old Testament prophet,” Churchill told his son when Weizmann had left.
In 1939, Weizmann travelled from Palestine to England to convince the Government not to publish the proposed White Paper limiting the Balfour Declaration to Palestine west of Jordan, creating an independent Palestine to be governed by Palestinian Arabs and Jews in proportion to their numbers in the population, establishing a limit of 75,000 Jewish immigrants for the five-year period 1940–44 (consisting of a regular yearly quota of 10,000 and a flexible supplementary quota of 25,000). After 1944, the further immigration of Jews to Palestine would depend on permission of the Arab majority. Restrictions were also placed on the rights of Jews to buy land from Arabs.

With the debate on the White Paper approaching in the House of Commons, Weizmann wrote: “Shortly, after my return from my brief visit to Palestine, I met Winston Churchill and he told me he would take part in the debate, speaking of course against the proposed White Paper. He suggested that I have lunch with him on the day of the debate….There were present at lunch, besides Churchill and myself, Randolph Churchill and Lord Cherwell….He produced a packet of small cards and read his speech out to us; then he asked me if I had any changes to suggest.”

“I answered that the architecture of the speech was so perfect that there were only one or two points I might want to alter—but they were so unimportant that I would not bother him with them. As everyone now knows, Mr. Churchill delivered against the White Paper, one of the great speeches of his career.”

The Government won a victory on 23 May 1939 by 268 votes to 179.

The Second World War

During the War, Benjy, the oldest son of Chaim and Vera Weizmann, joined an artillery battalion and was stationed in the South of England. Their younger son Michael enlisted in the RAF. Through Weizmann’s efforts, Churchill approved the establishment of the British Army’s Jewish Brigade Group. It was formed in late 1944, and its soldiers fought the Germans in Italy. The brigade was composed of Jews from the Yishuv (Jewish residents in Palestine) and was commanded by Jewish officers who served in Europe.

In early 1942, Weizmann received a call from John Gilbert Winant, the United States Ambassador to the United Kingdom. Subsequently, the men met, and Winant told Weizmann that President Roosevelt had expressed an interest to have him come to the United States to work on the problem of synthetic rubber. The Weizmanns arranged to fly to New York on 13 February. On the 12th they were in Bristol for the night. Early the next morning before leaving for the airport, Weizmann was informed that his son Michael had been posted as missing on the night of the eleventh.

While serving as a pilot in No. 502 Squadron, Michael Weizmann was killed at the age of twenty-five when his plane was shot down over the Bay of Biscay on 11 February 1942. Chaim Weizmann never fully accepted his son’s death thinking perhaps he had been captured, and he made a provision in his Will in case he returned.

Meanwhile, Churchill and Weizmann developed a close friendship. In a letter from Churchill to Weizmann dated 30 October 1942, he made reference to the forthcoming twenty-fifth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration and the anguish of the Jews by the Nazis. Churchill wrote: “My thoughts are with you on this anniversary. Better days will surely come for your suffering people and for the great cause for which you have fought so bravely. All good wishes.”

Churchill’s high opinion of Weizmann was in evidence in July 1944. When Weizmann learned early of the horrific gassing of Jews at Auschwitz, he went to the Foreign Office on 6 July with Moshe Shertok, the Jewish Agency official in charge of diplomatic contacts and initiatives, to see Anthony Eden. Eden immediately passed on their news and pressing requests to Churchill. With deportations still taking place in Hungary, Weizmann and Shertok asked the allies to bomb the railway lines leading from Budapest to Auschwitz. Churchill immediately wrote Eden: “Get anything out of the Air Force you can, and invoke me if necessary.”
The President and the Prime Minister

Before travelling to Palestine in 1944, Weizmann visited Churchill at 10 Downing Street. According to one of Weizmann’s friends, as they shook hands, Churchill said, “You’re looking very young.” Weizmann replied: “I’ll be 70 next month.” Churchill replied: “So will I, but I don’t look it.” But before Weizmann could put forward a suitable response, Churchill exclaimed: “And why, pray, don’t you return the compliment?”

On 17 February 1949, as the head of the first Jewish state in 2,000 years, Chaim Weizmann was inaugurated as the first President of Israel. Raising his right hand before the recently elected Israeli Parliament that named him President the night before, he said: “I, Chaim Ben Ozer Weizmann, as President of the state, swear allegiance to the state of Israel and its laws.”

One of the first letters Churchill received after he became Prime Minister for the second time on 26 October 1951 was from Weizmann, who congratulated him on his return to power. Churchill responded: “Thank you so much for your letter and good wishes. The wonderful exertions which Israel is making in these times of difficulty are cheering to an old Zionist like me. I trust you may work with Jordan and the rest of the Moslem world. With true comradeship there will be enough for all. Every good wish my old friend.”

Worn out by sorrow, strenuous political dissenion, and afflicted by frail health and failing sight, Weizmann, nevertheless, maintained a brave appearance in the postwar years. However, after a long illness, Chaim Weizmann died on 9 November 1952.

On the day following Weizmann’s death, during a parliamentary debate on Egypt, Churchill stated: “There is another country I must mention at this moment. Those of us who have been Zionists since the days of the Balfour Declaration know what a heavy loss Israel has sustained in the death of its President, Dr. Chaim Weizmann.”

“Here was a man whose fame and fidelity were respected throughout the free world, whose son was killed fighting for us in the late war, and who, it may be rightly claimed, led his people into their promised land, where we have seen them invincibly established as a free and sovereign State,” said Churchill.

“A Man of Vision and Genius”

In the years that followed, Churchill remembered Weizmann’s friendship and the role he played in the creation of Israel. In March 1954, the Manchester Zionist Council organized an exhibition titled “Manchester and Israel: a city’s contribution to the birth of a state.” The exhibition coincided with the fiftieth anniversary of Weizmann’s arrival in Manchester.

“The city of Manchester may be proud,” wrote Churchill, “of its connection with Dr. Weizmann, a man of vision and genius, whose lasting memorial will be the vigour and the prosperity of the State of Israel, which he did more than any other single man to inspire and create. I am indeed glad that Manchester should commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of this great man’s arrival in our country. And I send my best wishes for the success of the exhibition which is being held.”

Churchill admired Chaim Weizmann as a scientist, a Zionist, and as a statesman. Weizmann had a high regard for the British statesman, particularly for his early support of Zionism, as a war-time leader, and supporter of Israel. Moreover, after their initial meeting in 1905 at the protest assembly in Manchester, they eventually developed a friendship that lasted almost fifty years. During that time, Churchill and Weizmann each established his place in their countries’ histories.

Fred Glueckstein is a frequent contributor to Finest Hour and the author of Churchill and Colonist II reviewed on page 43.
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The greatest book of the twentieth century is *The Diary of a Young Girl* by Anne Frank. Anne’s tragically short biography is well known. She was born on 12 June 1929 in Frankfurt, Germany, a city with a long and rich history of Jewish culture. After the Nazis came to power in 1933, her family emigrated to the Netherlands and settled in Amsterdam.

Anne adored her adoptive country, but following the German invasion of the Netherlands in the spring of 1940 (on the day Churchill became prime minister), Anne’s father Otto began to make arrangements to hide his family from the inevitable Nazi roundup of Jews.

On 6 July 1942 the Franks and another family went into hiding together in a specially prepared “secret annex” at the back of a warehouse on the Prinsengracht Canal, now home to the Anne Frank Museum. Altogether there were eight people in seclusion: Anne, her sister Margot, their parents Otto and Edith, Hermann and Auguste Van Pels (known as the Van Daans in the book), their sixteen-year-old son Peter, and, starting in November 1942, Fritz Pfeffer (an elderly dentist known in the book as Mr. Dussel.)

Anne was thirteen when she went into hiding. Unbeknownst to her family, she had already started a diary. She continued to keep it up as soon as the Franks were settled in the annex. Her first entry from that point was made on 8 July 1942. Every few days she wrote new entries documenting her perilous existence for the next two years. The final entry was made on 1 August 1944. Three days later the annex was raided by the Nazis, and all were arrested. Anne and Margot were sent to Bergen-Belsen in Germany, and in that disease-ridden camp they perished in the early months of 1945. Anne was fifteen.

Of the others, only Anne’s father survived. After the war he returned to Amsterdam, where his friends, who had been assisting the family while in hiding, presented him with the writings and drawings of Anne that had been found left behind. After some urging, Otto Frank resolved to publish the diary, and the first edition appeared in 1947.

No evidence has emerged that Winston Churchill ever read the English translation, although it was published in 1952 when he was once again prime minister. If he ever had read the book, he no doubt would have

---

“Our Beloved Winston Churchill”

Churchill in the Diary of Anne Frank

By David Freeman
been moved to learn that one of his greatest admirers during the war was Anne Frank. She made several references in her diary to Churchill, whose activities and speeches she carefully followed via the radio.

The first entry mentioning Churchill is for 10 November 1942 and describes the Allied landings made in North Africa, Operation TORCH:

The biggest surprise came from Mr. Van Daan when, at one o’clock, he announced that the British had landed in Tunis, Algiers, Casablanca, and Oran. “This is the beginning of the end,” everyone one was saying, but Churchill, the British Prime Minister, who had probably heard the same thing in England, said: “This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.” Do you see the difference?¹

Perceptive indeed for a thirteen-year-old, and the diary reveals a keen observer of events wise beyond her years. On Saturday, 27 February 1943 she wrote: “Churchill has had pneumonia but is improving slowly. The freedom-loving Gandhi of India is holding his umpteenth fast.”²

Likely this pithy observation would have raised a chuckle from Churchill, who was indeed recuperating from a serious case of pneumonia, and had just written that he was, “feeling definitely better. So is Gandhi. Once he saw that his antics would have no effect he took a marked turn for the better.”³ Gandhi was living in comfortable arrest in Poona after calling for all India to withdraw support for the war effort. To make his point he vowed a three-week fast. Meanwhile, the Franks were living in daily fear for their lives on a strictly rationed diet as the German army occupied their country, enslaved civilians, and murderously hunted down Jews.

Over one year later and twenty months into hiding, Anne wrote on Monday, 27 March 1944 that the adults in the annex were obsessively following news on the radio:

Just as if the German Wehrmacht news bulletins and the English BBC were not enough, they have now introduced Special Air-Raid Announcements….The British are making non-stop business of their air attacks, with the same zest as the Germans make a business of lying. The radio therefore goes on early in the morning and is listened to at all hours of the day, until nine, ten, and often eleven o’clock in the evening.

Anne began to show her exasperation with this:

Arbeiter-Programm, Radio “Oranje,” Frank Phillips or Her Majesty Queen Wilhelmina, they each get their turn, and an ever attentive ear…. Ugh! It gets so boring, and it’s quite a job not to become a dull old stick oneself. Politics can’t do much more harm to the parents!

However, she went on to add: “I must mention one shining exception—a speech by our beloved Winston Churchill is quite perfect.”⁴

Ten weeks later came the biggest news of all: Tuesday, 6 June 1944. After recording having listened to various radio announcements about the D-Day
English news in English at one o’clock: 11,000 planes stand ready, and are flying to and fro non-stop, landing troops and attacking behind the lines; 4,000 landing boats, plus small craft are landing troops and material between Cherbourg and Le Havre incessantly. English and American troops are already engaged in hard fighting. Speeches by [Dutch Prime Minister] Gerbrandy, by the Prime Minister of Belgium, King Haakon of Norway, De Gaulle of France, the King of England, and last, but not least, Churchill.5

The numbers of planes and aircraft that she recorded were the same figures given by Churchill that day in his speech to the House of Commons, although Anne confused “landing boats” for ships as the landing boats were counted among what Churchill described as “several thousand smaller craft.”6 Three days later Anne wrote:

We heard over the BBC that Churchill wanted to land with the troops on D-Day, however, Eisenhower and the other generals managed to get him out of the idea. Just think of it, what pluck he has for such an old man—he must be seventy at least.7

Churchill was in fact sixty-nine, and famously did have to be dissuaded by King George VI himself from personally participating in the D-Day landings. Anne’s admiration helps to explain the passion she continued to express in what became her final entry about Churchill made on Tuesday, 13 June 1944:

Yesterday Churchill, Smuts, Eisenhower, and Arnold visited French villages, which have been conquered and liberated. The torpedo boat that Churchill was in shelled the coast. He appears, like so many men, not to know what fear is—makes me envious.8

Churchill’s first visit to the Normandy beachhead did take place on 12 June, but it was a destroyer, HMS *Kelvin*, not a torpedo boat that Churchill’s party boarded for return to Portsmouth. Still Anne no doubt would have been thrilled to learn that it was Churchill’s personal suggestion that the *Kelvin* “have a plug” at the Germans before going home.9

Anne was quite right to believe that Churchill was without fear. While he was still on shore meeting with General Montgomery, air alarms occasionally sounded. At least one was a real threat. Viewing a photograph that captured the moment, Montgomery later recalled: “A German came over. There was an air battle. Everyone was rather alarmed. Winston was rather pleased. There was shelling. Everything was happening.”10 Pluck indeed.

There was, of course, no happy ending for Anne Frank. Following capture that August, she died bald, emaciated, and shivering not in a gas chamber but of malnutrition and disease probably some time the following February. Her body was interred with thousands of others in an unmarked grave.

The diary of Anne Frank has inspired millions with its poignancy, insights, and sense of foreboding. Near the end she wrote, “A quiet conscience makes one strong!”11 During her ordeal Anne was sustained primarily by her faith and the love of her family, but her testimonial reveals that she also drew strength from the leadership of Winston Churchill.
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Lord Randolph Churchill’s Legacy: Shares not “Sacks” of Gold

By David Lough

Lord Randolph Churchill died in January 1895 at the age of forty-five. His son Winston Churchill claimed thirty-five years later in his autobiographical volume *My Early Life* that Lord Randolph had died “at the moment when his new fortune almost exactly equaled his debts.” Ever since historians have usually accepted this verdict.

It is true that Winston’s parents had struggled with money all their married lives. Each of the Churchill and Jerome families had contributed enough assets to the young couple’s Marriage Settlement to put them in the top percentile of Britain’s income earners at £3,000 a year; in addition Lord Randolph’s father, the seventh Duke of Marlborough, gave them an extra £10,000 with which to buy a London home.

Yet this start had never been enough to satisfy the expensive tastes that Lord Randolph and Jennie Jerome had acquired in their youth: Jennie could no more give up buying her clothes from expensive designers in Paris than Lord Randolph could cast off the male Churchill’s fondness for gambling.

The couple soon resorted to borrowing, first from the Standard Life Insurance Company and then from more unofficial and expensive moneylenders. The situation improved in 1883 when the Duke of Marlborough died and left his personal assets in trust for eventual inheritance by his second son. On the strength of the will, Lord Randolph was able to reduce his borrowing costs by consolidating all his debts, now at £30,000, with the more keenly priced Standard Life.

The Mercurial Politician

Two years later, in 1885, his finances improved again on his appointment to the post of Secretary of State for India in Lord Salisbury’s Conservative cabinet: the ministerial salary amounted to no less than £5,000. The relief lasted only until the end of the year when William Gladstone’s Liberal party regained power; seven months later, however, in the election of July 1886, Lord Randolph played a decisive role in ousting Gladstone permanently from power and was rewarded by Lord Salisbury with the much more powerful position in his new government of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

A cautious chancellor could have expected his position—and salary—to last for several years but by the end of the year Lord Randolph had overplayed his political hand once too often in his attempts to force a reduction of military expenditure. Salisbury unexpectedly calmly accepted a rash resignation by his chancellor, leaving Lord Randolph once more without gainful employment.

His attempts at political rehabilitation encountered growing difficulties as a result of ill health. He suffered from a progressive illness (treated by his doctors as syphilis) that entailed long absences from Westminster and made it even more difficult to keep his wife Jennie and young sons Winston and Jack (aged eleven and six when their father resigned) in the style to which the family had become accustomed.

For as long as he could Lord Randolph displayed the Victorian aristocrat’s disdain for the world of business and money: almost four years after his resignation, he still felt able to turn down the offer of £2,000 a year to act as chairman of an American mining company in London.

The Rothschilds

It was one of his friends in the money world, Lord Rothschild, who in 1891 eventually found a solution that was socially acceptable to a duke’s younger son. A friend since their schooldays together, Nathaniel Rothschild suggested that Lord Randolph should assemble an investment syndicate to finance a gold prospecting expedition that he would lead to southern Africa, with the Rothschilds providing banking and logistical services. Southern Africa formed the metal’s fashionable...
new frontier at the time, yet still accounted for less than one per cent of world gold production.

Many forecast that this share would rise sharply once explorers reached new territory such as Mashonaland (later Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe) or succeeded in mining at greater depths. Alfred Beit, a German-born mining engineer and financier who was close to the Rothschilds, argued that deeper mining would prove the more fruitful strategy (he had just bought properties in the Central Rand and was eyeing the Witwatersrand region near Johannesburg). The Rothschilds, however, wanted Lord Randolph to concentrate on Mashonaland.

The expedition’s budget required Lord Randolph to raise at least £12,000 from investors. The Rothschilds lent him £4,000 so that he could take a personal stake of one-third, but Lord Randolph succeeded in raising a further £11,000 from “family and friends.” To keep his share close to one third, he borrowed another £1,000 unofficially, taking the final amount raised to £16,000. Amongst the contributors was another of his school friends, Algernon Borthwick, whose family owned the Morning Post and Daily Graphic newspapers. Borthwick not only invested in the syndicate but commissioned Lord Randolph to write a series of twenty reports on its progress for their newspaper at a personal fee of £100 per report.

The fund-raising phase complete, Lord Randolph transferred £2,000 to his own bank to help pay for personal equipment: according to the Weekly Dispatch, this included twenty-five cases of champagne. Initially he also agreed to take a new gold-washing machine patented by his brother-in-law Moreton Frewen, but at the last minute he decided that the machine was another of Frewen’s improbable ventures and left it behind along with its inventor. Instead he took the more conventional services of the Rothschilds’ recommended mining engineer, Harry Perkins and their logistical expert, Captain George Giles.

On arrival at Cape Town in April 1891 Lord Randolph carried a Rothschild letter of credit for £10,000 to cover local expenses. He found to his alarm that supplies would cost “nearer 4000£ than two” and decided to join forces with two syndicates that had already arrived to stake out mining claims in Mashonaland. The combination added four more Europeans (each with a manservant), a French cook, four native grooms and twelve native drivers to a party that was already accompanied by ninety oxen (to pull five ox-wagons), twelve mules, twelve donkeys and eight horses. “The business affairs of my amalgamated syndicates out here are not altogether satisfactory,” an anxious Lord Randolph wrote home. “Very much more money has been spent than I or the people in London had any idea of.”
While the main party set off for the diamond mines of Kimberley, Lord Randolph stayed in Cape Town to discuss politics and invest £1,000 of the syndicate’s spare funds in the mining company De Beer. He rejoined his colleagues for the five-day march to Johannesburg, where he temporarily invested the rest of the surplus in gold stocks traded either on the local stock exchange or on London’s so-called kaffir market for southern African companies, asking his friend Oliver Borthwick to buy “Transvaal Silvers” and “Nigels.”

Back home in London, Jennie was finding money so tight that she put the family house up for sale and moved with Winston and Jack first into her sister Clara Frewen’s home and then into the dowager Duchess of Marlborough’s larger house in Berkeley Square. “How I long for you to be back with sacks of gold,” she wrote to Lord Randolph.

It was not to be. The travelling arrangements of her husband’s party became something of a local joke as they took six weeks to travel from Johannesburg to Fort Salisbury, the capital of Mashonaland. “The wonderful thing was that they could never buy enough,” wrote the experienced African traveller Percy Fitzpatrick. “They put in some supernumeraries at Cape Town, and some ‘after-thoughts’ at Kimberley, and etceteras at Johannesburg, and extras at Pretoria, and replenishments at Pietersburg, till they looked like the commissariat of a continental army.”

Once they reached Mashonaland and started to prospect, it became clear that there was little gold. Perkins, the mining specialist, found only one feature, the Matchless, which held out real promise: Lord Randolph spent £2,000 to buy a half-share and fund efforts to mine it more deeply. Two weeks later he reported to Jennie that it could be worth “a quarter to half a million” pounds if the mining grades held up at lower depths. But soon afterwards the Matchless filled with water and had to be abandoned.

The expedition team started its long march back to Cape Town with only a profit of £1,000 on Lord Randolph’s Johannesburg investments to show for its efforts. The London share purchases were still rising in value, so Lord Randolph persuaded the Rothschilds to lend the syndicate an extra £6,500 so that he could keep the London shares for longer while he settled local bills before leaving Africa. He waited for a year after his party’s return in January 1892 to sell the last of the shares; nevertheless the syndicate’s final accounts at Rothschild show that its investors lost every penny.

Lord Randolph, however, fared better. Not only did he receive £4,000 for his reports to the Daily Graphic plus his expenses, he also gleaned vital intelligence about the Transvaal’s gold prospects that convinced him to take advantage of a private investment opportunity offered by Alfred Beit. Beit invited both Lord Randolph and the Rothschilds to buy shares in his new Witswatersrand mining company, Deep Levels, at a privileged price of five shillings per share before its planned public stock market flotation. Lord Randolph diverted his mining experts to take a closer look at the area during the march back to Cape Town and, on the strength of their report, borrowed £1,250 to buy 5,000 shares.

This single transaction was to fund his family for the short balance of his life and help him to leave a substantial legacy. Deep Levels’ share price rose appreciably even before its public flotation, allowing the Rothschilds to lend Lord Randolph growing sums after his return to England; then, once the shares floated on the public markets in 1893 (becoming known thereafter as Rand Mines), he was able to sell parcels of them to produce cash. He raised £2,000 in October 1893 by selling 500 shares at £4 each and £1,100 in February 1894 by selling another 200 at £5 12s. each.

The kaffir share boom continued throughout 1894: several hundred brokers and market-makers carried on trading outside the Stock Exchange each day after it closed. “In clubs and trains, in drawing rooms and boudoirs, people are discussing ‘Rands’ and ‘Modders,’” financial journalist S.F. Van Oss reported. “Even tradesmen and old ladies have taken to studying the Mining Manual, the rules of the Stock Exchange, and the highways and byways of stockbroking.”
Estate Settlement

As quickly as the Rand Mines share price rose during 1894, Lord Randolph’s health was fading. After cutting short a world cruise during the fall, he died on 24 January 1895 at home, still owning 2,300 Rand Mines shares. By then each share was worth more than one hundred times the price he had paid for it three years earlier. As their price continued to rise, his executors waited before selling them through the Rothschilds in two batches: 1,000 on 8 March for £26 each and the other 1,300 on 11 March at £29.75.24

The proceeds from the sales accounted for nine tenths of the value of Lord Randolph’s gross estate, published as £75,971.22 Winston’s claim that his father died when his debts almost equalled these assets is not supported by the evidence of the Rothschilds’ banking ledgers, which survive today in the family’s London archive. Three weeks before Lord Randolph’s death, he owed only £12,758 across all his four accounts at the bank.23 The Rothschilds sent his executors two checks: first an interim one for £2,000; then a second in April 1895, calculated after subtracting all the debts, for £52,237.24

In his will Lord Randolph left Jennie a small cash legacy of £500 and settled the rest of his estate into a trust, to be known for many decades thereafter as Lord Randolph Churchill’s Will Trust. The trust started with capital of just over £50,000, effectively all provided by the sale of the Rand Mines shares. The will stipulated that the income produced by this capital should go to Jennie during her lifetime, then pass equally to their two sons, Winston and Jack. Lord Randolph added a clause, however, to allow his trustees (of whom Jennie was one)25 to divert half the trust’s income to Winston and Jack “after the…second marriage of my said wife.”

The ambiguous wording of this clause left it unclear whether he intended the trustees to consider this move at the beginning or end of Jennie’s second marriage.26 In any event, no one raised the matter when six years later she did remarry, choosing a man of half her own age who had his own financial difficulties.27 Winston and Jack remained unaware of the clause until Jennie’s second marriage ended in 1913. Then an alert young lawyer spotted the clause while carrying out checks for a new loan that Jennie badly needed. Her sons were angry at having been kept in the dark; in the circumstances, however, neither wished to press for a diversion of the trust’s income.

It was not until their mother’s death in 1921 that Winston and Jack took over their share of the income from their father’s trust. Winston soon started borrowing its capital to help defray the cost of modernizing Chartwell. Well before he finished writing My Early Life in 1930, he had tapped it for £12,000.28 It is curious that he should have overlooked this paternal legacy, but money was never Winston’s strong suit.

David Lough is the author of No More Champagne: Churchill and His Money published in the US by Picador and in the UK by Head of Zeus, 2015.
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Churchill and Islam

By Imam Ahmed Abdel Rahman El Mahdi

Imam Ahmed Abdel Rahman El Mahdi is the grandson of the Mahdi—Mohamed Ahmed ibn Abdallah—who led a jihadist uprising by the Ansar (as the Mahdi's followers were known) against Turco-Egyptian rule in Sudan in the late nineteenth century. This brought about the demise of General Gordon in Khartoum in 1885, which in turn led to the River War of 1898 involving a young Lieutenant Churchill. The Imam spoke at the thirty-second International Churchill Conference in May 2015.

Ladies and gentlemen I am delighted to be here today to take part in this important conference and to speak in this session on Churchill and Islam. Churchill’s involvement in the Sudan was an important aspect of his amazing life. Churchill showed a remarkable degree of interest and insight into Islam. The Muslim world formed an important part of the British Empire. Apart from the relations with the Ottoman Empire, which governed most of the Muslim world, there were millions and millions of Muslims under British rule.

Churchill’s earliest contact with Islam was in India in 1896, when he must have had direct and practical relationship with Muslims. He is known to have had positive views about Muslims whom he fought with or against.

But one of his early deep encounters with the Muslim world came in 1898 when he was attached as a soldier and journalist to Kitchener’s great expeditionary force to re-conquer the Sudan and avenge the death of General Gordon. There he came face to face with Mahdism. The Mahdi was not only waging a holy war against the corrupt Turkish administration of the day but also leading a revolution to reform Islam. The Mahdi saw himself not just as a Sudanese national leader, but as the expected Saviour that the Prophet Mohammed had promised would one day come to inspire reform, achieve justice and show the true path for the faithful in times of difficulty and despair.

The Mahdi claimed that he had received direct inspiration from the Prophet Mohamed himself and that his divine mission was to revive the path of the Koran and the Sunna and to establish a new doctrine for the future of Islam.

[God is One, Mohammed is his messenger and Mohammed El Mahdi is the successor of His messenger.]

The new creed of Mahdism was to run as follows:

الله هو لا إله إلا هو محمد رسول الله

[God is One, Mohammed is his messenger and Mohammed El Mahdi is the successor of His messenger.]

This new creed was inscribed on the banners of the Mahdists. The four great banners were: White, Black, Green and Red.

The government in Khartoum sent a senior officer with some notables to order the Mahdi to come to Khartoum. They argued that he ought to follow the Koran that instructs Muslims to obey their rulers. The Mahdi answered that, from now on, he was the ruler. The result was the first battle at Aba Island. The seat of the Khalifa of Islam was no longer in Constantinople. The Mahdi assumed authority over all Islam. He, his family, his successors, and his comrades, were all in the addition of those of the Prophet Mohammed.

His outlook represented a new order that was to surpass and override all the traditional sects and establish a doctrine on the basis that every age has its merits and every time has its men.

“We are no longer obliged to follow blindly the opinion of our learned jurists who lived ages ago. They had their opinion, we have ours,” said the Mahdi, “and if they were living today they would follow me for I have direct inspiration from the Prophet Mohammed himself.”

Mahdism was a reformation movement within the Muslim world. It had no quarrel with Christianity or any other religion, nor was it a movement against the West, as such. But Britain’s colonial involvement in Sudan inevitably brought about conflict. This explains the Mahdi’s extraordinary policy towards General Gordon. The Mahdi eagerly welcomed Europeans who accepted Islam and offered peace and dialogue to those who refused it.
Father Ohrwalder, the Austrian priest who preached Christianity in Sudan’s Nuba Mountains, bore witness to how respectful the Mahdi was towards Christianity and how keen he was to discuss religion with a Christian priest. He writes in his book *Ten Years Captivity in the Mahdi’s Camp*:

“After a long conversation on the Psalms of David, the Mahdi said: “I know that you, Christians, are very good people and that you feed the hungry” (122).

Ohrwalder mentions in his book how the Mahdi repeatedly calls him to interviews. The Father was really a captive of war, not a captive of the Mahdi.

When Churchill arrived in Sudan in 1898, he would have heard all about the Mahdi’s relations with General Gordon, who was killed in the Mahdi’s siege of Khartoum in 1885. The Mahdi deliberately prolonged the siege of Khartoum, against the advice of his generals, in order to give Gordon as much time as he could to change his mind. Had it not been for the attempted advance of the Relief Expedition towards Khartoum, the Mahdi would probably have never allowed the attack on Khartoum. The miracle he hoped for was the surrender of Gordon, not the reddening of the Nile with blood up to Cairo, as portrayed inaccurately in the [1966] film *Khartoum*. Churchill observed that the Mahdi and his Generals begged him to surrender. The Mahdi went as far as to ask him not to commit suicide, quoting the Koran: “Don’t kill thyself,” for God is merciful.”

Although Gordon misunderstood Mahdism, the Mahdi admired Gordon’s personality and integrity. He described him as the wisest of his people and was keen to establish direct contact with him. He once sent him a trustworthy woman to bring back his answer. He urged him to bring the right person to translate his letters so that there would be no misunderstanding and offered

---
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to send him whoever he wanted as mediator between the two of them. The Mahdi never gave up the hope of coming to terms with Gordon. And there is sufficient evidence that the Mahdi never wanted Gordon killed. That is why, up to this day, we do not know for sure who was really responsible for the death of Gordon.

Professor Mekki Shibeika, the distinguished Sudanese historian, writes:

Although the Mahdi was in complete control of the situation and the siege of Khartoum, was confident of the loyalty of his followers who were eagerly awaiting the order of their Imam to take the fortified city, and believed in his continuous and overwhelming victories over his enemies, he nevertheless tried to use peaceful persuasion to avoid bloodshed. He addressed Gordon politely, describing him as “he who is dear to Britain and the Khedive” and always used his title “Pasha.” In acknowledgment of Gordon’s reputation, the Mahdi offered to allow him to leave Khartoum and join the British without any ransom and with his dignity and honour intact, bearing in mind that the objective of the Relief Expedition was to save General Gordon, as was clear from Lord Wolseley’s instructions. So, if Gordon had gone peacefully to his people, the Expedition would have achieved its aims.

That might have been possible but the leader of the “Ever-Victorious Army of China” would not yield, and he came into clash with another Ever-Victorious Army. The Mahdi warned that in front of his army marched the Prophet Himself, behind Him the Angel Azrael, Peace be upon Him, holding a luminous banner, and around him the four Khalifas and all the dignitaries of Islam both dead and alive, and that the Prophet had presented him with The Sword of Victory. So no one could conquer him.

Dr. David Mowat of Oxford University in his most interesting play for the BBC, *To die in Africa*, showed how desperate the situation was in Khartoum yet how adamant Gordon was and how strongly he believed that God was on his side. So, alas, the two Ever Victorious armies had to fight it out.

Gordon’s last letter to the Mahdi was much more conciliatory. In contrast to the aggressive tone of his previous letters, Gordon told the Mahdi that he would open the gates of Khartoum and allow its citizens to go over to the Mahdi. He asked the Mahdi to treat them as befitted a man like himself, and said he was sure of the Mahdi’s mercy towards them because they were his nationals (Naom Shukier, *Geography and History of the Sudan*, p. 850).

Now, all this must have been of great interest to Churchill, a young intellectual and die-hard imperialist, who was not part of the Relief Expedition, but joined the Avenging Expedition. Whereas the Relief Expedition failed, the Avenging Expedition did not.

The Mahdi died only six months after General Gordon in 1885 but the Mahdist state continued under the leadership of his Khalifa Abdullahi.

After its occupation of Egypt in 1882, Britain inevitably got involved in the Sudan. At the time of Gordon, its involvement was defensive. But developments in Europe, political temperaments in Britain and the situation in Egypt and in Africa paved the way for an offensive policy aimed at the re-conquest of the Sudan in the name of Egypt. The plans and preparations for that re-conquest were to allow no chances for defeat.

The force mobilized by Kitchener against the Mahdists had far more advanced weapons and logistics than Africa had ever experienced before, including Maxim guns, gunboats, and railways. So the battle of Omdurman was easily won but at the cost of being one of the bloodiest massacres ever.

It may suffice to quote Churchill’s words: “Thus, ended the battle of Omdurman, the most signal triumph ever gained by the arms of science over barbarians. Within the space of five hours, the strongest and best armed savage army yet arrayed against a modern
European power had been destroyed and dispersed with hardly any difficulty, comparatively small risk and insignificant loss to the victors” (The River War, p. 256). Churchill admits that the Khalifa was conquered by the railway. He noted that the Mahdist were not conquered but destroyed.

The bravery and martyrdom of some 25,000 Mahdist soldiers armed only with spears and obsolete rifles who tried to stand up to a far superior colonial army equipped with maxim guns is still commemorated every year in Sudan.

There are many books about the battle of Omdurman from a military perspective but none have the depth and insight of Churchill’s The River War. This book is familiar to many Sudanese especially now that it is available in Arabic translation. The astonishing details, comprehensive coverage, and beautiful literary style, are remarkable. Compared to General Gordon, Churchill exhibited in this book a considerable understanding of the significance of Mahdist and Islam. Yet he was very harsh and critical of the Mahdist state, which he called “the Dervish Empire.” It is surprising that Churchill dismissed the soldiers of Islam as “savages, fanatics, barbarians and superstitious.” The term dervishes, which he used, was contemptuous and insulting and was forbidden by law in the Mahdist State. Nevertheless, Churchill later made clear that he admired the courage and fighting qualities of the Sudanese soldier, describing them as the bravest who had ever walked the earth.

In spite of his critical opinion of the Mahdist state, Churchill’s assessment of the Mahdi in The River War was a positive one. He writes:

The triumphs of the Mahdi were in his life time far greater than those of the founder of the Mohammedan faith; and the chief difference between Orthodox Mohammedism and Mahdism was that the original impulse was opposed only by decaying system of government and society and the recent movement came into contact with civilization and the machinery of science.

Recognizing this, I don’t share the popular opinion and I believe that if in the future years prosperity should come to the peoples of the Upper Nile and learning and happiness follow in its train, then the first Arab historian who shall investigate the early annals of that new nation will not forget foremost among heroes of his race, to write the name Mohamed Ahmed (35).

In volume II, page 212 of the earlier edition of The River War, Churchill says:

Whatever misfortunes the life of Mohamed Ahmed may have caused, he was a man of considerable nobility of character, a priest, a soldier, and a patriot. He won great battles; he stimulated and revived religion; he founded an empire; to some extent he reformed public morals; indirectly by making slaves into soldiers, he diminished slavery. It is impossible for any impartial person to read the testimony of such men as Slatin and Ohrwalder without feeling that the only gentle influence, the only humane element in the hard Mohammedan state, emanated from that famous rebel.

Admirable judgment and wonderful foresight that shows how far Churchill went into Islam.

Again in 1931, Churchill expressed his views on Islam and Mahdism. In a brilliant introduction to the book, The Mahdi of Allah written by a German, Richard Bermann, Churchill writes:

The life of the Mahdi is a romance in miniature and wonderful as that of Mohamed himself. The rebellion of the Sudan was the last outburst of the blood-red flower of Islam. The black banner of the Mahdi swept Sudan to the booming of the war trombone made of elephant tusk. The rule of the saint was established. The puritans of Islam enforced prohibition. Smoking was punished as a deadly sin. The Mahdi was a mystic and a visionary. The Mahdi raised himself to dazzling heights by virtue of poverty and Holy war, the ascetic and the Sufi, the twelfth Imam that was to come, who came and conquered and wisely went again before he was conquered himself.

Now, these are strong words. They show that Churchill not only has a great sympathy with the Mahdi and Islam, but that he talks with authority and conviction.

The relationship between the Mahdists and Great Britain took a dramatic turn with the outbreak of the First World War. In return for support from the Mahdi’s son Sayed Abdel Rahman during the war, the British lifted the restrictions they had imposed on the Mahdists. In 1919 a historic meeting took place between King George V and Imam Abdel Rahman who came to London as part of a Sudanese delegation to celebrate the victory.
The former bitter enemies were now friends. A new more positive phase in their relationship began in which Sayed Abdel Rahman revived Mahdism but renounced the use of violence. He attended the coronation of King George VI and that of Queen Elizabeth and visited the United Kingdom a number of times for political discussions with the British Government.

In 1952, Sayed Abdel Rahman came to London to pursue negotiations with the British Government on independence. He had a memorable meeting with Churchill, who was then Prime Minister, of which there is a well-known photograph showing Churchill hiding his cigar out of respect for the Mahdi’s son and teachings. “Stop,” Churchill told the photographer, “I cannot allow you to photograph me with a cigar in my mouth in front of the Mahdi’s son.” Sayed Abdel Rahman was told by the Foreign Secretary “We have agreed to all your demands. It shall be declared in Parliament that if the Egyptians agree to the self-government of the Sudan, well and good; if not, we shall wait six months according to the law. Then the British will walk out of the Sudan and you can declare the independence of your country” (Sayed Abdel Rahman’s Memoirs, p. 82).

When he got to Cairo to continue negotiations with the other partner in the Condominium, Sayed Abdel Rahman was in a strong position because of British support and overwhelming Sudanese backing. He therefore warned the Egyptian government that if they hesitated in accepting self-determination for the Sudan, they might lose everything because the British would support independence. The Egyptians initially tried to insist on retaining nominal sovereignty but eventually backed down as a result of General Neguib’s intervention and withdrew their claim of sovereignty over the Sudan, a step that became far easier after the abolition of monarchy in Egypt.

THE MAHDI’S GRANDSON

Sir Winston Churchill Memorial Window
St. Martin’s Church, Bladon

The design of the new Sir Winston Churchill Memorial Window fits seamlessly into the architecture of St. Martin’s Church to reflect the design of the existing Spencer-Churchill window.

The main figures are St. Martin and St. Alban. St. Martin is, appropriately, the patron saint of soldiers. St. Alban was chosen to be the second saint as he is held to be the first martyr of England.

The design is crowned by Sir Winston’s coat of arms. The window is thereafter divided into two “lights,” one for each saint, and fitting in with the existing tracery.

The left hand “St. Martin” light, features the cap badge of the 4th Queen’s Own Hussars. Vines and grapes form the background; St. Martin is the patron saint of vintners. At the foot of the light is a vignette of Sir Winston touring a wartime dockyard, cheered by the workers.

The right hand “St. Alban” light features the badges of the Queens Own Oxfordshire Hussars, the 6th Battalion of the Royal Scots Fusiliers, and the cap badge for the Harrow Rifles at the top of each light. Thus all four of Sir Winston’s most important military units are represented. The footing shows Churchill, Montgomery, and Alanbrooke on the banks of the Rhine.

The border symbols include: a butterfly (for those at Chartwell,) Spitfire, a book written by Sir Winston, Sir Winston playing polo, Jock the cat, Rufus the poodle, Sir Winston’s bow tie, the portcullis of the House of Commons, two men fencing to represent Sir Winston’s fencing prowess, the Union Jack in black and white, “Come into the Factories” poster, an evacuee child with a label and a suitcase, the Stars and Stripes in colour, poppies in red, a tank, a gas mask, St. George’s flag in colour, the V for Victory salute, tin hat, painting brushes, car, Sir Winston’s racing colours, a soldier, Pol Roger champagne, black swan, ink pen, Liberator “Commando,” WSC’s profile with cigar, Nobel Literature prize, and an image of barbed wire broken to represent Sir Winston’s escape from a Boer prisoner of war camp.

Running throughout the coloured background to both lights are many quotations from Sir Winston’s speeches, writings and “bons mots.” All images and quotations have been verified: they are all reliable and, we feel, appropriate, referencing Sir Winston’s career and humanity. They will offer an education to visitors as they consider each aspect of the window.

—The Reverend Canon Adrian Daffern
“Flying in a Hurricane”:
Winston Churchill and T.E. Lawrence
Shape the Middle East

By Warren Dockter

Few friendships shaped history as much as that between Winston Churchill and T.E. Lawrence. In *Great Contemporaries*, Churchill reminded his readers that Lawrence “flew best and easiest in the hurricane.” The same might be said of Churchill. Both were men of genius littered with paradoxes; both had an unyielding sense of justice; and both were products of the British Empire. Churchill admired Lawrence as a sort of Napoleon and undoubtedly saw traces of himself in Lawrence. Both men were early enthusiasts of air power, and both enjoyed not only making history but writing it. This helps explain the nature of what might appear to have been an unlikely friendship, especially after their first meeting in Paris during the 1919 Peace Conference.

The two were both attending a luncheon when Churchill was told a story about Lawrence refusing honours to be bestowed upon him by King George V. Churchill’s impression was that Lawrence, wishing to make a political statement, declined the honours during an official, public ceremony. Churchill was outraged and quickly rebuked Lawrence calling his actions “most wrong.” Only later did Churchill learn that Lawrence had refused the honours in a private reception with the King in order to demonstrate “the honour of Great Britain was at stake in the faithful treatment of the Arabs and that their betrayal to the Syrian demands of France would be an indelible blot on our history.” Lawrence’s cool demeanour and “good humour” regarding the incident stood out in Churchill’s mind.

By 1919 it had become apparent that Britain’s antiquated and chaotic system of colonial governance (split between the Colonial Office, Foreign Office, and India Office) was not capable of creating a coherent Middle East policy. The most glaring example of deficiency resulted from three important promises made during the First World War, each of which proposed seemingly different arrangements for the post-war Middle East. The Hussein-McMahon pledges made in 1915 and 1916 supported Arab national aspirations, which Lawrence defended at the Paris Peace Conference. The 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement proposed splitting the remains of the Ottoman Empire between France and Britain. Further complicating the situation, the 1917 Balfour Declaration stated that Britain would work toward establishing a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Churchill was appointed Colonial Secretary in early 1921 to find a solution to this tangled and embarrassing fiasco.

Churchill wholeheartedly flung himself into the task of creating a new Middle East Department. He enlisted a host of experts on Middle Eastern affairs including John Shuckburgh as Department Head and Major Hubert Young as his Assistant Secretary. Both men were sympathetic to the Arab cause. However, Churchill’s advisor on military affairs in the Middle East, Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, was a fierce Zionist who frequently butted heads with Lawrence. Remembering Lawrence’s passion for Arab national aspirations and his willingness to sacrifice his own career to bring the matter before the King, Churchill immediately set on Lawrence to be his special advisor on Arabian Affairs despite apprehension from colonial officials, who feared that Lawrence’s temperament was unsuitable for public office and asked Churchill, “wilt thou bridle the wild ass of the desert?”

Bringing Lawrence into the department began an enduring friendship with Churchill, which had long-term effects on British policy in the Islamic world. Among the things they discussed in their first official meeting in January 1921 was Lawrence’s support of Prince Feisal, a son of King Hussein of Mecca, in his designs for Mesopotamia. As they were discussing...
possibilities for the region, Lawrence pointed out to Churchill that if the British supported Feisal, it would “tend towards cheapness and speed of settlement.” Churchill concurred.

With his new Middle East department set up, Churchill swiftly called for a conference in Cairo to determine how exactly Britain might administer the region in a cost effective manner. The Cairo Conference opened on 12 March 1921 at the Semiramis Hotel. It was attended by “some 40 British experts from London and the Middle East,” including A.T. Wilson from Persia, the high commissioners Percy Cox (Mesopotamia) and Herbert Samuel (Palestine), T.E. Lawrence, Gertrude Bell (Cox’s oriental secretary and the only woman among the delegates), as well as several representatives of Somaliland and Aden. This conference decided to structure the region on what Churchill called the “Sherifian solution,” which vested power with the Hashemite family and its patriarch King Hussein. This ensured King Hussein would be King of the Hejaz and would be based in Mecca. It placed his son Feisal on the throne of Iraq and his son Abdullah on the throne of Jordan.

Beyond Lawrence’s ability to find solutions, Churchill’s relationship with him was characterized by “deep mutual admiration and respect.” “Lawrence’s influence on Churchill was considerable,” resulting in “Churchill’s adherence to Lawrence’s recommendations even on issues [with] which the rest of the Middle East Department dissented.” Meinertzhagen recorded in his diary that he was “struck by the attitude of Winston towards Lawrence, which almost amounted to hero worship.” Churchill’s admiration of Lawrence became a thorn in the side of Meinertzhagen because Lawrence typically steered Churchill towards Arab sympathies. As a result, Lawrence and Meinertzhagen became rivals for Churchill’s attention and mouthpieces for the opposing Arab and Zionist causes in the Middle East. Usually, Lawrence won out.

Churchill’s admiration for Lawrence might be explained by his similarities to Churchill’s old friend and well-known Arab sympathizer Wilfrid S. Blunt. In some ways, Lawrence was a “caricature” of Blunt. Churchill even arranged a meeting of his two greatest influences in Islamic and oriental matters in early 1922. Whatever the cause of Churchill’s admiration for Lawrence, he sometimes trusted Lawrence’s positions on the Middle East to a fault. For instance, Lawrence pushed heavily for Feisal to become the sovereign in Iraq despite Feisal’s Sunni faith clashing with the predominately Shia population he aspired to rule. While Percy Cox and Gertrude Bell also supported Feisal, it was Lawrence’s reports (Feisal “behaved like a real gentleman and with a fine sense of honour and loyalty” and was “the best possible one for us in the present circumstance”) that led Churchill to believe “Lawrence’s thesis that Britain owed a great deal to Feisal and his followers.” Moreover, it was Lawrence who pushed British favour away from Feisal’s brother Abdullah, whom Lawrence depicted as “lazy and by no means dominating.”

Perhaps more insidiously, Churchill absorbed negative notions about Palestinian Arabs from Lawrence who went as far as characterizing them as “stupid, materialistic, and bankrupt.” This most likely came from the belief that Palestinian Arabs were loyal to the Ottoman Empire in the First World War, while the Bedouin Arabs allied with Britain. However, the reality was that most Arabs overwhelmingly supported the Ottoman Empire with the exception of those associated with Feisal’s Hashemites. Despite this, the anti-Palestinian feeling was commonplace among Lawrence’s allies such as Feisal, who was “contemptuous of the Palestinian Arabs” and did not “even regard them as Arabs.”
At the Cairo Conference, Lawrence also worked to create an independent Kurdistan because he felt the Kurds should not be under Arab rule. In doing so he broke ranks with Percy Cox and Gertrude Bell, who thought the proposed area “formed an integral part of Iraq” and should be kept in a united Iraq. As a result, Bell, who felt Lawrence was becoming unruly, called Lawrence a “little imp,” to which “his ears and face turned red and he retreated in silence.” Churchill agreed with Lawrence because he was fearful that the future ruler might “outwardly accept constitutional procedures [but] at the same time despise democratic and constitutional methods.” In this situation it would prove all too easy for the new king to “ignore Kurdish sentiments and oppress the Kurdish minority.”

Plans for independent Kurdistan came to nought, however, due to the region not being completely under British control. The new Turkish government led by Mustapha Kemal contested the region in the mountains between the two Zab Rivers west of Arbil, making a Kurdish nation all but impossible. Churchill later came to regard Kemal, the Atatürk, as a “Warrior Prince” and spoke of his quality as a military tactician. These and other praises prompted Lawrence to write that he “was glad to see [Churchill] say a decent word about Mustapha Kemal.”

While in Cairo, Churchill and Lawrence had time to venture out, along with Clementine Churchill, Percy Cox, and Gertrude Bell to see the pyramids and ride around the Sphinx. Famously, Churchill fell off his camel. According to Gertrude Bell, he looked like “a mass of sliding gelatin.” Clementine laughed, “How the mighty had fallen.” Churchill barked back that he had “started on a camel and…would finish on a camel.” Far from being embarrassed, Churchill kept a copy of the story clipped from the local paper, Palestine Weekly, which noted the incident and concluded by saying that he and “Col Lawrence camelled back to Mena House.” Much to Churchill’s appreciation it was reported that he did indeed finish on a camel.

From Cairo, Churchill and Lawrence went to Jerusalem to finish the puzzle by finding a place for Abdullah. Their solution was to partition Palestine. The lands west of the Jordan River would remain under British control through a League of Nations Mandate. East of the Jordan, Transjordan (later simply Jordan) would become Abdullah’s kingdom. Lawrence was cautious about Abdullah as ruler there, fearing the French might dangle the throne of Damascus toward Abdullah to bring Transjordan into the French orbit. However, Churchill remained steadfast. He believed that “a Sherifian candidate was essential. To support Feisal in Mesopotamia, but to refuse to support his brother in Trans-Jordan would be courting trouble.” Churchill wanted to “adopt a [Jordanian] policy...which would harmonize with our Mesopotamian policy.” Lawrence quickly reversed his position, in part because he supported an overall Sherifian solution to the Middle East, as Churchill suggested, but mostly because he believed that “neither Britain nor Amir Abdullah were strong enough at present to hold Transjordan without the assistance from the other.”

Churchill (second from left) and T.E. Lawrence (fourth) visit the Pyramids in 1921
After restructuring the Middle East, Lawrence and Churchill saw less of one another. However, they still shared their thoughts and literary accomplishments. Churchill shared his memoirs of the First World War, *The World Crisis*, with Lawrence who thought it was a masterpiece and praised Churchill as a writer and a historian. While Churchill admired and respected Lawrence, he was in awe of his writing. Lawrence’s account of the Arab revolt, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, Churchill believed, “ranks with the greatest books ever written in the English language,” not least because it said that “Mr. Winston Churchill…was entrusted…with the settlement of the Middle East; and in a few weeks, at his conference in Cairo, he made straight all the tangle, finding solutions fulfilling…our promises in letter and spirit.” But Churchill also recognised the limits of Lawrence’s work. He confided in his old age to Anthony Montague Browne, that while *Seven Pillars of Wisdom* was “a remarkable work,” Lawrence was a “stylist” and *Seven Pillars* could not be read as factual history. But this did not matter to Churchill. The legend of Lawrence of Arabia was much more important and held much more interest than historical accuracy.

It is no wonder that Churchill encouraged Lawrence to visit him at Chartwell. Lawrence did visit and even helped Churchill lay bricks on his massive wall in the garden. Characteristically, Lawrence “never announced his arrival” and had the ability to steal the conversation even from the great man himself. Sarah Churchill remembered that everyone, even her father, would be quiet and “listen in pin-drop silence to what [Lawrence] had to say.”

When Lawrence died in a motor-cycle crash in 1935, Churchill was deeply saddened and gave a eulogy at the unveiling of the Lawrence Memorial at Oxford High School. Churchill received several letters, odes, and poems remembering Lawrence. He also participated in raising money for the memorial. Later on, he often recalled his time together with Lawrence. In 1946, when he was questioned about the Middle East in the House of Commons, Churchill remarked that when Lawrence gave him *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, he had written in it that Churchill “had made a happy end to the show.”

As we know today, that is not entirely accurate. There is certainly no happy end to the show, and the hurricane that engulfed the Middle East one hundred years ago still rages, though winds blow from different directions. What can be said is that Churchill and Lawrence flew in the winds of the hurricane together.
“Often in the casual remarks of great men one learns their true mind in an intimate way.”
*Marlborough, 1931*

I have always been fascinated by the biographies of great leaders. Although many great men who seized their destiny at critical moments and rewrote history have influenced me during my rise through the leadership ranks in the financial services industry, it was the life and leadership of Sir Winston Churchill that always interested me the most. In 2009, Winston Churchill went from an interest to an inspiration as I entered the greatest battle of my career.

I was Co-CEO of a large division of Citigroup. We had approximately 2,000 employees and were doing over one billion dollars in annual revenues. Our business was successful, but we were ready to part ways with Citi. In fact, we had been working for two years on an Initial Public Offering (IPO) that would have granted our freedom. Then the world collapsed, and Citi was at the epicenter of the financial crisis. The fall-out of the crisis began to crush our division, and an exit from Citi went from a convenience to an absolute necessity.

At that moment, my business partner and Co-CEO, Rick Williams, and I were fighting an existential battle for our business. We committed with our whole heart not only to save a company where we had worked for a combined sixty years, but also to save the jobs of thousands of our friends.

That year we spent more than forty weeks in New York fighting the battle. Coincidentally, HBO had just released the Second World War film *Into the Storm*, starring Brendan Gleeson as Churchill. It was showing on the Delta Airlines entertainment system. Every week for months, I watched that movie on my flight back and forth to LaGuardia.

My interest in Churchill began to change into something deeper. I read voraciously Sir Martin Gilbert’s *Churchill: A Life*. I spent time learning as much as I could about the man in my downtime during our fight for the IPO. In many ways, the spirit and courage of Sir Winston became my muse as I walked through my personal trial. I had every intention of turning the trial into “my finest hour.”

During the journey, I drew on Churchill’s leadership influence and these vital lessons:

“*You will never get to the end of the journey if you stop to shy a stone at every dog that barks.*”
*Speech, 3 December 1923*

Churchill was repeating an old maxim. At times of chaos, a leader must be laser-focused. Distractions are abundant, and clear direction is scarce. At such times, a leader must be a lighthouse not a weathervane. A lighthouse is just a pretty building when the seas are calm. But in the storm, a lighthouse is a beacon that leads ships to safe harbor.

That was Sir Winston to the letter. When Europe was in chaos and almost totally Nazified, he stood as the lighthouse of courage with one mission: Victory at all costs. I made that my mission in 2009. Financial chaos ruled the markets. IPOs and deals were said to be impossible, but we knew that we had to make it happen. We had to avoid distractions and stay laser-focused on the mission.

“*Difficulties mastered are opportunities won.*”
*Broadcast, 21 March 1943*

For most of 1940 and 1941, Sir Winston and Britain dealt with one disaster after another. He battled for survival much more than for victory. He could not just endure adversity, he had to embrace the storm and overcome it. He did this through the power of his personality, his stirring oratory, and his incredible work ethic. He knew he must rally a nation to persevere and survive enormous odds.

We were in very much the same position in a different arena. Our business was under siege. Our
salesforce and our employees had lost much of their net worth in the collapse of Citi stock (so had Rick and I). People were scared and doubtful about the future. Rather than buckle under continual losses, we had to embrace the adversity and challenge inherent in constantly changing circumstances. We had to turn adversity into opportunity.

“Courage is rightly esteemed the first of human qualities because, as has been said, it is the quality which guarantees all other.” *The Strand*, July 1931

Throughout his life, Sir Winston displayed courage consistently. Whether it was on the battlefield as a young army officer, as a voice in the wilderness against Hitler in the 1930s, or in an underground bunker as the ultimate wartime leader, he portrayed a personal courage that shined for everyone around him. I am quite sure that he had massive doubts and fears as we all do. I am sure he doubted his ability to deliver and feared for his nation. However, he projected calm courage to his people.

During 2009, I had many sleepless nights. I had countless 3:00 AM bouts of fear and doubt. The future for my business was truly in jeopardy. Sir Winston’s example was a guide for me. I knew that I must master my doubts to project and exemplify courage and confidence for my team.

“You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: Victory—victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival.” *The House of Commons, 13 May 1940*

Whether through his words, his famous victory sign, or most important, his actions, Churchill exemplified victory at all costs. He was not focused on negotiated survival. He was focused on complete victory. Even in managing his relationship with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, victory was foremost in his mind and his actions. He would not countenance defeatist thinking. He was a force of nature, and through that force, the Allies achieved victory in May of 1945.

Achieving an IPO and saving a company do not compare with saving Western civilization, but through tenacity and perseverance, we had a very successful IPO in April 2010. The experts said it could not be done, but we were twenty-two times oversubscribed and had one of the most successful IPOs of that year. We saved nearly 2,000 jobs and the businesses of over 90,000 independent sales representatives.

During my journey through the storm, Sir Winston was a lighthouse guiding my actions. His leadership principles are not notes for a history book. They are inspiration in times of struggle. They are living, breathing lessons for all generations.

*John Addison*, a member of The Churchill Centre, served as a Co-Chief Executive Officer of Primerica, Inc. from 1999 to March 2015.

Below: WSC with the Chiefs of Staff on V-E Day

*Standing: Major General Leslie Hollis and General Sir Hastings Ismay. Seated: Marshal of the Royal Air Force Sir Charles Portal, Field Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, WSC, Admiral of the Fleet Sir Andrew Cunningham. Photo: Imperial War Museum*
125 YEARS AGO
Spring 1890 • Age 16
“\textit{I am working my very best}”

In December 1890, Winston was set to take the Preliminary Examination for Sandhurst. In the days leading up to the exam, however, he told his mother that he thought he would not pass because he had been put under a master “whom I hated & who returned that hate.” Lady Randolph was not pleased, and her displeasure made its way to her son. In mid-November, Winston wrote and reassured her that he had complained to the headmaster about the hated master, who had since been replaced “by masters who take the greatest interest in me & who say that I have been working very well.” “Arithmetic & Algebra are the dangerous subjects,” Winston continued, but he was “sure of English” and “nearly sure of Geography, Euclid & French.” He concluded his letter asking her to take his “word of honour…that I am working my very best.”

Apparently Lady Randolph did not do so and visited Harrow herself to talk to Harrow’s Headmaster James Welldon, who backed up Winston’s claim. She wrote to her husband on 23 November explaining that “Winston was working under a master he hated—and that one day the master accused him of a lie—whereupon Winston grandly said that his word had never been doubted before & that he wld go straight to Welldon—which he did.” She explained further that Welldon had sided with Winston and placed him with a new master and that Welldon “thought Winston was working as hard as he possibly cld & that he would pass his preliminary exam.”

In the event, Winston did pass his preliminary exam in all subjects including the “dangerous” mathematics, something accomplished by only twelve of the twenty-nine students who took the exam.

100 YEARS AGO
Spring 1915 • Age 41
“Asquith will throw anyone to the wolves”

From his position on the Dardanelles Committee, Churchill continued to write memoranda and letters on war policy. He optimistically wrote to his brother Jack on 2 October that “I am slowly gathering strength & influence in council in spite of” the Dardanelles. His optimism proved to be premature.

On 5 October, Churchill wrote to Asquith outlining four possible attacks against Bulgaria in the Balkans if it invaded Serbia and suggesting the War Office examine them. On 6 October, he wrote to Asquith proposing that a special sub-committee of the Dardanelles Committee be established to examine the future of the Gallipoli campaign and report to the War Council because Lord “Kitchener [the War Secretary] is far too busy” to do so. Churchill proposed that he and Lloyd George be appointed to the special sub-committee because he was known as an advocate of continuing the Gallipoli campaign whereas Lloyd George was in favor of evacuating troops from the peninsula.

Nothing came of Churchill’s proposals, and, in late October, Asquith announced his intent to disband the Dardanelles Committee and replace it with a three-man war policy committee consisting of himself, Kitchener, and Arthur Balfour, the First Lord of the Admiralty. Churchill, therefore, would have no direct input into war policy, and on 30 October he tendered his resignation from the Cabinet.

Asquith persuaded Churchill to defer his resignation for a few days as he intended to make a statement in the House on 2 November that he said would include a full explanation of the Dardanelles. Thinking the Prime Minister intended to defend him from what Churchill believed were unfair and unfounded charges, he agreed and prepared a statement for Asquith to deliver on the Dardanelles. In the event, Asquith defended the Dardanelles in only general terms and defended Churchill’s role not at all.

Thereafter, Asquith finally gave in to the Cabinet’s growing discontent with Kitchener. Instead of a three-man war policy committee including Kitchener, the Prime Minister created a new five-person war committee on 11 November that did not include Kitchener or Churchill. That same day, Churchill resubmitted his resignation and Asquith accepted.

Earlier, on 6 November, Churchill had asked Asquith to make him Governor-General of British East Africa and Commander-in-Chief of British forces there, who were then fighting the Germans. On 12 November, Churchill’s old nemesis, Conservative leader Andrew Bonar Law, now a member of the new War Committee, wrote to Asquith endorsing Churchill’s appoint-
ment. Despite this, Asquith still denied Churchill the appointment.

In late November, a decision was made to evacuate troops from the Gallipoli Peninsula, a decision that Cabinet Secretary Maurice Hankey characterized in as “an entirely wrong one” in his diary. “Since Churchill left the Cabinet and War Council,” Hankey went on to write, “we have lacked courage more than ever.”

Churchill went to France with the intention of taking up a position in the army. The British Commander-in-Chief, Sir John French, offered Churchill command of a brigade with the rank of Brigadier-General. Asquith, however, vetoed the idea when he learned of it. Later, when French himself was relieved of command, Churchill wrote to his wife, “Asquith will throw anyone to the wolves to keep himself in office.”

75 YEARS AGO
Spring 1940 • Age 66
“We are waiting....So are the fishes”

D uring the first week in October, 2000 people were killed in German bombing raids following 7,000 killed the previous month. When the Chief of the Air Staff reported to the War Cabinet that he had ordered a raid on Berlin using 100 bombers and an attack on German barges in the Channel ports using fifty bombers, Churchill told his Private Secretary John Colville, “Let ‘em have it. Remember this. Never maltreat the enemy by halves. Once the battle is joined, let ‘em have it.”

By attacking London and other large cities, however, Churchill believed Hitler had miscalculated. As he wrote to Neville Chamberlain on 20 October, “The Germans have made a terrible mistake in concentrating on London to the relief of our factories, and in trying to intimidate a people whom they have only infuriated.” When MPs pressed him to retaliate in kind on Berlin, Churchill declined, saying, “This is a military war and not a civilian war. You and others may desire to kill women and children. We desire...to destroy German military objectives. I quite appreciate your point. But my motto is ‘Business before Pleasure.’”

Early in autumn, it was still not clear that Hitler had abandoned plans to invade England. On 22 September, President Roosevelt warned Churchill that Germany would invade that day but corrected this the next day to say it was French Indo-China that was to be invaded by Japan, not England by Germany. On 21 October, Churchill delivered a radio broadcast to France where he referred to the possibility of a German invasion, “We are waiting for the long-promised invasion. So are the fishes.” Later that month and early in November, Enigma intercepts indicated that German invasion plans had been indefinitely postponed.

On 9 October, Churchill agreed, over his wife’s objections, to become leader of the Conservative Party. In his speech of acceptance, however, he emphasized his view that “Empire and liberty” were the sources of British strength and that “all political parties—Conservative, Liberal, Labour—all have borne a part.”

That Churchill retained the confidence of other parties after becoming the Conservative leader is reflected in a diary entry of Labour MP Harold Nicolson on 5 November after Churchill had given a speech on the war situation: “He is rather grim. He brings home to the House as never before the gravity of our shipping losses…it has a good effect. By putting the grim side foremost he impresses us with his ability to face the worst…. If Chamberlain had spoken glum words such as these, the impression would have been one of despair and lack of confidence. Churchill can say them and we all feel ‘Thank God that we have a man like that!’ I have never admired him more.”

A welcome naval victory came on 11 November, the first since Churchill had taken office in May. British naval air forces attacked the Italian fleet at anchor in Taranto and sank three of Italy’s six battleships with torpedoes, a foreshadowing of the equally successful Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor a little over a year later. Churchill sent an account of the attack to FDR and advised taking precautionary steps at Pearl Harbor, e.g. torpedo nets. This was not done because Pearl Harbor, with only a thirty-foot depth, was thought too shallow for use of aerial torpedoes, which convention held needed seventy-five feet of water to be launched successfully. Despite having broken Japanese naval codes, the US Navy never learned that the Japanese had developed shallow-draft torpedoes with which their pilots practiced for six months prior to Pearl Harbor.

The Taranto victory was followed by another a month later in North Africa, where a British offensive effectively drove the Italian Army out of Egypt. Over 7,000 Italians were taken prisoner, including three generals. After this victory, Churchill sent a telegram to South African General Jan Smuts in which he said, “One has a growing feeling that wickedness is not going to reign.”

During this period when victory was far from certain, General Ismay sought to console Churchill that “whatever the future held, nothing could rob him of the credit of having inspired the country by his speeches.” Churchill, to Ismay’s surprise, denied this was so. Foreshadowing his “lion’s roar” observation after the war, Churchill told Ismay that he had only expressed “what was in the hearts of the British people.”

In reaction to this, Ismay wrote, “I had never attributed to him the quality of humility, and it struck me as odd that he failed to realize the upsurge of the national spirit was largely his own creation. The great qualities of the British race had seemed almost dormant until he had aroused them. They put their trust in him.”
A century ago Western politicians, as this book makes clear, were as clueless about Islamic culture and politics as they are today. But then as now that did not prevent Westerners from making airy pronouncements about the Islamic world or relieve their leaders of the need or temptation to formulate policies towards Islamic societies and initiate actions within them. Even a man such as Winston Churchill, who evinced a consistent interest in Islam and could bring to bear his intense intelligence, simply did not have a deep or objective enough knowledge to appear, in retrospect, well informed.

Finest Hour readers will be aware of the extent of Churchill’s association with the “Islamic world,” and the manner in which it presented itself to a politician of the period. The Ottoman Empire regularly intersected British imperial and foreign policy and influenced public awareness of the fault lines between east and west, Islam and Christianity. Further, the British Empire’s position as a “Muslim power” was never far from the thoughts of statesmen. Churchill experienced fighting on India’s North-West Frontier and was influenced by figures such as Wilfrid Scawen Blunt and T. E. Lawrence. He engaged with Islamic regions during stints at the Air Ministry, Colonial Office, and War Office, and was instrumental in determining the political contours of the Middle East following the Great War. Later came his engagement with political reform in India and the position of the subcontinent’s Muslim population, and the travails of British policy in Palestine.

Warren Dockter’s meticulously researched study is a welcome addition to the procession of Churchill and... titles. It gainfully corrals information regarding Islamic people and regions scattered across a long and helter-skelter life of action, thinking, and writing, and makes analytical sense of it all. This approach is a profitable way of “data-mining” Churchill’s biography, discovering what influenced him, and how in turn he influenced and acted upon events. It also allows Dockter to cast a powerful beam on important aspects of Churchill’s career and thinking. This illumination sharpens the picture and aids its interpretation, even if experts will already know—or at least have an intuitive sense—of what is there to be found.

By examining Churchill’s entire career, Dockter offers a nuanced understanding of Churchill’s attitudes towards Islamic people, their culture and politics. Understandably, the story of Churchill and the “Islamic world” (itself, a vague and problematic appellation) is one of “ever-changing ideas, attitudes, and policies.” Because his attitudes were “multi-dimensional and highly complex,” profound revelations about Churchill’s attitudes and what motivated his actions, and the discovery of an interpretative golden thread, is beyond this study. This is no fault of the author’s, because these things are not there to be found in the first place.

Churchill’s attitudes were influenced by his mercurial enthusiasm as well as his humanity, perceptiveness, focused intelligence, judgement, and magnanimity. Nevertheless, his core beliefs in the beneficence of the British Empire, British superiority, and the need to act in the interests of his country skewed things considerably. Sometimes, principal and intellectual logic were compromised by the imperatives of political expediency. So while seeking to suggest that Churchill had a deeper understanding of, and “camaraderie” with, the Islamic world, Dockter cannot overcome the constraints his subject imposes upon him.

It is impossible to escape the fact that Churchill was over-confident in his knowledge and complacent...
when pronouncing on lofty issues (such as world religions) and the intimate affairs of people whom he had never met, studied, or understood. As Dockter is happy to state, “Churchill’s fascination with Islam proved only to be aesthetic and passing. His knowledge of Islam was largely predicated on Victorian notions [as in many other studies, the ‘Victorian’ cliché for Churchill and his ideas is unhelpful, given that the attitudes so described remained powerful and indeed commonplace deep into the twentieth century], which heavily romanticized the lifestyle and honour culture of the Bedouin desert tribes. As a result, Churchill never really acquired a deeper understanding of Islam.”

Given this, only so much renovation is possible, especially considering the chasm that separates acceptable political and cultural ideas then and now. While it is true that Churchill “shared many Victorian prejudices such as the belief that British culture was inherently superior to Eastern cultures...his experience of the Islamic world informed his opinions and differentiated him from many politicians of the day.” But the racial prejudices and assumptions cannot be expunged, and Dockter makes no attempt to do so. Neither can the effects of the prevailing beliefs in the British Empire as a civilizing force and the British as legitimate rulers and arbiters of the affairs of others.

Churchill’s attitudes and actions were paradoxical and complex, but they could not really have been anything else. He was a product of his own background and time, as Dockter avers; Churchill’s ideals and policies were filtered through the needs of his country, as he perceived them. Perhaps Churchill’s most fundamental interest in Islam was the extent to which Muslims might help or hinder the interests of the British Empire.

In many ways, Churchill’s antique views are of little relevance to today’s world, though some will naturally seek to cast a book such as this as a “must read” for those wanting to gain extra insight into (say) the modern Middle East and the West’s engagement with Islam and Muslim populations. What this study does, admirably, is to place under the microscope Churchill’s attitudes on a fascinating subject, and enrich our appreciation of what motivated him, thereby better explaining his thoughts and actions.

Ashley Jackson is Professor of Imperial and Military History at King’s College, London and author of the biography Churchill published by Quercus in 2011.

---

**Forgotten Hero**


**Review by W. Mark Hamilton**

S teve R. Dunn has brought back to life a forgotten hero of the Royal Navy. Not only does the author focus on the life of Rear-Admiral Sir Christopher “Kit” Cradock, but on the life and times of the late Victorian and Edwardian Navy—Dunn’s “Victwardian Navy.” Cradock’s actions at the Battle of Coronel in November 1914 resulted in the first British naval defeat in 100 years and the loss of 1,600 lives off the coast of central Chile. Yet, Dunn’s effort portrays Cradock as a true hero up against the questionable actions of the ambitious and youthful First Lord of the Admiralty, Winston Churchill. The book is extremely critical not only of Churchill’s actions, but of the class-ridden Royal Navy’s officer “establishment” before 1914. Cradock personally did not welcome Churchill’s arrival at the Admiralty in 1911 and believed the new First Lord never liked him.

During the early months of the First World War, Cradock found himself and his squadron facing German Vice-Admiral Maximilian von Spee off the coast of South America. All the belligerents knew the German squadron was vastly superior as a fighting unit to the British. As the conflict approached, Cradock requested additional naval support, which was refused.

The author paints a picture of confused and untimely messages between Cradock and the Admiralty. Cradock understood that his orders were to fight to the end, regardless of the odds against him. Churchill ultimately blamed Cradock for dividing his forces as von Spee approached. Cradock’s decision to confront the German ships—which had more firepower and speed—resulted in the destruction of two British ships and Cradock’s death. Churchill’s subsequent criticism in *The World Crisis* of Cradock’s actions caused great controversy.

Dunn goes into considerable detail concerning Cradock’s career and family, and the author seems to speculate on the sexual orientation of the life-long bachelor without providing definitive evidence. Cradock’s China Station service during the Boxer Rebellion (1900) is noted, as is his heroic saving of the life of the Crown Prince of Siam while at sea.
and the subsequent jewel-encrusted gift he received from a grateful father and monarch. Cradock’s friendly and supportive interactions with the British Royal Family are well documented, including his service as naval Aide-de-Camp to King Edward VII in 1909.

Dunn makes no pretense of being a professional historian, and this is evident in the many “side roads” diverting the reader from the main historical narrative. Still, the side roads are interesting and informative. Dunn portrays Churchill as a strong defender of the Admiralty status quo without discussing Churchill’s reforms of the naval staff and administrative planning before 1914. Dunn’s bibliography is solid, but the lack of photo captions is an unfortunate omission. Also, the membership of the British Navy League in 1914 was 100,000 at most—certainly not 2.5 million! The Scapegoat is well worth reading to rediscover a nearly forgotten British naval hero and the men of his squadron, who drowned in the cold waters off Chile. To blame most of this calamity on Churchill remains, to this reviewer, open to question.

To its credit the Royal Navy achieved rapid and decisive revenge with the destruction of Admiral von Spee, his two sons, and 2,000 German sailors at the Battle of the Falkland Islands in December 1914.


**When the Blast of War Blows**


*Review by Richard A. McConnell*

*Churchill and the Generals* is a quick and excellent read for those looking for a concise primer on the unique leadership dynamics embodied by Churchill and the generals whom he led. Although brief, the portraits of the military leaders include engaging details that span through their childhood, education, military service, personal quirks, and challenges or triumphs interacting with Churchill.

All of this comes wrapped in an attractive package that includes beautiful illustrations, numerous photos of the subjects, two DVDs containing vintage footage of the Second World War, and an excellent photo timeline from 1939 through the end of the war. Whether well acquainted with the subject or a beginner, you will find *Churchill and the Generals* to be a must read.

Lepine’s pen portraits start with Churchill himself. Naturally this takes up the largest section of the book as Lepine expertly pilots the reader through Churchill’s life and career. Some of the most engaging portions are descriptions of Churchill’s early life such as his relations with his parents, his childhood nanny Mrs. Everest, and his interactions with senior military leaders when he was but a junior officer in the British Army. Readers will see taking root the seeds of character that germinated to create the national leader of the Second World War.

As for the generals, Lepine assigns a moniker to each that serves as a helpful signpost to the personality depicted such as “Wavell, the Scholar,” “Wilson, the Dependable,” and “Dill, the Bridge Builder.” The full complement of personalities in Churchill’s generals ran the gamut from soft-spoken and selfless public servants like Hastings Ismay, who seemed to get along with everyone, to the brash and egotistical Bernard Montgomery, who seemed to make enemies every time he spoke.

Altogether Lepine’s portraits form an engaging collage depicting a team of leaders working under great stress for the very highest stakes. Although an engaging read, Lepine’s narrative betrays a British bias. In his description of Montgomery’s service during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944, he asserts that, “The American response was piecemeal and chaotic” and goes on to present Montgomery as the leader who pulled the plan together. Lepine does not even mention that General Patton’s American forces liberated Bastogne, the center of the bulge.

Still, Lepine might be forgiven on this one point since his book does contain much that is informative and thought provoking. For historians, leadership scholars, and laypersons, *Churchill and the Generals* is an essential read. It is said that war is a human endeavor characterized by numerous relationships between leaders directing the effort. Those leaders consist of a collaborative team of military personnel and their civilian masters.

*Churchill and the Generals* depicts the challenging collaboration that Churchill orchestrated with all its triumphs and blemishes. These were not perfect people, but their collaboration during a time of great tribulation defined a generation and reshaped the world.
The Troubled Trio
ISBN 978-1137442369

Review by Warren F. Kimball

This book’s cover accurately labels the Baltic nations “a neglected corner of wartime Europe.” But Josef Stalin never neglected them, occupying Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania without ceremony in June 1940. He had waited while fighting the Winter War with Finland in the hope that the three states would Sovietize themselves—which they did not. The swift fall of France that spring only fed Stalin’s suspicions that some sort of Anglo-German entente was afoot, prompting his move.

What could the little Baltics states do? Caught between the Soviet Union and Germany, they had no political leverage and even less military strength. All they really had was their own sense of cultural and (to a somewhat exaggerated degree) historic nationalism. As with Finland, the West reflexively empathized and sympathized (though much less noisily)—and did nothing. Whether the West could have done anything effective is what this book is about.

The stage was set for the entire war by the initial reactions of Britain and the United States: reactions too minor to be called policy. The personal involvement of Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt showed equal indifference. Soviet concerns and reactions were far more important to the two leaders than awkward promises of self-determination made in the Atlantic Charter.

A few old-line Foreign Office diplomats called for protests, but Prime Minster Neville Chamberlain and most of his cabinet were too distracted by events in Poland to pay any attention to the Baltics. Churchill, ever the geo-politician when in office, spoke of Russia’s historic interests, telling Soviet ambassador Ivan Maiskii in October 1939, that “it would be better if they [the Baltics] were incorporated into the Soviet rather than the German state system.” Obviously a Hobson’s choice, but Churchill noted that annexation corresponded with history and geography, and could help stabilize Eastern Europe (26).

For FDR, the Baltics were far too peripheral to jeopardize his policy of promoting a long-term cooperative relationship with the Soviet Union: “the question was not how to make the world safe for democracy…but whether democracy could make the world safe from another war” (127). Roosevelt’s geo-political philosophy centered on preventing a future world war by ensuring trust and collaboration between the UK, the US, and the USSR—the great powers of that time. Churchill bought into that approach, rarely wobbling until near war’s end.

Occasionally, both the US and the UK toyed with using the Baltics as leverage with Stalin, but to no avail. He cared not about Western recognition for his actions; the Baltics were back under full Russian political control, no longer caught in what he termed “the Finnish puddle” (9). By the time of the Tehran Conference in December 1943, FDR was talking of “plebiscites” in each of the Baltics—votes he acknowledged would be won by the occupiers; votes that would give him plausible propaganda cover at home (the politics of betrayal charges did not come until after the war). Stalin would have none of it.

Arguing that Roosevelt and Churchill should have stood tall and spoken out early and often, condemning Soviet expansion and violations of self-determination, remain false either/or formulations. Neither that, nor publicly labeling them “midget states,” to use E. H. Carr’s phrase, would have been rational. The Anglo-American leaders had a war to win, and they could not do that without the Red Army. Even into early 1944, they worried about Stalin striking a deal with Hitler, leaving Germany in control of Western Europe. Piirimäe describes how both the UK and the US avoided any formal acceptance of de facto Soviet control of the Baltics (the British did recognize de jure control), which helped a little regarding postwar repatriation arguments. But, in essence, Churchill and Roosevelt and their governments chose simply to pay no serious attention to the Baltics.

A brief closing discussion of the Baltic states in the early postwar years begins: “The Baltic question had been put into cold storage by 1950” (157). Quite true. It would take the collapse of the Soviet Union to restore their briefly held independence. Whether that was and is best guaranteed by joining an alliance premised on a Russian threat or by copying the “Finnish Exception” is for history to decide.

Warren F. Kimball is Robert Treat Professor Emeritus of History at Rutgers. He is a member of the Editorial Board of Finest Hour and editor of Churchill & Roosevelt: The Complete Correspondence (Princeton, 1984).
The Men Who Went Into The Cold


ISBN 978-1784531027

Review by Alonzo Hamby

Most histories of the early Cold War, especially those written by Americans, give center stage to US statesmen, notably Harry Truman, Dean Acheson, and George Marshall. Richard Crowder, a youngish British diplomat educated at Oxford and Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, focuses his engagingly readable account on the other side of the Atlantic. His narrative provides equal time to such British figures as Clement Attlee, Ernest Bevin, and Duff Cooper. It also gives more attention to continental European leaders than they customarily receive.

It is significant that a Labour government led Britain into the Cold War with remarkably little internal dissent. Bevin, a former trade union leader with a rudimentary formal education was at first glance an unlikely foreign secretary. He is perhaps too easily caricatured. The author quotes him as telling the eminent career diplomat Gladwyn Jebb, “Must be kinda queer for a chap like you to see a chap like me sitting in a chair like this….Ain’t never ’appened before in ‘istory.” [120] At times Bevin could be too rough and blunt for his own good—as when in an incident Mr. Cooper passes over, he accused American leaders of supporting mass Jewish immigration to Palestine because “they did not want too many of them in New York.” [quoted in Robert J. Donovan, *Conflict and Crisis*, 317]

His shortcomings, however, were more than offset by his conviction that Communists and their Soviet sponsors were enemies of freedom and hostile to the interests and values of the working class. Harry Truman never quite forgave the remark about Palestine, but nonetheless came to value Bevin as a trusted ally in the Cold War.

Winston Churchill plays a bit role in this book. Out of power and leading the Conservative opposition to Clement Attlee’s Labour government, he is largely treated as just another voice. Stressing the negative reaction of a few influentialis such as Walter Lippmann to Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” speech at Fulton, Missouri in 1946, the author understates its considerable impact in the United States. From time to time, moreover, Mr. Crowder stumbles with the trivia of American life and politics—Ferdinand Magellan for example was the name of the President’s private railway car, not the entire train—but such lapses are never serious.

Mr. Crowder rightly gives considerable attention to the establishment of the United Nations organization. He reminds us of the central role it was expected to play in world politics, and shows us how it instead became a venue for great power rivalry. Eleanor Roosevelt, appointed by President Truman to the American delegation, serves as a case study of disappointed American hopefulness. Soviet ambassador to the UN Andrei Gromyko personifies his nation’s intransigent hostility.

We get a good sense of how the Cold War developed out of unnecessary Soviet excesses in what could have been simply an Eastern European sphere of influence. First came the American decision to support the Greek government against a Communist insurgency and to extend backing to a Turkish government that was under Soviet pressure. Mr. Crowder effectively demonstrates the way in which President Truman justified the policy by invoking liberal democratic principles, prefaced by the phrase “I believe.” This was quickly followed by a decision to frustrate a Communist drive for political power in Western Europe by an American program of massive relief and economic assistance, the Marshall Plan.

Especially critical in solidifying the emerging Cold War was the needless Communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the fatal deenestration of Jan Masaryk, a leader much esteemed in the United States. This event, deserving more attention than it gets, followed by the Berlin blockade, demonstrated that the wartime alliance was beyond repair. The logical conclusion to all this was the North Atlantic Treaty and establishment of NATO—a triumph of decisive, yet cautious, containment of Soviet ambitions and a logical conclusion to this fine narrative.

For reasons that are not apparent, however, the author ends his story with an account of the psychiatric breakdown and suicide of American Secretary of Defense James Forrestal. Whether he means simply to retell a dramatic story or represent Forrestal’s tragedy as symbolic of a larger diplomatic failure is uncertain.

New Mee Same As The Old Mee

Charles L. Mee, Jr., *The Deal: Churchill, Truman, and Stalin Remake the World*, New World City, 2014, 348 pages, $2.99 on Kindle. ASIN B00HO6ZEHC

Review by Mark Klobas

In 1975 Charles L. Mee published *Meeting at Potsdam*. His account of the July 1945 summit between the victorious “Big Three” Allied leaders became a standard popular history of the subject, one frequently reprinted for new audiences. Last year on the eve of the seventieth anniversary of the conference, a book by Mee on the same subject but with a different title was released by Kindle. Has Mee revisited his work?

The answer is no. Mee’s *The Deal* is simply *Meeting at Potsdam* in a new format. Apart from the title, everything in the original text has been imported intact into the electronic version, with no effort to correct, modify, or update Mee’s original work. The only difference in the new format is the addition of Wikipedia links embedded within the text, which provide a useful way for readers to learn more about the principals and some of the other subjects that the author mentions in the text. Yet this alone is poor compensation for the deficiencies it contains. For all of the strengths that *The Deal* inherits from Mee’s original book, it is now burdened with an even greater share of weaknesses.

The best part about the book is the narrative. Mee is a good storyteller and uses his sources well to present the record of the Potsdam conference. He focuses on the three main participants: Winston Churchill, Harry S. Truman, and Josef Stalin. Through the observations and recollections of the various staff members and other contemporary observers, he turns the conference into a dramatic interaction between some of the most important personages of the twentieth century—one that he sees as setting the stage for the Cold War that followed.

Unfortunately, there are a number of flaws in the story as Mee tells it starting with a disappointing degree of moral equivalency between the three sides, which are portrayed as motivated by base concerns only. The portrayal of Truman is the most egregious example of this.

The President is depicted as almost eager to use the newly-developed atomic bomb on Japan not as a means of ending the war but as a way of impressing Stalin with the scope of American power. Missing from this is any mention, let alone consideration, of the other factors influencing the decision, such as the casualty figures from the battles of Iwo Jima and Okinawa and the foreshadowing they offered of the bloodiness of any invasion of the Japanese home islands. Also left unacknowledged is the long shadow cast by the Paris Peace Conference over a quarter-century earlier—this despite the fact that several of the main people involved in the Potsdam meeting had attended that earlier conference and possessed firsthand memories of the failures of the last great postwar settlement.

It is not just Mee’s analysis that is flawed, either. His descriptions of the main personalities often veer towards caricature as well. Nowhere is this more evident than with Churchill, who is portrayed as an alcohol-fueled gasbag whose contributions to the talks were periodically hampered by the maladies of old age (the four-year age difference between Churchill and Stalin apparently spared the Soviet leader from similar issues). And Mee’s lack of endnotes makes it impossible to trace his source material.

A new edition could have improved upon Mee’s original text by addressing these concerns. Instead, by failing to do so, he has effectively doubled down on them by ignoring nearly four decades of scholarship based on the opening of archives previously unavailable to Mee. Simply consulting Martin Gilbert’s chapter on Potsdam in volume eight of the *Official Biography*, for example, would have provided an effective riposte to William Hayter’s complaint that Churchill was not reading his briefs. Instead, that misconception joins all of the others that are perpetuated without any reconsideration based upon recent research.

This is disappointing considering Mee’s gifts as a writer. His ability to give life to the contrived discussions that take place at such meetings is truly impressive and helps to explain the enduring appeal of this book. Releasing it in an electronic format, though, only ensures that many of the fallacies and erroneous interpretations contained within the text will be perpetuated for new readers. Anyone seeking to learn about the Potsdam Conference would be better served by turning to Michael Neiberg’s *Potsdam: The End of World War II and the Remaking of Europe* [reviewed in FH 169], which provides a fresh account that is far more balanced and informative than Mee’s dated effort.

Mark Klobas teaches history at Scottsdale College in Arizona.
Speaking the Speech


Review by Richard Toye

In the United States there is a longstanding and very healthy tradition of rhetorical scholarship, which can be traced at least as far back as the founding of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* in 1915. Jeffrey Tulis’s book *The Rhetorical Presidency* (1987) was a landmark, which considered (and was quite critical of) the ways in which modern Presidents had used public speech as a tool of governance. It is only comparatively recently, however, that British historians and political scientists have started to investigate systematically the oratory of UK politicians.

*Conservative Orators* is a welcome addition to this growing body of work, and complements the editors’ earlier volume on Labour speakers. All the chapters are lucid and well-researched and the introduction and conclusion provide helpful context.

Readers of *Finest Hour* will, of course, be particularly interested in the chapter on Churchill by Kevin Theakston, author of *Winston Churchill and the British Constitution* (2004). Ideologically Churchill is rather hard to place. Naturally he deserves to be considered a Conservative orator, but of course he also spent about twenty years in the Liberal Party. In later years, this Liberal identity played a significant part in his rhetoric, as he sought to remind progressively minded voters that he himself had been one of the fathers of the welfare state.

Worth remembering also is that the demands of public speaking changed quite substantially during Churchill’s lifetime. Some things remained constant—such as the need for politicians to be able to deal with hecklers—but the advent of new forms of media created pressures and opportunities that were unknown to the Victorians. All things considered, Churchill (who was fascinated by technology) adjusted pretty well, although never to television.

In the interwar years, though, it was Stanley Baldwin who was the master of the political broadcast, as Andrew Taylor’s chapter on him notes. Churchill, who was largely kept off the BBC during his “wilderness years” had fewer opportunities to practice, but arguably it was the public’s very lack of familiarity with his style and voice that allowed him to appear fresh and interesting (in contrast to “the old gang”) after the outbreak of the Second World War. Certainly, his broadcasts in 1939–40 as First Lord of the Admiralty helped establish Churchill in the public mind as a potential successor to Neville Chamberlain.

Theakston’s chapter, however, bypasses the war years and focuses on Churchill’s oratory in the years 1945–51. Some readers might find that disappointing, but it is in many ways a wise choice, because it permits a sustained focus on aspects of Churchillian rhetoric that are often neglected. Theakston’s argument about Churchill’s speech-making in this period is simple but compelling. He suggests that “whereas as Leader of the Opposition his preferred approach was to mount thunderous, slashing, and strongly worded attacks on the mistakes and failings of the Labour government, his tone on return to office was more restrained and consensual” (31). Once back in Downing Street Churchill presented himself almost as a Baldwinian–style societal healer, promising “several years of quiet, steady administration” (39).

Theakston also notes how, as Churchill’s health declined, speech-making became an important way for him to demonstrate to his colleagues and the public that he was still up to the job. Happily for him, prime ministers during that era were not expected to speak outside the House of Commons nearly so often as they are today. This gave him sufficient time to work himself up for periodic set-piece orations, which he prepared with very little assistance. Theakston correctly concludes: “Whatever his other limitations and failings as prime minister for the second time in the 1950s, Churchill remained capable of formidable oratory and stylised public performance pretty much until the final curtain” (46).

There does remain some scope for further research, especially into popular reactions to Churchill’s post-war speeches. Nevertheless, Theakston is to be congratulated on what is a significant contribution to the Churchill literature. Similarly, the collection as a whole deserves praise for its insights into the nature of Conservative leadership and British rhetorical culture more generally.

Richard Toye is Professor of History at the University of Exeter. He has written three books about Churchill including *The Roar of the Lion: The Untold Story of Churchill’s World War II Speeches* (Oxford, 2013).
Churchill and The Sport of Kings


Review by Bill Dwyre

It is refreshing to learn that not all of Winston Churchill’s races were political. We discover this in a recent book written by New York writer and frequent author on all subjects Churchillian, Fred Glueckstein.

In *Churchill and Colonist II* we discover that the British prime minister who walked side-by-side with us through the horrors of the Second World War, dearly enjoyed walking into a horse race winners’ circle, or, for that matter, into the clubhouses of England’s racetracks.

Colonist II was a grey horse, and not a particularly pretty one, who was purchased by Churchill when the former prime minister was seventy-five. It was not Churchill’s first foray with horses—he had ridden joyfully at prep school and in the military—but it came at a time when his postwar political fortunes had dipped and so had his general mood. His son-in-law, Christopher Soames, saw the gloom and the need to address that. So he found Churchill a horse, Colonist II, and a love affair began.

Glueckstein’s book is almost startling in its simplicity. He takes the reader race by race, with mostly success and some less-than-sparkling outings by Colonist II. There is little elaboration, zero prattling speculation.

Colonist II either wins or is caught in the stretch. He is either good enough, or in a bit over his head. Most of the time, he is good enough, and the headlines he makes, in concert with his owner’s status, makes him a sports celebrity.

Before he is retired at age five with an injury, Colonist II runs twenty-three races, wins thirteen of them and is in the money in five more. Churchill is frequently on hand, loving the moment. That is especially true when Colonist II is running against a black filly named Above Board, owned by King George VI. More often than not against Above Board, to Churchill’s delight, Colonist II is good enough.

“Many congratulations on your win,” wrote the King. Churchill replied, “I am deeply grateful for your Majesty’s most kind and gracious telegram.” Churchill also wrote the King’s daughter Princess (now Queen) Elizabeth, “I wish indeed that we could both have been victorious—but that would be no foundation for the excitement and liveliness of the Turf.”

Glueckstein gives clarity to this late-in-life hobby and diversion for Churchill, who knew that buying and racing horses would be frowned upon by a certain straight-laced element of the British population, and possibly even cost him votes in future political pursuits.

It was not only that Churchill had found schoolboy success as a rider, or that his father, Lord Randolph, had also owned and raced horses. It was a fascination, even a love, of the animal.

Churchill wrote in his autobiography that parents should give their children horses, not money. “No hour of life is lost that is spent in the saddle,” he wrote. “Young men have often been ruined through owning horses, or through backing them, but never through riding them; unless, of course, they break their necks, which, taken at a gallop, is a very good death to die.” On 22 April 1922, Churchill was thrown from a horse, but escaped a “very good death to die.” He was forty-eight then and played polo until he was fifty-two.

As Secretary of State for War, Churchill reacted with horror when he discovered that thousands of horses sent into battle during the First World War were being left behind to wander or die on the battlefields at war’s end. According to documents only recently unearthed by British newspapers, it was Churchill’s internal pressure that brought immediate action and the life-saving rescue of thousands of those horses.

Churchill died at ninety. His racing operation had included thirty-eight thoroughbreds that won seventy-one races for him and $168,000. Of that total, Colonist II won $33,423.

Churchill eventually expanded his racing operation into a stud farm, but always worried about the political impact of his involvement in horse racing. Near the end of Colonist II’s racing career, when it was suggested that his prize horse would draw lucrative stud fees, Churchill reportedly responded, in jest: “To stud? And have it said that the Prime Minister of England is living on the immoral earnings of a horse?”

By then, fears of his racing connections undercutting his political life had proved to be unfounded. In 1951, for a second time, Winston Churchill had become Prime Minister.

Churchill even had a horse run in the United States, the $100,000 Laurel International at Laurel Park in Maryland in 1956. Le Pretendant,
a half brother to Colonist II, ran to his name and a disappointing last-place finish in the muck and mud of a November Maryland day.

Despite Le Pretendant’s failure, Churchill does have a prestigious spot in US racing. His pink and chocolate brown racing silks hang in the National Museum of Racing in Saratoga Springs, New York. They were placed there on 2 August 1963. They stand next to the silks of Queen Elizabeth II.

*Bill Dwyre is a columnist for the Los Angeles Times covering various sports including horse racing.*

---

**How to Think Like Churchill (Or Not)**


ISBN 978-1782433217

**Review by Jill Syrcadia**

The poet Rupert Brooke, well known to Churchill and to his secretary Edward (Eddie) Marsh, famously said, “A book may be compared to your neighbour: if it be good, it cannot last too long; if bad, you cannot get rid of it too early.” Of the books seeking to advise readers on how to live their lives, Daniel Smith’s *How to Think Like Churchill* is one of the least painful. A freelance author of more than twenty books, Smith writes in an amiable tone, brimming with fondness and respect for his subject. This book (one in a series by Smith) includes a refreshingly complete timeline of Churchill’s life, but, unsurprisingly, falls short of teaching us how to think like Churchill.

The fine, heavy paper and the aircraft bomber silhouettes in the table of contents add a certain charm, but the pleasant, breezy tone begins to wear rapidly as Smith trivializes that which he seeks to praise by heavily relying on catch-phrases and clichés. The author generally has his facts straight but still serves up slight inaccuracies, misquoting a passage written by Churchill here or excluding important details there. In his best moments, Smith’s writing flirts with history and biography, but altogether the sentences worth reading would fit only a pamphlet.

Smith appreciates Churchill’s language as “visual, and masterfully evocative” and reminds us that he “sought to keep the standard of language high even in official documentation” (34), refusing to bend to the obscure and vague tendencies of bureaucratic communication. Ironically the book starts to wear out its welcome as it fails to meet these very standards.

We learn from Smith that Churchill knew how to keep his “eye on the prize” (18) and was educated in “the school of hard knocks,” which prepared him for “his face-off with Hitler” (63). Churchill was there for Britain “when the chips were down” (65), did not throw in any towels, and was always “rolling with the punches” on his path to “superstar status” (66). He is a man whom “you can hardly blame...for a touch of the ‘I told you sos’” (86). His appearance “was all about promoting his personal brand”; he “learned how to style himself for maximum visual impact” (165). He was “like a fire-walker” (138) and wrote “a series of epoch-defining addresses” (122) which helped him “make the grade” (37) in the eyes of the Nobel Prize Committee. And Clementine was “his lifelong partner-in-crime” (41).

In a few cases, when Smith is discussing Churchill in his mature years, he inexplicably calls him “Winston” rather than “Churchill.” As the book goes on, typographical errors irritate the long-suffering reader, who becomes more vexed with their multiplication. The book has no index, but it does have a selected bibliography, which lists well-known sources (but not always the best editions), and two excellent websites, identified only by their URLs.

People would do well to think for themselves before they try to think like anyone else. For that, a reader would have to know more than what is in Smith’s book. The heart of the book is biography, not advice—which makes it tolerable, since it avoids, for the most part, the pitfalls of misinformation, stretched truths, or bogus quotations. But readers seeking a short biography of Churchill would do better to read Paul Addison’s more thorough and accurate work *Winston Churchill* (Oxford University Press, 2007).

*Jill Syrcadia serves as a research assistant for several forthcoming editions of Churchill’s works.*

---

**Churchill For Children**


ISBN 978-0448483009

**Review by Grant Agamalian**

I liked *Who Was Winston Churchill?* for two reasons. First it is just over 100 pages, and I had a reading assignment at school that called for a book with a minimum of 100 pages. Secondly, the book is about Winston Churchill. I really admire him and think he is super interesting.
When I flipped through the book at the store I noticed it had lots of nice pictures! That was cool, and it meant less reading too! I read it in one day and liked it. I learned new things about Churchill, and the drawings inside gave me a different perspective than just reading words.

I read the book a second time when the editor of Finest Hour asked me to review it for The Churchill Centre. I still like the book. I think it would be a good first book for kids to read if they were curious about Winston Churchill. Other books I have read about Churchill might scare them off!

Grant Agamalian is a twelve-year-old student in Newport Beach, CA. His artwork appeared on the cover of Finest Hour 168.

Mapping History


Review by Paul H. Courtenay

This very slim booklet tells the story of a little-known member of Churchill’s inner entourage, whose experiences deserve to be known about. Richard Pim was very much a Northern Ireland worthy and a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. Shortly before the partition of Ireland in 1922, he had become a police cadet in the Royal Irish Constabulary and, after this date, was appointed a senior civil servant in the newly established government of Northern Ireland. In 1924 he added an important activity to his credentials by joining the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve (RNVR); he attended regular training, which included extensive sea-time, rising to the rank of Commander. As a trained reservist, he was mobilised in September 1939 and was posted to the Admiralty and put in charge of the map-room on the day after Churchill’s re-appointment as First Lord. In May 1940 Pim was promoted to Captain and accompanied Churchill to Downing Street. Pim remained in this position until July 1945 and often was called to brief his master several times a day.

Pim reported to the Prime Minister each morning with a summary of overnight reports. At the time of the Dunkirk evacuation, he asked Churchill for temporary leave of absence so that he could take a boat across the English Channel. He was allowed to do this for a period of four days, when he captained a flat-bottomed barge that carried a number of motor-boats that were launched to bring parties back from shore to ship. It is estimated that he rescued some 3,500 men, including a number of sailors from sunken vessels. Later, at a period of the war when nothing seemed to go right, Churchill told Pim that he was seriously thinking of handing over his load of responsibilities to other shoulders; Pim is reported to have replied, “By God, Sir, you can’t do that!”

Pim and his maps accompanied Churchill to the meeting with President Roosevelt at Placentia Bay and both Quebec conferences; also to the White House, Cairo, Algiers, Marrakesh, Yalta, and Potsdam. At each of these places Churchill continued his practice of frequently visiting the map room wherever Pim had established it. Regular visitors also included Eisenhower, Alexander, and other commanders. Churchill brought the King, Roosevelt, Truman, and Stalin to see the map-room, when Pim would answer questions and describe how the facility operated. FDR was so impressed, that he had his own map room installed, taking Pim’s advice on its operation. Stalin said that he “had never seen the like.”

Author John Potter describes Pim’s activities in historical terms as year succeeded year, so that the reader gets a feel for how important he was to Churchill in the conduct of the war. After the Potsdam meeting Pim had one final duty: he kept a close tally of the 1945 election results as they came in, so that Churchill could be instantly informed. In August 1945 Churchill’s resignation honours list included Captain Richard Pim, who became a Knight Bachelor; he was also appointed to the US Legion of Merit. After that, Pim returned permanently to Northern Ireland where he was selected for the post of Inspector General of the Royal Ulster Constabulary; on retirement he was honoured as a Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire (KBE). His wonderful record of public service is well recorded by John Potter, who (as a member of the Ulster Defence Regiment in the 1970s) was well acquainted with him.

Paul H. Courtenay is a Senior Editor of Finest Hour.
I called and a respectable study simply (2010) and the Second World War Britain, Ireland previously published of Winston Churchill before, having field, he has strayed into the world century AD. Despite this narrow the 300 years from the mid-fifth covered most of modern France plus over the Franks (whose territory during intended for coffee tables in the fiftieth-anniversary year of Churchill’s death. It consists of eighty-one illustrations; of these, only thirty-four are of Churchill himself, of which eight are unfamiliar. The text is unexceptional and covers the outline of the subject’s life in some seventy-five pages; these deal with the main points with only a few questionable opinions.

Despite the brevity of the text, however, there was some careless proofreading. Numerous minor errors undermine the reader’s confidence in what the author wishes to say. A few examples: in 1893 Sandhurst was the Royal Military College (not the Royal Military Academy); Clementine was not the daughter of the Earl of Airlie (he was her maternal grandfather); German currency in 1923 was not the Deutschmark (which did not appear till 1948); “Lady Mary Soames” (the author should have known better); Paris’s “Arc de Triumphs” (Aaaargh!) Taken as a whole, one is tempted to ask: “What was the point of publishing such an unnecessary book?”

---

**Churchill and the Genuine Article?**

**Fake or Fortune?** Season Four, Episode Four
Executive Producer: Simon Shaw
First broadcast by the BBC on 26 July 2015

**Review by Paul H. Courtenay**

Each week on the BBC Television show Fake or Fortune? art experts examine paintings of dubious authenticity. Using forensic skills as well as Sherlockian methods, the experts eventually decide whether or not the owners of the paintings are about to become millionaires. This past summer the subject of inquiry was a painting possibly done by Churchill but which was unsigned.

The owner of the painting, Charles Henty, received the canvas from his father, who had bought a London house around 1962 that once belonged to Churchill’s daughter Sarah. Three paintings were found in the coal cellar: one was signed by Churchill, and two were not. Henty’s father showed them to Sarah’s mother, Clementine, who took possession of the picture signed by her husband and a second, which she said was by Paul Maze. The finder was allowed to keep the unsigned painting, which thus became the subject of the recent BBC programme.

The mystery painting certainly appears to the untutored eye as if it very well could have been painted by Churchill. It shows a street-corner containing a fountain and other features, the architecture appearing to be of Mediterranean design. Henty, who is Under Sheriff at the Old Bailey, said that he had heard that the work might have been painted in Fez (Morocco); but that he had become a little deaf, so it might have been in Èze (near Nice in the South of France).

The picture was shown to Minnie Churchill, who is the family expert on the paintings of WSC. She knew that Sir Winston had visited Èze and found the colouring very striking, but she had never seen people painted by him in the way they were depicted and was therefore not sure about the picture’s origin. Thus she felt unable to give it her blessing. David Coombs, author of the definitive catalogue of Churchill paintings, gave a cautious reaction, saying that the colouring was not typical and that the figures were not sufficiently amateur, adding that it would be necessary to know when and where it had been painted and the history of the picture between its completion and its discovery in the coal-cellar.

Henty and programme co-host Fiona Bruce then visited Èze, but could find no sign of the street-corner nor any inhabitants who could identify such a location in the village. They then had the luck to meet a local artist who said that it was a street-corner in the nearby village of St Paul-de-Vence, where he himself lived. Visiting the hilltop village, the team found the undoubted site. They then visited with a widow whose husband had run an art gallery opposite the very street-corner in the picture. The woman explained that her late husband had met Churchill when the scene was being painted shortly after the war and had even provided...
Three personalities dominated the allied conferences of the Second World War, whether or not they were all present in person: British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, US President Franklin Roosevelt, and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin. Now the ten major conferences are the subject of a new board game, appropriately named *Churchill: Big Three Struggle for Peace*, a 2015 release from GMT Games, one of the leading producers in the genre of table-top, conflict simulations.

**Review by J. Peter Rich and Steve Carey**

Though technically classified as a “war game,” *Churchill* is more of a political design of simultaneous strategic thinking: how much time Churchill spent in the company of the great English painters of his era such as William Orpen and John Lavery and how immensely Churchill respected these artists, who in turn respected him because they understood how seriously he approached painting. Marr describes himself as an amateur artist while admitting he is not as good as Churchill, who at his best was a very good amateur painter indeed. Throughout the program Marr is seen making his own efforts at drawing or filling a canvas. He travels to Morocco and the south of France to visit Churchill’s favorite “paintatious” venues. Marr reveals that he has recently recovered from a major stroke and that painting for him, as it had been for Churchill during the First World War, was a way of recovering from adversity. If at times Marr overdoes his descriptions of Churchill’s dark moods—especially his florid and faulty depiction of Churchill during the Wilderness Years—he redeems himself with his own passionate appreciation of the seriousness and humanity of Churchill’s life as a painter. Clearly Marr’s own personal trauma has led him to a very personal understanding of what painting meant to Churchill, and we come to understand that there is in fact more blood and sweat in Churchill’s oil painting than first meets the eye.

David Freeman is editor of *Finest Hour*. 

![Happy Are The Painters!](image)

**Andrew Marr on Churchill: Blood, Sweat, and Oil Paint**

Directed by David Barrie, Executive Producer for Wavelength Films: Patrick McGrady. First broadcast by the BBC in August 2015

During the fiftieth anniversary year of Churchill’s death, the BBC continues to probe his legacy. Veteran British journalist Andrew Marr ventured to Chartwell to examine Churchill’s painting studio and tell the story of how “Britain’s greatest prime minister”—his words—took to painting as a pastime and how this sustained Churchill from then on.

Marr interviews Churchill’s granddaughters Celia Sandys and Emma Soames, who recall how serious their grandfather was about painting. The studio at Chartwell was every bit as out of bounds for the grandchildren as the study, so much did Churchill dislike being interrupted while working. Celia explains that her grandfather became completely absorbed in his canvas while painting and that the grandchildren learned not to disturb him at these times even though they knew their grandfather loved them dearly.

Also interviewed by Marr is Churchill painting authority David Coombs. They discuss how much time Churchill spent in the company of the great English painters of his era such as William Orpen and John Lavery and how immensely Churchill respected these artists, who in turn respected him because they understood how seriously he approached painting.

David Freeman is editor of *Finest Hour*. 

![Strategic Thinking](image)

**Strategic Thinking**

Mark Herman, *Churchill: Big Three Struggle for Peace*, GMT Games, 2015, $70. ASIN: B013SCRACW

**Review by David Freeman**

During the fiftieth anniversary year of Churchill’s death, the BBC continues to probe his legacy. Veteran British journalist Andrew Marr ventured to Chartwell to examine Churchill’s painting studio and tell the story of how “Britain’s greatest prime minister”—his words—took to painting as a pastime and how this sustained Churchill from then on.

Marr interviews Churchill’s granddaughters Celia Sandys and Emma Soames, who recall how serious their grandfather was about painting. The studio at Chartwell was every bit as out of bounds for the grandchildren as the study, so much did Churchill dislike being interrupted while working. Celia explains that her grandfather became completely absorbed in his canvas while painting and that the grandchildren learned not to disturb him at these times even though they knew their grandfather loved them dearly.

Also interviewed by Marr is Churchill painting authority David Coombs. They discuss how much time Churchill spent in the company of the great English painters of his era such as William Orpen and John Lavery and how immensely Churchill respected these artists, who in turn respected him because they understood how seriously he approached painting.

Marr describes himself as an amateur artist while admitting he is not as good as Churchill, who at his best was a very good amateur painter indeed. Throughout the program Marr is seen making his own efforts at drawing or filling a canvas. He travels to Morocco and the south of France to visit Churchill’s favorite “paintatious” venues. Marr reveals that he has recently recovered from a major stroke and that painting for him, as it had been for Churchill during the First World War, was a way of recovering from adversity. If at times Marr overdoes his descriptions of Churchill’s dark moods—especially his florid and faulty depiction of Churchill during the Wilderness Years—he redeems himself with his own passionate appreciation of the seriousness and humanity of Churchill’s life as a painter. Clearly Marr’s own personal trauma has led him to a very personal understanding of what painting meant to Churchill, and we come to understand that there is in fact more blood and sweat in Churchill’s oil painting than first meets the eye.
cooperation and competition where each of the three sides (the US, the UK, and the USSR) strives to advance its own national agenda. Long-time conflict simulation designer Mark Herman has injected a series of innovative concepts into the game that compel players to think and act in a manner similar to their historical counterparts.

This is not a family board game along the lines of *Monopoly* or *Risk*, nor is it nearly as easy to learn and quick to play as chess. A session requires a minimum commitment of three hours for the tournament game (the last five conferences) and may take the majority of a day for all ten conferences. But the game is never boring because, unlike other multiplayer games, players are constantly involved, with almost no “down time.”

By design, *Churchill* is a game, which, in order for a player to prevail, requires constant situational assessment and reassessment, careful strategy based on swift analysis of the ever-changing situation, bluffing, and creativity. Unlike other games, the side that scores the most points does not necessarily win. The game tries to mimic the central goal of the conference participants to cooperate with allies. Thus a player that leads with too many points over the last-place opponent may lose to the second-place player. Preserving the alliance is key, with players attempting to leverage their allied partners while still maintaining a fragile bond as the war draws to an end.

All of this is simulated on an abstract playing board, which represents multiple military fronts and also a conference table where specific issues (e.g., the Atom Bomb; US and UK production; US, UK, and Soviet Directed Military Offensives) are presented, debated, and won via the careful play of strategic staff member cards. The cards represent the important individual staff members of each of the three powers (Brooke, Attlee, Eden, and Beaverbrook for Churchill; Hopkins, Marshall, Stimson, and King for FDR; and Molotov, Beria, Zhukov, and Zhdanov for Stalin) all of whom have their own special attributes and numerical values based on their historical strengths and weaknesses. How these staff cards are utilized is one of the key foundations of the game.

Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill each has his own personalized, and very powerful, leader card. When utilized, there are both positive and potentially negative game effects. For example, whenever Churchill’s card is used, he is not only deactivated for the rest of that conference but may miss the next conference (based on a die roll) due to a heart attack or other health problems. Stalin faces the risk of paranoia, and his staff members may be liquidated by the dreaded Beria. Similarly, FDR has a risk of dying whenever his card is implemented.

When not present at a conference, a leader may not engage in advancing an issue but may still debate out-of-turn. When inactive due to prior debate or illness, the leader’s card may not be used at all, and the staff members will have to shoulder the burdens alone.

After a conference, the issues “captured” by each player are implemented on multiple battlefronts, from Europe to the Pacific. Points will eventually be scored based on which of the Allies advances the farthest and fastest against the Axis power that faces them. To simulate Churchill’s concern that D-Day might fail and his preference for the Italian Campaign, the UK player will receive bonus points if Allied troops advance further into Italy before D-Day. However, if D-Day occurs too late and the Western Allies do not enter and defeat Germany, Churchill and FDR may lose points to a greedy Stalin.

If this all seems too complex, it is really much less so than it appears. Initially the game may be a bit daunting for new players, but after playing your first game things will proceed very smoothly. A short training scenario is provided with that in mind.

*Churchill* is a remarkable effort that not only conveys a strong sense of history but is also a lot of fun. The game is even playable as solitaire since there are easy-to-use charts included which govern the behavior of all three participants. Whether you choose the role of Churchill, Roosevelt, or Stalin, *Churchill* presents a rich and deeply satisfying board game experience. &

*J. Peter Rich* practices law in Los Angeles and is a rules editor of historical strategy board games.

*Steve Carey* is a contributing editor for *C3i* magazine. He has published three historical board conflict simulations including a solitaire game on the Pacific War.
At Bladon

By The Reverend Canon Adrian Daffern

St. Martin’s Church, Bladon, is well known, not least to members of The Churchill Centre, as the final resting place of Sir Winston Churchill. Many of you will have visited the church, and the Churchill graves. This anniversary year has had quite an impact on us, and it has been a privilege to welcome even more visitors who make their pilgrimage to pay tribute to Churchill.

All readers of Finest Hour know the date of Churchill’s death: 24 January 1965. Exactly fifty years to the day since he died, his family attended a quiet service of thanksgiving and commemoration at St. Martin’s. At Churchill’s grave the Last Post and Reveille were played, some of his great-great-grandchildren laid wreaths, and the actor Robert Hardy, who has played Churchill on so many occasions, read the poem At Bladon, which concluded Richard Dimbleby’s celebrated television commentary at Churchill’s State Funeral. At the same service I was also able to dedicate Lady Soames’s Garter Banner. Lady Soames bequeathed her banner as a Lady of the Garter to the church, and that now hangs proudly on the west wall. This is the Bidding Prayer that I adapted from the one used at the funeral in St. Paul’s in 1965:

Today we gather,
in the name of Jesus Christ,
who died and was raised
that we might have life in all its fullness.
We gather to remember a man who rendered extraordinary service to his country and to the cause of freedom.
We recall with thanksgiving a man raised up in this nation’s days of desperate need to be our leader and inspirer, a man of dauntless resolution and untiring vigilance, a man of courage and endurance.
We remember him before God, the merciful Judge of all, and the giver of eternal life, praying that the memory of his virtues and his achievements may remain an essential part of our national heritage, and continue to inspire generations to come to emulate his magnanimity and patriotic devotion.
So, fifty years to the day since he died, let us commend Winston Leonard Spencer-Churchill to the unfailing mercy of God, trusting that, with him, we may know the love and peace of Christ Jesus our Lord.

St. Martin’s Parochial Church Council had decided in 2014 that something tangible should be done to mark the fiftieth anniversary of Sir Winston’s death. The vision of a member of the church, Marenka Roseby, inspired us all—a new stained glass window. We began the process of commissioning a design, and short-listed three artists. The brief was specific—while we wanted a memorial to Sir Winston, we did not want a pictorial representation of the great man himself; rather, a depiction of the Patron Saint of the church, Martin (also the patron saint of soldiers), together with imagery and text that would provide a suitable celebration of Churchill’s life and work.

Emma Blount’s glorious design took our breath away, and we were glad to ask her to
undertake the work. An excellent committee set to the business of fund-raising and publicity, the necessary permissions were gained, donors were wonderfully generous in response, and, in less than a year (some kind of record?) the window was installed. [See pages 26–27].

Thus it was that on a cloudy but warm June day members of the Churchill family, together with a number of local dignitaries, including Their Graces the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, gathered with children from Bladon Church of England Primary School and villagers to welcome Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cornwall to unveil the window. A simple ceremony was held in the church before HRH drew the curtain to reveal the window in all its glory. The standard service books do not contain much in the way of window blessings! So I wrote one especially for the occasion:

Everlasting God,  
the source of light eternal, whose Son Jesus Christ  
has delivered us from the dominion of darkness,  
and given us a share in the inheritance of the saints:  
we dedicate this window  
to the immortal memory of your servant Winston Leonard Spencer-Churchill.  
May the light which streams through it,  
shine in our hearts;  
may the life that it honours inspire our minds;  
may the beauty of its design illumine our spirits; –  
and may the blessing of this same God,  
the one, the true, the only Light,  
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,  
irradiate our lives, and dwell within us,  
now and for ever.  
Amen.

Members of the committee were presented to HRH. They included Marenka Roseby, who presented her with a beautiful glass plaque to commemorate the event. HRH then went to pay her own respects at Churchill’s grave, leaving a posy of flowers presented to her by children from the local school.

This was the first of two significant events that day—for the royal party then moved on to Blenheim to dedicate the new Churchill Memorial Garden. This was very much the vision of the late eleventh Duke, who was keen for the Palace, like the church, to be a part of the fiftieth anniversary commemorations. Kim Wilkie’s innovative design includes a pathway, intersected by a “river” of poppies, which tells Churchill’s story with simple inscriptions depicting milestones in his life set in the ground. HRH unveiled a magnificent bust of Churchill by Oscar Nemon that dominates the whole garden and which has already become a popular new feature of the Blenheim visitor experience.

St. Martin’s Church, Bladon, is, perhaps, everything you would expect an English village church to be: a loyal and local congregation, active in the community, and a much-loved and well-attended centre of worship. It is, however, much more. As the custodians of Sir Winston’s final resting place, we welcome many thousands of visitors who come to honour his memory. That means that we have a particular double calling: to be a place of honour for the man who many regard as a modern saviour; and to be a place of worship for the One who Christians know as their eternal Saviour. As we look back over a year of special events and memorable occasions, we give great thanks for this double calling. And we look forward to welcoming you the next time you come to visit us in Bladon. ☼
The Oscar Nemon bust in the Churchill Memorial Garden at Blenheim (above). Reverse side of the Garter Banner of Lady Soames hanging at the rear of the Nave of St. Martin’s Church, Bladon (right). The new gravestone at Bladon of Lord and Lady Soames was installed in May 2015 (below).

*Tom Weller photography.*

The Reverend Canon Adrian Daffern is the team Rector in the Benefice of Blenheim, which includes St. Martin’s.
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