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I. BOOKS BY WINSTON S. CHURCHILL

   Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Woods A1(b), note, where this shown in fact to be an issue confused by Woods or unknown to him. Inscribed ‘Winston S. Churchill: 14 Feb 1908,’ followed by autograph signature of John Morley. Viscount Morley was Secretary of State for India in 1908. Very good to fine, with only light spotting on maroon cover.”
   According to Langworth, this book, Churchill’s first, “is a true-life adventure story, comprising his experiences when attached to Sir Bindon Blood’s punitive expedition on the Northwest Frontier of India in 1897” (p. 11). Churchill’s account demonstrates his willingness, despite his youth and junior rank, to take issue with generals, including Kitchener, who later attempted to keep Churchill from participating in his expedition to take back the Sudan.
   This copy is part of the Second Edition, Silver Library Issue, which contains a new “preface to the Second Edition.” Altogether 2500 copies were printed of this edition; this is one of the thousand copies printed February 1901.
   Langworth’s Comments are very interesting: “We collect first editions to get as close as possible to the author’s original expression; in the case of Churchill’s first book, the First Edition was irrevocably altered by Moreton Frewin’s proofreading. It is the Second Edition which conveys the text as Churchill wished it to read from the start” (p. 23). And in his Appraisal Langworth adds that the Silver Library Edition’s “chief value is that it contains Churchill’s text as he wished it” (p. 23), and points out that as rare as good copies of the first impression are, “the 1901 impression is rarer in any condition” (p. 23).
   Churchill had begun his military career with the cavalry. He hoped to join Gen. Sir Bindon Blood, commander of a punitive expedition on the Northwest Frontier of India, in 1897, but Blood could accommodate him only as a correspondent. Churchill managed to get an appointment to the Malakand Field Force from the Allahabad Pioneer, Kipling’s old newspaper, to which he was supposed to send 300 words a day. In addition, his mother persuaded the Daily Telegraph to pay him five pounds per column. The success of The Story of the Malakand Field Force launched Churchill on his career. His writing gave him financial independence for a period and his journalism spread his fame, opening up the door to a position in parliament.


According to Woods, the book was translated into French and Swedish (p. 21). Woods quotes Churchill in *My Early Life*, p. 374: “The sales of *The River War* and of my two books of war correspondence from South Africa, together with the ten months’ salary amounting to 2500 pounds from the *Morning Post*, had left me in possession of more than 4000 pounds.”

Langworth’s comments are interesting. Calling *The River War* “Arguably the most aesthetically beautiful of original trade editions of Churchill’s books,” he also gives it high marks for its scholarship – ”a brilliant history of British involvement in the Sudan and the campaign for its reconquest: arresting, insightful, with tremendous narrative and descriptive power.” Langworth finds the book’s “passages of deep reflection about the requirements of a civilised government of ordered liberty” still highly relevant. According to Langworth, Churchill does not take for granted “the superiority of British civilisation” but admires the Sudanese aspiration for freedom and takes the British commander, Lord Kitchener, to task for failing to show “civilised respect for the liberty and humanity of adversaries that alone could justify British civilisation and imperial rule over the Sudan” (p. 27).

Langworth believes that “the out-of-print Churchill book most in need of reprinting” is the “original two-volume unabridged version, with Angus McNeill’s beautiful line drawings” (p. 28).

From Langworth’s description of the first edition we learn that the publication price of 36s., the equivalent of nine dollars, represented “a towering price in an age when one pound per week was a living wage” (p. 29).

The Chapin Library’s set, not surprisingly, lacks dust jackets. Langworth reports that they are “virtually extinct” (p. 30). He calls the first edition of *The River War* “one of the gems of any Churchill library.”

Gilbert, in the single-volume biography, sheds light on Churchill’s state of mind while writing the book. To his mother he described Kitchener as “a vulgar common man, without much of the non-brutal elements in his composition” (p. 102). And to his cousin Ivor Guest he compared writing a book to living in a strange world whose northern and southern boundaries were, respectively, the Preface and the Appendix and whose geographical features are chapters and paragraphs. Though worried that the book’s publication would win him few friends, he told Guest that “friends of the cheap & worthless every-day variety are not of very great importance. And after all, in writing the great thing is to be honest” (p. 102).

From the multivolume biography we learn that though the book was “much praised by the literary and military critics of the day” (v. 1, p. 442), “it was to be many weeks after the reviews had appeared that Churchill had the satisfaction of
reading them; for within ten days of the book’s publication, he was a prisoner of war. His capture and escape may well have promoted the sales of this comparatively expensive work” (pp. 443-444). While acting as correspondent to the *Morning Post South Africa*, he was incarcerated in a Boer prison camp in Pretoria (from which he famously escaped).

Norman Rose, in his biography *Churchill: The Unruly Giant* (1994), finds a comment Churchill makes in *The River War* reflective of his own ability to overcome childhood parental neglect: “Solitary trees, if they grow at all, grow strong; and a boy deprived of his father’s care often develops, if he escapes the perils of youth, an independence of vigour and thought which may restore in after life the heavy loss of early days” (Rose, p. 15).

From Jenkins’s biography we learn that Churchill’s “most valued source” for *The River War* was Lord Cromer, “the effective head of the government of the country, with whom his relations became at least as good as those with Kitchener were bad” (p. 44). Jenkins calls Cromer, who did not mince words in his critique of the work in progress, “one of the few people who succeeded in establishing a mixture of moral and intellectual ascendancy over the almost irrepressible Churchill of this period” (p. 45).

Antiquarian bookseller Buddenbrooks, in a recent brochure advertising the sale of selected important items of Churchilliana, calls *The River War*, “Churchill’s Great Work on the Soudan . . ., Churchill’s second book, very scarce. A fascinating account of the British campaign against the forces of the mahdi, including the author’s eyewitness account of the Battle of Omdurman and his participation in the cavalry charge there” (p. 6).


This volume is part of the first impression of 1,000 copies described in Woods A2(b) as “Second Edition (Abridged).” Langworth points out (although Woods does not) that the first impression was followed by a second impression of an unknown total number of copies, though Langworth believes it “could not have been numerous” (p. 31).
According to Langworth, “The primary bibliographic importance of this work is its new material: a new Preface by the author and a new chapter describing the destruction of the Khalifa and the end of the war” (p. 31). He also notes that in preparing this edition, “the text of which has been used by every reprint to date,” Churchill edited out his attacks on Kitchener and other controversial material totalling about one-fourth of the original text. He attributes this editorial decision on Churchill’s part to the fact that “he had entered Parliament, and was less sanguine about burning bridges” (p. 28). Langworth laments the decision to leave out “many detailed appendices and all drawings, as well as nine of the exquisite fold-outcolour maps.”

In his Appraisal Langworth states that “For its important additions and deletions, this book or one of its successors belongs on the shelf alongside the First Edition. Copies are rather scarcer even than the first edition. . . . The binding retains all the Victorian period splendor of the First edition, . . . and the 1902 remains one of the most desirable River Wars among bibliophiles” (pp. 31-32).


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Rebound in full crushed morocco, gilt, marbled endpapers, a.e.g. by Bayntun-Riviere. Facsimile signature on upper cover in gilt. Advertisements and front pictorial cover cloth retained. Fine.”

A recent brochure of Churchill materials for sale (“Their Finest Hour: A Selection of Important Books, Articles and Ephemera by and About Sir Winston S. Churchill,” Boston: Buddenbrooks) describes the “Scarce First Edition”: “A personal record of the first five months of the Boer War includes an account of Sir Redvers Buller’s campaign for the relief of Ladysmith along with Churchill’s capture and escape from the Afrikaners.

“In a daring escape reminiscent of the exploits of Indiana Jones, Churchill climbed a ten-foot fence and passed a sentry at less than five yards. He had to reach Delagoa Bay, almost three hundred miles away. Finding a railway, he hurled himself aboard a moving train and jumped off later to find water. After a five-day walk, he came to a village where he happened to knock on the door of the only Englishman within a twenty mile radius. (The help Churchill received from this man had to be omitted from the book because the Boer War was still being fought at the time of publication). Eventually Churchill reached Delagoa Bay . . . ” (p. 4).

According to Langworth, while Churchill’s views of native Africans represented in this book are “not that of, say, Martin Luther King, Jr half a century later,” they nonetheless “are in striking contrast to those of most contemporary Britons,” with Churchill “representing the same essential approach to native emancipation as the South African reformers of the early 1990s” (p. 51). One of Churchill’s “most popular books,” it tells the story how, as a press correspondent to the Morning Post, Churchill became embroiled in a rebellion among the Boer settlers of the Transvaal and Orange Free State against British authority. The book is dominated by the “true-life adventure story” of Churchill’s
escape from prison, where he was incarcerated shortly after his arrival (p. 52). Langworth calls the book “splendid . . . both aesthetically and from a literary standpoint,” making it “one of the most sought-after titles in the canon,” though “readily available if not always cheap” (p. 54).


Churchill in his Preface says that the main event he deals with “is the march of Lieutenant-General Hamilton’s column on the flank of Lord Roberts’s main army from Bloemfontein to Pretoria.”

According to Langworth, “A very good copy is a scarcity and a fine one is truly rare, selling for a huge premium” (p. 60). Langworth reports that as the “sequel to *London to Ladysmith,*” the book “completes Churchill’s coverage of the Boer War, including the liberation of the Boer prison camp in Pretoria where he had been held prisoner. It describes the fighting march of Ian Hamilton’s mounted division from Bloemfontein to Johannesburg (Churchill rode a bicycle in ‘Jo’burg’ a day before the Army arrived) and on to Pretoria, where the author was able to help liberate his former fellow prisoners at the Staats Model School.” He explains that “General Sir Ian Hamilton is of particular interest because of his long friendship with Churchill which began with this adventure.” Although Hamilton helped lead “the fatal 1915 Gallipoli landings,” he never laid blame on Churchill for that rout. He bought from Churchill the latter’s first country home, “Lullenden.” Langworth also reports that the book, after being out of print for almost nine decades, has “recently” been combined with *London to Ladysmith* into a single volume, *The Boer War* (p. 58).

In his one-volume biography of Churchill, Gilbert reports that this book, published October 12, 1900, less than two weeks after his election to Parliament, is “based on the thirteen telegraphic reports he had sent to the *Morning Post*” (p. 136). Ever conscious on how he stood to benefit financially from his writings, Churchill was pleased with the 8,000 copies the book had sold in Britain by year’s end, together with an additional 1,500 copies in the U.S. Following the book’s publication he also began “another career, that of paid lecturer,” telling “the story of the Boer War to audiences all over Britain” (p. 136). Though he feared he would be less successful as a lecturer than author, he not only held his audiences rapt but also earned a pretty penny doing so (p. 137). Churchill was known to brag that having published five books between 1898 and 1900, by the time he was 25 he had written “as many books as Moses” (p. 136). [The five books are: *The Story of the Malakand Field Force* (1898), *The River War* (1899), *Savrola* (1899), *Ian Hamilton’s March* (1900), and *From London to Ladysmith* (1900).]
Rose dismisses this book, as well as *London to Ladysmith*, as “largely rehashes of his despatches from South Africa,” which “are today little more than historical curiosities” (p. 56).


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Dec. 1989. “Woods A6(b). Without wrappers and trimmed to fit binding with seven other scarce political satire pamphlets, three of which have Churchill references unnoticed by Woods. . . . All bound together in maroon cloth of a very near contemporary style, spine titled ‘In a Conning Tower Etc.’ In fleece-lined box. Internally nice.”


According to Langworth, *Mr. Brodrick’s Army*, consisting of several speeches lambasting Secretary of State for War St. John Brodrick for his plan to expand the permanent peacetime Army from two to three divisions, was until 1977 (when it became available in facsimile form) “one of two Churchill books virtually impossible to acquire” (p. 65). He also calls it “The single rarest Churchill book” (but perhaps only when “Bound in red card wrappers with title, author’s name, publisher, date and price printed black and centred on front face,” p. 67?).

Gilbert, in the single-volume biography, summarizes Churchill’s quarrel with Brodrick’s position: He believed that the “fifteen per cent increase in military expenditure” proposed by Brodrick “was unnecessary. It would, he argued, be ineffective. It would not make the Army stronger. It was bad value for money. If more public money was to be spent, it should be on the Navy, not the Army” (p. 141).

In volume 2, *Young Statesman: 1901-1914*, Randolph S. Churchill explains that Churchill maintained “until at least 1908” the beliefs expressed “in his criticisms of Mr Brodrick’s Army,” namely, “that with an unchallengeable navy Britain could take as much or as little part in any great war as she chose. A small army was enough for home defence and for Imperial garrisons. According to this view, if Britain’s interests should ultimately involve her in a European war, a great army could be brought into being, trained and armed, while the Royal navy
maintained her sea communications throughout the world and kept the island inviolate” (p. 493).


I cannot find any information on the dedicatee, W. T. Cooke.

According to John Keegan, author of Winston Churchill (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002), Churchill learned toward the end of his father’s life “the true nature of the fatal illness” – tertiary syphilis. “The facts were never to alter his feelings for Randolph” (p. 23). When his father died Churchill was not yet 21. Since his father’s estate was “almost completely consumed by debt . . . In 1895 Winston’s future had no material foundation” (p. 23).

6A. A second set of Lord Randolph Churchill


In his opening remarks Langworth notes that this, although the author’s first venture into biography, was the second of six biographies of his father and “the most elegant stylistically.” He describes it as “an almost strictly political book, concentrating heavily on his father’s career after the latter’s entering Parliament as the Member for Woodstock in 1880.” Langworth does not subscribe to the view often voiced that the son could not be an objective assessor of his father: “While the author is undeniably his father’s champion, . . . he also lists the tactical miscalculations by Lord Randolph” that undermined his career (p. 68).

In his discussion of Churchill’s activities in 1905, Gilbert, in the single-volume Life, remarks: “Churchill briefly put current politics behind him in order to finish writing his father’s life. . . . In this task he was extraordinarily successful, receiving 8,000 pounds, the highest amount yet paid in Britain for a political biography, and 350,000 pounds in the money values of 1990” (p. 171). Gilbert also notes that the date of publication, January 2, 1907, coincided with the beginning of the election campaign, and that the TLS described the book as “certainly among the two or three most exciting political biographies in the language” (p. 175). Later he reports that after meeting, not for the first time, Clementine Hozier at a London dinner party in March 1908, he said he would send her a copy of the biography, which she had not yet read, if she promised to
read it; she said she would do so willingly, but he failed to send it. Although she later recalled her displeasure at his failure to keep his side of the bargain, “it was not to be the end of the story” (p. 191).

In *In Search of Churchill*, in response to his own questions, “How did he write his many books and articles? . . . How did he organize his research help? What sort of literary boss was he?” Gilbert reports, “Before the First World War, a research assistant had helped him put together the documents for his life of his father, *Lord Randolph Churchill*” (p. 137). Later in the book Gilbert recounts how in 1974, while working on the multi-volume biography, he met with Harold Macmillan, whose term as prime minister had ended 11 years earlier, and shared with him his problems with his publishers. “Macmillan, a publisher himself (his father had published Churchill’s two-volume *Lord Randolph Churchill* in 1906), was indignant on my behalf . . . ” (p. 241).

Jenkins calls Churchill’s two-volume biography of his father “the most important, substantial and reputation-enhancing of all his young man’s writings” and notes that “Subsequently he wrote nothing of remotely comparable scope until, in 1923 and on the approach to his fiftieth birthday, *The World Crisis*, his five-volume history of the First World War, began to appear” (p. 98). Jenkins calls attention to “two markedly unfavourable notices . . . in the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Sun,*” which “were balanced by letters of strong appreciation” from a variety of admirers (p. 103).

Rose is one of those who believes that in preparing his father’s biography, “although Churchill went through an historian’s motions, . . . his critical faculties are blunted, and he lacked academic detachment” (p. 260).

According to Best, “Winston made the most of [his] Liberal and democratic inclinations in the heavyweight biography of his father . . . the work was at once admitted to that distinguished club, the Great Victorian Biography, where it has remained ever since. The painstaking biographer disclosed rather more than the admiring son intended. Lord Randolph was presented in a manner sufficiently true to life that no thoughtful reader could fail to realise why the man had become distrusted and, in some quarters, disliked” (pp. 19-20).


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Red printed wrappers, in fleece-lined box. Foxing on fore-edge and in some outer margins in the preliminaries, otherwise very good.”

From Langworth we learn that “The 1906 General Election was the first which Churchill fought as a Liberal. He campaigned for Manchester North-West on a single issue, Free Trade, an institution dear to the hearts of the Manchester cotton manufacturers. Although the constituency had long been Tory, Free Trade had opened an opportunity for the Liberals who, unlike the conservatives, were firmly committed to it” (p. 77).
According to Jenkins, “Churchill kept Free Trade in the centre of his campaign and as a result secured the support of most of the textile trade including the former prominent Tory and splendidly named Mr Tootal Broadhurst” (p. 108).


Antiquarian bookseller Buddenbrooks (Boston and Deer Island, ME), in a recent brochure of important Churchilliana, describes its copy as “Scarce, very handsome Africana from Churchill’s adventurous years. Winston Churchill is, of course, chiefly known for his position as England’s Prime Minister during World War II and his political writings, but in his earlier days his love for traveling and big game hunting had the greatest command of his pen. He offers this book, ‘a continuous narrative of the lighter side of what was to me a very delightful and inspiring journey,’ in hopes that the British with recently-acquired estates in Africa would have their interest piqued and make the most of what Africa had to offer. It is the companion to his earlier . . . writings, *The Story of the Malakand Field Force, The River War, and London to Ladysmith . . .*” (p. 7).

Woods (A12) reports that a shorter version of the book originally appeared, in serial form, in *The Strand Magazine*; the book’s illustrations were chosen from those in the magazine. Only the book’s final two chapters appeared first in book form in order to satisfy the terms of the agreement between Hodder and Stoughton and Churchill’s agent, which called for about 10,000 of the book’s approximately 45,000 words to be previously unpublished (pp. 41-42).

Langworth describes *My African Journey* as “physically beautiful . . . and for that reason one of the most popular Churchill works.” Not only is the cover “striking,” but the “profuse illustrations” are also appealing (p. 82). Langworth reports that no dust jackets are known to have survived, though the publisher was using them at the time.

In volume 2 of the multivolume biography, *Young Statesman: 1901-1914*, we learn that “While he was in Africa Churchill received an offer from the *Strand Magazine* for five articles about his travels for 150 pounds each” (p. 223). Churchill readily accepted the offer, and the money he earned from writing about the expedition exceeded the costs of mounting it.


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Another copy. Rebound in full red morocco, gilt, marbled endpapers, a.e.g. Cover and spine cloth bound in.”

Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Published 26 Nov. 1909. Inscribed ‘from Winston S. Churchill to H.J.T. [H.J. Tennant, Secretary of the Board of Trade during Churchill’s tenure as president (1908-Feb. 1910) and later Secretary of State for Scotland] 3.2.10.’ Very good, except for fore-edge foxing and damp mark on lower corner.”

According to Langworth, “*Liberalism and the Social Problem* ranks among the most important Church speech volumes. . . . Unfortunately, the first edition is exceedingly rare and, . . . scarcity is maintaining *Liberalism* prices at a high level” (p. 92) Langworth notes that the book is dedicated “To My Wife” – *Liberalism and the Social Problem* is his first publication following his marriage, on 12 September 1908, to Clementine Hozier. “The dedication was politically as well as romantically apt, since Clementine was a lifelong Liberal, who never quite trusted the Conservatives, even after Churchill had returned to them as Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1924” (p. 90). Langworth also draws our attention to the foreword by Henry William Massingham (1860-1924), “who espoused many of Churchill’s positions on handling the Boers in South Africa and was editor of *The Nation* from 1907 through 1923” (pp. 90-91).

In his introductory remarks about the book, Langworth says: “That a young, radical Churchill was once held the scourge of the British Establishment and a traitor to his class is largely forgotten by those who think of him only in the modern or at least the Second World War context. Yet by 1909, when his third book of speeches was published, Churchill was an ardent reformer, the bane of Torydom, Lloyd George’s chief lieutenant and ally among the Young Turks of the Liberal Party in their assault on the privileges of the House of Lords, their championing of the earliest forms of welfare legislation, and their campaign for Home Rule in Ireland” (p. 90). In his section on “Comments,” Langworth points out that “the title page author’s name ‘WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL’“ is “the last use of the full ‘SPENCER’ in first editions of Churchill’s works” (p. 92).

According to Gilbert, in the one-volume Life, in late October 1909 Churchill “was busy with a new book, a collection of twenty-one of the speeches he had made on social policy over the previous three years. It was published a month later with the title *Liberalism and the Social Problem*, followed within three weeks by a further collection of speeches, *The Peoples’ [sic] Rights*” (p. 209).

Best reports that “The Liberals and their Labour allies could not . . . get enough of [Churchill]. Their intellectuals admired the clarity as well as the eloquence of his speeches, made widely available later that year in book form under the title *Liberalism and the Social Problem*” (p. 34).

From Jenkins, in a discussion of Churchill in 1916, we learn that at that time H. J. Tennant was the War Office parliamentary secretary (p. 311).

Woods points out that the American edition appeared less than three months later, in early February 1910 (p. 44).


“Vol. 1, published 10 Apr. 1923, inscribed ‘from Winston S. Churchill to Ian Hamilton’; with 12-line note by Hamilton 18 May 1923 describing the occasion after dinner the previous night (17 May) when Churchill signed the flyleaf and paused, saying ’It isn’t fair to make a man tot up all the d——d wriggles in your name after dinner.’


Written in pencil on the inside cover of vol. 1 is the following notice: “1,250 pounds. 6 vols. 1st Editions Each inscribed by Churchill.”

A recent brochure from antiquarian bookseller Buddenbrooks (Boston, MA, and Mt. Desert Island, ME) of select “Important Books, Articles, and Ephemera by and About Sir Winston S. Churchill” offers a “Full Set of the Rare First Editions” of this work (p. 5).

Gilbert in *In Search of Churchill* reminds us that General Sir Ian Hamilton had been Lord Kitchener’s nominee to lead the military forces in April 1915 (p. 58); that Churchill’s brother Jack had served on Sir Ian’s staff at Gallipoli (p. 67); that Hamilton’s *Gallipoli Diary* was, in 1962 (when Gilbert first began his work for Randolph Churchill), “one of the most frequently consulted sources for the Dardanelles” (p. 229); but that that the book was not actually a contemporary record of the events but rather dictated in summer 1916 – ”months after Hamilton had been recalled to London, and more than a year after he had gone to Gallipoli, while preparing evidence for the Dardanelles Commission of Enquiry” (p. 229).

Langworth says that whenever he is asked to recommend a “big work” by Churchill, he recommends *The World Crisis*, which he considers “an even more readable multi-volume work” than Churchill’s *The Second World War* or *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, despite its tendency “to magnify and defend his own role in affairs” (p. 101). The Chapin Library’s set is part of the “First English Edition”; according to Langworth, even though this is not the “true first edition,” it is not only “more aesthetically desirable, being bound in a more
durable and uniform material and equipped with shoulder notes on each page which summarise the subject of that page” but also “more popular among collectors who wish to own only one edition (p. 108).

From Gilbert’s single-volume biography we learn that Churchill received hefty advances from both an English and an American publisher to write the book; he wrote Clementine, “the pelf will make us feel very comfortable” (p. 443). Describing the work, Gilbert says, “Appearing over a period of ten years, [the volumes] covered the origins of the war, the war itself, and the post-war era up to Chanak. Copious documentation, humour, irony, narrative excitement, thoughtful reflection and combative self-defence fill a total of 2,150 pages” (p. 458). He quotes from a review of the first volume in the New Statesman, “He has written a book which is remarkably egotistical, but which is honest and which will certainly long survive him” (p. 458). J.M. Keynes spoke of the third volume as “a tractate against war – more effective than the work of a pacifist could be” (p. 481). By the time Churchill had made the final corrections to the last volume, he was eager to move on to the multi-volume biography of his ancestor John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, a contract for which he had signed in spring 1929 (pp. 488, 502).

According to John Keegan in Winston Churchill (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002), like his biography of Marlborough, The World Crisis “concerned Britain’s struggle to achieve or sustain its status as a great power during a major conflict,” in this case, the First World War (p. 13).


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Rebound in full morocco, gilt in elaborated design, with inset ivory portrait miniature, watered silk doublures and gilt dentelles, a.e.g., by Sangorski & Sutcliffe. Fine.”

Woods reports that the book, A37(a), was translated not only into Braille but also into many languages, and that after buying the film rights in 1960 Paramount hired C. S. Forester to write the script (p. 61).

Langworth reports that scholars agree that Churchill “took certain liberties” in describing his life from birth in 1874 through his first few years in Parliament (up to 1906). For example, he was neither as stupid in school as he suggests nor as ignored by his parents. Nonetheless, Langworth calls this autobiography the “most approachable and readable of Churchill’s books” (p. 129). It provides insights into “Churchill’s emerging political philosophy, studded with remarkably advanced views on British society and the Empire” (p. 130). Langworth also notes that this “was one of the two Churchill works excerpted by the Nobel Library – for Sir Winston’s 1953 Nobel Prize in Literature was won not for his war memoirs but the totality of his work” (p. 130).

Jenkins also calls this early autobiography “probably the most engaging of all his books, using a light and sparkling note of detached irony” (p. 8); he ranks it as Churchill’s best book, with second place going to Great Contemporaries and third to Lord Randolph Churchill (p. 102), and calls it the most notable of “his more
taut and personal works . . . like draughts of clear spring water” (p. 430). Jenkins reports that Churchill devoted “no fewer than ten (out of twenty-nine) chapters” of My Early Life to his adventures in South Africa, “with four of them specifically on his own capture and escape” (p. 59). From Jenkins we also learn that (a) Churchill spent much of the late summer of 1928 working on My Early Life; he wrote Baldwin on September 2: “I have had a delightful month – building a cottage & dictating a book: 200 bricks & 2000 words per day” (p. 421), (b) this was not his only work to be dictated completely from his head and then painstakingly corrected (p. 429), and (c) although the publisher of this book (and Churchill’s regular publisher at the time), Thornton Butterworth, went into liquidation in 1938, “There is no evidence that Churchill’s terms, although stringently negotiated and favourable to the author, contributed significantly to this fate” (p. 421).

Gilbert, in the single-volume biography, contrasts Churchill’s authorial satisfaction with My Early Life to his “unhappiness at his growing political isolation” within the Conservative Party (p. 496).

From Best’s biography we learn that My Early Life began as a serial in the News Chronicle, and from those beginnings “became the most attractive and admired of all his books” (p. 131).

Keegan calls My Early Life “a lighthearted and still delightfully readable memoir of his youth at school, Sandhurst, and in the army, which reveals much of his character and aspirations” (p. 107).


A Google search reveals that Michael Graham-Dixon was the copyeditor at Weidenfeld for Thomas Pakenham’s The Boer War(1979). In 1945 Churchill also inscribed a copy of Great Contemporaries to Graham Dixon; see below.

According to Langworth, “When Thornton Butterworth went into liquidation, this title and others were obtained by Macmillan” (p. 139). The copyright page lists three different dates: “First Published October 1930; Transferred to Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1941; Reprinted 1942.” Langworth also notes that the Macmillan editions were printed “in pulpy wartime paper, but seem to be holding up well regardless.”


There is a typo in Langworth, which gives 1930 as the date of the first edition (p. 156); it actually first appeared in November 1932.
Langworth calls this collection the “broadest range of Churchill’s thought between hard covers,” comprising “essays on a vast array of subjects, attesting not only to the breadth of the author’s comprehension but of his personal experience” (p. 154). Langworth divides the contents into several different categories: musings on his own career, on politics, on the future, and a category-defying essay on Moses (pp. 154-155).

   Inscription dated January 27, 1934, from E.S.F. and MA to E. G. Storrs Fox (?) (possibly the father or son of E.S.F.?).
   This set is part of the “general edition” of Woods A40(a), “First English edition (limited and general)” (p. 67). “General edition bound in plum buckram over bevelled boards, red and yellow headbands, top edge gilt. On top board, as in limited edition, Marlborough arms stamped gilt” (p. 68).
   Langworth describes the dust jackets on the set: “All jackets are printed deep plum with the Marlborough Arms gilt on heavy, mottled grey (Vol. I), cream (Vols. II and III) and light green (Vol. IV) paper” (p. 167). Langworth also comments that “Among Churchill’s publishers, Harrap probably produced the most beautiful trade editions. . . . Collectors of fine bindings . . . have made room for this trade binding on their shelves because of its physical magnificence” (p. 167).
   According to Langworth, this biography of John Churchill, the first duke of Marlborough, and thus “his warrior ancestor” (Best, p. 129), at “One million words long and ten years in the making, . . . is Churchill’s greatest biography. It may be his greatest book. To understand the Churchill of the Second World War, the majestic blending of his commanding English with historical precedent, one has to read Marlborough. Only in its pages can one glean an understanding of the root of the speeches which inspired Britain to stand when she had little to stand with” (p. 164). In his “Comments” Langworth notes that “among Churchill’s publishers, Harrap probably produced the most beautiful trade editions” (p. 167). In his “Appraisal” he reports that “Churchill was immensely proud of Marlborough and inscribed many copies for his friends and colleagues (including some of his most strident political opponents)” (pp. 167-168).
   Woods reports that “Marlborough was serialised pre-publication in the Sunday Times, whose Gold Medal award it won in 1938” and that it was translated into French, Belgian, Dutch, Spanish, and Swedish (p. 68).
   From Gilbert’s one-volume Life we learn that Churchill began work on the biography “Within two weeks of the Conservative defeat at the polls on 30 May 1929,” and that he simultaneously was working “to seek some means of reversing the Conservative defeat.” He was assisted in his research on Marlborough by “A young Oxford historian, Maurice Ashley,” who brought him original material
from a variety of archives in Britain and Europe (p. 491) and dictated his chapters
to Violet Pearman (p. 508), who was later assisted in the secretarial work by
Grace Hamblin and later still by Kathleen Hill (p. 579). To help with the
subsequent volumes, he brought in first John Wheldon, another young Oxford-
trained researcher (p. 532), and then Bill Deakin, a “young Oxford don” (p. 557).

Gilbert reminds us how lucrative Churchill’s authorial ventures proved;
tallying up the intake of a single month in 1929, “the advance for his
Marlborough biography, payment for three articles in Nash’s Pall Mall, and
royalties on the last volume of his war memoirs were the equivalent of two and a
half years’ earnings for a Prime Minister” (p. 494). While working on the book at
Chartwell with Ashley in late September 1932, Churchill collapsed from a
recurrence of paratyphoid, having “suffered a severe haemorrhage from a
paratyphoid ulcer,” and he spent some time at a London nursing home.
Nonetheless, “By the end of October Churchill had completed half of the first of
his Marlborough volumes: and was already planning “his next literary effort, a
four-volume History of the English-Speaking Peoples,” which brought in a huge
advance (20,000 pounds, equal to 420,000 pounds in 1990) (pp. 508-509). While
completing the final Marlborough volume at Chartwell in summer 1938, he
simultaneously completed the first chapter of the four-volume History (p. 593).
He was a prodigious worker who kept himself to a strict schedule.

Gilbert reports that one of those to receive an inscribed copy of Marlborough
was FDR. Two days after the publication of the first volume in early October
1933, he inscribed a copy, “With earnest best wishes for the success of the
greatest crusade of modern times” (p. 522). Even while celebrating the
publication of the third volume, in October 1936, “by sending out more than
seventy inscribed copies, . . . there was a shadow to the celebration; a month
earlier his daughter Sarah had announced her intention to marry an Austrian-born
music hall comedian, Vic Oliver, who had been twice married before”; Churchill
later reported having overcome his initial objection to the match and developed
affection and respect for his son-in-law (p. 563).

In his In Search of Churchill, Gilbert informs us that Churchill’s first research
assistant on the Marlborough project, Maurice Ashley, was “son of one of
Churchill’s Board of Trade officials before the First World War” (p. 137).
Although Churchill was delighted when Ashley took First Class honors at Oxford,
“He was less pleased with his socialistic views” (p. 138), though he reassured
others that Ashley’s “silly ideas” did not interfere with “his competence and
industry as an historical investigator” (p. 139). Resembling Henry IV in his
invidious comparisons of Prince Hal to Hotspur, Churchill wrote Ashley’s father,
“It must give you great pleasure to watch his development. My son is very idle,
and profits little by the life of the University” (p. 138). Gilbert reports that Ashley
left Churchill in 1934, working first at the Manchester Guardian and then as a
historical author in his own right – his books include Churchill as Historian
(1968); during World War II he worked for Military Intelligence (p. 141).

Gilbert sheds light on Ashley’s successors’ careers as well: Wheldon
returned to full-time teaching at Oxford in 1936; was wounded at Dunkirk in
1939, when he went as an officer to France; and spent much of the rest of the war
deb briefing British and French agents brought out of occupied Europe (p. 145). Wheldon’s replacement, Deakin, segued seamlessly from the final Marlborough volume to the first volume of the history of English-speaking peoples (p. 148).

We also learn from Gilbert’s *Search* that Churchill’s team for the Marlborough project included still others: a member of the Harrap firm, C. C. Wood, “who became a full-time member of the literary team, responsible for proof-reading of Marlborough volume two and beyond. From then on, the proof-reading process was known at Chartwell as ‘wooding’” (p. 139); a naval assistant, a military assistant, and, for an eight-day intensive working session at Chartwell, one Keith Feiling (p. 139).

According to Gilbert, Churchill retained a sense of responsibility for his long-time secretary, Violet Pearman. After her death in 1941, “Churchill made arrangements for her monthly salary . . . to be paid to her daughter Rosemary, then aged eleven, and for a further seven years beginning in 1943 he paid 100 pounds a year towards Rosemary’s education” (p. 159). Grace Hamblin, her assistant, “stayed with Churchill for six years, before becoming Clementine’s secretary when Churchill went to the Admiralty, to help lessen the demands made on a minister’s, and later on a Prime Minister’s, wife”; she remained with Mrs. Churchill “from the outbreak of the war in 1940 until after Churchill’s death in 1965” (p. 159). Hamblin told Gilbert that while they were working on the Marlborough project, Churchill “would dictate until 2 or 3 in the morning . . . He worked so hard himself and was so absolutely dedicated to the task in hand that he expected the same from others. He accepted it as his right. And in time we who worked for him realized that in full return for the stress and strain, we had the rare privilege of getting to know the beauty of his dynamic, but gentle character” (p. 160).

Among the interesting tidbits we learn from Gilbert’s *Search* about Churchill’s Marlborough work is that historian Lewis Namier objected to Churchill’s “use in his [draft] narrative of imaginary conversations.” Although Churchill agreed to omit these, he argued to Namier that documentary evidence often does not make for compelling history, and “to fill in the picture one has to visualize the daily life” (p. 246). We also learn that “Among the medallions of which Churchill was most proud” was his “*Sunday Times* Literary Award given to him in 1938 for his four Marlborough volumes” (p. 307).

Jenkins adds a considerable amount of information about the Marlborough project. Churchill originally envisioned it “as a one- or at most two-volume work of between 180,000 and 250,000 words” (p. 422), but it ultimately amounted to four volumes and “a little under a million words” (p. 430). Churchill originally turned to a literary agent, A.P. Wyatt, to negotiate a contract for him, but when the firm came up with an offer of a mere 6,000-pound advance from Hodder & Stoughton, he negotiated on his own, and succeeded in getting a10,000-pound advance “for British and Commonwealth rights” from Harrap, supplemented by 5,000 pounds from Scribner’s for the American rights “and another 5,000 pounds for the serial rights” from the *Daily Telegraph* (p. 422). A few years into the project, Churchill began to refer to Marlborough as “John Duke” (p. 445). The paratyphoid that felled him while working with Ashley at Chartwell was
contracted in 1932, “In south Germany, which should have been one of the healthier places in the world,” leading him to a two-week stay at a sanatorium in Salzburg (pp. 445-446).

Jenkins also informs us that Ashley wrote his own biography of Marlborough, which was published in 1939; while in Churchill’s half-time employ, he earned 300 pounds a year.

Jenkins has a refreshing comment about the literary value of the work: Although “the central part is compulsive reading,” he finds “the first chapter, about John Churchill’s antecedents,” not at all gripping. Still, “From chapter two onwards . . . Marlborough soars into the air” and “One boring chapter on forebears, a notoriously soporific contribution to many biographies, is not excessive. But it was curious that Churchill, such an accomplished and indeed commercial writer, should have allowed this chapter to sit surlily at the entrance to his first major biography since his life of Lord Randolph Churchill” (p. 450).

Churchill biographer John Keegan (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002) says that this four-volume biography of his great ancestor, like his later book The World Crisis, “concerned Britain’s struggle to achieve or sustain its status as a great power during a major conflict, the War of the Spanish Succession, 1701-14, and the First World War, respectively” (p. 13).


This set is no. 82 of the signed limited edition, Woods A40a. According to Langworth, “The only signed trade edition in the Churchill canon and one of only two publisher’s leatherbound first editions (the other is presentation binding of The Second World War) this consists of 155 four-volume sets sold by advance subscription. . . . Clearly this is the most desirable of the first editions. . . .” (pp. 168–9).


Inscribed “To Michael Graham Dixon from Winston S. Churchill 1945” – all a Google search reveals is that Michael Graham-Dixon was the copyeditor at Weidenfeld for Thomas Pakenham’s *The Boer War* (1979). In 1945 Churchill also inscribed one of the Chapin Library’s copies of *My Early Life* to Graham Dixon; see above.

The first edition, we learn from Langworth, consisted of 21 profiles; the revised 1938 edition added four. Of the 25, 16 are British. “With the exception of four military figures and an eclectic threesome (Shaw, George V, Baden-Powell) all of these represent the cultured, urbane British political leadership of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Three of them – Balfour, Rosebery, Asquith – had been Prime Ministers. Several of the others had wishes to be, including Lord Curzon, for whom Churchill reserves some of his most penetrating and witty prose” (p. 176). The four military figures include “Generals Haig and French, Admiral Fisher and Lawrence of Arabia. Lawrence was always a romantic hero to Churchill, who failed to enlist his further efforts after Lawrence had helped him create modern Iraq and Jordan at the 1921 Cairo Conference” (p. 177). He singles out the essay on Lawrence as “a gem” (p. 179). The nine foreigners include “three German/Austrian (the ex-Kaiser, Hindenburg and Hitler); two Russians (Savinkov and Trotsky, one executed, one about to be); Spain’s King Alfonso XIII, America’s Roosevelt, and the two greatest Frenchmen of the age, Foch and Clemenceau” (p. 177).

The Chapin Library’s copy seems to be from the second impression of the Macmillan issue, which Langworth describes as following: “The product of wartime inflation? Macmillan first published *Great Contemporaries* in 1942, using the same plates that had produced the two book club editions immediately preceding, but taking further economy measures: dropping the individual title pages for each entry, dropping the photo section and (since America was now an ally, dropping that diffident chapter on Franklin Roosevelt). The result saved almost 60 pages . . . the Macmillan Edition has no aesthetic significance, and is important only to illustrate the political exigencies of the time” (p. 185).

Antiquarian bookseller Buddenbrooks (Boston and Deer Island, ME), in a recent brochure of important Churchilliana, describes its copy as “Important First Edition. This is Churchill’s great multi-biography of the men he considered to be the greatest figures of his time. Churchill composed these short sketches between 1928, when he composed the piece of Herbert Asquith, and 1936. Among the notables rank: George Bernard Shaw, Adolf Hitler, t. E. Lawrence, Curzon, King George, Hindenburg and others for a total of 21 . . . A fascinating look at the great men of the age by someone who is not simply a biographer but unquestionable [sic] a peer” (p. 8).

According to Norman Rose, in *Churchill: The Unruly Giant* (NY, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: The Free Press, 1994), Churchill undertook not only this book (which first came out in 1937) but about a dozen others within the same decade, in addition to his journalistic obligations to several newspapers in England and the United States. He took on so many writing projects because “he had to earn a living. Whatever his income, it was never enough to satisfy his expensive tastes” (p. 230). Contrasting Churchill’s shorter biographical sketches
to his longer forays into biography, Rose also suggests that “What motivated human activity was of marginal interest to Churchill. . . . In his two biographies, for all his commitment, his heroes appear as unfinished, not to say hollow, characters. He was more successful in his pen-portraits. When he empathized with his subjects, and when he was dealing with events that he had experienced, he was able to illuminate their careers in a vivid, credible, and succinct fashion, as he did in his portraits of Rosebery, or [John] Morley, or Birkenhead in *Great Contemporaries*” (p. 261).

According to Jenkins, *Great Contemporaries*, which he describes as “a series of 4,000- or 5,000-word profiles” (p. 423), is one of Churchill’s two best books, along with another brief volume, *My Early Life* (p. 102); in his estimation, “his more taut and personal works, most notably *My Early Life* but also *Great Contemporaries* and *Painting as a Pastime* (1948) are like draughts of clear spring water” (p. 430). From Jenkins we learn that the original working title for the book was *Notable Contemporaries* (p. 448). Jenkins also tells us that “The most spirit-lifting of Churchill’s writing activities of 1937 was the assembling and publication of *Great Contemporaries* in the summer and early autumn. . . . *Great Contemporaries* came out at the beginning of September, and had an immediate and continuing moderate success. . . . The reviews, many anonymous in those days, were also mostly good. . . . There was throughout the whole collection a welcome feeling of freedom from the literary atelier. . . . *Great Contemporaries* remains a very bright star in the constellation of Churchill’s literary work” (pp. 509-511).

Martin Gilbert in his one-volume *Churchill: A Life* (London: Heinemann, 1991) says that the book, “a collection of Churchill’s magazine articles,” was characterized by “penetrating and amusing essays, including those on Rosebery, Balfour, Asquith and Lloyd George. At the request of the Foreign Office the essay on Hitler, originally printed in the *Strand* magazine, had been made less sharp” (pp. 580-581). In *In Search of Churchill: A Historian’s Journey* (London: HarperCollins, 1994), Gilbert spells out the Foreign Office’s request: “. . . when Churchill decided to reprint his Hitler article in book form, in *Great Contemporaries*, a Foreign Office official wrote to Churchill’s secretary, Violet Pearman, ‘It is hardly to be thought that this article would be at all palatable to the powers that be in Germany. In the present rather delicate state of our relations with that country, when one does not know which way the cat will jump, it might therefore be questioned whether republication just now was advisable’” (p. 275).

Langworth opens his discussion of the book by referring to the type of criticism made by Jenkins: that Churchill’s work is marred by a lack of interest in others. He dismisses it by saying, “The reader of *Great Contemporaries* will come away with entirely the opposite impression. No one could have written such vivid essays on the great personages of his time without comprehension, understanding and regard for them” (p. 176).

From Woods we get a sense of how much the author benefited financially from the book’s sales: his “royalties were 25 per cent to 5000, 27 per cent between 5000 and 10,000, and 30 per cent thereafter” (p. 78); a total of 15,000 books were printed of the first edition alone, which was priced at 21s. The book
was translated into nine languages – “French, German, Italian, Swedish, Portuguese, Norwegian, Dutch and Hebrew” – and came out in paperback as well as hardback in German (p. 78).


Inscribed “To Sylvia from Winston S. Churchill, November 1938.” Sylvia Stanley Henley was Clementine Churchill’s cousin. According to Churchill biographer Jenkins, Sylvia and Clementine had a strong and long-lasting friendship (p. 138). Martin Gilbert, author of the eight-volume Churchill biography, in *In Search of Churchill* (London: HarperCollins, 1994), calls the Honorable Sylvia Henley “one of those who had known Churchill best, and longest” (p. 51) and “a frequent guest at Chartwell” (p. 305) – Churchill’s home in Westerham, Kent. (According to Geoffrey Best, in *Churchill: A Study in Greatness* [London and New York: Hambledon and London, 2001], “Chartwell was . . . where the bulk of Churchill’s writing was done” [p. 147].)

Paper insert “With the respectful compliments of Chas. J. Sawyer, No. 1 Grafton Street, New Bond Street, London, W1X 3LB.”

Dedicated by Randolph S. Churchill “To My Father ‘Without Whose Help This Book Could Never Have Been Written.’” Preface by RSC (pp. 5-8): “My father has consented to a suggestion I made him some time ago that I should compile a volume of his speeches on Foreign Affairs and National Defence. This book is the result.”

Roy Jenkins, author of *Churchill: A Biography* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), uses “Arms and the Covenant” as the title for his 26th chapter. According to Jenkins, such a title for the 1938 collection of speeches would not have been justifiable in 1934. Jenkins points to a “significant shift in emphasis in Churchill’s attitude during 1935” (p. 481) that justified the use of the title three years later. Before that year “he had been more eager to shock the House of Commons than to persuade it. . . . Gradually over the mid-decade year he became more concerned to broaden his appeal. . . . Churchill began to see the League [of Nations], not as a threat to the Royal Air Force and to the French army, but as a possible instrument for resistance to fascist aggression. He adopted a two-handed policy, which made it possible for a collection of his 1930s speeches . . . to be reasonably entitled *Arms and the Covenant*” (p. 482). Jenkins later notes of the collection of speeches that they were “appropriately entitled, at least for those after 1935, *Arms and the Covenant*, although before that date there was much more of Arms than of the Covenant” (p. 518).

According to Jenkins, agreeing to let RSC compile the speeches for publication “was a gracious paternal gesture on Churchill’s part, for in February and into March [1938] he had had an appalling epistolary row with his only son,” a not uncommon event (p. 519). Argument notwithstanding, “Randolph did the editing task competently, the speeches were prescient and mostly good, the title
apposite and resonant in the context of the time.” Although the book sales were respectable at “about 4,000,” Churchill had hoped for better. Jenkins quotes a letter from Clementine (July 12, 1938): “I’m sorry Darling you are disappointed at the sale of the Book. I’m sure it’s the price – The sort of people who want to hear that the Government is all wrong are not the rich ones – The Tories don’t want to be made to think!” Jenkins concludes his discussion of the book by noting: “Nevertheless the book provided a filial reconciliation as well as a manifesto for his current campaign, and is of continuing interest” (p. 519). [See Churchill’s disappointment in his son’s idleness during his university career and his invidious comparisons of Randolph to his researcher Ashley while speaking with Ashley’s father; search “Hotspur.”] (According to Keegan [p. 70], “Randolph emerged as a sort of caricature of Winston, insufferably bumptious, garrulous, and attention seeking. He tried to make careers both in politics and journalism, proving an embarrassment at elections and descending to sensationalism in the newspapers. His only redeeming feature was his heartfelt devotion to his father, whose official biographer he much later became.)”

Richard M. Langworth, in A Connoisseur’s Guide to the Books of Sir Winston Churchill (London and Washington: Brassey’s, 1998), compares the collection to “a concert with three movements,” beginning in a “light, sometimes even humorous” vein, with Churchill’s 1928 “Disarmament Fable”; moving on to “a gathering solemnity” with “a terrible crescendo,” tracing “the sad, dreary progress of German rearmament and Britain’s refusal, first to see it and later to match it”; and then “ending in the awful finale of March 1938,” with “Eden’s resignation as foreign secretary, [and] the Austrian Anschluss.”

Langworth points out that “The book appeared well before Munich, a time when prevailing opinion held that Hitler had made his last demands, and few save Churchill insisted otherwise.” Langworth also notes that while the British edition of Arms and the Covenant came out toward the end of June, the “American Edition did not appear until late September, so its publishers had three further months and the Munich pact in which to contemplate a title. They entitled it appropriately: While England Slept” (p. 191).

Frederick Woods, in A Bibliography of the Works of Sir Winston Churchill, 2nd revised edition (St Paul’s Bibliographies No. 1, 1975), notes that “Each speech is preceded by its individual divisional half-title and diary of events.” With regard to the issue of the book’s price, raised by Clementine, Woods also points out that while the first edition of 5000 copies was priced at 18s, “The book was re-issued as a cheap edition, price 7s. 6d. in June 1940. 3381 were sold at the original price, and 1382 at the lower price. A new edition was published by Odhams in 1947.” Woods indicates the book was translated into Swedish (p. 82).


Inscribed “Inscribed for M. Philips Price by Winston Churchill March 1939.” According to www.atour.com/~history/1900/20000718w.html, Price was “War Correspondent For Various British and American Newspapers on the Caucasian Front.” A fuller biography on spartacus.schoolnet reveals that Morgan Philips Price (1885-1973), son of an MP for Tewkesbury, was educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, and later served in Parliament himself as a member of the Labour Party. On the eve of World War I he helped found an important British anti-war organization, the Union of Democratic Control. His writings, in addition to his war correspondence, include *The Diplomatic History of the War* (1914), *My Reminiscences of the Russian Revolution* (1921), and a memoir, *My Three Revolutions* (1969).


In 1915 Nellie Hozier (1888-1957) married Colonel Bertram Romilly. A typo in Langworth (p. 197) gives the date of the first edition at 1937, instead of 1939.

This copy of the first edition is bound in the dark green cloth described in Langworth, p. 197.


Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Another copy. Rebound in full red morocco, gilt, marbled endpapers, a.e.g.”

Langworth describes the book’s contents as a collection of 82 newspaper articles, “from the German reoccupation of the Rhineland in March 1936 through the Spanish Civil War, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis, Hitler’s absorption of Austria and Czechoslovakia, President Roosevelt’s inquiry about what Hitler and Mussolini intended for the States on their borders, to Churchill’s May 1939 prediction that Hitler would next attack Poland” (p. 196). He notes that the book “enjoyed good sales” (p. 197).


Langworth describes the original binding of the first English edition as “Black cloth blocked gilt on spine” (p. 264). “Since our author insisted that the English Edition was the definitive version, this is clearly the set to own if you plan to own only one” (p. 265). To those who argue that the books are not truly a history,
Langworth responds: “The Second World War is indeed intensely personal, considering the war from Churchill’s angle, not Britain’s, and it moralises because the memoir-writer passionately believed in those morals. . . . I am not sure what is so wrong about that” (p. 255). In Langworth’s estimation “The Second World War, a prose epic like The River War and Marlborough, belongs with them amongst the first rank of Churchill’s books. Flaws and all, it is indispensable reading for anyone who seeks a true understanding of the war that made us what we are today (p. 258).

Antiquarian bookseller Buddenbrooks, in a recent brochure advertising the sale of selected important items of Churchilliana, in describing it first edition as “a superior set,” calls it “Churchill’s Nobel Prize winning Work . . . in 1953 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in spite of the fact that the work was not yet published in full. In that same year he was distinguished by being made Knight of the Garter by Queen Elizabeth II” (p. 5).

Churchill called the epigraph of this series of volumes – ”In war: resolution. In defeat: defiance. In victory: magnanimity. In peace: goodwill” – the “Moral of the Work.”

Gilbert, in the single-volume biography, informs us that in April 1948 Life began to serialize the first volume of these war memoirs; “It was the beginning of a massive public readership, enhanced when the volume itself was published, and renewed with the appearance of each of the subsequent five volumes. These formed the first fully-documentated account of the war, and the only account written by one of the Big Three. Sales were enormous, including foreign-language sales” (p. 879). We also learn that as he prepared the work, “there was a constant revision of the chapters as Churchill received, from many of the participants in the drama, the criticisms he had sought from them” (p. 887). Together with his assistants, Denis Kelly and F. W. Deakin, he reviewed the many letters that poured in with suggestions and responses to queries. Even after a diagnosis of increasing deafness was confirmed in June 1950, Churchill continued to work at the war memoirs. “Eakin later recalled his master’s ‘enormous power of living for the moment, the most intense concentration I have ever known’ “ (p. 891). By the time the final volume was nearing completion in summer 1952, “Churchill was content that his helpers should take on the full weight of these final aspects” – the appendices and the maps (p. 906). Gilbert gives an example of a typical note Churchill dictated while preparing the final volume: “The death of President Roosevelt. How did it reach me? How soon did I speak to Parliament? What did I say?” (p. 908). But Gilbert also quotes the impression of Walter Graebner of Time-Life who visited Churchill at Chartwell while he was working on the final volume and was impressed with the prime minister’s vigor: “Work began at the luncheon table after the second bottle of champagne was emptied and cigars were lighted. ‘Now let’s get down to it,’ Churchill said. We were still sitting there at a quarter to five, Churchill having gone over every word in the manuscript to make sure that he understood the full story of the battle and that he had related it clearly and in his best words. In the years that I knew him, his mind was never sharper than on that grey August afternoon in 1953” (p. 917).
Jenkins notes that Churchill, beginning in 1939-1940, when he became First Lord of the Admiralty again (as he had been 1911-1915), started his habit “of firing off departmental minutes. . . . These were brief, mostly courteous, occasionally witty, probing enquiries or comments. . . . The picture they give in . . . The Second World War, is distorted by replies hardly ever being allowed a place. They had however both spontaneity and impact. He dictated them without hesitation as soon as he read or physically observed something which attracted his attention. There never has been a minister or a writer more dependent upon the constant attendance of a stenographer. He needed secretaries by day and far into the night, more even than many great men need sycophants” (pp. 552-553). The habit intensified after he became Prime Minister (1940-1945). Jenkins also describes that during the postwar years, when Churchill was Leader of the Opposition (1945-1951), “the tangled but remunerative story of the writing of The Second World War was as central to Churchill’s life as was his politics” (p. 819). His writing habit in general “was his best protection against ‘black dog’—depression. “The marshalling of proofs and of teams of researchers, advisers and ladies who took his dictation until far into the night was the best substitute for red boxes, the flow of telegrams in and out, and the constant availability of private secretaries supplemented by generals, admirals and air marshals. Furthermore he greatly needed the money. He ended the war with his finances as precarious as they had mostly been. His war memoirs made him securely rich and, because of the way in which he held taxation at bay and disposed of the money, made his descendants rich after him” (p. 819).

According to John Keegan, author of Winston Churchill (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002), Churchill’s story in these volumes was “how a great nation, often threatened by tyrants, had in the severest of its ordeals staved off defeat and emerged once again victorious” (p. 14). Keegan also notes that Churchill wrote these volumes using the method he had “perfected while writing his biography of Marlborough in the 1930s. A team of research assistant assembled the documents. He composed the text largely by dictation, often from his bed” (p. 174). Keegan notes that the completion of the six volumes in five years was “an astonishing achievement for an author who on November 30, 1951, entered his seventy-eighth year” (p. 174). He points to the monetary inducements to progress at a rapid pace; the publishing agreements “for the first time in his life, freed him of financial anxiety and even allowed him to set up a trust fund for his grandchildren” (p. 174). Nonetheless, it was not money that led Churchill to undertake the project; his goal was “to ensure that his vision of the war would become the accepted version” (p. 174). Churchill depicted a struggle between the Nazi villains and the British heroes “in a conflict between tyranny and liberty of universal significance. The universality of principle was perpetuated in the motto chosen to preface each volume: ‘In war, resolution; in defeat, defiance; in victory, magnanimity; in peace, goodwill.’ The text bore it out, to a degree remarkable in a work of such length. The Second World War is a great work of literature, combining narrative, historical imagination, and moral precept in a form that bears comparison with that of the original master chronicler, Thucydides. It was wholly appropriate that in 1953 Churchill was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature” (pp. 174-175).

Gift of John C. Walsh to the Chapin Library, Williams College, June 25, 1992. Described: “Rebound in three-quarter morocco, gilt, marbled endpapers, a.e.g. Fine.”

Calling this “Churchill’s last great work” (p. 312), Langworth notes that, like Churchill’s multi-volume works on World Wars I and II, it is less an original contribution to history than an interpretation from a man uniquely gifted as both a statesman and a writer (pp. 313-314). Having assembled outlines from many scholars, Churchill put to work on this new project the same literary team he had gathered to work on the *Marlborough* biography, which he had just completed when he begin his first draft. Although the project was initially intended to fill a single volume, over the nearly two decades that elapsed from his first draft in the late 1930s until its publication in the second half of the 1950s, it evolved into four volumes, each of which comprises three “books.” According to Langworth, this project kept Churchill going once he was no longer at the country’s helm; “one is struck by . . . how rapidly he sank into decline and depression after the final volume was published” (p. 312). Churchill chose the date 1885 as the terminus for the fourth volume, *The Great Democracies*. According to his diary he told his physician, Lord Moran, “I could not write about the woe and ruin of the terrible twentieth century” (pp. 312-313).

Langworth is an admirer of the dust jackets on this, the first trade edition (which, for the first time in Churchill’s writing career, was published simultaneously in Britain, the US, and Canada), but the Chapin Library’s set sports none. Churchill was pleased with the physical outcome of this edition, and admiringly told Lord Moran that the book stayed open without the reader’s having “to break the back of the book” (p. 316).

In Gilbert’s single-volume biography we learn that Churchill’s main assistant on the project was Alan Hodge, editor of the monthly publication *History Today* (p. 916). Cassells, his English publisher, was run by the Flower family, to one of whom, Sir Newman Flower, Churchill wrote in 1939, “It has been a comfort in this anxious year to retire into past centuries” (pp. 616-617). He repeated that sentiment to historian G. M. Young later that summer: “It is a relief in times like these to be able to escape into other centuries.” That night Nazi forces invaded Poland (p. 619). Although the history of the English-speaking peoples “had been set up in print on the eve of war,” it remained unpublished, and Churchill did not resume work on it until after he suffered a stroke in June 1953. Only two months later Churchill was confiding in Lord Moran, his physician, “I’ve been living on the Second World War. Now I shall live on this history. I shall lay an egg a year – a volume every twelve months should not mean much work” (p. 916).

Jenkins does not consider this “one of his best literary productions” (p. 448), and in fact says that “By no stretch of the imagination was it the best of Churchill’s books” (p. 900). Although the work was completed in 1939, the initial deadline stipulated in the Cassell contract, it “was then put into cold storage, first by the war and then by the priority which Churchill wished to be given to the
many volumes of *The Second World War*” (p. 448). Jenkins reports that Desmond Flower of Cassells was dissatisfied with the initial submission of the book, primarily because of Churchill’s decision to end it in the 19th century (p. 562). Author and publisher reconciled, however, and the work would prove “highly profitable to both” (p. 900). In 1946 London-based filmmaker Alexander Korda paid Churchill 50,000 pounds for the film rights to *The History of the English-Speaking Peoples*. Jenkins also gives some details about how Churchill went about “recasting” the work in the 1950s. Alan Hodge was assisted by Denis Kelly, “the shadowy figure who had first come to Chartwell to assemble documents for *The Second World War*” (p. 899), along with academics who were thrilled to be invited to participate. The work gave Churchill a lease on life.

According to Keegan, Churchill conceived the idea for this project soon after being injured in a car accident in New York in late 1931, followed by bouts of paratyphoid fever (p. 108), when he was “politically in the wilderness . . . when Ramsay MacDonald formed his National Government without a place for Churchill” (p. 109). The project would unite the history “of his father’s nation with his mother’s country.” The advance for the project cheered him up. “The book would not see the light of day for nearly twenty years. In the interval it helped to sustain his perennially extravagant way of life” (p. 108).
II. LETTERS, SPEECHES, AND OTHER SPECIAL ITEMS


On the back of this folded note is an autograph letter from T.E.H., dated August 15th, 1899, from Castle Leod, Strathpeffer. According to www.serenery.com/887CastleLeod.html, “Castle Leod was built about 1610 by Sir Roderick Mackenzie of Coigach. Sir Roderick’s grandson was created Earl of Cromartie in 1703, however the 3rd Earl was forfeited for his part in the Jacobite Rising of 1745. The property and titles were later recovered and a wing added to the castle 1854.” From www.chebucto.ns.ca/Heritage/FSCNS/Scots_NS/Clans/MacKenzie/Castles_MacKenzie/Castle_Leod.htm, we learn that Castle Leod, Strathpeffer, is the “Scottish Highlands SEAT of CLAN MACKENZIE.”

Another letter to Hickman, dated 3 VII 99, from Quetta Baluchistan, in autograph pencil, is in the folder, from the first “celebrity of sorts,” Hunter.

Although I cannot find any references to T. E. Hickman, in Companion Volume I, Part 2 (1896-1900), to Randolph S. Churchill’s *Winston S. Churchill* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), one finds a letter from Churchill to Lord Salisbury written on August 9, 1899, the day after Churchill’s letter to Hickman. In it Churchill reports, “I have at length finished my book describing the recovery of the Soudan. It is to be published in two volumes by Messrs Longman’s on the 1st of October” (pp. 1039-1040). The reference both here and in the letter to Hickman is to Churchill’s *The River War: An Historical Account of the Reconquest of the Soudan*, which Churchill dedicated to “The Marquess of Salisbury, K.G. under whose wise direction the Conservative Party have long enjoyed power and the nation prosperity during whose administration the reorganisation of Egypt has been mainly accomplished and upon whose advice Her Majesty determined to order the reconquest of the Soudan.”


J. Travis-Clegg was the Oldham Tory Chairman. Oldham, northeast of Liverpool, was WSC’s constituency from 1901-1905 (first as a Conservative and then as a Liberal). Churchill wrote this letter several days before the Colonial Conference, which took place in ten sessions over the period June 30 to August 11, 1902. In the middle of the conference Salisbury resigned as prime minister; Michael Hicks-Beach (1837-1916) resigned as Chancellor of the Exchequer with him. Balfour replaced Salisbury as Prime Minister (and C.T. Ritchie replaced Hicks-Beach).
The second volume of the multivolume biography of Churchill, *Young Statesman, 1901-1914*, chapter 2, “Crossing the Floor,” opens with coverage of some of the issues at the heart of this letter. Some relevant information from that chapter: “On 14 April 1902 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had reintroduced, as part of his Budget, a registration duty of threepence a hundred-weight on imported corn and grain. . . . Hicks-Beach said that in view of the continuing demands being made on the Exchequer . . . it was necessary to enlarge the existing basis of taxation. At the same time, however, he denied that the tax on imported corn was the precursor of a protectionist policy. . . . The Corn Tax was expected to raise 2,650,000 pounds . . . ” (p. 47). The Liberal opposition objected to the tax on the grounds “that it was a tax on the people’s food” (p. 48). Churchill was able to support the Corn Tax possibly “because he knew that his father’s old friend Hicks-Beach was at heart a staunch Free Trader” (p. 49).

I do not know the identity of either the hostile Mr. Hilton or the mysterious Mr. Smelhurst to whom WSC refers above. Nor can I identify WSC’s two strongest supporters in Oldham, to whom he refers. Although I am not sure what “Mr. Chamberlain’s scheme” was, Austen Chamberlain (1865-1937) was Financial Secretary to the Treasury from 1900-1902, Postmaster-General during 1902-1903, and Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1903-1905.

3. Churchill, Winston S. Autograph letter to Lloyd George, dated April 8, 1910. David Lloyd George, 1st Earl (1863-1945), was the Liberal MP for Carnarvon Boroughs from 1890 through 1945. In 1908 WSC succeeded him as President of the Board of Trade, a position he held until February 1910. At the time he wrote this letter, Churchill was Home Secretary, a position he held from February 1910 through October 1911 (when he became First Lord of the Admiralty). Lloyd George was Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1908-1914. In 1909 he introduced the “People’s Budget,” which led to a constitutional crisis following a veto by the House of Lords. Together with WSC, Lloyd George introduced social reforms that are the underpinnings of the modern welfare state.

Churchill inscribed the Chapin’s copy of *The Malakand Field Force* to John Morley, the subject of this letter, in 1908, when Morley was Secretary of State for India, a position he held from 1905-1910, and Chancellor of Manchester University. In 1908 Morley was also raised to the peerage. As Lord President of the Council he played an important role in the reform of the House of Lords. Morley’s speech threatening to create as many new peers as it took persuaded the Lords to back-down in its conflict with Asquith’s Liberal Government. WSC also wrote a profile of Morley in *Great Contemporaries*.

Background to the letter can be found in http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/L1911.htm:

In 1908 David Lloyd George, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Liberal government led by Herbert Asquith introduced the Old Age Pensions Act that provided between 1s. and 5s. a week to people over seventy. To pay for these pensions Lloyd George had to raise government revenues by an additional £16 million a year.

In 1909 David Lloyd George announced what became known as the People’s Budget. This included increases in taxation. Whereas people on lower incomes were to pay 9d. in the pound, those on annual incomes of over £3,000 had to pay 1s. 2d. in the pound. Lloyd George also
introduced a new supertax of 6d. in the pound for those earning £5000 a year. Other measures included an increase in death duties on the estates of the rich and heavy taxes on profits gained from the ownership and sale of property.

The Conservatives, who had a large majority in the House of Lords, objected to this attempt to redistribute wealth, and made it clear that they intended to block these proposals. Lloyd George reacted by touring the country making speeches in working-class areas on behalf of the budget and portraying the nobility as men who were using their privileged position to stop the poor from receiving their old age pensions.

With the House of Lords extremely unpopular with the British people, the Liberal government decided to take action to reduce its powers. The 1911 Parliament Act drastically cut the powers of the Lords. They were no longer allowed to prevent the passage of ‘money bills’ and it also restricted their ability to delay other legislation to three sessions of parliament. The bill also changed the maximum length of time between general elections was reduced from seven years to five and provided payment for Members of Parliament.

When the House of Lords attempted to stop this bill’s passage, the Prime Minister, Henry Asquith, appealed to George V for help. Asquith, who had just obtained a victory in the 1910 General Election, was in a strong position, and the king agreed that if necessary he would create 250 new Liberal peers to remove the Conservative majority in the Lords. Faced with the prospect of a House of Lords with a permanent Liberal majority, the Conservatives agreed to let the 1911 Parliament Act to become law.

According to the brief biography at the opening of Randolph S. Churchill, *Winston S. Churchill: Young Statesman, 1901-1914*, “MORLEY, John, 1st Viscount (1838-1923); Liberal MP 1883-1908; Secretary of State for India 1905-10; Lord President of the Council 1910-14 when he resigned over British intervention. His official biography of Gladstone published 1903.” RSC also notes that Morley was one of the few people “from conversation with whom” his father claimed to “have derived . . . pleasure and profit” (p. 217).

The “main question” to which Churchill alludes in the letter was the abolition of the veto of the House of Lords. According to *Young Statesman*, Churchill wrote a long memo on February 14, 1910, calling for “the total abolition of the House of Lords. . . . He favoured a second chamber subordinate to the Commons,” which would lack the “power to make or unmake Governments” (p. 324). Two days before writing this letter to Lloyd George, WSC wrote the King, “The debate on the motion preliminary to the Veto Resolutions was concluded on Monday by the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr Lloyd George addressed to the House a long and soberly reasoned argument. It was designed to show how very unfair the existing system and the use of the Lords Veto were to the Liberal party. It set forth how at each General Election the country chooses broadly between two opposing programmes. When the Conservatives are returned they can and do carry their controversial party bills, like the Education Act of 1902 and the licensing act of 1904. When the Liberals are returned they are only allowed to carry so much of their policy as the Conservative Opposition approve of, or as they do not judge it expedient to disapprove. In 1906 every Liberal candidate pledged himself to deal with Education, Licensing, Land Values, Plural Voting. Every one of these measures was actively discussed in every constituency. Every single one was rejected by the House of Lords although sent to them by enormous majorities” (*Winston S. Churchill: Young Statesman, 1901-1914*, Companion Volume II, Part 2, 1907-1911, p. 1003).
On the day after Churchill’s letter to Lloyd George, 9 April 1910, WSC wrote the King, “The Resolution abolishing the financial Veto of the House of Lords has been fully debated and was carried without amendment on Thursday night by the respectable majority of 102” (p. 1004). On 13 April, in another letter to the King, WSC wrote: “The House of Commons has this week entered upon and pursued the discussion of the Resolution which is designed to restrict to a period of two years the Veto of the House of Lords upon ordinary legislation” (1005-1006).

According to Peter Rowland’s biography of Lloyd George (New York: Macmillan), “At the end of March . . . [Prime Minister] Asquith introduced three resolutions in the Commons. The first declared that the Lords should have no control over financial legislation, the second that their veto on other legislation should be so restricted that the will of the Commons would prevail during a single Parliament and the third that Parliaments should not last longer than five years. . . . On April 14th, amid scenes of great jubilation from the ministerial benches, [Asquith] introduced a Parliament Bill into the Commons, designed to give practical effect to the three resolutions already approved, and announced that if it were rejected by the Lords the Government would ‘tender advice to the Crown as to the steps which will have to be taken if that policy is to receive statutory effect in this parliament.’ If this advice were rejected the Government would either resign or recommend a dissolution ‘under such conditions as will ensure that in the new Parliament the judgment of the people as expressed in the election will be carried into law’” (p. 234). A few weeks later King Edward VII died (p. 235).


   From February 1921 through October 1922, WSC was Secretary of State for the Colonies. Erez Israel is Hebrew for “the land of Israel.” The number 5682 in the publication’s title is the Hebrew year equivalent for 1922.

   According to http://www.jnf.org/site/PageServer?pagename=history, Theodor Herzl (the father of political Zionism), on the fourth day of the Fifth Zionist Congress in Basel, Switzerland in 1901, called for the establishment of a national fund to purchase land in Palestine. Herzl, his aide, and a delegate to the congress each pledged small sums of money, and in this modest way the JNF came into existence. In spring 1903 the JNF acquired its first parcel of land; by 1921, JNF had acquired 25,000 acres in Erez Israel, and by 1927 it held some 50,000 acres on which 50 communities stood. Shortly after the fund was founded it began to plant forests on the land, an undertaking that continues today; in fact, because of the JNF’s work, Israel was the only nation in the world to end the 20th century with more trees than it had at the beginning. Throughout this period JNF continued to reclaim land and drain swamps. The Jewish National Fund was destined to play a major role in Zionist history. It purchased the land that became the State of Israel in 1948, helped develop it, even while protecting the environment.

   In his Preface (pp. 5-6) the editor is forthcoming about the motive for publishing the yearbook: “it is hoped to secure more generous support in the
immediate future from Jews in English-speaking countries by the issue of this Year-Book.” He notes that while the JNF has issued yearbooks “during the last few years in various languages,” the current publication “is the first time that such a Year-Book appears in English.”

The foreword “by the Right Hon. Winston S. Churchill, M.P., Secretary of State for the Colonies” (pp. 7-8), includes a small photograph of WSC. A footnote indicates “The above is an extract from the speech delivered in the House of Commons, on June 14, 1921, by Mr. Churchill, who visited Palestine in the previous March. It is used here, with a slight verbal alteration, as a Foreword, with Mr. Churchill’s permission.”

The entire speech from which the Foreword has been extracted appears, of course, in Robert Rhodes James, ed., *Winston S. Churchill, His Complete Speeches, 1897-1963*, vol. III, 1914-199 (New York and London: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974). The passage constituting the Foreword appears on pp. 3108-3109 of a speech that runs in total from p. 3095 to 3111. WSC’s opening remarks present contextual background whose import remains vital in the early 21st century: “I must take, as my starting point this afternoon, the obligations and responsibilities in which this country has entered in the Middle East, and which, in accordance with the policy of the Government, I am endeavouring to discharge. During the War our Eastern Army conquered Palestine and Mesopotamia. They overran both these provinces of the Turkish Empire. They roused the Arabs and the local inhabitants against the Turks. We uprooted the Turkish administration, and, as the Army moved forward, set up a military administration in its place. In order to gain the support of as many of the local inhabitants as possible, pledges were given that the Turkish rule should not be re-introduced in these regions. There is no dispute about these pledges. . . . Secondly, in order to gain the support of the Arabs against the Turks, we, in common with our Allies, made during the War another series of promises to the Arabs. We made them, through King Hussein and those who gathered round him, for the reconstitution of the Arab nation, and, as far as possible, for a restoration of Arab influence and authority in the conquered provinces, or, as we term them, the liberated provinces. There is no doubt about these pledges either. In regard to Palestine, a third promise of a very important character was made, on behalf of the Government, by my right hon. Friend the President of the Council (Mr. Balfour), on 2nd November, 1917, that Great Britain, if successful in the War, would use her best endeavours to establish a Jewish national home in Palestine. Such was the position, and such were our obligations when the War came to an end.”

After explaining Britain’s obligations in the Middle East as a result of the peace conferences following World War I, WSC states: “Under decisions arising out of these Treaties we have solemnly accepted before the whole world the position of mandatory Power for Palestine and Mesopotamia. That is a very serious responsibility. . . . We are at this moment in possession of these countries. We have destroyed the only other form of government which existed there. We have made the promises that I have already recited to the inhabitants, and we must endeavour to do our duty, to behave in a sober and honourable manner, and to discharge obligations which we entered into with our eyes open. We cannot
repudiate light-heartedly these undertakings. We cannot turn round and march our armies hastily to the coast and leave the inhabitants, for whose safety and well-being we have made ourselves responsible in the most public and solemn manner, a prey to anarchy and confusion of the worst description. We cannot, after what we have said and done, leave the Jews in Palestine to be maltreated by the Arabs who have been inflamed against them, nor can we leave the great and historic city of Baghdad and other cities and towns in Mesopotamia to be pillaged by the wild Bedouins of the desert.” WSC points out the uselessness in “consuming time and energy at this stage in debating whether we were wise or unwise in contracting the obligations I have recounted.”

The passage that constitutes the Foreword covers WSC’s positive reaction to what he saw in his recent visit: “I defy anybody, after seeing work of this kind [cultivation of previously barren land], achieved by so much labour, effort and skill, to say that the British Government, having taken up the position it has, could cast it all aside and leave it to be rudely and brutally overturned by the incursion of a fanatical attack by the Arab population from outside.” Churchill predicts that “if Jewish capital is available, as it may be, for development in Palestine,” the entire community – “Arabs and Christians as well as . . . Jews” – will benefit. “I see no reason why with care and progress there, there should not be a steady flow of Jewish immigrants into the country, and that this flow should be accompanied at every stage by a general increase in the wealth of the whole of the existing population, and without injury to any of them. That, at any rate, is the task upon which we have embarked, and which, I think, we are bound to pursue.”

It is interesting to note that a little over a year before WSC’s trip to the Middle East he wrote a piece called “Zionism versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People,” which appeared in the Illustrated Sunday Herald, of February 8, 1920. In it, after calling Jews “beyond all question the most formidable and the most remarkable race which has ever appeared in the world,” Churchill asserts that the “conflict between good and evil which proceeds unceasingly in the breast of man nowhere reaches such an intensity as in the Jewish race.” He compares and contrasts three types of contemporary Jewish political self-definition: national Jews, international Jews, and Zionist Jews. The first and last categories he calls “helpful and hopeful in a very high degree to humanity,” while “the third [is] absolutely destructive.” To WSC, national Jews are those “who, dwelling in every country throughout the world, identify themselves with that country, enter into its national life and, while adhering faithfully to their own religion, regard themselves as citizens in the fullest sense of the State which has received them.” He notes that during the Great War, national Jews “in many lands” fought “preponderatingly on the side of the Allies.” By contrast, those WSC calls international Jews “adherents of [a] sinister confederacy,” who are not only responsible for the creation of Bolshevism but also for perpetrating Bolshevik terrorism. He finds hope particularly in Zionism, which “In violent contrast to international communism, . . . presents to the Jew a national idea of a commanding character.” Churchill’s belief in the importance of the Jewish National Homeland in Palestine thus seems to be rooted in his revulsion at Communism: “. . . if, as may well happen, there should be created in
our own lifetime by the banks of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four millions of Jews, an event would have occurred in the history of the world which would, from every point of view, be beneficial, and would be especially in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire.” He calls the struggle between Bolshevism and Zionism “little less than a struggle for the soul of the Jewish people.” He concludes this piece by calling on national Jews everywhere to “take a prominent part in every measure for combating the Bolshevik conspiracy” as a way of vindicating “the honor of the Jewish name.” In addition, however, he calls for “building up with the utmost possible rapidity a Jewish national centre in Palestine which may become not only a refuge to the oppressed from the unhappy lands of Central Europe, but which will also be a symbol of Jewish unity and the temple of Jewish glory.”

An interesting biographical summary of Churchill, highlighting his policies toward Jews and Zionists, appears in http://www.jewishpost.com/jewishpost/jpn201b.html, as a note to a piece by Dr. Yoav Tenembaum called “The Last Romantic Zionist Gentile”:

“*CHURCHILL, SIR WINSTON (1874-1965): British statesman. He strenuously opposed restrictive legislation on immigration into England, mainly affecting Jews, 1904-5; supported the Saturday Closing and Sunday Opening Bills; and fought for specific Jewish educational rights. As early as 1908, he expressed his “full sympathy with the historical aspirations of the Jews” to restore “a center of racial and political integrity” in Palestine. As colonial secretary, he virtually cut off Transjordan from the Palestine Mandated territory (1921), and in the Churchill WHITE PAPER (1922) formulated what he believed would remain the basis of Anglo-Jewish cooperation. His subsequent attacks against the measures proposed in the Passfield White Paper of 1939 were based on the premise that they constituted a breach of an agreed policy expressed in his White Paper. Under his premiership during World War II, Britain maintained her respective policy in Palestine, but his Memoirs reveal that while concentrating singlemindedly on winning the war and wishing to avoid disagreement with his colleagues, he maintained his pro-Jewish attitude throughout. He was one of the first in Britain to insist on recognition of the State of Israel.”

The Churchill White Paper of 1922, alluded to above, can be found at www.wzo.org.il/home/politic/white.htm. The document states in part:

“So far as the Jewish population of Palestine are concerned, it appears that some among them are apprehensive that HMG may depart from the policy embodied in the Declaration of 1917. It is necessary, therefore, once more to affirm that these fears are unfounded, and that the Declaration . . . is not susceptible of change.

“During the last two or three generations the Jews have recreated in Palestine a community now numbering 80,000, of whom about one-fourth are farmers or workers upon the land. This community has its own political organs; an elected assembly for the direction of its domestic concerns; elected councils in the towns; and an organization for the control of its schools. It has its elected Chief Rabbinate and Rabbinical Council for the direction of its religious affairs. Its business is conducted in Hebrew as a vernacular language, and a Hebrew press
serves its needs. It has its distinctive intellectual life and displays considerable economic activity. This community, then, with its town and country population, its political, religious and social organizations, its own language, its own customs, its own life, has in fact “national” characteristics. When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world, in order that it may become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride. But in order that this community should have the best prospect of free development and provide full opportunity for the Jewish people to display its capacities, it is essential that it should know that it is in Palestine as of right and not on sufferance. That is the reason why it is necessary that the existence of a Jewish National Home in Palestine should be internationally guaranteed, and that it should be formally recognized to rest upon ancient historic connection.

“This, then, is the interpretation which HMG place upon the Declaration of 1917, and, so understood, the Secretary of State is of the opinion that it does not contain or imply anything which need cause either alarm to the Arab population of Palestine or disappointment to the Jews.

“For the fulfillment of this policy it is necessary that the Jewish community in Palestine should be able to increase its numbers by immigration. This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals. It is essential to ensure that the immigrants should not be a burden upon the people of Palestine as a whole, and that they should not deprive any section of the present population of their employment. Hitherto the immigration has fulfilled these conditions. . . . ”

According to Keegan, Churchill, as colonial secretary in 1921, “went on a mission to Palestine and came home a convinced Zionist. Speaking to the House of Commons, he assured it that Jewish immigration into the Promised Land would be ‘a very slow process and the rights of the existing non-Jewish population would be strictly preserved.’ Privately he suspected otherwise; nevertheless he authorized the use of British military force to inaugurate the first wave of Zionist immigration. He was thereby to become an honorary Zionist and to remain so for the rest of his life” (p. 99).


This speech appears in Woods as A60(a).

A 16-page paperback pamphlet, with *Number One* printed on the bottom lefthand corner of the cover. At the bottom of p. 16, in the righthand corner appears the following information: “Wt. 25179/P673. 300m. 8/40. The Baynard Press.”

Churchill became Prime Minister when Chamberlain resigned on May 10, 1940.
This speech appears, naturally, in Robert Rhodes James, ed., *Winston S. Churchill His Complete Speeches 1897-1963*, Vol. VI 1935-1942 (New York and London: Chelsea House, 1974). Under the title “The Few,” it appears on pp. 6260-6268. The following italicized introduction precedes it: “On August 15, the crisis of the Battle of Britain was reached. All the resources of fighter Command in the South were used. The most difficult and dangerous period of the Battle of Britain was between August 24 and September 6, when the German attack was directed against the R.A.F. airfields in the South of England with considerable success. In this speech Churchill coined the phrase ‘The Few’ to describe the R.A.F. fighter-pilots. The phrase stuck. The final sentence of this speech, including the use of the word ‘benignant,’ is a good example of Churchill’s choice of unexpected and assertive adjectives to make a phrase memorable.”

James is referring to Churchill’s use of the Mississippi River as a metaphor in the last sentences of the speech. Like the river, which in the words of lyricist Oscar Hammerstein, “just keeps rolling,” Churchill hopes, too, that the cooperation of Great Britain, the U.S. and Canada will continue. “Let it roll. Let it roll on full flood. . . . I could not stop it if I wished; no one can stop it. Like the Mississippi, it just keeps rolling alone [sic]. Let it roll. Let it roll on full flood, inexorable, irresistible, benignant, to broader lands and better days.” Note that the speech was delivered nearly a year and a half before the U.S. entered the war.

Interestingly, in a message broadcast to FDR on Feb. 9, 1941, Churchill continued the aquarian metaphor; according to Keegan, in that message, “he worked indirectly on American emotions” by speaking of “the ‘mighty tide’ of aid flowing across the Atlantic” (p. 143).

6. Churchill, Winston. Typed letter signed, February 26, 1941, to Sir Archibald Weigall. 1 p. In Churchill’s hand are the salutation (“My dear Weigall”) and complimentary close (“Yours [illegible, to me], Winston S. Churchill.” Typed text: “Thank you so much for your letter of February 15 and for your invitation to me to be President of the Conservative and Unionist Films Association. I shall be very pleased to accept.” Typed at bottom of page is “Lt. Col. Sir Archibald Weigall, Bt., K.C.M.G.” Weigall was thus both a “baronet” (a British hereditary title of honor, ranking next below a baron, held by commoners) and a knight commander of St. Michael and St. George, member of the second highest rank of a British order of knighthood.

According to www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Rotunda/2209/South_Australia.html and other websites found on a Google search, Sir William EG Archibald Weigall (1877-1952) was governor of South Australia from 9 June 1920 through 30 May 1922. According to the Churchill Papers Catalogue, Churchill also wrote Weigall upon his resignation from the governorship “for financial reasons” (www-archives.chu.cam.ac.uk/perl/node?a=a&reference=CHAR%2017%2F11).

Interestingly enough, in the early morning of February 26, 1941, Churchill was preoccupied by much more serious matters than the presidency of the films association. At 3 a.m. he was advised of an attack on a convoy, which led him to
respond that if such disastrous attacks continued to prevail, “it will be the end of us” (Gilbert, *Winston S. Churchill*, vol. VI, *Finest Hour, 1939-1941*, p. 1016).

   Typescript, blocked for delivery, of Woods A106.
   
   Woods gives the speech the title “Here is the course we steer.” This phrase appears on p. 9 of the typescript, which runs 33 pages. That oratorical phrase balances the preceding one: “Here is the high road along which we march with assured and growing confidence. Here is the course we steer in the full tide of successful experiment.” Churchill looks ahead in this speech to the successful conclusion of the war in Europe “before the summer ends, or even sooner” (p. 10). That outcome, though highly wished for, he predicts, will also lead to an end to the successful coalition that has seen Britain through the war. The party will have to arrange for a general election, and if the party prevails, “enormous tasks . . . will lie before us” (p. 13). In the meantime, “We have to finish the war against Japan . . . and repay the injuries they have inflicted and the infernal cruelties they have perpetrated upon H.M. subjects . . .” (p. 16). Jobs must be provided “for all who have served their country on the war fronts and for those who were for good reasons ordered by the State [in pencil: to serve it] with equal fidelity in the fields and factories at home” (p. 18). Following the war “the revival and expansion of our export trade will be a prime and indispensable factor in our prosperity” (p. 31). To ensure such national prosperity, agriculture will need to be cherished “as the first of British industries” (p. 32).
   
   Gilbert, in vol. 7 of the biography of Churchill (*Road to Victory, 1941-1945*), reports: “On March 15, Churchill spoke at the Conservative Party Conference at Central Hall, Westminster, ‘a good fighting speech,’ noted Henry Channon in his diary, ‘which ought to win the next election’. [Channon, a lifetime diarist, was American-born but served as a Conservative M.P. before becoming, upon his father’s death, a member of the House of Lords.) During the course of his speech, Churchill criticized those whom he called the ‘stay-at-home’ Left Wing intelligentsia, who intended to offer ‘a new world’ to the soldiers returning from the war: a new world, he said, ‘constructed behind their backs by politicians who seek their votes.’ These soldiers, he added, ‘do not regard themselves as a slumbred serf population chased into battle from a land of misery and want. They love their country and the scenes of their youth and manhood, and they have shown themselves ready to die not only in defence of its material satisfactions, but for its honour’ “ (p. 1251). Gilbert quotes Channon again from his diary on the following day: “The country’s reaction to the PM’s speech is favourable. Even the Labour people half admit that he has won the next election already by his address yesterday” (p. 1252). Nonetheless, Churchill was rejected by the electorate in the general election of July 1945, when he became Leader of the Opposition, a position he held until he became prime minister again in October 1951.

   [This speech appears in v. 7 of the Complete Speeches (pp. 7128-7135) under the title “Imperium Et Libertas.” This title comes from Churchill’s reference to the phrase — “The maxim of Lord Beaconsfield, *Imperium et Libertas*, is still our guide. This truth has already been proved abundantly since those words were
spoken. Without freedom there is no foundation for our Empire; without Empire there is no safeguard for our freedom” (p. 7130).]

The way Churchill marked up the typescript of this speech sheds a little light on his oratorical skills. According to Keegan, in *Winston Churchill* (NY: Viking Penguin, 2002), Churchill was “not a natural speaker,” but over the years of his political career he “struggled to find the means to make his words effective in the ears of his fellow men. He eventually discovered the way to do so by writing his speeches in structures sentences and delivering them paragraph by paragraph” (pp. 189-190).


Under the title on p. 1 of the pamphlet appears the introductory statement: “Mr. Churchill Maps out the Tasks that Face the Nation.” The following two paragraphs appear in italics: “Mr. Churchill received a rousing welcome when he entered, and a tumultuous send off at the conclusion of his address to the Party Conference at Central Hall, Westminster, on March 15th, 1945. Mr. R. A. Butler, Minister of Education and Chairman of the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations was in the chair. [new paragraph] Following is the full text of Mr. Churchill’s speech.”

Following the conclusion of Churchill’s address (p. 11), “Mr. Butler’s Tribute” appears. Butler proposed a resolution: “That this Conference expresses to Mr. Winston Churchill its deep gratitude for his magnificent leadership of the nation during the war, and most warmly congratulates him on the great success which has already been achieved as the result of his splendid efforts. [new paragraph] The Conference also pledges to him the constant and loyal support of the Conservative and Unionist Party in the united movement now in progress for the complete overthrow of the tyrannical enemies of freedom both in Europe and Asia.” This resolution “was carried with three hearty cheers for the Prime Minister” (p. 11). Using Ibsen’s phrase, Butler calls Churchill “the Master Builder,” and offers him the party’s “help in this his latest and greatest work – our National Reconstruction” (p. 12).

The front cover bears a photo of Churchill, cigar in mouth, dressed in uniform. The remaining photos (two on each of the inside covers and one on the back cover) illustrate various remarks Churchill makes in the speech. On the inside front cover, the top photo showing a British family with three young children bears the caption: “Their heart’s desire is that after their duty has been done and the job is finished they shall come back home”; the bottom photo of a class of boys at their school desks bears the caption: “We have passed into law the greatest Education Act ever known in these islands.” On the inside back cover, the top photo, labeled “London Burns, December 1940,” bears the caption: “We held aloft the flaming torch of freedom when all around the night was black as jet,” while the bottom photo, of laborers constructing a new building, is captioned: “I can assure you we are grappling with the housing shortage to the
utmost that is possible.” The outside back cover – a rural scene of a team of horses plowing a field – is captioned, “The treasure house of the British soil.”

[This speech appears in v. 7 of the Complete Speeches (pp. 7128-7135) under the title “Imperium Et Libertas.” This title comes from Churchill’s reference to the phrase – “The maxim of Lord Beaconsfield, Imperium et Libertas, is still our guide. This truth has already been proved abundantly since those words were spoken. Without freedom there is no foundation for our Empire; without Empire there is no safeguard for our freedom” (p. 7130).]


An election pamphlet, urging voters “For Prosperity on the Land, Vote National,” printed on a single sheet of paper, folded into four. Picking up the themes of the importance of agriculture and general living conditions to the nation’s attainment of postwar prosperity presented in “Here is the course we steer,” the pamphlet presents from Churchill’s “Declaration of Policy to the Electors” his comments on “Stable Markets and Prices” (“to maintain stability and avoid the evils of recurring scarcity and gluts”), “Greater Freedom” (“allowing full scope for each farmer to make the best use of his land”), “Better Living Conditions” (better rural housing; extension of electrical, water, sanitary, communications, health, and social services to farming districts), and “Benefits to Town and Country” (a vigorous agricultural sector will invigorate both town and country; the fishing industry must also be promptly rebuilt).

[Woods must be wrong about the date of the speech to the Conservative Party in London; it could not have been on 25 March 1945, and must have been the same speech he gave on March 15. According to Gilbert, in v. 7 of the biography, “On March 25 Churchill drove to Eisenhower’s headquarters near Rheinburg,” arriving in time for lunch (p. 1263). Furthermore, the Complete Speeches, v. 7, does not include one delivered to the Conservative Party on 25 March 1945, only the 15 March speech. The next speech in that volume is one to the House of Commons delivered on March 28, 1945.]


Woods lists the speech under the title “The Day Will Come.” In v. 7 of the Complete Speeches it is called “Failures of the Government’s ‘Doctrinaire Socialism’” (pp. 7308-7311). Woods’s title is also the title on the pamphlet containing the speech, published (see below) by the Conservative Party. The cover of the pamphlet bears the italicized pull quote: “We may be sure that the day will come when the heart of Britain and of all who love her fame and happiness will return to the Conservative and Unionist Party, without whose abiding influence the life of the British nation will be broken and shorn.”
According to v. 8 of Gilbert’s biography, when Churchill returned to England from the US in late March 1946, he was suffering from dizziness. By the end of April he was well enough to make the trip to Scotland, where he received an honorary degree from Aberdeen University on April 27. Two days later, at Edinburgh, he spoke on “the failure of the Government’s ‘doctrinaire Socialism’” (pp. 221, 227-229). According to the Complete Speeches, the address was made to the Scottish Unionist Rally. Churchill’s main point in his scathing critique of the Socialist government: “Indeed there never was a country nor a people whose way of getting a livelihood was more unsuited to the crude application of the Socialist system. Nor was there ever a moment in our long history – just as we are emerging in a distracted world from an exhausting struggle – which was less suitable for such an experiment.” Churchill predicts that “If the normal, active, well-established processes of enterprise and production are bent and blurred by the violent impingement of a Utopian Socialist scheme, we are on the road . . . to financial bankruptcy and economic collapse, the inexorable effect of which will be an immense decline in our present standard of living and the final and fatal loss of our world position . . . ” (p. 7311).


The 13-page pamphlet is No. 3838 published by the Conservative Central Office, 24, Old Queen Street, London, S.W.1. Printed by Metchim & Son, Ltd., the price on the cover is One Penny. The inside cover bears this notice: “When you have read this please pass it on to a friend at home or in the forces.”

The pull-quote containing the title appears both on the cover and on the top of the first page: “We may be sure that the day will come when the heart of Britain and of all who love her fame and happiness will return to the Conservative and Unionist Party, without whose abiding influence the life of the British nation will be broken and shorn.”

The back cover of the pamphlet asks readers to consider subscribing to the Conservative Literature Service, which publishes fortnightly Notes on Current Politics, a Weekly News Letter, the monthly Onlooker, as well as “Leaflets, Pamphlets and selected Educational publications.” Although one can subscribe to individual publications, an annual comprehensive subscription to all of the publications is available for a little over a pound.

According to Jenkins, the Edinburgh speech was not one of the two famous ones Churchill delivered in 1946. The first of those was delivered on March 5 at Fulton, Missouri, at Westminster College, where he spoke of an “iron curtain” that had been lowered over eastern Europe, resulting in the need for even greater cooperation between America and Britain, within the framework of the United Nations (p. 810). The Complete Speeches, v. 7, introduces this speech “as the most important Churchill delivered as Leader of the Opposition (1945-51). . .it is the passage on ‘the iron curtain’ which attracted immediate international attention, and had incalculable impact upon public opinion in the United States.
Jenkins calls the speech delivered on September 19 at Zurich University the second famous one from 1946. It called for “a partnership between France and Germany” as the “first step in the re-creation of the European family” (p. 813). Jenkins also notes that both of these speeches set forth doctrines “at least premature to many people,” though destined “to become axiomatic within a few years” (p. 814).


In volume VIII of the biography (‘Never Despair’ 1945-1965, pp. 275-276) Gilbert says:

On 5 October 1946 Churchill spoke at the Conservative Party Conference at Blackpool. His speech was a sustained attack on the Labour government’s policy at home and overseas. ‘In little more than a year,’ he said, ‘they have diminished British influence abroad and very largely paralysed our revival at home.’ Speaking of the food supply he declared: ‘The German U-boats in their worst endeavours never made bread-rationing necessary in war. It took a socialist government and Socialist planners to fasten it on us in time of peace when the seas are open and the world harvests good. At no time in the two world wars have our people had so little bread, meat, butter, cheese and fruit to eat.’

The Conservative Party, Churchill commented, was opposed to State control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. It was asked: ‘What are your alternatives?’ To this he replied: ‘A property-owning democracy,’ and he went on to explain: ‘In this I include profit-sharing schemes in suitable industries and intimate consultation between employers and wage-earners. In fact we seek so far as possible to make the status of the wage-earner that of a partner rather than of an irresponsible employee.’

Churchill then turned to the part which the State should play in setting up ‘systems of safeguards’ against failure, accident or misfortune. ‘We do not seek,’ he said, ‘to pull down improvidently the structures of society, but to erect balustrades upon the stairway of life, which will prevent helpless or foolish people from falling into the abyss.’ His personal part in this linked both the Liberal and conservative Parties of earlier years:

It is 38 years ago since I introduced the first Unemployment Insurance scheme, and 22 years ago since, as conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer, I shaped and carried the Widows’ Pensions and reduction of the Old Age pensions from 70 to 65. We are now moving forward into another vast scheme of national insurance, which arose, even in the stress of war, from a Parliament with a great Conservative majority.

Speaking of the Government’s India policy, Churchill told the assembled Conservatives:

The Government of India has been placed – or I should rather say thrust – into the hands of men who have good reason to be bitterly hostile to the British connection, but who in no way represent the enormous mass of nearly 400 millions of all the races, States, and peoples of India who have dwelt so long in peace with one another.

I fear that calamity impends upon this sub-Continent, which is almost as big as Europe, more populous, and even more harshly divided.

It seems that in quite a short time India will become a separate, a foreign and none too friendly country to the British Commonwealth.

In addition to Gilbert’s comments, one may note also Churchill’s brief comments about the Government’s bungling of the Jewish-Arab problem: “What are we to say of the handling of the Palestine problem by the Socialist
Government? At the election they made lavish promises to the Zionists and their success at the polls excited passionate expectations throughout the Jewish world. These promises were no sooner made than they were discarded, and now all through this year the Government stand vacillating without any plan or policy, holding on to a mandate in which we have no vital interest, gaining the distrust and hostility both of Arab and Jew, and exposing us to worldwide reprobation for their manifest incapacity. . . .”


The italicized pull quote on the cover of the 16-page pamphlet highlights the title given to the speech: “It is right to arouse our people to the peril in which they stand. Only when they realise fully the decline and descent, psychological, social, financial and economic, into which they have fallen, and in part, been thrust, since our glorious victory, will those forces arise in the land in which redemption and recovery can be found.”

In vol. 7 (1943-1949) of the collected speeches, the title given is “Economic Situation.” In this speech Churchill accuses the Socialist Government of committing “a crime against the British State and people.” Instead of pulling the people together after the war to “solve and overcome the problems” that confronted the nation, the Socialists, notwithstanding having polled “only 37 per cent. of the total electorate, . . . nevertheless deemed it their mission to impose their particular ideological formulas and theories upon all the rest of their fellow countrymen, regardless of the peril in which we all stood, regardless of the urgency of the work to be done, most of all, regardless of the comradeship by which alone we had survived the war.” The consequences of the Government’s criminal action, he goes on to say, “have hampered our recovery, darkened our future and now endanger our very life.”

Churchill charges that instead of showing “that they were Britons first, and Socialists only second,” the ruling party “have spread class warfare throughout the land and all sections of society, and they have divided this nation, in its hour of serious need, as it has never been divided. . . .”

He goes on to enumerate the various blows the Socialist Government has inflicted on the nation: (1) “the injury to the spirit,” (2) “a bread shortage and . . . the breakdown in coal” that “could have been provided against by reasonable foresight and prudence,” (3) mishandling of the housing shortage, (4) improper expenditures of money and manpower (e.g., “82 million pounds since the socialist government came into power squandered in Palestine, and 100,000 Englishmen now kept away from their homes and work, for the sake of a senseless squalid war with the Jews in order to give Palestine to the Arabs, or God knows who” and in the military services).

Winding up his speech, Churchill asserts that “In most cases, management by private enterprise is not only more efficient, but far less costly to the wage-
earners, than management by the huge official staffs now quartered upon the producers. . . . Is it the interest of the wage-earners to serve an all-powerful employer – the State – or to deal with private employers, who, though more efficient in business, are in a far weaker position as masters?” He insists that it is impossible for the Government to “save the country and carry on the class warfare and a Socialist programme of nationalisation at the same time. They must choose between the two. . . . The choice is theirs, but on it our fate depends.”

Churchill concludes by revealing two heartfelt convictions: (1) “somehow or other, we shall survive, though for a time at a lower level than hitherto,” and (2) “things are going to get worse before they get better,” but that ultimately the people will recognize “the decline and descent, psychological, social, financial and economic, into which we have fallen, and in part been thrust, since our glorious victory.” Only then “will those forces arise in the land in which redemption and recovery can be found.”


Five pages of galleys with Churchill’s corrections in black ink. Later appeared as a 16-page pamphlet, Trust the People, published by the Conservative and Unionist Central Office, No. 3874, and listed in Woods as A119. (See immediately below.)

The speech appears under the same title in the collected speeches, vol. 7, pp. 7489-7499. The phrase appears in Churchill’s opening paragraph: “The year that has passed since I last had the honour to address the Unionist Associations of Scotland has been marked by a steady improvement in the strength of our Party throughout the United Kingdom. . . . This is a remarkable vindication of the maxim ‘Trust the people,’ which has guided the Conservative party ever since the days of Lord Beaconsfield and later of Lord Randolph Churchill. . . . ”

In vol. VIII of the biography Gilbert incorrectly gives the date of the speech, both in the text (p. 330 – “On May 15 Churchill was at Ayr, where he spoke to the Unionist Associations in Scotland”) and in a footnote (n. 1, p. 331), as May 15, 1947. Nonetheless, as always, the passages he isolates from the speech are among the most crucial:

It was a shocking misfortune that on the morrow of our victory, after we had rendered services for which the whole world should be grateful, we were suddenly struck down and laid low by the arrival in power of a narrow, bigoted, incapable socialist faction, who, instead of trying to help the country out of its perils and solve its problems, cared above all for the gratification of their Party dogmas and did not scruple to divide our nation as I have never seen it divided before. This is their offence against the State and people, namely that they have used the power that a misguided electorate gave them – an electorate which for ten years had not had a chance to use the franchise – in an unthinking moment, not to forward the national recovery and revival, but to prove what good Party men they are, and thrust their Socialist doctrines upon our Island in its hour of exhaustion.

Gilbert also focuses on Churchill’s critique of the Labour Government’s economic policies and their effect on Britain:
Do not underrate, I warn you – and I have given some warnings before – in any degree the gravity of the economic and financial circumstances and distresses into which we are moving. They will be of a greater intensity and severity than any we have known before. There is no victorious country in the world that is being racketed to pieces in the way we are, and there is no country, because of its complicated artificial structure, less capable of surviving such maltreatment.


Pages 3-6 of this 16-page pamphlet, which sold for One Penny, are uncut. On the back cover the Conservative Political Centre (CPC) advertises its two bookshops, one in London, one in Leeds. “If you are one of those who like to think things out for themselves and come to their own conclusions, the Conservative Political Centre Bookshops can help you. One part of our service is to provide the books, white papers and reports you need if you are to know the facts that lie behind present-day world events. We will also be glad to tell you about books on any subject of particular interest to you.”

According to Gilbert in vol. VIII of the biography, “There is a recording of this speech in the BBC Written Archives Centre, Library No. 16288” (n. 1, p. 331).


The speech appears in vol. 7 of the collected speeches under the title “Conservative Women’s Conference.” The title of the pamphlet comes from the final paragraph, in which Churchill exhorts his audience: “The time has come – indeed it is overdue – when this country needs a new Parliament and a new approach to solve our national problems. The Conservative party, if called on by the electors, will form a Government devoid of Party prejudices and working with single-minded purpose to restore our national prosperity and the true greatness of our country. Let all be ready when the hour strikes; let all work tirelessly till the hour strikes and thus render true service not to a Party but to the island home we love so well.”

17. Two press releases issued by the Press Department, Conservative and Unionist Central Office, Abbey House, 2-8, Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.1 (Telephone: WHItehall 8181), related to Woods A121, above.

Release 397. “Local Tory Women to Hear Churchill in London”:
The Conservative Women’s 21st Annual conference which takes place this year on April 20th and 21st will bring between 6,000 and 7,000 delegates to London from all parts of the country, representing the largest women’s organisation of any of the political parties.

Six representatives are entitled to attend from every constituency, including, for the first time this year, one Young Conservative. The resolutions to be debated come from all parts of the country, and local speakers will be heard on every subject ranging from food and agricultural housing to Government advertising.

The Conference will be concluded with a Mass meeting at the Albert Hall at which Mr. Churchill is to address the 6,500 delegates, on Wednesday, 21st April at 3 p.m.

Release 390. “Mr. Churchill to Address 6,500 Tory Women.”

Mr. Winston Churchill is to address 6,500 Tory women at a mass meeting at the Albert Hall on Wednesday, 21st April. [1948 inserted above in blue ink] This mass meeting concludes the two-day Annual Conference of the Conservative Central Women’s Advisory Committee.

William Maxwell Aitken (1879-1964) was born in Canada, where he made a fortune in cement mills by 1910. After moving to England, he became a Conservative member of Parliament. He was granted the title Lord Beaverbrook in 1918. During World War I he served in Lloyd George’s coalition government as Minister of Information. Beaverbrook acquired a controlling interest in The Daily Express during the war, turning it into the world’s most widely read newspaper. He created a newspaper empire by founding The Sunday Express (1921) and purchasing The Evening Standard (1929). During World War II he served in Churchill’s Cabinet successively as Minister for Aircraft Production (1940-41), Minister of Supply (1941-2), Minister of War Production (1942), and Lord Privy Seal (1943-45).

I am sending you out by your plane a copy of our Conservative paper on Imperial Policy. I took great pains with it myself bearing in mind what you had written to me at my request. I hope you will find it interesting and not out of harmony with the mission of the Conservative Party. I hope particularly that the title “British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations” will be adopted universally by our friends. Please ring me up when you have received and read the paper.

Every good wish. We are having lovely weather here.

Presumably the content of the paper is related to Churchill’s speech of May 20, 1949, extracts of which appear in the collected speeches, vol. VII (pp. 7822-7823), to a Conservative Rally, Ibrox Park, Glasgow. To that audience Churchill said: “I hope we shall continue to call ourselves the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations. In this title there is room for all and none need be repelled or slighted by its terms.” Churchill goes on to speak of the “Lamentable disasters [that] have occurred in India, Burma, and Palestine,” for which the Conservative Party cannot be held responsible . . ., but is bound all the same to face the consequences. . .”

John Keegan, in *Winston Churchill* (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002) says that Beaverbrook was one of the “three Bs, lawyer and politician Lord Brikenhead (F. E. Smith), newspaper magnate Lord Beaverbrook (Max Aitken), and his
parliamentary private secretary Brendan Bracken” (pp. 12-13) who were “those supposed to be [Churchill’s] friends” (p. 12). Clementine, however, “rightly identified” them “as at best collaborators, at worst cronies. She disapproved strongly of their influence on him, which she correctly recognized as encouraging his regrettable tendency to boastfulness and rash judgment” (p. 13). According to Keegan “Clemmie correctly identified all three as careerists, more concerned to use Churchill than to serve him” (p. 93).


The opening photographs show Churchill at the Monument of the Resistance at Laxou, “where numerous patriots were shot by the Germans” (carrying a wreath of flowers, descending the stairs having deposited the wreath, with others who are presumably town dignitaries).

The next set of photographs show Churchill at Place Stanislas in Nancy.

20. Blue-velvet lined frame enclosing a round silver (?) plate bearing a bronze (?) likeness of Churchill in bow-tie.

21. Blue box (Toye Kenning and Spencer Limited. By Appointment to Her Majesty the Queen Suppliers of Gold and Silver Laces Insignia and Embroidery Toye Kenning & Spencer Ltd London) lined in cream silk (?), enclosing two silver (?) goblets bearing same likeness of Churchill in bow-tie as #18, and bearing the legend “Churchill Centenary 1874-1974.”

A description of Toye Kenning at (www.bdec-online.com/bd-dets/bdt1.htm) indicates: “Company Description: Manufacturer and supplier of a range of products for both the military and other organisations. Able to design and supply complete head to toe uniform packages or single product lines. . . . Service Classifications: ; Manufacturing services-Bespoke design services.”


The inside cover bears the following notice: “Lovers of Liberty You can best support the existing Irish Republic and work for its recognition by joining the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic. If there is not already a Council in your district – Start one. Write for particulars to Joseph Begley, Secretary Irish Republican Headquarters 3 East 42nd Street New York City”
According to www.churchill-books.com/list.cfm?category=Contributions, this is “An extremely rare paper pamphlet, not present in Woods.” It is clearly anti-British.

In 1921-22 Churchill was Secretary of State for the Colonies. He had earlier in 1922 told the House Commons that Britain would never recognize an Irish Republic. Sir Henry Wilson, a staunch Irish Protestant, was shot dead in London by Catholic Republicans on June 22, 1922. According to vol. 4 of Gilbert’s multivolume biography (The Stricken World, 1916-1922), “Lloyd George asked Churchill to draft a letter to Michael Collins, informing him ‘that the ambiguous position of the I.R.A. could no longer be ignored’ and that it was ‘intolerable’ that a Republican force ‘should be permitted to remain . . . in the heart of Dublin . . . , acting as a centre of murder organization and propaganda’“ (p. 734). Gilbert reports that Churchill did not sleep in his bedroom that night, where he feared he would be too easy a target for an assassin. “As the summer progressed the problems of Ireland became all-demanding” (p. 740). Gilbert also reports that “Churchill had hoped, with Collins’ help, to bring together a secure Free State and a moderate Ulster. This hope did not long survive Collins’ death. The Free Staters and the Republicans plunged into a civil war which the people of Britain could only watch, and wonder at” (pp. 747–8).

Keegan, in Winston Churchill (NY: Viking Penguin, 2002), reports that Churchill and Collins hit it off, and Collins agreed to “a compromise creating an Irish Free State inside the British Empire.” Collins realized in doing so “I may have signed my death warrant,” and in the ensuing civil war, he died in an anti-Free State ambush in August 1922 (p.98). According to Keegan, “Ireland was the worst of the problems to confront Churchill in his postwar appointments as secretary of state for war and then for the colonies” (p. 99).


A Colophon at the back of the thin pamphlet indicates that “These two sonnets of Rupert Brooke have been published in his volume 1914 and Other Poems. The memoir of Winston S. Churchill appeared in the Times of April 26th 1915. We give this reprint, without use of stream, somewhere in occupied Holland, in honour of our British Allies on the Ides of March 1945 as number 1 of the series Vliegend Verzet.” At the bottom of the page where the colophon appears an italicized printed note indicates “The edition has been limited to 100 copies. This is nr” with 28 written in red ink. Also in red ink is an inscription, dated 30.3.45, “A good luck to Nike and Arthur!” signed Fred. A note in pencil on the inside front cover indicates: “Clandestinely printed during German occupation. 100 copies. Inscribed by publisher (Fred Batten).”

The timeliness of the reprint of Brooke’s sonnets “Safety” and “The Soldier” is summed up in Churchill’s comments on Brooke’s death: “... he was all that one would wish England’s noblest sons to be in days when no sacrifice but the most precious is acceptable, and the most precious is that which is most freely proffered.”

Woods D(b)68 describes this small book: “Contains 12 pp. facsimiles of entries by Churchill in Montgomery’s autograph book.”

Montgomery writes in his Foreword, “It has been a long journey: from Alamein to the Baltic Sea. At various stages in that journey the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, wrote a page in my autograph book and recorded his impressions: in his own handwriting. These pages have been photographed, exactly as they were written, and they form the main feature of the book.”

Churchill’s comments are dated Aug. 20, 1942; Feb. 4, 1943; June 3, 1943; January 1, 1944; May 19, 1944; June 12, 1944; November 6, 1944; March 4, 1945; March 26, 1945; and May 24, 1945. Churchill’s final comment begins: “At last the goal is reached. The terrible enemy has unconditionally surrendered.”


The copyright page indicates: “This edition is limited to 500 copies. Nos. 1-250 are in the gift of the author, who has permitted Cassell & Co. Ltd., London and Cassell Australia Ltd. to reserve Nos. 251-500 for their friends. Christmas, 1965.” This is copy #258.


Toward the end of his tribute, “One Fire Burning In Him,” which Menzies, as Prime Minister of Australia and at the time senior Commonwealth Prime Minister, gave from the crypt of St Paul’s Cathedral, he underscores that while other powerful men “have cast Shadows across the world,” Churchill, by contrast, “was a fountain of light and of hope.” Earlier in the tribute he also says, “It was because he was a great human being that, in our darkest days, he lit the lamps of hope at many fire sides and released so many from the chains of despair. There has been nobody like him in our lifetimes. We must, and do, thank God for him, and strive to be worthy of his example.”

According to Keegan, in *Winston Churchill* (NY: Viking Penguin, 2002), “The British people recognized in his death the passing not only of one of the greatest of their fellow countrymen who had ever loved but also of a supremely heroic moment in their own life as a nation. Whatever rancors he had aroused during his domestic political career were forgotten. It was resolved to bury him with all the splendor due to a warrior-chief. His coffin was taken to Westminster Hall, and three hundred thousand mourners filed past while it lay there in state. A state funeral was arranged in St. Paul’s Cathedral, the first to be be given to a commoner since the death of the Duke of Wellington in 1852. Unprecedentedly, it was attended by the queen; by tradition the monarch attends the funerals only of other members of the royal family” (pp. 183-184). Keegan also describes the aftermath of the ceremony at St. Paul’s: “his coffin was placed on a barge and sailed up the Thames to Waterloo Station. . . . From Waterloo the coffin was
taken by train and road to the churchyard of the little Oxfordshire village of Bladon, near his birthplace at Blenheim Palace. There he was buried next to his parents” (p.184).


Churchill’s article is subtitled “Why we did not hang him” (“Pourquoi nous ne l’avons pas pendu”). An italicized editorial comment precedes Churchill’s article: “A l’heure où, dans les journaux du monde entier, on se demande quel sera, après la victoire, le châtiment d’Hitler, comment on pourra mettre définitivement l’Allemagne hors d’état de nuire, il nous a paru indiqué de placer sous les yeux du lecteur cet article de Winston Churchill, où, non sans ironie, le Premier Ministre britannique qui nous conduit à la victoire, explique comment, après l’autre victoire, le coupable de la ‘Grande Guerre’ esquiva son châtiment.”

Churchill writes that after World War I the small countries were very much “à la mode,” and wielded their sovereign power against the big countries. Holland refused to hand over the Kaiser.


At the age of 23 Churchill hoped to be appointed to the headquarters staff of the commander of the Malakand Field Force. On August 22, 1897, Churchill learned that while there was no room for him on the staff, he could join the expedition as a war correspondent. Churchill then sent a series of unsigned telegrams and letters for the Pioneer Mail. Woods notes that while Churchill did not write The Risings on the North-West Frontier, he did write The War in the Indian Highlands by a Young Officer. According to www.winstonchurchill.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=176, “Personally he wanted to sign them because it would advance his political career. The first of fifteen articles was published in the Daily Telegraph on 6 October, the last on 6 December. They formed the basis for his first book, The Story of the Malakand Field Force. He was paid five pounds per column.”

Inscribed in black ink “Drew Middleton His book London 7/2/42.” Below that inscription, inscribed in blue ink, is the explanation for the presence of this item in the Churchill collection at Chapin Library:

“To: Bob Volz

When we bought Drew Middleton’s set of *History of the English Speaking People* [sic] signed by Winston Churchill, I recalled that somewhere in my collection of Civil War books I had another Middleton volume. I found it just a few minutes ago and was stunned to discover that Middleton inscribed the book precisely 50 years ago to the day from this very moment. Such an improbable coincidence deserves at least a minor place among the collection I’ve donated to the Chapin. John Walsh ’54 7/2/92”

[N.B.: actually, Middleton’s inscription was probably written on February 7, 1942, not on July 2, because the British use the format for dating where day of the month precedes the month of the year.]


H.H. Asquith (1852-1928) was prime minister from 1908 to 1916.

A handwritten letter from John W(alsh) to Bob V(olz) clarifies why this poetry volume is in the Churchill collection:

“This book makes for an interesting association –

We already have the Churchill note to Ian Hamilton – from the principal architect of Gallipoli to the guy who failed in its execution.

This one is from the guy who failed to the man who was Prime Minister at the time of Gallipoli – Hamilton to Asquith. Note also that Hamilton made the gift on Jan 27, 1916 – only a couple of months after the Gallipoli disaster. Perhaps he was trying to make up with Asquith.”

(From Oct. 1911 through May 1915 Churchill was First Lord of the Admiralty. It was his idea to attack the Gallipoli Peninsula, which guarded the approaches to the Turkish capital, Constantinople. According to Keegan, “Churchill saw that, if the narrow passage of the Dardanelles, leading from the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, could be forced and Constantinople taken, Allied supplies could be shipped directly to the Black Sea ports of Russia, thus intensifying the weight of attack it could apply to Germany’s eastern front” [p.
Although he had to work to press his case, he succeeded, and on March 18, 1915, the attempt began. The results were disastrous. “In November it was decided to evacuate, an operation successfully concluded in January 1916. The failure of Gallipoli was to haunt Churchill for decades afterward. Even before it was confirmed by evacuation, it had brought about his political downfall. In May, Asquith decided that the maintenance of the war effort required his Liberal government to share power with the Conservatives, and a coalition was formed. Part of the price the Conservatives extracted was that Churchill should cease to be First Lord” [p. 86]. Asquith let Churchill stay on in the War Council in the nonexecutive post of chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. Churchill took refuge in a country retreat and in a new hobby: painting. He then began a second military career, serving in the western front with Grenadier Guards, and accepting an appointment as Lieutenant-Colonel, commanding the 6th Battalion of the Royal Scots Fusiliers in France. He left the British Expeditionary Forces on May 6, 1916, after nearly six months at the front. Clementine advised her husband to insist on the right to clear his name of blame for Gallipoli. Prime Minister Asquith finally agreed to have an independent committee review the Dardanelles papeers. In its findings, published in March 1917, Churchill was cleared of culpability for the failure of the operation [p. 93].


The quotation from the New Testament is in French; in the English of the New International Version it reads, “When Jesus spoke again to the people, he said, ‘I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life.’

A note tucked into the book indicates that “Jennie was 15 in 1869. She married Lord Randolph at the British Embassy in Paris in 1874.”

Jennie Jerome (1854-1921) was born in New York City. According to John Keegan, author of Winston Churchill (New York: Viking Penguin, 2002), “It was an era of alliances between rich American beauties and titled British gentlemen. American money was desired . . . to rescue once great families from the consequences of extravagance,” but “Randolph, compulsively extravagant (horses, cards, but above all the expensive game of politics), did not acquire enough money by the marriage to fund his way of life. . . . Their relationship was . . . fraught from the start with tension, and they spent much time apart even during Winston’s infancy” (pp. 20-21). After Randolph Churchill’s death in 1895 her affairs “became more flagrant . . . and culminated in her making two unsuitable marriages.” Keegan concludes that his relationship with his mother “brought him more storm than sunshine. A boy born into the sort of family that normally supplied the imperial service class, in which he was to make his career,
should have been able to count on the support of high-minded, principled parents, wedded to the ideals of duty, honor, country. Instead his family inheritance was of ruthless political ambition on his father’s side and frivolous social and sexual self-indulgence on his mother’s. Churchill should have gone to the bad. The wonder is that he did not” (pp. 24-25).

According to the Williams College Website (http://www.williams.edu/home/parents_faq.php), purple is the Williams color because of Jennie Jerome. “The story goes that at the Williams-Harvard baseball game in 1869, spectators, watching from carriages, had trouble telling the teams apart (there were no uniforms) so one of the onlookers bought ribbons from a nearby millinery store to pin on Williams’ players. The only color available was purple. The buyer was Jennie Jerome (later Winston Churchill’s mother) whose family summered in Williamstown.”

   Queen Alexandra (1844-1925) was the Danish wife of King Edward VII, whom she married on March 10, 1863. Eldest daughter of Christian IX, King of Denmark, she was mother of King George V.

32. The British Gazette. Published by His Majesty’s Stationery Office. Edited by Sir Winston Churchill. 1926.
   Nos. 1-8, dated Wednesday, May 5, through Thursday, May 13, 1926; there was no Sunday issue.
   In vol. 5 (The Prophet of Truth, 1922-1939) of the multivolume biography, Martin Gilbert devotes much of two chapters to the Gazette episode in Churchill’s life, which came while he was serving as Chancellor of the Exchequer (1924-1929): Chapter 9, “The General Strike and the British Gazette” (pp. 146-65) and Chapter 10, “Tonight Surrender: Tomorrow Magnanimity” (pp. 16-174). A final mention of the Gazette is in Chapter 12, “The Smiling Chancellor” (pp. 222-36). Basically what happened is that the compositors of the English newspapers went on strike in support of the miners, and “the leading newspaper editors” were asked “to cooperate in the publication of a single emergency news-sheet,” to be underwritten by the government (p. 151).
   Some historical background about the British general strike of 1926 from Wikipedia (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UK_General_Strike_1926):

   In 1926 the General Council of the Trades Union Congress (TUC) called out workers on a general strike for nine days in an unsuccessful attempt to force the government to act to prevent the wages and conditions of coal miners from being reduced.
   The British mining industry suffered an economic crisis in 1925. This was largely caused by the fall in prices resulting from the import of free coal from Germany as reparations in the aftermath of World War I. Mine owners therefore announced their intention to reduce the wages. The TUC responded to this news by promising to support the miners in their dispute. The
Conservative government, under Stanley Baldwin decided to intervene. The Government declared that they would provide a nine month subsidy to maintain the miners’ wages and a Royal Commission under the chairmanship of Sir Herbert Samuel, would look into the problems of the Mining Industry. This decision became known as Red Friday because it was seen as a victory for working class solidarity. In practice, the subsidy gave the mine owners and the Government time to prepare for a major labour dispute.

The Samuel Commission published its report in March 1926. It recognised that the industry needed to be reorganised but rejected the suggestion of nationalization. The report also recommended that the Government subsidy should be withdrawn and that the miners’ wages should be reduced in order to save the industry’s profitability.

Following publication of the report, the mine owners then published new terms of employment for all miners. These included an extension of the seven-hour working day, district wage-agreements, and a reduction in the wages. Depending on a number of factors, the wages would be cut by between 10% and 25%. The mine owners declared that if the miners did not accept the new terms then from the first day of May they would be locked out of the pits.

A Conference of the TUC met on the 1st of May 1926, and subsequently announced that a general strike “in defence of miners’ wages and hours” was to begin on the 3rd of May. The leaders of the Labour Party were terrified by the revolutionary elements within the union movement and were unhappy about the proposed General Strike. During the next two days frantic efforts were made to reach an agreement with the Government and the mine owners. However these efforts failed.

The TUC feared that an all out general strike would bring revolutionary elements to the fore. They decided to bring out workers only in the key industries, such as railwaymen, transport workers, printers, dockers and iron and steel workers.

The Government had prepared for the strike over the ninth months in which it had provided a subsidy, creating organisations such as the organisation for the maintenance of supplies and did whatever it could to keep the country moving. It rallied support by emphasising the revolutionary nature of the strikers. The armed forces and volunteer workers helped maintain basic services.

On the 7th of May the TUC met with Sir Herbert Samuel and worked out a set of proposals designed to end the dispute. The Miners Federation rejected the proposals. On the 12th of May the TUC General Council visited 10 Downing Street to announce their decision to call off the strike, provided that the proposals worked out by the Samuel commission were adhered to and that the Government offered a guarantee that there would be no victimization of strikers. The government stated that it had “no power to compel employers to take back every man who had been on strike.” Thus the TUC agreed to end the dispute without such an agreement.

For several months the miners continued to hold out, but by October 1926 hardship forced many men back. By the end of November most miners were back at work. However, many were victimized and remained unemployed for many years. Those that were employed were forced to accept longer hours, lower wages and district wage agreement.

In 1927 the British Government passed the Trade Disputes and Trade Union Act. This act made all sympathetic strikes illegal, and ensured that trade union members had to voluntarily “contract in” to pay the political levy. It also forbade Civil Service unions from affiliating with the TUC, and made mass picketing illegal.

The Churchill Organization (www.winstonchurchill.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=193) includes this chronology of Churchill’s involvement with the newspaper:

May 1
Miners rejected pay reduction and are locked out.

May 3
WSC summoned newspaper editors to a meeting and then spoke on the possibility of a General Strike in the House of Commons.

May 4
Unions called General Strike. WSC announced creation of the British Gazette.

May 10

WSC spoke on the British Gazette in the House of Commons.

May 12

Unions called off General Strike.

May 13

Final issue of the British Gazette.

May 17

WSC spoke on the British Gazette and the cost of the General Strike in the House of Commons.

May 18

WSC spoke on the British Gazette in the House of Commons.

A subsequent page (www.winstonchurchill.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=194) explains Churchill’s role in greater detail:

“TOMORROW, MAGNANIMITY”

Churchill played no part in the Baldwin government’s negotiations with the miners and the coal owners which led to the General Strike of 1926. The coal owners locked out the miners on Saturday, 1 May 1926 after the miners had again rejected a proposal for an immediate reduction in wages. A national strike in support of the miners was announced for Monday, 3 May. Government negotiations continued with both sides on Sunday, 2 May, until 11 PM, when word came that printers at The Daily Mail had stopped its publication because they did not approve of the lead editorial critical of the impending strike. Baldwin believed that a national strike was an unconstitutional attempt to undermine parliamentary democracy and, in response, he broke off negotiations, a move that received the unanimous support of the Cabinet.

The next day, Churchill spoke in conciliatory fashion in the House, acknowledging that the miners had a legitimate right to strike: “But that is an entirely different thing from the concerted, deliberate organized menace of a General Strike in order to compel Parliament to do something which otherwise it would not do.” Churchill said that once the threat of a national strike is withdrawn, “we shall immediately begin, with the utmost care and patience with them again, the long and laborious task which has been pursued over these many weeks of endeavouring to rebuild on economic foundations the prosperity of the coal trade. That is our position.”

The strike commenced on 4 May and Baldwin diverted Churchill to the secondary role of supervising publication of a daily government newspaper, The British Gazette. The first issue of the paper came out on 5 May and Churchill wrote the leading, unsigned, article on the front page in which he explained why a government newspaper was necessary during the strike: “Nearly all the newspapers have been silenced by violent concerted action. And this great nation, on the whole the strongest community which civilisation can show, is for the moment reduced in this respect to the level of African natives dependent only on the rumours which are carried from place to place.”

The first issue of The British Gazette printed a total of only 230,000 copies but six days later, the last day of the General Strike, over a million copies were printed and distributed. Churchill wrote that day to Baldwin offering his advice on how to proceed next: “The point to which I wish to draw your mind is that there must be a clear interval between the calling off of the General Strike and the resumption of the coal negotiations. The first tonight, the second tomorrow. But nothing simultaneous and concurrent. That will I am sure be fatal. . . . Tonight surrender. Tomorrow magnanimity. . . .”

Gilbert points out “several defects” that resulted from “the somewhat chaotic nature” of the publication of the first edition of the Gazette: “Of its four pages, the centre two were blank. Several items on its back page had been culled from the reserve copy of the Morning Post, so that neither the ‘Zoo Notes’ nor the item on ‘Ice Hockey in Canada’ bore any relation to the gravity of the hour” (p. 157). On
the whole, however, “each of the paper’s fourteen columns of print bore the professional look of a well-established paper” (p. 157).

Churchill wrote, but left unsigned, the lead article, on the sixth and seventh columns of page 1, “The ‘British Gazette’ and Its Objects.” He warned that the success of the strike might lead to the transformation of the Trade Union’s leaders into “masters of the whole country,” with the result of “the virtual supersession of Parliament and of the representative institutions which we have established in our island after three hundred years of struggle, which we have preserved almost alone among the nations of europe, and which are the foundation of our democratic freedom” (p. 157).

In response to Churchill’s arguments in the newspaper the British Worker, the strike newspaper published beginning the evening of May 5 by the General Council of the TUC, wrote in its May 10 issue that the threat of revolution “exists nowhere save in Mr Churchill’s heated and disorderly imagination” (Gilbert, v. 5, p. 168).

Gilbert also informs us that Lord Beaverbrook (see Churchill’s 1949 letter to him) loaned Churchill three individuals from his Daily Express (“a master of the technacal side of printing, and his two senior engineers”) who were instrumental in putting together the paper (p. 156). Within a few days, however, Beaverbrook, “anxious to begin printing the Daily Express again,” threatened to withdraw the three men. Like other newspaper proprietors, Beaverbrook “had begun to resent” Churchill’s foray into publishing, “fearing that when they were ready to appear, he would use his emergency powers to continue to control newsprint, ink and personnel” (p. 167). On May 11 Beaverbrook made the decision to start publishing the Daily Express once again, “and resisted churchill’s attempts to requisition his newsprint” (p. 169). Reluctantly Beaverbrook pledged his willingness “to hand over his final two hundred tons of paper ‘if it is absolutely necessary for the Government’” (p. 170). At a Cabinet meeting that evening Churchill agreed “to bring the Gazette to an end as soon as the daily newspapers were in a position to resume normal publication” (p. 170), but wrote the following morning to Beaverbrook, asking him to “defer, as you have so consistently done hitherto, to my wish in the public interest, and take no fresh departure at any rate until we have had some further conversation” (p. 171). He had heard rumors, soon to be borne out, that the TUC was prepared to end the strike and had begun trying to persuade the miners to resume negotiating with the Government. (Gilbert later tells us that the friendship between Churchill and Beaverbrook, “despite the brief friction over the British Gazette, had continued to flourish” – p. 223.)

Once the General Council of the TUC approached the prime minister (Baldwin) to say it would no longer support the miners’ determination to remain on strike, Churchill assembled the leading newspaper editors to the Treasury, where they agreed that the May 13th issue of the British Gazette would be its last (p. 171). The final edition announced not only the end of the strike (“Surrender received by Premier in Downing Street”) but also its own demise. An article drafted by Churchill concluded: “The British Gazette may have had a short life; but it has fulfilled the purpose of living. It becomes a memory; but it remains a monument.”
A nice summation of Churchill’s effort with the *Gazette* comes from John Colin Campbell Davidson (1889-1970), who at the time was Conservative MP for Hemel Hempstead and Parliamentary Secretary, Admiralty:

> Winston is really a most remarkable creature. His energy was boundless and he ran entirely on his own lines. Whether it was right or wrong he desired to produce a newspaper rather than a news sheet. He, in fact, conceived that the *British Gazette* should be a better newspaper than any of the great journals whose operations had been temporarily suspended. . . . The result was, I think quite good, and the energy and vitality of Winston were very largely responsible for it. He is the sort of man, whom, if I wanted a mountain to be moved, I should send for at once. I think, however, that I should not consult him after he had moved the mountain if I wanted to know where to put it (Gilbert, p. 173).

In a letter written on June 10, 1927, Churchill reflected on the *Gazette* episode of his life: “I shall always look back to that extraordinary ten days. They form one of the most vivid experiences of my somewhat variegated life. . . .” (p. 174).

Keegan, in *Winston Churchill* (NY: Viking Penguin, 2002), reports that as Home Secretary (Feb. 1910-Oct. 1911) Churchill had had to deploy police against strikers – particularly against miners in Wales – on more than one occasion. “At one stage he was even obliged to put troops on standby during riots at Tonypandy, an action for which the Labour movement never forgave him. ‘Remember Tonypandy!’ was a cry that haunted him for years after his return to the Conservative party in 1925, and helped to make him, quite unfairly, better remembered as a home secretary hostile to the working classes than as the president of the Board of Trade who had been their friend” (p. 74).


Nine-page pamphlet. Contains, in both English and French versions, a letter from Churchill to de Gaulle; a memorandum of agreement divided into five sections; a letter from de Gaulle to Churchill.

Churchill’s letter acknowledges that de Gaulle is “recognised by His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom” as “leader of all free Frenchmen, wherever they may be, who rally to you in support of the Allied Cause.” He adds that after “victory has been gained by the Allied arms,” the British government intends “to secure the full restoration of the independence and greatness of France.”

The memo of agreement states that the volunteer force de Gaulle is organizing “will be . . . employed against the common enemies” but “will never be required to take up arms against France.” The British government “will, as soon as practicable, supply the French force with the additional equipment which may be essential to equip its units on a scale equivalent to that of British units of the same type.” The agreement will be “regarded as having come into force” on July 1, 1940.

As de Gaulle’s letter indicates, he was based at 4 Carlton Gardens, London, S.W. 10, and had been “recognised by His Majesty’s Government in the United
Kingdom as leader of all free Frenchmen, wherever they may be, who rally to me in support of the Allied cause.” He confirmed that “the French force now in process of constitution is intended to take part in operations against the common enemies (Germany, Italy or any other hostile foreign Power), including the defence of French territories and territories under French mandate, and the defence of British territories and communications, and territories under British mandate.”


www.ePier.com/BiddingForm.asp?822478 identifies this work: “Nazi German publication about Churchill. A direct attack on Churchill as a leader and his politics. History of Churchill from 1914 till 1940 in the opinion of the writer. Franz Rose was a very anti Semitic person and wrote a couple fo books about it. The book is in excellent condition and has 95 pages, yellowed by age but still very good. . . .”


Cartoons in this collection rooted in “Churchill’s speeches and deeds” are headed by excerpts from Churchill’s speeches (in German translation). The cartoon on p. 76, for example, is headed by an excerpt from Churchill’s speech in the House of Commons on June 10, 1941. In *Winston S. Churchill, His Complete Speeches* (v. 5) it is called “The War Situation” (pp. 6408-6423). Excerpted from the final paragraph, in the original it reads: “But if the next six months, during which we must expect even harder fighting and many disappointments, should find us in no worse position than that in which we stand to-day . . . , then I say that a famous chapter will have been written in the martial history of the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations” (p. 6423).

The caption next to the cartoon, which shows Churchill tying what seems to be a helmet around the bottom, reads: “‘Churchill’ Nach dem ‘Sieg’ binde den Helm fester” (“Churchill: After your ‘victory,’ buckle [or tie] your helmet on more firmly [ or tightly]”).

It appeared in *Kladderadatsch*, on October 4, 1941.


A review of Langworth by Glenn Horowitz for the Churchill Center Book Club has this to say about Woods: “Throughout Langworth relies on the bibliographical research of the late Frederick Woods, who devoted decades to tracing Churchill’s works, and whose bibliography, to date, has not been superseded. Langworth states that his goal is to amplify, not expand upon,
Woods’s early work, and in this, I think he is too humble: he clarifies innumerable pockets of obfuscation transmitted by Woods...”