

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

Churchill made history - quite a lot of history
Churchill wrote history - quite a lot
of history. Many wrote Churchill's history
but ^{at} least of all Sir Winston Churchill himself.

Perhaps no other man has written
so extensively and over so long a period
of time about himself as Sir Winston
Churchill. And perhaps no other man
has again over so long a period
been in the public eye, talking or
being talked about, photographed
analyzed, scrutinized upheld or
condemned. And yet perhaps there
is no other public man living or dead
who is essentially less known than
Churchill.

Here lies a paradox. A monumental

as a "gallant relic of the 18th century"
lingered on. A man from another epoch ~~endowed~~
with unbreakable pugacity, a political
buccaneer charged with explosive mood
and intellect strayed into the ^{frustrated}
~~hated~~ ^{need} cold and
logical prosaic world of post-war Britain.

During the war as soldiers we felt
not only his inspiration but his benevolence.

That the unpeakable shambles of
the first war were not repeated it was
felt ~~unduly~~ ^{instinctively} that it was
due to him.

Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL.

- A Shadow Sketch.

~~Perhaps no other man has written~~

Sir Winston Churchill has made a lot of history and has written a lot of history. Many people have also written Churchill's history and foremost among them Sir Winston himself.

Perhaps no other man has written so extensively and over a long period of time about himself as Sir Winston Churchill; and perhaps no other has lived for so long under the harsh arc-lights of publicity for so long or been subjected to all the gamut of verbal praise or outlaughed by the hierophants of the press as Churchill has. And yet there is no other ^{great} man living or dead less essentially known.

world figure whose activities cover more than half - to use his own words - of this "tumultuous century" who have been ^{continuously} ~~constantly~~ under the arc-lights of publicity, ~~has~~ has shown less of himself than the most retiring and god-fearing ecclesiastics. No man has written more about himself and said less than Winston Churchill.

About a dozen years ago in a provisional sketch of the war Prime Minister who was just defeated in a general election I penned somewhere that Churchill victorious in war and in so many other fields of human war one of the great "defeated" of history. ~~It was felt by many~~ ^{War has ruffled many} that it was feelings except that of superiority. We felt that he was out of touch with the rhythm of his fine-lookin' partisan descriptions.

thous Churchill. The Panegyrics are many and varied and Churchill's daemology from the Communist to the Munichite is prodigious.

But the paradox remains. Here is a massive world figure who activities cover half of this "tumultuous century" (to use his own words) who has said so much about himself and yet revealed less about himself than the most retiring or god-fearing ecclesiastic.

About a dozen years ~~it~~ a provisional sketch I have read in a foreign journal that Winston Churchill, was among the great "defeated" of history. His fame would rest only on his pragmatism. I was inclined to agree. Larkin's schoolmaster's description "as a gallant relic of the

enough comfort. There an eloquent physiognomy portraying all the ingredients of the tragedy. Grim resolve and vast sadness - a human compassion that could not encompass being men reduced to mere numbers funnelled down the charnel house of the battle-field. In six years of war ~~and~~ which the British power was deployed from the four seas to the Caribbean ~~the~~ British losses were less than what were sustained during the slugging match at Passchendaele or the grim spring of 1918.

And yet no sooner was the war over and Churchill was discarded. To him the blow must have been, judging by what he himself writes, momentarily - but only momentarily - shattering. His usual buoyancy ^{asserted} ~~ascertained~~ itself. But the election itself was a tribute to the

18th century" was fresh in mind and somehow ring true. Had Churchill then disappeared from the scene in all probability he would have remained in history as a war-leader of genius but in everything else an ~~expensive~~ anachronism. There was a ^{a political} ~~political~~ ^{humaner} ~~humaner~~ ^{charged with explosive, rounded} ~~charged with explosive, rounded~~ ^{intellect} ~~intellect~~ man from another epoch straying into the tattered, cold, frustrated ^{neurotic} and inhibited post world of post-war Britain.

During the war we take soldiers felt not only his inspiration but his benevolence. Somehow thought it is difficult to define it there was an instinctive feeling feeling that Churchill the "war monger" would spare ^{us} the the monotony of the tread-mill carnage that mangled our father. A picture of him and his wife sailing down the Thames ^{to} ~~to~~ the visit bombed East-End was sufficient

British people themselves. Considered by practically every foreign "expert" - i.e. all those with superficial knowledge of English modes of thought and English history - as a political, the British people with the longest record of freedom in the world display uncanny uncanny political sagacity. The dismissal of Churchill was an act of political wisdom. A free nation requires no saviours and even if it does require one they must be put aside quickly before saviours turn into tyrants. And the British like to feel that the politicians are their representatives and not their masters. And who could have persuaded in 1945 that Churchill who for 40 years bravely refused to be confined within the harness of political orthodoxy, forever, spurned or by

unceasing mental turmoil, on political
forums ~~and~~ or looking beyond the rim of
actuality to the currents of events impercei-
ved by the multitude, would not by sheer
force of brain and will ~~shatter~~ impede rather
than advance post-war reconstruction. To see
1945 simply as a victory of Labour over the
Conservatives ~~was~~ is misleading. Policy played
no part in it. Ninety-per cent of the soldiers
who voted ^{for the first time} have not read led alone digest
the policy statement of the parties. People
did not know what Labour was going to be
like except that Labour vaguely meant change
and definitely meant no Churchill.

Churchill ~~was~~ ^{as} a nation's leader
was transferred from the seat of power
to the seat of sentiment. In adversity he
won the people's hearts. From quiet, he
~~and ever more~~

arena. His last premiership, sandwiched between two periods of stress, was an example of autumnal felicity. It did not detract from his reputation as a world statesman.

x x x

I do not consider it rash to say that Churchill's defeat in 1945 was a "blessing in disguise" - Clementine Churchill's words - for Churchill and Great Britain. It left the humdrum tasks in the hands of more down to earth politicians. It allowed him to scan the wider horizons of human endeavour and focus the attention of humanity on the new issues and new dire threats. It enabled him to win his greatest and bloodiest victory.

I remember ^{seeing} him at that time, and it was the only I saw him close by, a

became the nation's mascot. He became an institution and the people have taken him into their hearts with ever deepening affection. Out of office, away from the dangers and responsibility of day to day decisions which - and who can say that his decisions in a situation where change and adaptation were necessary would not have been catastrophic - Churchill has entered the Hall of the truly great. Weak always in the technique of politics in the sordid affairs of give and take, of balance and expediency but with a brain that can grasp fundamental human issues and illuminate the path of destiny Churchill was projected on to the international stage. He became a world figure. The pre-war English parochialism has been enlarged to a world

robust septuagenarian with a youthful
complexion and a

Βιβλιοθήκη Πανεπιστημίου Κύπρου