

A Queen, a Carpet, and a Historian of U.S. Foreign Relations

Mary Ann Heiss  
Presidential Address  
Ohio Academy of History  
6 April 2013

It's truly an honor to be here this afternoon taking the reins as president of the Ohio Academy of History. I presented my first scholarly paper at the 1991 Academy meeting at Capital University while still a doctoral student at Ohio State and certainly never dreamed then that I would be fortunate enough to get a job less than an hour from where I grew up. But even further from my mind at that time was the prospect that I would one day deliver an address like this one. My short remarks this afternoon are what I consider part research talk in that I'll be presenting an outline of one of my back-burner projects (which means I can devote sustained time to it once I finish my second substantial monograph) and part historiographical musing about how I see that (admittedly unconventional) project fitting into my own field, the history of U.S. foreign relations. Mindful of the fact that you've just finished a big meal and aware of the need to prepare our venue for the Reddin Symposium to come, I promise to follow Franklin Roosevelt's advice regarding public speaking: "Be sincere. Be brief. [And] be seated."<sup>1</sup>

The first element of my talk's three-subject title is Queen Mary of England, who was born in 1867 a minor member of the British Royal Family by virtue of her mother's status as a granddaughter of King George III. Although her full name was Victoria Mary Augusta Louise Olga Pauline Claudine Agnes, she was known in her early life as "May," the month of her birth. The product of what one biographer has described as a "merry but fairly strict" upbringing, May, at the age of twenty-four, struck Queen Victoria as an acceptable prospective consort for her grandson Prince Albert Victor (who was known as Eddy), eldest son of the Prince of Wales and

second in line to the British throne.<sup>2</sup> After Eddy's death from pneumonia in early 1892, May was subsequently betrothed, this time in a real love match, to his brother, George; the two were married the following July. Queen Victoria's death in early 1901 elevated May's father-in-law to the throne as King Edward VII; after his own death a little more than nine years later, her husband ascended to the throne as King George V and she became known as Queen Mary, having explicitly rejected the use of her given name, "Victoria." George and Mary reigned during tumultuous times for Britain and saw the monarchy through the identity crisis wrought by the First World War, together forging the House of Windsor as a direct counter to criticism of their collective Germanic heritage. The oldest of the couple's six children became King Edward VIII in 1936 when George V died. After he abdicated the following year in one of the British monarchy's gravest constitutional crises, his younger brother Albert became king, taking the name George VI. George VI's death in 1952 elevated his older daughter, on whom Queen Mary doted, to the throne; Queen Mary passed away in March 1953, just ten weeks before Elizabeth II's coronation.

Like royals before and after her, Queen Mary lent her name and support to numerous charities; representatives of several hundred such organizations, in fact, participated in her funeral. The queen took a particular interest in charities that served or involved women and traditional women's work, most notably nursing societies, such as Queen Alexandra's Royal Naval Nursing Service, and organizations that promoted women's handiwork, such as the Women's Home Industries division of the Women's Voluntary Services. Although she championed all British handicrafts, her special passion was needlework. A long-time patron of the Royal School of Needlework, for years she personally presented its graduates with their diplomas. Queen Mary was also an accomplished needle worker herself who stored her needles

in an etui received as a wedding gift in 1893 and carried her brocade sewing basket wherever she went.<sup>3</sup>

It is Queen Mary's interest in needlework—or perhaps more accurately, something specific that she created—that brought her to my attention, and that brings me to the second element in the title of my talk this afternoon, a carpet. While on forced exile to Badminton in Gloucestershire west of London during the Second World War, Queen Mary spent much of her time working on what became a twelve-panel *gros point* carpet or tapestry in an eighteenth-century design of flowers and birds that was inspired by pieces held by the Victoria and Albert Museum in London and designed in consultation with the Royal School of Needlework. Her interest in *gros point* stemmed from 1932, and in 1948 six chair covers she worked were privately purchased and then donated to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the \$10,000 proceeds going to the Queen's District Nursing Fund.<sup>4</sup> Queen Mary personally selected and blended the 448 different colors evident in the piece, sewed every one of its nearly one million stitches and embroidered the floral border, and signed each of the twelve panels (due to wartime shortages, the panels' shades do not match perfectly) with her cipher, "Mary R," and the year in which each was completed. (The first is dated 1941; the border, 1950.) She found time to work on it almost daily for nine years, on holidays at Sandringham and in the gardens she adored at her official London residence, Marlborough House, which currently houses the British government's Commonwealth Secretariat. Originally, the carpet, which was truly a magisterial piece, measuring 10 feet 2 inches by 6 feet 9 1/2 inches and weighing around 113 lbs., was intended to grace one of the royal residences, perhaps Windsor Castle, and thereby join the royal family's other treasured heirlooms, including other needlepoint pieces Queen Mary had stitched.<sup>5</sup> Instead, it crossed the Atlantic on the RMS *Queen Mary* in March 1950 and began a

twelve-week tour of public exhibitions throughout the United States and Canada.<sup>6</sup> After exhibits in almost two dozen cities, the carpet was to be sold for dollars, which would be used to boost Britain's foreign exchange coffers at a time when the nation was experiencing a serious dollar crisis. In offering the carpet to Britain in this way, Queen Mary hoped to do her small part to help her country in its time of need and to inspire others to do likewise.<sup>7</sup>

Although the carpet drew large crowds and much public interest, few serious bids were tendered, perhaps because the one stipulation on the carpet's sale was that it find a home in a public institution or building rather than a private collection.<sup>8</sup> Ultimately, the carpet was purchased by a patriotic Canadian women's organization, the Imperial Order, Daughters of the Empire (IODE), which raised the necessary funds by sponsoring an extensive tour of the carpet throughout Canada. By the summer of 1951, the IODE's Queen Mary's Carpet Fund had reached the pledge amount of \$100,000 through admission fees and money raised from the sale of postcards and booklets about the carpet, as well as private donations from around the world.<sup>9</sup> In October, the IODE presented the carpet to Her Royal Highness Princess Elizabeth, who in turn presented it to the National Gallery of Canada on behalf of the Canadian people.<sup>10</sup> The carpet is today still held by the National Gallery and appears periodically on public display. (Careless handling and exposure to sunlight during early exhibitions compromised its structural integrity and faded its colors, so it is not on permanent display.) It was last exhibited in 2001-2002 for the IODE's centennial celebration.<sup>11</sup>

Now, at this point, many of you are probably wondering how a historian of U.S. foreign relations—and this one, in particular—got caught up in the story of a *gros point* carpet stitched by an English queen. The answer to that question brings me to the third part of my talk, in which I hope to explain how I discovered the queen's carpet, why I find it so intriguing, and why I

think at least parts of its story can indeed be fitted into the historiography of the field of U.S. foreign relations.

My area of specialization within the field is the Anglo-American relationship, particularly in the post-World War II era, and my first book, *Empire and Nationhood: The United States, Great Britain, and Iranian Oil, 1950-1954*, explored in large part the way that Washington and London cooperated—and didn't—when it came to handling the Iranian nationalization crisis.<sup>12</sup> One of the subthemes of that book, although more implicitly than explicitly, was the way that core nations, like Britain and the United States, viewed peripheral nations, like Iran, and exploring these sorts of views led me to a larger—and still ongoing—project on Anglo-American conceptions of empire. Research for that project yielded some interesting archival material on how colonial questions at the United Nations strained the transatlantic special relationship, and when my former colleague Victor Papacosma approached me several years ago about participating in a planned conference at Kent State on intrabloc conflicts within NATO and the Warsaw Pact, I decided to pull that material together for a contribution to both the conference and a volume that Victor and I subsequently co-edited.<sup>13</sup> That small essay, which offered some preliminary thoughts about the ways decolonization was handled at the United Nations during its early decades and how the results of UN interest in decolonization affected Anglo-American relations, led me to further research on the subject. The result is my current book project, tentatively titled *From Interest to Involvement: The United States, Great Britain, and the UN Role in Non-Self-Governing Territories, 1945-1963*.

That long ago shelved exploration of Anglo-American conceptions of empire—which I really will get back to someday—is also responsible for introducing me to the queen's carpet, as I first came across reference to it in some files I was researching for that project at The [British]

National Archives in Kew, which was then known as the Public Record Office. I had never heard of the carpet and was immediately intrigued. The more I was able to find out about it, the more intrigued I became, though in the interest of full disclosure, I should probably admit that at this point the carpet has become an obsession for me. Since first learning about it, I've doggedly tracked down whatever information I could on it, on both sides of the Atlantic. I've also scoured eBay for all manner of carpet-related treasures, scoring in the process postcards and brochures from the original exhibitions, do-it-yourself carpet panel kits (both completed and not) that were originally offered for sale through the magazine *Women's Journal*, and even a completed twelve-panel replica of the entire carpet. Although many (perhaps most) aspects of the carpet's story fall outside of what would be considered the traditional boundaries of the field of U.S. foreign relations, measured by recent work that has expanded the field in all sorts of new (and terrifically exciting) directions, I see the carpet as an ideal subject of study, both for the ways it relates to my field and the ways it doesn't. What I'd like to do with the remainder of my remarks is briefly consider some of the aspects of the carpet's story that strike me as most important in the context of various elements of the field of U.S. foreign relations.

One way that I think the carpet story can be fitted into the field is by connecting it to work like Kristin Hoganson's *Consumers' Imperium: The Global Projection of American Domesticity, 1865-1920*, which considers the role of "things" in helping to shape an internationalized American identity during the Gilded Age and Progressive Era.<sup>14</sup> The surprisingly large crowds that turned out for the carpet's tour through sixteen U.S. cities between 23 March and 15 June 1950—New York, Washington, DC, St. Louis, Kansas City, New Orleans, Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Minneapolis, Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and then back to New York—suggest to me that it can be used

in a similar way to consider U.S. attitudes toward Britain.<sup>15</sup> The reasons for the large crowds in the U.S. cities on the tour were manifold. Some people felt compelled to view the carpet due to their “sympathetic interest . . . in the British Royal Family.” Others simply appreciated “the beauty of the work itself.”<sup>16</sup> Not surprisingly, many of those who viewed the carpet were of British ancestry, and many of those were war brides who welcomed the chance to reconnect with their beloved queen.<sup>17</sup> Some American women were moved by the queen’s personal sacrifice in making and donating the carpet to her nation, and many noted their belief that “Queen Mary ha[d] set an example of service for . . . American women too.”<sup>18</sup> They were also impressed with the example the queen had provided in “[sticking] to her job” and “[finishing] what she started.”<sup>19</sup>

A second way that I think the carpet story ties in with recent literature in the field is to consider it in connection to work like Thomas Zeiler’s *Ambassadors in Pinstripes: The Spalding World Baseball Tour and the Birth of American Empire* that chronicles what might be termed unconventional instances of international contact or interaction.<sup>20</sup> Like the 1888-89 Spalding tour, which Zeiler uses effectively as a lens for examining turn-of-the-century U.S. internationalism, I believe that the queen’s carpet provides a novel portal through which to examine such traditional topics as Britain’s postwar financial and larger world situations, overall Anglo-American relations, and the evolving British Commonwealth. Tracing these developments through the history of a single object may be unconventional, but to me no less so than Zeiler’s consideration of the foreign relations aspects of baseball, Scott Laderman’s creative look at surfing as a tool of U.S. foreign relations, or Craig Robertson’s use of the passport as a vehicle for exploring American identity.<sup>21</sup> All of these studies, and others besides, have used

objects or activities as opportunities for considering U.S. foreign relations in their broadest sense. I see the same sort of potential in uncovering the history of the queen's carpet.

Finally, the carpet provides the perfect opportunity for exploring the important—but often overlooked—role of women in foreign affairs. Molly Wood's terrific presidential address last year is just one good example of the sort of work that's currently being done to bring women, in all their manifold roles, into the study of foreign relations.<sup>22</sup> And when it comes to the queen's carpet, there are lots of possibilities for such exploration. I've already noted Queen Mary's connection to the Royal School of Needlework, whose members designed the twelve panels of the queen's carpet, joined the individual panels together, and attached the border to the finished carpet.<sup>23</sup> If the Royal School of Needlework therefore facilitated the production of the carpet, its sale was made possible through the efforts of another women's organization, the Women's Voluntary Services (WVS). Founded during the Blitz by Lady Stella Reading, the WVS originally undertook civil defense and other wartime tasks. Rather than disbanding at war's end, however, it refashioned itself as an all-purpose women's philanthropic and service society that allowed women of leisure an opportunity to make a positive and important contribution to Britain's postwar recovery.<sup>24</sup> Among the WVS's divisions by the late 1940s was Women's Home Industries (WHI), which was devoted to producing high-end embroidery and needlework for export to the United States. The WHI had previously handled the sale of chair covers the queen had worked, a sale that generated \$10,000 for the Queen's District Nursing Fund. Naturally, it was hoped that Queen Mary's Carpet would generate a sum far in excess of that for the British Treasury.<sup>25</sup> In addition to generating much-needed dollars for the British Exchequer, the carpet, like the chair covers made earlier by the queen, was expected to generate U.S. interest in British needlework and thereby lead to additional sales of products manufactured



under the auspices of the WHI.<sup>26</sup> The carpet campaign also complemented ongoing British government efforts to encourage women to take jobs in the nation's textile mills, which were operating far below capacity due to a shortage of workers. Government officials saw Queen Mary's example as likely to spur ordinary women to volunteer for mill jobs in much the same way that they had accepted factory work during the war.<sup>27</sup> And the members of the IODE as well as the women who coordinated the carpet's tour throughout the United States, whether as representatives of the British government or members of the various women's and arts organizations that handled local arrangements across the country offer a variety of research possibilities.<sup>28</sup>

Additionally, of course, there is also much to learn about women's roles in foreign relations by considering Queen Mary herself, who saw her own decision to donate the carpet to the nation's dollar export initiative within the larger context of "every British citizen's duty to contribute something directly to help [the nation] achieve prosperity."<sup>29</sup> The queen's personal sacrifice in donating to the nation what amounted to nine years of work was a constant theme in publicity about the carpet, as was the point that at eighty-three years of age she was unlikely to complete another such work for her own enjoyment.<sup>30</sup> Her personal contribution to the nation was also highlighted in repeated references to the fact that she had made the carpet herself, that it had not come from "the rich stores of the nation" and was most definitely "not a family heirloom." It was "an *individual* contribution towards overcoming a *national* crisis."<sup>31</sup> Publicity about the carpet sale also played up the queen's long history of supporting charitable causes. Hospitals and other charities with which she was involved, in fact, had often received gifts of her own embroidery.<sup>32</sup> So Queen Mary's carpet donation in 1950 was part of a long-term pattern that symbolized her personal determination to do something tangible to help her country out of

its financial crisis. And while she was under no illusion that her gesture would single-handedly solve Britain's dollar crisis, she was convinced that it could stimulate other British craftswomen to do likewise.<sup>33</sup> An early theme for the carpet campaign, in fact, was "Leadership to the People of Britain to Work for Prosperity." Self-sacrifice and community cooperation, it was maintained, would restore the nation's solvency, much as they had assured victory in the Second World War.<sup>34</sup>

My research on the carpet has come in fits and starts, and I still have much to learn and ponder. And at this point, I'm not fully certain what sort of finished product that research will result in. I do know, however, that although I could certainly go on, and on, and on, about other aspects of the queen's carpet that fascinate me, I promised at the outset that I would be brief and I'm determined to keep my word. So as I bring my remarks to an end, I would like to thank you again for giving me the opportunity to serve the Ohio Academy as president for the 2013-2014 year—and to share with you the story of how a queen, her carpet, and a historian of U.S. foreign relations got together.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Roosevelt quoted in Paul L. Soper, *Basic Public Speaking*, 3d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963), 12.
- <sup>2</sup> James Pope-Hennessey, *Queen Mary* (London: George Allen Unwin Ltd., 1959), 66.
- <sup>3</sup> “The Story of the Carpet,” Records of the Board of Trade, Advisory Committee on Commercial Information Overseas: Correspondence, Record Class BT 202/13, The National Archives, Kew, England; Publicity notice, 13 February 1950, Records of the Board of Trade, Publicity Campaigns (Home): Queen Mary’s Carpet, Record Class BT 202/3, The National Archives, Kew; clipping from *The All Canadian Needlecraft Magazine*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Curatorial File, Queen Mary’s Carpet, Acc. No 6181, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa. I am grateful to Cheryl Gagnon, Jane Robertson, and other members of the National Gallery’s staff for assistance in identifying and making use of the Curatorial File.
- <sup>4</sup> See unsigned Treasury memorandum, attached to Sharp to Cass, 28 November 1949, Prime Minister’s Office: Correspondence and Papers, 1945-1951, Record Class PREM 8/1270, The National Archives, Kew; undated, “Queen Mary’s Rug,” Records of the Foreign Office, Queen Mary’s Carpet, Record Class FO 620/11, The National Archives, Kew; “The Story of the Carpet,” BT 202/13; McGregor to Clutterbuck, 14 January 1950, Records of the Dominions Office, Sale of Queen Mary’s Carpet for Dollars, Record Class DO 35/3493, The National Archives, Kew; clipping from *The Times*, “Carpet Made by Queen Mary,” 27 January 1950, Records of the Board of Trade, Registration of Queen Mary’s Carpet in USA, Record Class BT 209/1015, The National Archives, Kew; and Board of Trade outward tel. 79, 26 January 1950, BT 202/3.
- <sup>5</sup> See acting high commissioner for Canada in Great Britain tel. 143 to secretary of state for external affairs, Ottawa, 23 January 1950, Protection of the Design of the Queen Mary Carpet, Record Group 25, series G-2, vol. 8171, file 6104-A-40, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa; and “The Story of the Carpet,” BT 202/13.
- <sup>6</sup> Press release by Queen Mary’s Contribution to the Dollar Drive Committee, 12 June 1950, BT 202/3.
- <sup>7</sup> See “The Story of the Carpet,” BT 202/13; e-mail from Karen Colby-Stothart, Curatorial File, Queen Mary’s Carpet, Acc. No 6181; undated “Queen Mary’s Rug,” FO 620/11.
- <sup>8</sup> Board of Trade confidential note for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, “Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 13 May 1950, BT 202/3; E. A. Cleugh circular 48, “Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 8 June 1950, FO 620/11; clipping, “Queen’s Carpet Fails to Gain Major Revenue” (Reuters), 14 June 1950, from *Ottawa Morning Citizen*, RG 25, series G-2, vol. 8171, file 6104-A-40; and Kenneth McGregor to Sir Alexander Clutterbuck, 14 January 1950, DO 35/3493.

<sup>9</sup> Minutes of IODE Executive Committee meeting, 5 July 1950, Records of the Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire, Record Group MG 28, series I 17, vol. 7, folder: “Minutes—National Executive, 10 September 1947-6 December 1950,” National Archives of Canada. H. M. Queen Mary (Mary R) to Mrs. John H. Chipman (national president, IODE), 23 August 1950, 5-5-Q, Exhibitions in the Gallery, Queen Mary’s Carpet, 13 March 1950-5 January 1959, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa; minutes of IODE National Executive Committee, 6 September 1950, MG 28, series I 17, vol. 7, folder: “Minutes—National Executive, 10 September 1947-6 December 1950,” National Archives of Canada; and *Echoes*, Annual Meeting Number, Autumn 1950, no. 200, “Royal Carpet Goes on Tour,” copy in National Library of Canada. Public reaction to the carpet tour may be followed in the IODE’s scrapbooks, MG 28, series I 17, vols. 42-44, National Archives of Canada.

<sup>10</sup> “Princess Presents the Royal Carpet,” *Echoes*, Christmas 1951, no. 205, National Library of Canada.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.gallery.ca/en/see/collections/artwork.php?mkey=3562>.

<sup>12</sup> See Mary Ann Heiss, *Empire and Nationhood: The United States, Great Britain, and Iranian Oil, 1950-1954* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

<sup>13</sup> See Mary Ann Heiss, “Colonialism and the Atlantic Alliance: Anglo-American Perspectives at the United Nations, 1945-1963,” in *NATO and the Warsaw Pact: Intra-bloc Conflicts*, ed. Heiss and S. Victor Papacosma (Kent: Kent State University Press, 2008), 25-42.

<sup>14</sup> See Kristin L. Hoganson, *Consumers’ Imperium: The Global Production of American Domesticity, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

<sup>15</sup> See Patricia Hardie to Elsa, 24 March 1950, BT 202/3; Angus McDonnell to Lady Stella Reading, 6 April 1950, BT 202/3; P. H. Gore-Booth to M. L. G. Balfour, “Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 6 April 1950, BT 202/3; Hardie to Elsa, with attached report, undated, BT 202/3; unsigned “Report on Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 8 May 1950, BT 202/3; E. A. Cleugh to British Consulate (General), Boston, 8 June 1950, FO 620/11; and press release by Queen Mary’s Contribution to the Dollar Drive Committee, 12 June 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>16</sup> P. H. Gore-Booth to M. L. G. Balfour, “Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 6 April 1950, BT 202/3. See also Queen Mary’s Contribution to the Dollar Drive Committee, press release P.N. 2082, 12 June 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>17</sup> Hardie to Elsa, with attached report, undated, BT 202/3; unsigned “Report on Queen Mary’s Carpet,” 8 May 1950, BT 202/3;

<sup>18</sup> Hardie to Elsa, with attached report, undated, BT 202/3;

<sup>19</sup> Extract from letter received from Grace L. Dorey (ESU, San Francisco), undated, BT 202/3. See also extract from letter from Patricia Hardie, undated, BT 202/3.

<sup>20</sup> See Thomas W. Zeiler, *Ambassadors in Pinstripes: The Spalding World Baseball Tour and the Birth of the American Empire* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006).

<sup>21</sup> See Scott Laderman, *Empire in Waves: A Political History of Surfing* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014); and Craig Robertson, *The Passport in America: The History of a Document* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

<sup>22</sup> See Molly M. Wood, “‘Women are not Adapted to This Sort of Work,’ or Are They? The First American Women Diplomats, 1924-1940,” presidential address delivered before the Ohio Academy of History, 31 March 2012.

<sup>23</sup> Board of Trade tel. 79, 26 January 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>24</sup> For the early history of the WVS see James Hinton, “Voluntarism and the Welfare/Warfare State; Women’s Voluntary Services in the 1940s,” *Twentieth-Century British History* 9, no. 2 (1998): 274-305.

<sup>25</sup> See unsigned Treasury memorandum, attached to Sharp to Cass, 28 November 1949, PREM 8/1270; undated “Queen Mary’s Rug,” FO 620/11; clipping from *The Times*, “Carpet Made by Queen Mary,” 27 January 1950, BT 209/1015; and Board of Trade tel. 79, 26 January 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>26</sup> See unsigned Treasury memorandum, attached to Sharp to Cass, 28 November 1949, PREM 8/1270.

<sup>27</sup> See undated “Report to the Women of Britain No 14” and undated “Report to the Nation, Radio Times Special,” INF 12/693, PRO.

<sup>28</sup> On the history of the IODE see Katie Pickles, *Female Imperialism and National Identity: Imperial Order Daughters of the Empire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002). For the carpet tour, see unsigned Treasury memorandum, attached to Sharp to Cass, 28 November 1949, PREM 8/1270; undated “Report to the Women of Britain No 14” and undated “Report to the Nation, Radio Times Special,” General Records of the Central Office of Information, Operation Britain: Campaign to Publicize Britain, Record Class INF 12/693, The National Archives, Kew; and Board of Trade tel. 79, 26 January 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>29</sup> USIS Daily Wireless Bulletin, 21 March 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>30</sup> Publicity notice, 13 February 1950, BT 202/3.

<sup>31</sup> Lady Stella Reading (WVS) memorandum for Lady Cynthia Colville (lady in waiting to H.M. Queen Mary), 6 December 1949, PREM 8/1270; unsigned private and personal to Sir Alan

Lescelles, 29 November 1949, PREM 8/1270. See also CRO inward tel. 137 from U.K. High Commissioner in Canada, 7 February 1950, DO 35/3493.

<sup>32</sup> D. Geneva Lent, *Needle Point as a Hobby* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), 152.

<sup>33</sup> Lady Stella Reading memorandum to Lady Cynthia Colville, 6 December 1949, PREM 8/1270; Kenneth McGregor minutes, 9 January 1950, DO 35/3493.

<sup>34</sup> Unsigned letter to D'Arcy Edmondson, Esq., 23 January 1950, Records of British Information Services Activities in the USA, Record Class FO 953/1022, The National Archives, Kew.