

had swept through academia and the circles of power. There is simply no better way to stimulate jobs, economic growth and public welfare than by restricting government, tax levels and corruption.

These basic economic doctrines—fair trade and support for the common worker—were strictly consistent with Churchill's life long pursuit of social stability, prosperity and opportunity. In wider party politics Churchill was a radical who consistently attacked the Conservatives as a party of wealthy vested interests conspiring to exploit the poor. He had a rough belief in proper mass representative democracy (though part of him sympathised with the viewpoints of the controversial Nietzsche who feared for mass democratisation feeling that the great features of aristocratic or privileged existence would disappear), and most of his actions were 'de Tocquevillian' in the sense that the more unfettered society was from government technocracy the greater the progress and the more civil the culture would become. Churchill was fundamentally concerned that there should not be governmental obstruction to the mass of the people realising the benefits that a liberalising representative democracy could bring into their lives.<sup>64</sup> In 1908 he wrote to Asquith:

"There is a tremendous policy in social organisation. The need is urgent and the moment ripe. Germany with a harder climate and far less accumulated wealth has managed to establish tolerable basic conditions for her people. She is organised not only for war, but for peace. We are organised for nothing except party politics. The Minister who will apply to this country the successful experiences of Germany in social organisation may or may not be supported at the polls, but he will at least have a memorial which time will not deface of his administration."<sup>65</sup>

Churchill was a master at initiating social change especially during the 10 years of the 'radical' Asquith administration from 1905-1915. Churchill was usually able to convince the House of Commons to agree to his proposals even if he was in a subordinate or even antagonistic position. The skills used to complete such duties were varied. Very rarely did they include threats, bullying, trampling on souls, or the use of political power. Logic, parliamentary procedure, emotional colour and well-researched positions counted as more important. Churchill proposed and acquired the acceptance of the House on a number of far reaching proposals, including;

- Institution of Labour Exchanges and unemployed insurance
- National Infirmity Insurance
- Special state industries such as roads, afforestation
- Modernised poor law (law mandating that children should support their parents)
- State control of the railway
- Compulsory education until age 17

If we consider the tremendous tasks in which the human race and governments; local, regional, national, will struggle against in the near future then social organisation

and re-organisation, probably of a brutal or dislocative nature will not be completed in the current 'pork and play' atmosphere in today's political systems. Politicians engaged in change will need the courage to ignore the polls and do what needs to be done—with private capital it should be added. There are limits to government power and today we simply have too much government in our lives, doing too little and wasting too much. To a conservative like Churchill the panoply of programs, policies, bureaucracies and governmental nonsense would drive him to misery and depression. Government's role to regulate, secure, adjudicate and protect is obvious. But to Churchill and other Conservatives the power of government to deform, recreate and push anti-liberal and anti-conservative policies and ideals would rightly be seen as a threat to our civilisation's survival.

Churchill's economic beliefs and education, though broader and more profound than many politicians, were attached to a series of principles. He loathed dependence and esteemed individualism. He was fully in support of *laissez-faire* and the doctrines of 17th, 18th and 19th century English economics. His faith in Adam Smith, John Locke and Edwardian experience compelled Churchill to espouse his support in the benedictions of unshackled economic exchange. In October of 1902, in a letter to a political colleague while still a member of the Conservative party, Churchill commented that it was necessary by an 'evolutionary process' to create a wing of the Conservative party which would either infuse vigour into the entire unit, or allow the formation of a central coalition.

Churchill realised as he stated in the letter that his plan would become most important as an incident in or possibly as a herald of the movement, but that it would also move suspicion that he was moved only by mere restless ambition and not substantive issues. He needed a grand theme and found it in the Free Trade debate of 1903-4. Churchill was unable to countenance the stance of the Conservative party in their clamouring for protection and left joining the Liberals on May 31 1904. Allegations of opportunism, deceit and cowardice, rained down upon him as he shifted sides. In a note to a friend Churchill admitted; "(The) Free Trade issue subsides it leaves my personal ambitions naked and stranded on the beach—and they are an ugly and unsatisfactory spectacle by themselves, though nothing but an advantage when borne forward with the flood of a great outside cause."<sup>66</sup> Indeed without a great cause ambition is a rather repulsive picture.

For Churchill and others, orthodox liberal ideals as exemplified by the Free Trade question meant more than simply the abolition of protective tariffs. It personifies a whole philosophy of political, social and economic organisation. John Stuart Mill in 'Principles of Political Economy' in 1848 developed the '*Laissez-faire*', concept and every departure from it, unless required by some great good, is a certain evil. This commandment created the key notes of mid-Victorian liberalism: the reliance upon individualism, the establishment of self-respect, and self-reliance, and the organisation of voluntary and co-operative societies to better the plight of the weak, wounded and suffering.<sup>67</sup>

Support for such mantra was rooted in an earlier period of excitable prosperity. Coinciding with the advent of Free Trade in the years 1850-1870, there was an economic boom in the UK. It cannot be gainsaid that the removal of tariff barriers had a transformative and extraordinarily positive impact on the British economy and society. Britain in short became wealthy. Psychologically the advent of free trade was closely associated with entrepreneurial zest and commercial success. It appeared that market forces working within the social and political structure solved the question of English strength, which had preoccupied the country from 1820-50.<sup>68</sup>

Churchill knew his economic history well. It moulded and galvanised his political and philosophical beliefs. It shaped his political attitude and formed one of his bedrock principles—free movement of goods and services. This created in his political philosophy a paradox—Churchill was at once a radical and a traditionalist. He was a radical in changing structures and governmental organisations and arcane laws to facilitate the movement of finance and trade on a more fair and free basis. He was also a radical in his determination to raise the general standard of living, economic opportunity and chance for decent education and welfare. He was a traditionalist in his empathy that the productive capitalistic system was the only guaranteed method of sustaining society and providing a nation with the capability to ensure adequate standards of wealth and progress.

## Power

In assessing the use of power Churchill's career and leadership in this regard actually represents Britain's peculiarity as a great power which during its hegemony was formed in the conjunction of three factors: her naval strength, her imperial possessions, and her financial primacy.<sup>69</sup> Through two stints as First Lord of the Admiralty, Chancellor of the Exchequer and through two World Wars, Churchill devoted the lion's share of his time and energies to upholding these interlocking causes, making it conspicuously clear in the process that he had no intention of presiding over the liquidation of the British Empire.

As Chancellor of the Exchequer Churchill presented 5 budgets (1925-1929)—in British history only Pitt, Walpole and Gladstone can equal that record. Though vastly entertaining as pieces of oratory and acting adroitness his budgets adhered as much as it was possible to economic orthodoxy. Many times Churchill was accused of slight of hand sophistry in the compilation of his numbers and in the collection of his tax revenue. However, this allegation has been and could be made with more convincing effect against every other Chancellor in this century. What is more important to note is that Churchill's orthodoxy underpinned the Victorian notion of Britain's greatness.

Churchill was a realist and understood power. Power is really to be embraced and used and is in some ways the centre piece of leadership. To ignore it is to perish. Because of his somewhat apolitical view of the world Churchill could discern

very clearly the different perspectives on how nations viewed peace and how any destroyer of peace would appear in various forms to different nations. To prevent war and general international dislocation he at times called for zones and regional structures, including World-Grand Alliances. Power and strength were vital: In his words, "Appeasement from strength is magnanimous and noble and might be the surest and perhaps the only path to peace."<sup>70</sup>

Though primarily remembered as a war-hungry demagogue, Churchill on at least half a dozen occasions defiantly crusaded against the level and purpose of military spending. These personal programs were driven in part by his political position. That is only a small part of the answer. During the 1920's Churchill felt that military expenditure was too high and should be curbed given the threat of inflation, the spectre of economic dislocation and the vital investments needed in infrastructure and social programs. As Churchill always maintained it was quality above quantity that mattered.

These economic indicators drove Churchill to proselytise against excessive taxation and to insist on reviews of defence expenditures. It was necessary Churchill felt, to augment the Royal Air Force allotment and decrease the high administrative costs of the army and look suspiciously into the Royal Navy claims of needing more funding. The cabinet agreed with Churchill: "that the Fighting Services should proceed on the assumption that no great war is to be anticipated within the next ten years" although, "provision should be made for the possible expansion of trained units in case of an emergency arising."<sup>71</sup> Little of the war-monger appears in this sentiment though security was never to be imperilled.

Churchill was emphatic that the 10 year rule be reviewed each year. This 10 year dictum uttered in the mid 20's obviously proved false since in 1936, the Germans seized the Rhineland. Beginning with the rise of Hitler and the stench of his ideology, Churchill began advocating not only a mammoth increase in armament production but also a closer relationship with Russia. Strategy had changed again. This option was proffered from a man who in the early 1920's had supported the incursion of British soldiers into the heartland of Russia to cleanse it of Bolshevism. Churchill regarded Bolshevism as the lowliest creed and construct of mankind's civilised history. These adjurations were consistent with his concept of maintaining a balance of power and bargaining from a position of strength, all in the name of effacing and avoiding an evil tumult. It is—and should be—one of the chief reasons for our admiration and support of Churchill that he consistently advocated peace by international understanding and if understanding were to collapse to resist any impingement of freedom by force.<sup>72</sup>

But his political courtship of Russia was based on seemingly obvious and important facts. As Churchill previsioned in the early 30's a new line of French fortifications established only along the French part of the Rhine would enable Germany to attack France through Belgium and Holland. He knew that Germany would not respect the neutrality of the Low Countries in her desire to rip and tear