

the French to pieces. He also warned that Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Austria and the Baltic's, were at risk, and that Britain could not detain a German advance into these areas from her current submissive position of weakness. Churchill wanted to station a part of the British fleet in the Baltic to outnumber the German fleet.⁷³ To achieve measurable, guarded security an alliance with the Bolsheviks was inevitable, vital and more importantly achievable.

If stronger lines had been followed in the 1930's World War Two could have been avoided. With a 'Churchillian' leadership of the world and vision of power and morality we could have escaped the disgusting slaughter of 70 million people. In a 1945 speech to the combined Belgian Senate and Chamber, Churchill stressed what is still surely relevant in our world today; namely the resistance and prevention of dictator aggression: "If the United States had taken an active part in the League of Nations, and if the League of Nations had been prepared to use concerted force, even had it only been European force, to prevent the re-armament of Germany, there was no need for further serious bloodshed. If the Allies had resisted Hitler strongly in his early stages, even up to his seizure of the Rhineland in 1936, he would have been forced to recoil, and a chance would have been given to the sane elements in German life, which were very powerful especially in the High Command, to free Germany of the maniacal Government and system into the grip of which she was falling. Do not forget that twice the German people, by a majority, voted against Hitler, but the Allies and the League of Nations acted with such feebleness and lack of clairvoyance."⁷⁴ The same can be applied today in regards to fascist Islam and fighting the enemies of freedom in the Middle East and beyond.

After the Second World War Churchill continued such pleas arguing in various speeches for France and Germany to bind wounds and for Russia to become a partner with the West in the greater development of a peaceful Europe.⁷⁵ When it became obvious that the Soviets intended to challenge if not supplant the West (especially after the communist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia in 1948), than the tone of conciliation turned to a growling of an affronted bulldog as Churchill told American officials, that now is the time, promptly, to tell the Soviets that if they do not retire from Berlin and abandon Eastern Germany, withdrawing to the Polish frontier 'we will raze their cities'. In his signal 'Iron Curtain' speech in Fulton Missouri in March 1946, Churchill implored that the United Nations must work effectively to prevent another war recognising Russia as a leading nation, remembering the gallantry of its efforts in the last war, and acknowledging its 'Iron Curtain' control of Eastern Europe which necessitated the banding and collation of Western strength and might.⁷⁶

It is a complex issue and drives to the heart of politics that so many of us view with revulsion—peace through strength and shifting alliances and geopolitical supporters. To understand such necessities today we need to understand the human animal. In scanning leadership and the great broad stretch and gesture of events, the basic construct of the human animal has to be borne in mind. Churchill constantly reminded his associates of the base fact that we really have not changed genetically

in the last 100,000 years. As advances are made in understanding the human genome, advances must also be made in the way society and the leaders of society are structured and educated.

Churchill's view of international affairs was pragmatic though not machiavellian. He had two basic precepts of security—use history as a guide and foster a balance of power between the strongest lands and in particular between the natural allies of the Anglo-Saxon world and ensure that the internal national health was seasoned and keen. Churchill frequently referred to his debt to those who had laboured before himself as he did to Katherine Asquith, on April 5 1929; "How strange it is that the past is so little understood and so quickly forgotten. We live in the most thoughtless of ages. Every day headlines and short views. I have tried to drag history up a little nearer to our own times in case it should be helpful as a guide in present difficulties."⁷⁷

To say he was old-fashioned as some critics contend is simplistic. Churchill more than any other figure helped create the modern welfare nation state (though he would be appalled at its size and generosity today and would advocate a massive rollback), advocated economic and social innovation and change, defended conservative virtues and ideals, and was whole heartedly engaged in political reform and 'action this day' problem solving. Only his rhetoric could be defined as old-fashioned but Churchill's mastery of language can hardly be considered a negative.

To summarize an enduring commitment to knowledge and of increasing the power, and not the dependency of the layman, both intellectually and politically was the central tenet of Churchill's political genius. He could combine the new world with the old gleaning the important knowledge from the past, to help shape the institutions of the current and future. Churchill was a prototypical conservative.