

How Should We View Churchill (and Other Historical Figures) Today? Are We Looking At Them In The Right Way?

By Alan I. Saltman author of [No Peace With Hitler](#)

Over the last few years, we have seen a concerted effort to cancel or greatly reduce the visibility or diminish the reputation of some historical figures whose “bad” acts and beliefs, particularly with regard to race, some assert, warrant such action. These figures include, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Robert E. Lee and other Confederate leaders, past presidents and alumni of Ivy League schools, and Winston Churchill. The scope of these actual or proposed cancellations include the removal or defacement of their statues, changing the name of buildings, schools, streets etc. which have borne their names for decades if not longer, and a general diminution of the esteem in which they were once held.

Historical figures are complex. So too is the process of properly assessing them, But most people have neither the time nor inclination to unravel their complexity to see who they really were. They prefer to simply decide if the person was good or bad, and frequently do so based on a single factor, incomplete information, supposition rather than historical fact, their personal revulsion at the act/belief the figure is accused of and/or being influenced (either directly or indirectly) by the small slice of society of which they are a part.

No accurate assessment of historical figures can be made without knowledge of the actual facts that relate to them. It cannot properly be made on the basis of sensational but unsupported allegations that an individual did iniquitous things during his or her life. Indeed, in the absence an ability to distinguish fact from mere conjecture, any assessment is at best frail. It is thus very important that an assessment be accomplished in as objective and dispassionate a way as possible.

That said, the question also needs to be raised as to whether it is fair, as is often the case where racial prejudice is involved, to judge historical figures based solely on particular actions or views of theirs relating to race. Doesn't doing so indicate a belief that a person's entire life can be judged by a single factor? But is that ever true?

The Balancing Approach

Wouldn't a better assessment of an individual be one premised on:

1. an examination of the heinousness and scope of the wrongful action(s) /view(s) in question;
2. an examination of the virtuousness and importance of the person's other actions /views; and
3. a comparison of the results to see if the weight of overall "bad" is greater than the weight of the overall "good."

The results of such an assessment, although not provable to a mathematical certainty, would at least be the product of a fairly complete view of the individual rather than just a single factor. Hopefully too distortions will also be minimized.

Acts Involving Racial or Religious Intolerance

In assessing historical figures we generally look at actions taken by him/her in the past that are not consistent with enlightened 21st century views. That fact is, however, not relevant if the historical figure's misdeed involves matters dealing with racial or religious intolerance. The reason--taking pernicious action(s) toward people on the basis of their race or religion is wrong and, more to the point, has been wrong forever. Therefore, at least with respect to racial and religious injustice, there is no difference in vileness between an act performed in the past and one performed today. While societies have, on more than a few occasions, turned a blind eye to racial or religious injustice, on matters of race and religious prejudice that fact does not cleanse any past racial/religious intolerance of its turpitude.

That doesn't mean that acts dealing with racial or religious intolerance do not vary in terms of their vileness. They do. It is just that their despicability is not a function of when and in what circumstances they took place.

As the list set out below showing increasingly despicable actions demonstrates, acts and beliefs demonstrating racial or religious intolerance can, and always have, varied in their heinousness from:

- Merely showing a bigoted attitude on occasion, to
- Using racial or religious slurs, to
- Not allowing a group of people to work, go to school and/or live with the majority society because of their race or religion, all the way up to
- Using systematic violence to enslave, or even kill members of a targeted group of people merely because of their race, religion, or the like.

Thus, in a Balancing Approach assessment, the degree of heinousness of an historical figure's actions and beliefs, even with regard to racial or religious matters, can and should be considered.

Acts Not Involving Racial or Religious Intolerance.

Acts that do not involve matters of the race or religion generally encompass activities or beliefs that are not in accord with today's definition of morality or propriety. Good examples of this would be the historical figure's past participation in dog or cock fighting or dueling. In those instances, the fact that "everyone in his time used to do it" does not exonerate the historical figure, but does, however, provide more room to say that because doing it was common at the time or that the circumstance surrounding the act is somehow rationalized, i.e., its heinousness can be tempered for purposes of the assessment.

Subjectivity and Other Important Things to be Avoided in Making the Assessment

Of course, determining the heinousness of an action, can introduce subjectivity into what ideally should be an objective analysis. Impaired objectivity may even be more likely where the act in question does not involve race or religion but is merely one that may have been acceptable in the past but may or may not be offensive today. In that situation the assessor's personal standards of decency are quite likely to become involved.

One relevant example is dropping the atomic bomb on Japan in August 1945. At the time it happened, 85% of Americans approved using the bomb. Seventy years later, only 57% approved. In such an instance, notwithstanding increased feelings some seven decades after dropping the bomb that doing so was not justified, it seems that the heinousness (and moral reprehensibility) of dropping the bomb on Japan still needs to be tempered by the circumstances in which it occurred,¹ i.e., the need to bring a long bloody war to an end, the fact that by dropping the bomb the US did not have to invade Japan (an action that would have resulted in an estimated one million American casualties), and the fact that the total number of deaths which occurred on both sides before the war ended was actually less than would have been the case had atomic weapons not been used.²

Keeping subjectivity totally out of the assessment is not something easily done and may not even be possible. Nevertheless trying to be objective is the honest, rationale, intelligent, and mature way to do an assessment. Difficult as it may be, it is also important to avoid simply going along (consciously or unconsciously) with the views of one's contemporaries. On the other hand,

¹ In contrast, no diminution of the heinousness of the act due to the circumstances in 1942 would be appropriate with regard to the government's internment of Japanese Americans at the beginning of WWII because that action was based substantially on their race.

² Any assertion that the willingness to use the bomb was facilitated by the fact that its victims were Asian not Caucasian, can be rebutted by the fact that the Allies did not hesitate to heavily bomb Germany and kill many Caucasians in the process. Indeed, the February 1945 firebombing of Dresden alone killed an estimated 25,000 Germans.

one should also not be bullied by them (either explicitly or implicitly). One should not be afraid to do an assessment that might lead to a conclusion that differs from theirs — they may or may not be as informed, objective, thoughtful and unemotional as you are. In any event, don't fall back on emotionally charged personal feelings to the exclusion of more rationale beliefs of the *knowledgeable* greater majority who may or may not encompass your contemporaries. So too, avoid the satisfaction of feeling morally superior to the historical figure.

Also give some thought as to how you would react if, so to speak, the shoe were on the other foot, e.g. a large group of passionate, vocal, right-wing types want to have a statue of Martin Luther King removed from a public place because “his standards of morality do not represent *our values*” and “certainly do make him someone who should be praised or celebrated.” Would you simply go along with them because they were dominating the debate? Would a substantial moral deficiency, in and of itself, justify removing the statue?

Lastly, we frequently allow our assessments to be influenced by the revulsion we felt when we first heard that someone who we revered may have done or believed something repulsive or shocking. There is, however, no place in an assessment for the long-reverberating disappointment that comes from learning that a “hero” was perhaps capable of vile actions and of having despicable beliefs or beliefs that differ drastically from one's personal standards of decency.

Could the Historical Figure's Beliefs Have Evolved to Conform to Today's Standards of Decency?

Needless to say all of us are more comfortable when we get to judge another person's actions and beliefs by today's cultural standards. Unfortunately, we cannot, of course, resurrect long-dead historical figures, place them in a time machine and drop them (with a full knowledge of all relevant history) into today's society and see if they still possess views and attitudes similar

to the "questionable " ones they once exhibited. However, as an added factor in assessing these historical figures, we can examine the historical record for evidence during their lifetime of thinking/attitudes of theirs that evolved. If that is found, but only if it is found, an appraisal can then be made of the likelihood that over the years the "questionable" views and attitudes that they once held might have evolved such that, were the individual alive today, his or her views would likely not be inconsistent with current societal norms.

Armed with such evidence and the fact that in the 21st century the vast majority of similarly intelligent, educated people likely do not hold the heinous beliefs in question, it would not be rank speculation to believe that today the individual's beliefs and actions would be acceptable. In that case, in the assessment, the heinousness of his/her past acts/beliefs can be tempered substantially. However, without that evidence, it would be purely speculative to say that just because the figure was an intelligent, educated person his/her beliefs would have changed sufficiently over time.

Simple Examples of How the Balancing Approach Works

The Balancing Approach would, for example, help assess an individual who at some point in his/her career had a leading role in the violent suppression of a small protest against an authoritarian government, but later in life took strong action to uphold the basic human rights of a large group of oppressed citizens. In this example there would be a good case that the virtuousness of the person's upholding basic human rights later in life would outweigh the despicability of his/her earlier action. A similar conclusion would likely obtain where an individual was brutal, almost inhumane, in prosecuting a war but was instrumental in directing his country to enter that war and defeat one of the admittedly great villains of history. There once again, the virtuousness of defeating the villain would more than likely outweigh the heinousness

of the means used to do so. The Balancing Approach would, however, probably do nothing to enhance the assessment of a person whose only noteworthy action was being a slave owner.

Similarly using the Balancing Approach does little to improve the assessment of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney who is best known for having authored a case of wide spread import – the Dred Scott decision of 1857. In that case the Supreme Court held that, because Scott was black, he was not a citizen and therefore had no standing to bring suit (in this case to prove that he was a free man by having lived most of his life in the free state of Illinois). Although Taney was opposed to slavery, he believed that it was up to the individual states to deal with it. Moreover, after Lincoln’s election, Taney sympathized with the seceding Southern states. On the other side of the ledger, he also participated in the 1861 case of *Ex parte Merryman*, a case in which the Army arrested and then held a South-sympathizing Maryland planter inaccessible to normal judicial procedures. In *Merryman* the Supreme Court held that President Lincoln could not suspend the writ of *habeas corpus*. Based on the significance, virtue, or heinousness of each of Taney’s actions and beliefs, viewed as objectively as possible, Taney appears to be someone for whom the bad outweighs the good. Moreover, there does not appear to be sufficient evidence to successfully assert that, had he been alive today, his views would have evolved enough to meet societal norms. Accordingly, the resulting assessment would more than likely indicate that his public prominence should be reduced and his visibility limited to the pages of history books. This would be consistent with actions already taken by Congress to remove a statue of Taney from the Capital.

Winston Churchill

Having recently authored a book about Winston Churchill titled [No Peace With Hitler](#), I am most knowledgeable about him and will primarily use that knowledge to more thoroughly

answer the questions that I've posed about the way to look at historical figures, and will also show the results of applying the Balancing Approach to several other individuals.

Two recent articles in *The Times of London* report that Churchill's standing has faded markedly in recent years. That is, in a BBC poll taken 20 years ago, Churchill was voted as the greatest Briton of all time. However, today only 58% of Britons older than 65 have a positive view of the wartime leader, while only one in five Britons aged 18 to 24 has a positive view of Churchill.

The decline of his reputation has been attributed to the fact that in recent decades students in the UK have been taught that Churchill was little more than a colonial racist whose policies, among other things, exacerbated the Bengal famine of 1943 in which some 3 million Indians died. Moreover, as WWII has receded into history and Britons with firsthand memories of the Blitz and the threat of invasion become fewer and fewer, there is also a reduced understanding of what it felt like to be threatened by Nazi Germany when it was located a mere 20 miles across the English Channel and for Churchill to have helped ordinary Britons make it through the war.

That said, is Churchill being viewed appropriately today? Are his shortcomings being reflected honestly? Are his positive contributions being discussed at all? Should he be treated in the way that some in the United States are treating Confederate leaders like Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson and are now urging that slave holders like George Washington and Thomas Jefferson be treated? Should statues of him be removed and his name be withdrawn from schools, roads, etc.? How does Churchill fare under a Balancing Analysis?

In [No Peace With Hitler](#), I agree with almost all historians that Churchill's actions in May 1940 and thereafter saved Western Democracy (which was no small achievement). If Britain had cobbled together some kind of ignoble compromise peace with the Nazis in 1940,

then the history of the world would have been very different. At a minimum the whole of Europe would have fallen into what Churchill called ‘the abyss of a new Dark Age.’ Less well known today is the fact that in addition to being a renown wartime leader Churchill was also a great social reformer, and, on more than a few instances along the way, demonstrated substantial humanity.

But that said, he certainly was not a man without flaws. Indeed, he was a Victorian aristocrat who, like his contemporaries, thought of people based on the color of their skin, and felt that white people were superior. Moreover, particularly when angry or frustrated, or just to seem witty, Churchill would resort to the use of the racist tropes of the day whether he meant what he said or not. As late as the mid-nineteen sixties, when racial problems began to arise in England itself, the evidence indicates that Churchill was leaning toward the enactment of legislation limiting black immigration into the UK and using racial stereotyping in the process (“coloured people” being attracted to the UK “by the Welfare State”).

Nevertheless, I also point out that in comparison to his peers, who admittedly set a very low bar, he was much more informed and enlightened on racial matters, was not an antisemite and did a number of things that were quite admirable. For these reasons in [NPWH](#) I write that “Churchill was a racist—but.”

In a recent article in the *South China Morning Post* of January 3, 2023, Alex Low iterates this view but in a different way. That is, Low has no problem labeling Churchill as a racist. This is based on Churchill’s habit of making offensive remarks about non-whites but Low insightfully writes that “[i]n the end though, it’s not his words but what he did that mattered.” Referencing Sartre, Mr. Low asserts that a commitment to noble causes, such as the commitment that Churchill had, “presumably includes woke anti-racism.” More importantly, as he puts it

“The real question is whether [Churchill] could look beyond his racism in dealing with other peoples and make rational judgments”

Professor Richard Toye explains that notwithstanding Churchill’s racial prejudice, he was concerned about the welfare of British subjects throughout the Empire (some even called him a paternalistic imperialist) and believed there was a “need to act humanely toward supposedly inferior races, that might in their own way be worthy of admiration.” Likewise, Churchill did not feel there should be barriers that prevented anyone, regardless of race or religion, from reaching as high as their abilities could take them. There were also a number of instances of Churchill’s opposing actions in which non-whites were not treated as they should have been. For example, in 1898 he wrote of his disgust with the British Army’s killing and mutilating wounded Islamic warriors known as Dervishes who had fought bravely at the Battle of Omdurman in Sudan. In 1906, as Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, he cracked down on the use of corporal punishment against Chinese workers imported to work in South Africa’s mines. In 1919 he stood up against inhumane treatment of non-white subjects of the Empire when, controversially, he supported the Army’s discipline and forced retirement of Brigadier General Reginald Dwyer. Dwyer had ordered his troops to open fire on an illegal political demonstration by unarmed protesters in Amritsar, India, killing 379 of them and wounding over a thousand more. Churchill told the House of Commons that by his actions Dyer had engaged in “terrorism.” In 1942, after he "was advised ... that American army officers were imposing a “Whites only” policy in some British restaurants, Churchill and the Cabinet made it clear that British authorities would not help enforce segregation; admission to pubs, theaters, movies, and so on would not be restricted on the basis of race. Thereafter, Black Americans in Britain enjoyed a freedom they did not have in large parts of their own country".

Redeeming actions and views such as these were not often taken or held by other historical figures who felt that white people were superior. For example it would have been difficult prior to, and even for many years after, the American Civil War to find southerner leaders who were able to look beyond their racism. The political leaders of the Confederacy not only had a belief in the superiority of whites but went to war in order to perpetuate that view. During reconstruction and the Jim Crow era, southern whites again took to violence and enacted racist legislation to maintain the inferior status of southern blacks.

In contrast, Churchill does not have a record of taking action to preserve or perpetuate white superiority or advance positions aimed at limiting or worsening the plight of people based on their race, religion, or economic class. In recent years, Churchill has, nonetheless, been vilified by people claiming that his racial prejudice resulted in his not taking appropriate action to prevent the starvation of three million non-whites during the Bengal famine of 1943. As I discuss at some length in [NPWH](#), the evidence does not support the assertion that Churchill was complicit in the tragedy that hit India in 1943 or that racial prejudice in anyway influenced his response to the famine. To the contrary the evidence, including minutes of War Cabinet meetings, shows that he did everything reasonably possible to provide food to Bengal at a very tense time amid a global war. Indeed, the record demonstrates that both for humanitarian and military reasons (being sure that the people of India could, if necessary, repel an invasion by Japanese troops (who already occupied neighboring Burma,) getting as much food to India as possible “was of the highest importance” to Churchill and his Government. The fact the Churchill Government provided more than 1.3 million tons of grain to India in 1943 and 1944 is the antithesis of a genocide, let alone one based on race.

In determining if there were racial implications in any of Churchill's actions regarding the Bengal famine, it also bears noting that his performance during the famine in India was eminently more humane than was his failure to oppose maintaining the blockade of food shipments to the Caucasian population of Germany after WWI. That is, upon the Armistice ending the war becoming effective on November 11, 1918 Churchill wanted to follow his humanitarian instincts and immediately start shipping much needed food to Germany but, he was instantly overruled by Prime Minister Lloyd George. A few months later, however, he was willing to put his humanitarian principles aside and stood silent as the Prime Minister continued denying food to the starving population of Germany in an effort to get the German Government's agreement to the terms of the Versailles Treaty. Only when the Treaty was finally signed in June 1919 (seven months after the armistice) did desperately needed food shipments to Germany commence. In contrast, in 1943, with no one above him in the hierarchy, Prime Minister Churchill was able to go with his humanitarian impulses (particularly since doing so was militarily beneficial) and get as much food to India as he could under the circumstances.

Nonetheless, the underlying beliefs about race that Churchill held are unacceptable by twenty-first-century standards and should without a doubt be taught and explored with a critical eye.

That said, it is important to note that during his lifetime Churchill took many actions in which he sought social justice, i.e. tried to do the right thing for people without regard to their race, religion, or social class. These are things that would be praiseworthy today, more than a century later. For example, as Under Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1906, he negotiated a deal with the two Boer republics—Transvaal and the Orange Free State—that, in 1902, were defeated by the British in the Boer War, thereafter, became British colonies, and four years later

were seeking self-government. Churchill managed to work out a basis for their internal self-government: equal treatment for both Britons and Boers with voting based on universal adult white male suffrage. (By this white males in South Africa obtained greater voting rights than males in Britain possessed at the time.) Importantly for this discussion, he also pressed the Boers to grant the right to vote to black South Africans. However, the Boers were totally unwilling to do anything with regard to fair treatment of the native population even though, as Churchill argued, there already was limited black voting in the British colony at the tip of Africa known known as the Cape Colony.

As Under Secretary for the Colonies, Churchill also had to deal with another race-based problem in South Africa—the mistreatment of some 50,000 Chinese who had been brought into the country to work in the mines. The previous High Commissioner of South Africa had permitted the corporal punishment of these workers even though floggings were illegal and carrying them out violated assurance given by the British Government to both China and Parliament. Churchill denounced the practice of corporal punishment and took steps to see that it was eliminated.

Other instances in which Churchill stood against governmental/institutional actions which negatively affected people based on their race, religion, or status include:

- The aforementioned condemnation of the massacres in Sudan and at Amritsar, India.
- His speaking out against the caste system in India pursuant to which the majority Hindu population treated sixty million people as “Untouchables.”
- His warning that the partition of India to create Muslim Pakistan would, without British troops to maintain stability, result in the resumption of the historical

religious warfare between Muslims and Hindus. (It is estimated that one million people died as a result of the partition.)

- His opposition to the Chamberlain Government's halting Jewish immigration to Palestine in 1939, despite the Balfour Declaration of 1917 in which the British Government had set forth its support for the establishment in Palestine of a national homeland for the Jewish people.
- His having the instinct to send food to starving Germans immediately after WWI and actually doing so immediately after WWII ended.
- His speaking out against German mistreatment of the Jews as early as 1933.

Also relevant to a full assessment of Churchill is his extensive record as a social reformer at a time when such things were relatively unheard of.

Churchill was elected to Parliament in 1900 as a member of the Conservative Party which was traditionally the party of the upper classes and the powerful. This was the party to which his family had long belonged and into which he was born. Among other things, Conservatives did not approve giving the right to vote either to women or even to the huge percentage of British men over 21 who did not own property. Nonetheless, like his father, Churchill was a rebellious Conservative who advocated "Tory Democracy"— a philosophy that encouraged the enactment of social and economic programs designed to benefit ordinary people. Even before he "crossed the floor" and joined the Liberal Party in 1904, Churchill had come to accept Liberal positions such as supporting: the 8-hour day, a graduated income tax, Irish Home rule. and wider suffrage for both men and women. As a Liberal, after 1904 he took Tory Democracy to places his father never dreamed of, i.e., enacting laws that: established labor exchanges (places where the

unemployed could meet potential employers), provided for old age pensions, expanded national healthcare, and, established compulsory unemployment insurance. For these and other programs Churchill has, in fact, quietly been called “a grandfather of the welfare state.”

The more he tried to help the wage earning class, the more Churchill also began attacking the upper class. In early 1909 he described Conservatives as “the party of the rich against the poor... of the lucky, the wealthy, the happy, and the strong against the left out and the shutout millions of the weak and poor.” He also supported the imposition of a special tax on high income earners and increased taxes on luxury items like automobiles. Because of Churchill’s aristocratic background and his having split from them in 1904, Tories not only considered him a traitor to the Conservative Party but also a traitor to his class. To them he was utterly contemptible. Even Liberal Prime Minister Asquith felt that Churchill’s remarks about the uncaring rich crossed the line.

Other aspects of his humanity can be seen when he became Home Secretary in 1910. In that position he was required to review every criminal case in which the defendant had been sentenced to death and determine whether the sentence should be commuted to life imprisonment. Before Churchill became Home Secretary, his predecessors had commuted the sentence in 40% of the death penalty cases reviewed. Churchill commuted nearly 50%. He also championed prison reform by ending the practice of flogging prisoners, creating prison libraries, and reducing Britain’s prison population by releasing prisoners whose real “crime” was being too poor to pay a fine, especially the one for drunkenness.

In 1918, he supported legislation that, as originally proposed, would have only lifted the property ownership requirement which precluded 40% of British men over 21 from eligibility to vote. Churchill advocated for the inclusion of women (who had no right to vote at all) in the bill.

The result — the property ownership requirement was lifted for men, while women over 30 who met property ownership qualifications were granted the franchise. (Unconditional voting privileges for women over 21 were not granted until 1928.)

In 1921, he was given the thankless job of negotiating a treaty intended to end the generations-old conflict between the Catholics in Ireland, who fervently wanted Irish independence, and the Protestants of the UK, who opposed it. In April 1916, Irish Republicans launched the Easter Rising against British rule and proclaimed an independent Irish Republic. Although it was crushed after a week of fighting, “the Rising” and the brutal British response to it led to greater popular support in Ireland for independence.

In the UK’s December 1918 election, seventy-three members of the pro-independence Irish Sinn Féin Party were elected to Parliament. However, they refused to take their seats. In January 1919, they formed a break away assembly in Dublin (called the Dáil Éireann) and insisted on Irish independence. In addition, throughout 1919, the Irish Republican Army, led by Michael Collins, made attacks on British soldiers and officials, killing eighteen. This led to the introduction of legislation—The Government of Ireland Bill—in the House of Commons. Under that bill, the twenty-six Catholic counties in the south would get Home Rule, for which they had fought for years. Those twenty-six counties would be ruled from Dublin while the six predominantly Protestant counties in the north would be ruled from Belfast and would remain part of the UK.

Notwithstanding the introduction of this long-awaited legislation, in 1920 IRA violence increased. The reason—the bill did not grant Home Rule to all of Ireland. In 1921, a truce was finally reached which, for the first time, allowed direct negotiations between the leaders of the IRA and the British Government. When face-to-face negotiations commenced, included in the

Irish delegation was IRA leader Michael Collins. Some Cabinet members refused to shake hands with Collins et al.—men they regarded as murderers. Churchill was not among them. Indeed, surprisingly he and Michael Collins actually became friends during the negotiations. According to historian William Manchester, Churchill and Collins were “alike in many ways: fearless, charismatic, fiercely patriotic ... ready to sacrifice everything for principle ... and they shared a ready wit.”

A treaty was finally agreed to on December 6, 1921. Under the agreed terms, the twenty-six southern counties would be known as the Irish Free State and be independent but a part of the British Commonwealth where it would have Dominion status, as did Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. The six northern counties would remain part of the UK. The pact was immediately repudiated by both hardline Irish Republicans and diehard Tories, especially the Orangemen of Northern Ireland to whom the Irish Free State was anathema. Nonetheless, the agreement was ratified overwhelmingly by both houses of Parliament and on January 9, 1922, it was approved by a slim margin in the Dáil. Collins was elected chairman of the provisional Irish Government, which was to serve until a general election could be held. All this represented great change, but at the same time very little changed. The existence of the pact led to a murderous civil war in Ireland that lasted nearly a year.

During that time, anti-treaty factions engaged in numerous attacks and assassinations. In June 1922, Sir Henry Wilson, one of the most senior British Army staff officers during WWI, was killed by anti-treaty IRA gunmen just outside his home in London. And on August 22, 1922, this faction also killed Collins in an ambush in County Cork. He was just thirty years old. As he lay dying, Collins told a friend to “tell Winston that we could never have done anything without

him.” In October, the Dáil adopted the constitution which had been written in substantial part by Collins and Churchill.

On the other side of the ledger, with regard to acts and beliefs that did not relate to race or religion but which may or may not comport with today’s standard of morality, Churchill was a fierce supporter of using poison gas in war. Indeed, as Minister of Munitions toward the end of WWI, among other things, he oversaw enormous increases in the production of mustard gas. In the latter regard, he also advocated for the immediate construction of a new plant to increase production of poison gas shells and was irate upon learning that the Red Cross had proposed to outlaw poison gas. In WWII, Churchill was totally prepared to use poison gas to repel any German invasion of Britain. As he told the War Cabinet “We [have] the right to do what we like ... with our own territory.” He felt that the Germans would make short work of him if they caught him, and so he didn’t see why he should have any mercy on them.

If his support for using poison gas conflicts with current standards of decency, in assessing him, the heinousness of that belief can and should be tempered by the fact that it not only arose in wartime, but specifically at a time within that war when Britain was highly likely to be invaded and overrun by the Nazis..

He also supported dropping the atomic bomb on Japan. Something, the heinousness of which, has been a matter of debate for some years but, as noted, this too should be tempered by the vicissitudes of war. At the start of the cold war in 1947, when the US was the only country possessing an atom bomb and the Soviets, who controlled Eastern Europe, posed a substantial threat to Western Europe, Churchill talked, perhaps idly, about giving the Soviets the following sobering ultimatum:

We fought for liberty and are determined to maintain it. We will give you what you want and is reasonable in the matter

of boundaries. We will give you ports in the North. We will meet you in regard to conditions generally. What we will not allow you to do is to destroy Western Europe; to extend new regimes further there. If you do not agree to that here and now, within so many days, we will attack Moscow and your other cities and destroy them with atomic bombs from the air

Shockingly, Bertrand Russell, famed left-leaning British intellectual, pacifist, and future Nobel laureate, joined Churchill, in urging a war against Russia while the US had the bomb and the Soviets did not. As time passed, so did Churchill's thought of using America's atom bomb to extort the Soviet Union.

Given all of the above, the question is — should Churchill's visibility be diminished? In answering this question one realizes that, unlike some other historical figures, the first thing that most knowledgeable people think of with regard to him is a virtuous one— his having saved Britain and all of Western Democracy from Hitler. For the reasons noted, the hugely impactful action of saving Democracy is or should not be immediately offset by the monstrous, but wholly erroneous, allegation that he is culpable for the starvation of million people in India because they were not white. Comparing the virtuousness of his many actions in support of social justice and social reform and the heinousness of his: being a relatively benign racist, advocating for the use of poison gas to defend Britain against invasion, and talking idly, but scarily, of using America's atomic weapons in peacetime against the Soviets, it is hard to see that the weight of the “bad” things that he did even comes close to outweighing the “good” things he accomplished.

Moreover, there are a number of instances in Churchill's life where he evidenced an ability, over time, to make as much a 180 degree change in his thinking. These included his:

- view on the extremely contentious issue of Irish Home Rule.
- having evolved from an aristocrat of the highest order to a Government Minister who, virtually without peer, became a champion for improving the lot of the average working man. And an

- Infatuation with and subsequent rejection of eugenics.

Also, over time his hostility toward Islam, which is evident in his early writing, disappeared. Although, many attribute political as much or more than ideological reasons for it, over a period of about twenty years Churchill changed from being a Conservative to a Liberal and back to a Conservative .

As noted, Professor Richard Toye explains that notwithstanding his racial prejudice, Churchill believed there was a “need to act humanely toward supposedly inferior races, that might in their own way be worthy of admiration.” To this Toye adds that “recognizable as part of this was his opinion that members of these races might earn equal treatment, if not exactly warm acceptance, provided they reached an approved cultural standard...” It is for this reason Churchill did not believe that a civilized, educated white was superior to a civilized, educated black. While the notion of races having to “earn” equal treatment is grading to the 21st century ear, it does speaks to the possibility of change that he perceived with regard to race, i.e. he did not feel that whites were ordained to maintain an asserted superiority over other races forever. Indeed, at times, his comparatively progressive views on race, even caused some critics to think of him as being anti-Imperial³

Putting these things together does evidence some ability for Churchill’s thinking and beliefs to evolve. That said, it would not be unreasonable to believe that views he held with regard to racial superiority might in time have evolved such that, were he alive today, his beliefs would not be inconsistent with those held by the vast majority of intelligent, educated people.

A Brief Look at Some Other Historical Figures Who Are Under Attack and How They Fare Under the Balancing Approach?

³ Toye, *Churchill’s Empire* , Introduction

Robert E. Lee

Robert E. Lee was of course the most famous of all the Confederate generals. Toward the end of the Civil War he had overall command of the entire Confederate Army. Born in 1809 (just three weeks before Lincoln) he came from one of the great families of Virginia but did not have a privileged childhood as his father had gone off into exile in the Caribbean.

He never knew a world without slaves, but did think that slavery was evil. Like George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson, Lee inherited hundreds of slaves, hoped that eventually slavery would end, but saw no way to achieve that goal. Racial equality was, however, not his vision.

He graduated from West Point in 1829 after which he had a stellar military career serving in the Mexican War and later as Superintendent of the US Military Academy. On the eve of the Civil War two things happened that profoundly affected him. First on April 17, 1861 Virginia succeeded from the Union. Second, Lee was immediately offered the position of Major General in the United States Army. In that role, he would have been in a position to crush the Confederacy and end slavery. However, on April 20, 1861 he turned down the offer and resigned from the army in which he had served for 32 years. He told Lincoln's emissary that "I look upon succession as anarchy. If I owned the four million slaves in the South I would sacrifice them all to the Union; but how can I draw my sword upon Virginia, my native state?"⁴ Three days later Virginia iterated an earlier offer for him to take command of its state forces. Lee accepted and

⁴ Interestingly, in a 1994 interview, the late great Civil War historian, Shelby Foote, said that, even though he opposed slavery, had he fought in the Civil War there is absolutely no doubt that, being from Mississippi, he would have fought for the Confederacy right or wrong — "I would have fought with my people... because [doing otherwise] would have meant the end of my life as I'd known it... and a falsification of everything I'd lived by." Lee, despite having spent a good deal of his life associated with Northerners, likely felt the same way. Foote went on to add that he would not have fought to maintain slavery but for other things such as the freedom to secede from the Union.

was given the rank of Major General. After Virginia joined the Confederacy and the Confederate Army was constituted, Lee was named one of its first five full generals.

Starting in 1862, Lee commanded his troops masterfully. Although generally outnumbered, his skillful use of risky strategic moves more frequently than not led to Confederate victories. However, the tide turned against the South at the Battle of Gettysburg in early July 1863. Knowing that time was not on the side of the Confederacy, Lee and his army were nonetheless able to hold off the Union forces, which starting in 1864 were led by Ulysses S. Grant, until April of 1865.

At that point, unlike other Confederate leaders, Lee accepted the defeat of the South. He essentially wanted to move past the Civil War and quickly get back as closely as possible to how things were before the war. He was not arrested or otherwise punished for his war time activities except that he did lose his US citizenship and the right to vote in federal elections.

From October 1865 until his death in 1870 (at the age of 63) he served as the president of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University) in Lexington, Virginia. During his years in Lexington, Lee supported a system of free public schools for blacks but opposed allowing blacks to vote on the grounds that they were not yet able to vote intelligently and thus susceptible to charlatan chicanery. In 1869, President Grant invited Lee to the White House. Thereafter he became an icon of reconciliation between North and South, and the reintegration of former Confederates into the national fabric. As time passed, Lee's reputation grew. he was seen not only as a military genius but also as unifying figure because of the role he played after the Civil War in accepting defeat. He also became a cultural icon in the South.

A generation after the Civil War, statues memorializing him and others, monuments about which he had expressed disfavor during his life, started to appear throughout the South.

Many of these memorials have been taken down recently. His name is similarly being removed from schools, military installations, streets, and highways. Robert E. Lee's visibility and reputation has certainly been diminished as a result.

The question—is doing so appropriate?

The Answer—Lee does not appear to have sufficient virtuous acts and beliefs of significance to outweigh the heinousness and significance of his willingness to take up arms for a cause the primary purposes of which was to defend slavery (an institution that he knew was evil and against which he could have taken action to bring about its demise) and some of his continuing racist views. Since, under the Balancing Approach, his actions related to perpetuating the enslavement of people based on their race, cannot be mollified on the basis that having strong ties to one's home state was a predominate and honorable thing in 1861, he appears to be someone whose public prominence should be reduced.⁵ Things that simply pay homage to his memory, particularly those not located at historic sites, e.g. itinerate statues of him in public places, roads and public schools named after him, etc. should be removed. This does not mean, for example, that his birth place need be hidden or that it would be wrong to have battlefield markers to show where he decided to take particular military actions.⁶

That said, although the results of this assessment indicate that Lee's public visibility should be reduced, any attempt to obliterate Robert E. Lee, (or anyone receiving a similar assessment) from history would be wrong.

Thomas Jefferson

⁵ I write this even though, despite my being a native New Englander, I have long thought highly of Robert E. Lee and still do because of his military genius and stories of his graciousness in the aftermath of the Civil War.

⁶ Likewise, although erected by Southerners, there is no reason to remove markers such as the one indicating the spot where Stonewall Jackson was shot at the Battle of Chancellorsville.

Thomas Jefferson, generally recognized as the most progressive of our Founding Fathers, and the third President of the United States has, in recent years, also been the subject of efforts to have statues of him removed, have his name taken off public buildings, and have his stature diminished. Much of this has been done because in the words of some proponents of these actions, “Thomas Jefferson does not represent our values.”⁷ Others who seek to cancel his existence have gone so far as to liken him both to Pol Pot, the genocidal autocrat that ruled Cambodia from 1976 -1979, and other monsters of the 20th century.

Like both George Washington and Robert E. Lee, Jefferson (born in 1743) was raised in an upper class Virginia family. He was educated, having attended the College of William & Mary, and thereafter having read the law under George Whythe. Jefferson then had a long and distinguished career in public service serving as: a member of both the Virginia legislature and the Continental Congress, the United States Minister to France, the Governor of Virginia, Secretary of State in George Washington’s administration, Vice President under John Adams, and President of the United States. In these positions his accomplishments were many. Not the least of these was also his role as the principal author of the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty (expounding the freedom of religion and the separation of church and state). As President, he consummated the Louisiana Purchase, which doubled the size of the United States, and then sent Lewis and Clark out on a great, multi-year scientific and geographical expedition to assess what the country had acquired . In 1807, he also promoted the passage of legislation that prohibited the importation of slaves. into the United States.

Like Washington, Thomas Jefferson inherited a large number of slaves from his father-in-law. At the time Virginia law prevented him from emancipating his slaves but, even if he

⁷ The Balancing Approach is designed to avoid requiring the actions and beliefs of historical figures like Jefferson to meet 21st century standards of decency or, without more, face banishment to the history books.

could have, at no time during his life or at his death was he in a financial position to do so. Accordingly, at the time in 1776 when Jefferson penned the words “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness” he, like most of his contemporaries in Virginia, was a slave holder.

On its face this seems like hypocrisy in the extreme. However, it must be noted that in Jefferson’s draft of the Declaration of Independence he also included a strong rebuke of slavery and criticized King George for allowing the slave trade in the first place. The inclusion of these two points were very important to Jefferson. He believed that in spelling out inalienable rights he was doing so for *all* men not just those who were white. He also believed that this was not saying anything new — that the right to the pursuit of happiness was already contained in Virginia documents and these rights, he felt, were simply things about which American colonists (other than the Tories who soon would go to Canada) were in accord. Be that as it may, South Carolina and Georgia said that they would not sign the Declaration of Independence unless the pointed anti-slavery statements Jefferson wrote were removed; and they were. The Declaration was not Jefferson’ first attack against slavery. Indeed, just prior to working on the Declaration, he had included an anti-slavery proviso in the draft he was preparing of the Virginia constitution. That provision would have emancipated any slave born in Virginia after the enactment of that constitution. The powerful slave owners of Virginia forced that provision to be excised.

Jefferson’s desire to end slavery was also displayed several years later when, in *Notes on the State of Virginia* he said that slavery had a corrupting effect on American republicanism. As noted, he was also instrumental in ending the importation of slaves. Given these actions among

others, for many years Jefferson, although a slave holder, was viewed as being an enlightened, if somewhat ineffective, advocate for the abolition of slavery.

He thought that slaves, if emancipated and educated, were capable of making progress but also believed that was beside the point because they were human beings and therefore had the same inalienable rights as everyone else. He was, however, very pessimistic as to whether the United States could be a bi-racial society. He felt that the presence of former slaves in American society would always be a reminder to both blacks and whites of the deplorable way that blacks had been treated in America. As such, he favored emancipating slaves and sending them off to start their own country in Africa or the Caribbean. (For a time, this view would also be held by Abraham Lincoln.) After the Louisiana Purchase, Jefferson even had the idea of selling land in the west to pay slave owners for emancipating their slaves and covering the government's cost of transporting them elsewhere.

Jefferson's reputation began to decline in the 1970's upon the publication of *Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History* by UCLA Professor Fawn Brody. In her book, Professor Brody speculated about there having been a sexual relationship between Sally Hemings, a 14 year old slave at Monticello, who Jefferson (a recently widowed 41 year old) had taken with him to Paris in 1784 to look after his young daughter. The movement to denigrate Jefferson intensified in the 1990's when scientists uncovered DNA evidence demonstrating that male descendants of Hemings' son, Eston, (born in 1808 when Sally was 38 and Jefferson was 65) had a chromosome that was unique to the male Jefferson line. Although there were other Jefferson males that could have fathered Hemings' children, and Jefferson's paternity could not therefore be proven, the DNA information caused people to jump to the conclusion that Jefferson himself was the father of at least some of Sally Hemings' children. If this were true, Jefferson not only

was a slave holder but also one who had a sexual relationship (perhaps consensual but perhaps not) with a slave nearly 30 years his junior —i.e. Jefferson may have been a child abuser, a rapist or simply someone who took advantage of a woman over whom he had control.

However, as noted, the assessment of an historical figure must be based on historical fact not on mere speculation. Thus, in the absence of solid evidence defining the situation between Jefferson and Sally Hemings, Jefferson's provable bad acts come down to the fact that he was the owner of more than a few slaves. and that he did not emancipate them at his death. On the other hand, he was someone who sincerely believed that *all* men are created equal and that this was the credo on which America was built As such, he spoke out against the horrors of slavery on numerous occasions.

Given this and the other meritorious things that he did, based on the historical facts known today, totaling and comparing the significance, heinousness and virtue of Jefferson's various actions and beliefs, reveals him to be someone whose prominence should not be reduced. That said, should additional facts, not just supposition, on the subject of his association with Sally Hemings be uncovered, they are likely to be determinative in any re-assessment of Jefferson.

John Witherspoon

At Princeton there is currently a push to remove the statue of John Witherspoon who was the president of the school (then called the College of New Jersey) from 1768 to 1794 and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Why? He owned two slaves, did not advocate for immediate emancipation, and, in a debate at the Constitutional Convention over the best measurement of wealth for purposes of taxation, asserted that land and houses were, but in doing

so argued that slaves were property much like horses.⁸ The push at Princeton to remove his statue was the subject of an opinion piece in the November 15, 2021 edition of the Daily Princetonian and more recently, a campus petition in which Witherspoon was also accused of teaching and voting against the abolition of slavery.

There is little question but that the situation at Princeton stems from a failure to recognize that historical figures are complex and so is the process of properly assessing them. Like many have been, advocates for removing the Witherspoon statue also appear have fallen into the easy trap of deciding if the man in question was good or bad based on a single factor, incomplete information, and their understandable personal revulsion at some of the actions and beliefs of which the heretofore esteemed Founding Father now stands accused. Among other things, those who believe the statue should be removed also appear either not fully conversant with or do not place much value on a 2019 doctoral dissertation by Kevin DeYoung. In his dissertation, Dr. De Young notes that Witherspoon believed that: slavery is wrong (except as a punishment for crimes), abolition should be sought after and prayed for, slaves and black people, more generally, should be treated with decency and dignity, immediate abolition (on a personal and national scale) would, however, likely do more harm than good, and that slavery would soon disappear in America.

Dr. Witherspoon also tutored free blacks, believed slavery was bad but like Washington and Jefferson thought that immediate emancipation was not possible i.e. he felt that immediate emancipation of uneducated slaves would likely not have been in their best interest or in the best

⁸ Notably several years ago Princeton took action to reduce the public visibility of another former university president, Woodrow Wilson, by removing his name from its school of public policy. Wilson was a racist who among other things resegregated federal workers after years of being integrated. The Board of Trustees said that Wilson did not serve as a proper role model for those who study at the school. No attempt has been made to do a Balancing Approach assessment of Wilson.

interest of the county. (He “voted against abolition of slavery” only if his opposition to immediate emancipation is wrongly equated to a complete opposition to ending slavery.) His will provided that his two slaves were to be released from bondage at age 28. He also introduced a bill in the New Jersey legislature to free slaves born after the bill became law at that age.

In addition to the above, Witherspoon also rescued Princeton, which was foundering before he became its president. And, after signing the Declaration of Independence he marshalled all of Princeton’s students and resources to support the revolution.

The November 15, 2021 Princetonian, opined that “ it is not necessary to remember these *heinous historical figures* [like Witherspoon] through monuments nor monoliths, statues nor symbols.” (emphasis added). Interestingly, the piece also asserts that removing Witherspoon’s statue does “ not necessarily insinuate that there is no reason to honor someone like Thomas Jefferson.” Indeed, the Princetonian says that the positive things that both Jefferson and Witherspoon could still be honored by “keeping [them] alive in our history books.”

At least as far as Jefferson is concerned, this advocacy for the diminution of his visibility seems like an instant assessment of him which is based on —only one factor, incomplete information, supposition rather than historical fact, and the author’s personal revulsion at the act/belief of which this supposed heroic figure has been accused.

The assessment of Witherspoon, while better, suffers from several of the same infirmities and others. For example, the article’s author notes as a negative against Witherspoon the fact that three of his children lived in the South where their prosperity was built on a foundation of slavery. That condemnation, however, appears to be an overreach. It is neither fair nor logical to attribute to Witherspoon heinous deeds of people associated with or related to him unless there

was some demonstrated support by him for the slave holding of his children such as loaning them money to acquire slaves or teaching them that there was nothing improper about slavery.

Additionally, while it is not uncommon for us to be taken aback whenever we hear that an historical figure has been accused of doing something that by today's standards would be considered horrendous and/or had a belief that is vile, this feeling is exacerbated if the person were someone that we have deified and assumed had impeccable beliefs. The writer of the piece admits that he had once associated Founding Fathers such as Witherspoon and Jefferson with pure "heroism and valor" rather than thinking of them as the imperfect humans that they were. Unsurprisingly, he also admits to being horrified that statues glorifying them still existed at the time he learned of their "dark histories." In writing this, the author shows that his ability to objectively assess Witherspoon, and Jefferson has been compromised. He experienced an emotional jolt upon first hearing about alleged bad act(s)/attitude(s) associated with a person from a group that he had deified. This would have been the case even if the information received were more in the nature of speculation or rumor than the product of bona fide historical or scientific research. Such an emotional loss of perspective is also generally an enduring one; often taking years for the assessor to regain.⁹

As noted, a proper assessment of an historic figure has to start from the position that he or she was a human being, not a god, and was just as fallible as the next person. The petitioners

⁹ In my own life, I can recall at least one analogous incident where the emotion of the moment caused me to lose perspective and wrongly assess the situation. I was a junior in college and a member of the Student Council. We were deciding the important question of whether an extremely controversial group—one that at highly impassioned rallies advocated positions well outside the mainstream of public opinion that included resorting to violence—should be banned from campus. Doing what I wanted to do rather than what I should have done, I joined the majority of my colleagues on the Council and the student body and voted to ban the group whose positions I found fairly reprehensible. Several years later, although my belief that the group's views were wrong and offensive had not changed, when the emotion of the moment had finally dissipated, I was able to put into proper perspective the fact that, much as the KKK, although repugnant, had a right to march in the heavily Jewish city of Skokie Illinois in 1977, the group in question had a right to spew forth its radical ideas on our campus and, that I was completely wrong in helping to deny them that right.

who ask that Witherspoon's statue to be taken down do so because they believe he is not an adequate "model of humanity." However, if that were the standard by which it is decided whether statues of historic figures should remain or be removed, there would be very few of them still standing. And, in all probability, in a hundred years or less, there would be petitions seeking to tear those down.

The tainted perspective of the author of the Princetonian article aside, he does point out both Witherspoon's and Jefferson's "positive" achievement as a signer of the Declaration of Independence but, perhaps due to the reverberations of the shock he experienced when he learned that his heroes had feet of clay, immediately denigrates the import of that action saying:

Considering that Thomas Jefferson wrote the historic "all men are created equal" while there existed slaves on his own plantation, one can interpret these signers' involvement — or lack thereof — in the fight against slavery as a sign of passive support for the institution itself, an ambivalence that helped nurture the dark beginnings of this supposedly free country. Considering further that this country was built off the backs of slaves even after statements such as "all men are created equal," one can see that the counterargument of Witherspoon's significance as a signer renders itself irrelevant.

But this statement shows a seeming unawareness that, Jefferson's first draft of the Declaration of Independence included a strong rebuke of slavery and criticism of King George for allowing the slave trade in the first place. The inclusion of these two things in the document were very important to Jefferson, but South Carolina and Georgia said that they would not sign the Declaration unless the pointed anti-slavery statements were removed; which they were.

Such being the case, no analysis of Witherspoon can be considered complete without information concerning the degree, if any, to which he supported these provisions in the first draft of the Declaration. Fortunately, Princeton has many students and faculty members who could thoroughly and objectively research this question, find the answer and any other related

information, and publish the findings. Until this is done, any conclusion about Witherspoon and certainly the removal of his statue would be premature and inappropriate.

The position that removal of Witherspoon's statue is premature is also bolstered by his belief that the immorality of this country's treating blacks as inferiors would disappear over time. Because of Witherspoon's use of this as a rationale for opposing the immediate emancipation of blacks coupled with his insertion of a provision in his will that freed both of his slave (albeit not until they turned 28), there is some basis upon which to believe that if Witherspoon were alive today, his views on race would not be inconsistent with current societal norms. That possibility should be appraised as part of a proper assessment of Dr. Witherspoon.

That said whether or not a proper assessment, hopefully using a Balancing Approach, suggests that Witherspoon's statue should be removed or, at least, until a new assessment is completed and even thereafter, it would make eminent sense to install a plaque which contains a complete, factually-correct statement about all of Witherspoon's activities.

In any event what Princeton chooses to do about Witherspoon's statue will be noteworthy. We can only hope that it will be equally thoughtful.

Conclusion

In making a proper assessment of an historical figure:

- Remember that historical figures were complex and that assessing them is also complex.
- Remember too that historical figures were human beings, not gods, and were just as fallible as the next person.
- Do not base an assessment on a single factor.
- Do not make a final assessment of the individual without having a substantial knowledge of the facts related to each of the alleged bad acts/beliefs and each of his or her alleged good acts/beliefs.

- Resist the trap of basing an assessment on supposition rather than historical fact.
- Make the assessment in as objective and dispassionate a manner as possible. Trying to be objective is the honest, rationale, intelligent, and mature way to do an assessment.
- Avoid falling back on emotionally charged beliefs to the exclusion of the more rationale beliefs of the *knowledgeable* greater majority.
- Try to avoid an emotional response to hearing about bad act(s)/beliefs being attributed to the historical figure.
- Resist just going along (consciously or unconsciously) with the position of your contemporaries. Likewise, don't be bullied by your contemporaries (either explicitly or implicitly) And don't be afraid to do an assessment that might lead to a conclusion that differs from your contemporaries, who may or may not be as informed, objective, thoughtful and unemotional.
- Also try to avoid the satisfaction of feeling morally superior to the historical figure.
- Give some thought as to how you would react if, so to speak, the shoe were on the other foot.
- Based only on the facts, compare the total weight of the historic figure's bad acts/beliefs against the total weight of the individual's good acts and beliefs.
- In addition also look for evidence that some views that the individual possessed evolved over time or suggest that his/her bad beliefs would likely have evolved. If that evidence is found, judiciously determine if the historic figure's "bad" beliefs would likely have evolved so as to be acceptable by present day standards. Such a determination can be added to the assessment as a positive.

Much of the above relating to Churchill is explored in more detail and documented in [No Peace With Hitler](#). While the main objective of the book is to answer why Churchill decided to continue fighting against Nazi Germany when Britain stood alone in Europe, it also examines many of the other aspects of Churchill's life and career.

No Peace With Hitler is available in hardcover, softcover, and Kindle versions here: <https://wghobartpublishers.com/buy-book/> For more information on the book and its author, please visit our publisher's website at <https://wghobartpublishers.com/> and follow us on our social media pages at [@NPWH2022](#).