

WHAT WAS COCKRAN'S ROLE IN HELPING CHURCHILL DEVELOP POLITICAL CONSISTENCY?

COMPARE TO CHURCHILL'S COMMENTS ON COCKRAN'S POLITICAL CONSISTENCY IN HIS 1932 BOOK *THOUGHTS AND ADVENTURES*

I MUST AFFIRM THAT NEVER DURING OUR ACQUAINTANCE OF TWENTY YEARS DID I DETECT ANY INCONSISTENCY IN THE GENERAL BODY OF DOCTRINE UPON WHICH HIS VIEWS WERE FOUNDED.

ALL HIS CONVICTIONS WERE OF ONE PIECE WHICH ENABLED HIM TO PRESENT A SINCERE AND EFFECTIVE FRONT IN EVERY DIRECTION ACCORDING TO CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES.

HE WAS AN INDIVIDUALIST, DEMOCRAT, CAPITALIST, AND A "GOLD-BUG". ABOVE ALL HE WAS A FREE-TRADER AND REPEATEDLY DECLARED THAT THIS WAS THE UNDERLYING DOCTRINE BY WHICH ALL THE OTHERS WERE UNITED.

TWO SPEECHES—ONE BY BOURKE COCKRAN AND THE OTHER BY CHURCHILL—WHICH ILLUSTRATE HOW COCKRAN SERVED AS A ROLE MODEL TO WINSTON IN POLITICS AND ORATORY

GOVERNMENTS CREATE NOTHING

COCKRAN [1903]: SINCE GOVERNMENT OF ITSELF CAN CREATE NOTHING, IT CAN HAVE NOTHING OF ITS OWN TO BESTOW ON ANYBODY. IT CANNOT, THEN, BE BOTH JUST AND GENEROUS AT THE SAME TIME, FOR IF IT BE GENEROUS TO SOME IT MUST BE OPPRESSIVE TO OTHERS. IF IT UNDERTAKES TO ENRICH ONE MAN, THE THING WHICH IT GIVES HIM IT MUST TAKE FROM SOME OTHER MAN. IF IT HAVE A FAVORITE, IT MUST HAVE A VICTIM; AND THAT GOVERNMENT ONLY IS GOOD, THAT GOVERNMENT ONLY IS GREAT, THAT GOVERNMENT ONLY IS JUST, WHICH HAS NEITHER FAVORITES NOR VICTIMS.

CHURCHILL [1904]: YOU MAY, BY THE ARBITRARY AND STERILE ACT OF GOVERNMENT --- FOR, REMEMBER, GOVERNMENTS CREATE NOTHING AND HAVE NOTHING TO GIVE BUT WHAT THEY HAVE FIRST TAKEN AWAY --- YOU MAY PUT MONEY IN THE POCKET OF ONE SET OF ENGLISHMEN, BUT IT WILL BE MONEY TAKEN FROM THE POCKETS OF ANOTHER SET OF ENGLISHMEN, AND THE GREATER PART WILL BE

SPILLED ON THE WAY. EVERY VOTE GIVEN FOR PROTECTION IS A VOTE TO GIVE GOVERNMENTS THE RIGHT OF ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL, AND CHARGING THE PUBLIC A HANDSOME COMMISSION ON THE JOB.

TRADE VS. WAR

COCKRAN [1903]: THE ESSENTIAL OBJECT OF WAR BEING TO INJURE YOUR NEIGHBOR, WHILE THE ESSENTIAL OBJECT OF COMMERCE IS TO SERVE HIM, IT SURELY OUGHT TO BE SELF-EVIDENT THAT THE TERMS APPLICABLE TO THE ONE MUST BECOME LUDICROUSLY MISLEADING WHEN APPLIED TO THE OTHER.

INVASION IMPLIES AN INCURSION OF A FOREIGN ENEMY FOR THE PURPOSE OF TAKING AWAY OR DESTROYING BY VIOLENCE THE PROPERTY AND SOMETIMES THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE;

BUT AN “INVASION OF CHEAP GOODS” MEANS THAT SOME FOREIGN PRODUCER WILL SELL ME A SUIT OF CLOTHES FOR £5 WHICH, UNDER OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES, WOULD COST ME £7. INSTEAD OF TAKING MONEY FROM ME, THIS INVADER WOULD BE SEEKING TO GIVE ME £2.

NOW, IF ANY MAN INVADES MY POCKET TO TAKE SOMETHING FROM IT, I WILL RESIST HIM AS LONG AS I CAN. BUT IF INVADES MY POCKET TO FILL IT WITH SOVEREIGNS, HE IS WELCOME. I

CERTAINLY WON'T TRY TO STOP HIM. MY ONLY MOTION WOULD BE TO URGE HIM TO CONTINUE IF HE MANIFESTED ANY SIGNS OF FATIGUE.

CHURCHILL [1904]: NOW, FREE-TRADERS DECLARE THAT BOTH THE SELLING AND THE BUYING OF THESE THINGS WERE PROFITABLE TO US; THAT WHAT WE SOLD, WE SOLD AT A GOOD PROFIT, FOR A NATURAL AND SUFFICIENT RETURN; THAT WHAT WE BOUGHT, WE BOUGHT BECAUSE WE THOUGHT IT WORTH OUR WHILE BY BUY, AND THOUGHT WE COULD TURN IT TO ADVANTAGE.

AND IN THIS WAY COMMERCE IS UTTERLY DIFFERENT FROM WAR, SO THAT THE IDEAS AND THE PHRASEOLOGY OF THE ONE SHOULD NEVER BE APPLIED TO THE OTHER; FOR IN WAR BOTH SIDES LOSE WHOEVER WINS THE VICTORY, BUT THE TRANSACTIONS OF TRADE, LIKE THE QUALITY OF MERCY, ARE TWICE BLESSED, AND CONFER A BENEFIT ON BOTH PARTIES.