

Geopolitical Post-Mortem: Analyzing Buchanan's Critique of Churchill, Hitler, and the 'Unnecessary War'

Published: August 16, 2026 | Index ID: #869

The historiography of the twentieth century is dominated by the narrative of the "Good War," a conflict defined by a clear moral dichotomy between Western democracy and Totalitarian fascism. However, Patrick J. Buchanan's seminal work, **Churchill, Hitler, and "The Unnecessary War": How Britain Lost Its Empire and the West Lost the World**, introduces a rigorous, albeit controversial, strategic reassessment of this period. Buchanan argues that the catastrophic destruction of Europe and the subsequent dissolution of the British Empire were not the inevitable results of historical forces, but rather the outcomes of specific, identifiable diplomatic blunders committed by British statesmen, most notably **Winston Churchill**.

The Theoretical Framework of Historical Revisionism

In the context of strategic studies, revisionism serves as a tool for **post-incident analysis**. Buchanan's thesis does not aim to rehabilitate the image of Adolf Hitler; rather, it seeks to apply a **Realpolitik** lens to British foreign policy between 1914 and 1939. The core technical argument rests on the **Balance of Power** theory, which posits that Britain's security was traditionally maintained by ensuring no single power dominated the European continent. Buchanan contends that by intervening in World War I and later issuing the 1939 guarantee to Poland, Britain effectively destroyed the very balance it sought to preserve, leading to the rise of a far more formidable threat: the Soviet Union.

Defining the 'Unnecessary War' Concept

The term "Unnecessary War" was actually coined by Winston Churchill himself in his memoirs, though Buchanan uses it to draw a vastly different conclusion. In Buchanan's framework, a war is classified as unnecessary if:

- The core national security interests of the state were not directly threatened.
- The diplomatic objectives could have been achieved through non-belligerent containment.
- The outcome of the war resulted in a net loss of global influence and territorial integrity (the Imperial Overstretch phenomenon).

Technical Analysis of the 1939 Polish Guarantee

The most critical turning point identified in Buchanan's analysis is the **British Guarantee to Poland** issued on March 31, 1939. From a military logistics and strategic planning perspective, this guarantee was fundamentally flawed. It committed the British Empire to defend a nation (Poland) to which it had no geographic access and no means of providing immediate military support.

The Strategic Mismatch Matrix

To understand the technical failure of this policy, we must examine the disparity between diplomatic commitment and military capability in 1939:

Metric	British/French Capability (1939)	Polish Defense Requirements	German Wehrmacht Capability
Proximity	Remote (Naval access only)	Land-locked borders	Direct border adjacency
Armored Divisions	Low (Limited tank integration)	Minimal (Cavalry focused)	High (Panzer doctrine)
Air Superiority	Contested (RAF in development)	Negligible	Dominant (Luftwaffe)
Reinforcement Speed	Weeks (Via Sea/Land)	Immediate needed	Days (Rail and Road)

The technical breakdown of this guarantee shows that Britain issued a **strategic blank check** to a government (the Polish Colonels) over which it had no control. This emboldened Poland to resist German demands regarding Danzig (Gdansk), which Buchanan argues could have been settled through negotiation, thereby avoiding the immediate trigger for the global conflagration.

The Churchillian Strategy vs. The Realist Alternative

Winston Churchill is often characterized as the man who saved Western civilization. However, Buchanan's technical critique focuses on Churchill's long-term strategic vision. Churchill's primary objective was the total destruction of Germany, which necessitated an alliance with **Joseph Stalin**. While this alliance succeeded in defeating Hitler, the **geopolitical cost** was the ceding of half of Europe to the Soviet bloc.

Mathematical Modeling of Power Shifts

If we model the European power distribution before and after the war, we see a radical shift in the **Geopolitical Influence Index (GII)**:

1. Pre-1939: Multi-polar system (Britain, France, Germany, Italy, USSR, USA). High stability due to competing interests.
2. Post-1945: Bi-polar system (USA, USSR). Britain and France relegated to secondary status; Germany divided.

Buchanan argues that a **neutrality-focused strategy**, where Germany and the Soviet Union were allowed to exhaust one another in the East, would have preserved British hegemony and prevented the **Cold War**. This is based on the **Offshore Balancer** model, where an island nation avoids direct continental entanglement until the final stages of a conflict to dictate the peace terms.

The Dissolution of the British Empire: A Cost-Benefit Analysis

One of the most profound technical impacts of World War II was the financial and structural liquidation of the British Empire. Before 1939, Britain was the world's leading creditor nation. By 1945, it was a debtor nation, entirely dependent on the **Lend-Lease** program and subsequent American loans.

Economic Impact Data Point

Britain's external debt rose from roughly £500 million in 1939 to over £3.5 billion in 1945. The technical requirement to service this debt, combined with the domestic costs of a burgeoning welfare state, made the maintenance of the

Empire (India, Africa, Southeast Asia) fiscally impossible. Buchanan’s analysis suggests that the "victory" in WWII was, in technical terms, a **Pyrrhic victory**—where the cost of winning is so high that the winner is effectively destroyed.

Case Study: The Munich Agreement and the Failure of Deterrence

Historical orthodoxy suggests that the **Munich Agreement of 1938** was the ultimate act of cowardice and failure. Buchanan challenges this by examining the **Rearmament Timelines** of the British military. In 1938, the Royal Air Force (RAF) was not equipped with the Spitfire or Hurricane in sufficient numbers to defend London. The **Radar (Chain Home) network** was incomplete.

Rearmament Readiness Table (1938 vs. 1940)

Military Component	Status in Sept 1938	Status in July 1940	Impact of Delay
Fighter Command	Obsolete Bi-planes	Spitfire/Hurricane squadrons	Enabled victory in Battle of Britain
Radar Network	Experimental	Fully Operational	Early warning crucial for defense
Expeditionary Force	Non-existent	Fully mobilized	Allowed for continental intervention

Buchanan argues that Neville Chamberlain's "appeasement" was actually a necessary strategic pause to allow for technical modernization. By the time Churchill took office, the technical foundation for defense had been laid by his predecessor, yet Churchill's subsequent decision to expand the war into the Balkans and the Mediterranean (the "Soft Underbelly" strategy) is viewed by Buchanan as a waste of vital resources.

The 'Turning Point' Scenarios: Alternative Strategic Workflows

To understand the depth of Buchanan's critique, we must evaluate the **Alternative History Workflows** he proposes. These are not merely "what-if" scenarios but are based on a **Counter-Factual Analysis** of diplomatic cables and available intelligence from 1938-1939.

Scenario A: The Eastern Focus

In this workflow, Britain remains neutral regarding the German-Polish dispute over Danzig. Germany moves East against the USSR. The technical result is a protracted war between two totalitarian systems that leaves Western Europe (Britain and France) as the dominant, untouched arbiters of global power. The **Holocaust** might have been mitigated, as it was the chaos of the total war in the East that accelerated the 'Final Solution'.

Scenario B: The Stresa Front Maintenance

Britain maintains an alliance with Mussolini's Italy (The Stresa Front) to contain Hitler. This would have required recognizing Italy's claims in Ethiopia—a moral compromise. However, from a **Structural Realism** standpoint, this would have prevented the Rome-Berlin Axis and isolated Hitler within Europe, potentially preventing the war entirely.

Common Pitfalls in Modern Strategic Assessment

Analyzing Buchanan's work requires avoiding several common logical fallacies that often plague historical and technical writing:

- Presentism: Judging 1930s statesmen by 2024 moral standards.
- Confirmation Bias: Only looking at Churchill's successes while ignoring his strategic failures in the Dardanelles or Norway.
- The Hindsight Fallacy: Assuming that because the Allies won, the path they took was the only one possible.

Buchanan's book serves as a **Technical Field Guide** for avoiding these errors, urging modern policymakers to consider the long-term second and third-order effects of military intervention.

Strategic Lessons for the 21st Century

The implications of Buchanan's critique extend beyond historical curiosity. They provide a blueprint for evaluating modern foreign policy, particularly concerning **Overextension** and **Entangling Alliances**. The technical lesson is

clear: national prestige must never outpace national capability. When Britain issued guarantees it could not fulfill, it signaled the end of its global relevance.

As we analyze the shift from a uni-polar to a multi-polar world in the modern era, the themes of *The Unnecessary War* resonate with current debates regarding NATO expansion and interventions in regional conflicts. The technical core of Buchanan's argument—that every war has an opportunity cost that may include the very survival of the civilization that wages it—remains a vital consideration for any senior strategist.

Ultimately, Buchanan's work is a study in **Geopolitical Risk Management**. By examining the failures of the British leadership in the early 20th century, we gain a clearer understanding of the mechanics of imperial decline. Whether one agrees with his conclusions or not, the technical rigor with which he dissects the diplomatic failures of the era provides an essential counter-weight to standard historical narratives, forcing a more nuanced understanding of the forces that shaped the modern world.

Tags: [#Winston Churchill](#) [#World War II](#) [#Geopolitics](#) [#British Empire](#) [#Patrick J Buchanan](#)

