

New British research exposes Churchill as genocidal racist

by Mark Burdman

In 1943, Winston Churchill, then prime minister, was speaking to the British Cabinet about the famine that was raging through Bengal, India. Churchill told the secretary of state for India, Leo Amery, that the Indians were “the beastliest people in the world, next to the Germans,” and would continue to breed “like rabbits.” After another such outburst somewhat later, Amery was prompted to remark of Churchill that he, Amery, “didn’t see much difference between [Churchill’s] outlook and Hitler’s.”

This story has been recounted by British historian Andrew Roberts, both in the April 8 London *Times* and in an article in the April 9 issue of the weekly *The Spectator*, the latter on the theme of “Churchill’s life-long antipathy to colored people.” Roberts has completed a book, *Eminent Churchillians*, which will be published in July. His writings are among a spate of works now being previewed or released in Britain, that are challenging the mythologized image of Winston Churchill that has been carefully cultivated over the past decades, as the great defender of “western freedoms” against Adolf Hitler and, later, against the communist menace.

Whatever might be the final verdict on Churchill’s role in the 1940s, and whatever might be the ultimate motives of Roberts and other authors in presenting their findings, the reality that emerges from their research among various archives and documents, is that Winston Churchill was a racist degenerate, who supported the sterilization of “inferior” races, eugenics measures to defend the “British race,” and the establishment of apartheid in South Africa to separate the races, among other atrocities.

The revision in the public portrait of Churchill, and the debate erupting in Britain about it, are most timely. British influentials are now taking the lead, internationally, in organizing for the September 1994 United Nations-sponsored depopulation conference in Cairo. Meanwhile, the British have been flagrant, often using the U.N. as their vehicle, in imposing genocide on Bosnia, Iraq, Africa, and elsewhere in the world.

The findings on Churchill conform to these realities, and the fact that he is so important in the British 20th-century

pantheon makes the revelations the more devastating in their implications. In this regard, the various diatribes against Roberts and Churchill biographer Clive Ponting that have been published in late April and the first days of May have, perversely, been rather useful: The most persistent line taken in defending him, is that Churchill was “only” expressing views that were, after all, typical of the British upper crust in the first half of this century! For human beings who don’t subscribe to the bestialist British worldview, the public airing of this “debate” should help in further discrediting the British ruling elites.

Roberts and Ponting have been attacked across an ecumenical spectrum, ranging from the neo-conservative Sir Peregrine Worsthorne and others in the Hollinger Corp.’s *Sunday Telegraph* and *Daily Telegraph*, to writers for Rupert Murdoch’s *Sunday Times* and the left-liberal London *Guardian*. The *Guardian* recently merged with the London *Observer* weekly, owned by Lonrho Corp. magnate Tiny Rowland, the front-man for the British Foreign Office in much of black Africa.

‘A national and race danger’

The most controversial of the new works is that of University of Swansea (Wales) Professor of Politics Ponting, who in 1982 had, as Royal Family biographer Philip Ziegler put it in a hostile review of Ponting’s new book in the April 30 *Daily Telegraph*, “fallen spectacularly foul of Her Majesty’s Government” when he revealed damaging information about the British sinking of the Argentine ship *Belgrano* during the 1982 Malvinas War. For doing that, he was tried—and acquitted—under Britain’s Official Secrets Act.

Ponting bases his findings on Churchill on secret British government papers that have been made available to the public in recent years at the U.K.’s Public Records Office in Kew. Churchill’s own papers will probably not be available for another quarter of a century, perhaps considerably longer, because of a bizarre arrangement that the papers would only be released 20 years after his official biography is completed. Official biographer Martin Gilbert is still toiling away on his multi-volume *magnum opus* on Churchill. Careful readers of

Gilbert's meticulously detailed work up to the present, remark that he seems to have strangely "overlooked" his subject's racist/eugenicist views.

According to previews of Ponting's research published in the *Hindustan Times* and London *Guardian*, Churchill was a racist who wanted to forcibly sterilize 100,000 "mentally degenerate" Britons, and to send tens of thousands of others to labor camps, in order to halt the decline of the "British race." In 1899, Churchill sent a letter to his cousin Ivor Guest, stating that the improvement of the British breed is my "political aim in life."

By 1900, Churchill was embracing the proposals of the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble Minded, which concluded that "the feeble-minded" were a danger to the British race, and should not be allowed to "breed." He wrote privately to Prime Minister Herbert Asquith: "The unnatural and increasingly rapid growth of the feeble-minded and insane classes, coupled as it is with a steady restriction among all the thrifty, energetic and superior stocks constitutes a national and a race danger which I find impossible to exaggerate. I feel that the source from which the stream of madness is fed should be cut off and sealed up before another year has passed."

As Home Secretary in 1910, he unsuccessfully tried to introduce forcible sterilization. He also circulated to his government colleagues a pro-eugenics lecture by Dr. Alfred Tredgold, an adviser to the Royal Commission, who spoke on the theme, "The Feeble-Minded: A Social Danger." In this paper, Tredgold argued that "the feeble-minded" made up the class of "criminals, paupers and unemployables, prostitutes and ne'er do wells," who were breeding almost twice as fast as the national average. The dilemma facing Britain came from the fact that, in the natural world, these "inferior people" would be eliminated, but the modern state kept them alive. Hence, what was needed urgently were social laws, to ensure that the unfit did not propagate and did not interbreed with "healthy" members of society and thereby "lower the general vigor of the nation." In his note of recommendation to his colleagues, Churchill affirmed that "Dr. Tredgold speaks from wide experience and with special authority. This address gives a concise and, I am informed, not exaggerated statement of the serious problem to be faced."

In fact, writes Ponting, newly released Home Office files, originally closed to the public for 100 years because of their sensitivity, "show that Churchill was an extremist on the subject [of sterilization], and wanted to go much further than the Royal Commission, Dr. Tredgold, Home Office officials, and ministers." He was especially impressed with projects for "the forcible sterilization of degenerates" that were then being carried out in such American states as Indiana. He began to promote the idea, rejected by others in the Home Office, for forced labor camps, or labor colonies, for the "feeble-minded."

According to Ponting, Churchill "thought blacks were

inferior. He said so after his trips to Africa. He even thought Australians were a bad lot because of the stock they came from."

Churchill's "belief in the inherent superiority of the white race, in the world mission of the British empire, and his belief in the efficacy of public hanging were formed in the last two decades of [the 19th] century. . . . At that time, racist beliefs were prevalent in Europe and America, and equally influential were the ideas of social Darwinism, a 'philosophy' which argued that nations were like species—in the international struggle only the fittest would survive. In the decade after Churchill entered parliament in 1900 many among the political and social elite felt the nation was falling behind and its future was at stake. Britain was rapidly losing its industrial preeminence and share of world markets to the United States and Germany, and the Boer War had shown that its strategic position was weak and its defense organization a shambles. Among the elite there was a movement for 'national efficiency' . . . on the fringes [of which movement there was support for] social eugenics, the idea that the 'British race' had to be purified to fit it for the struggle with other nations."

Reviewers hit the ceiling

Ponting's book has produced a kind of lynch mob reaction among British reviewers. *Guardian* reviewer Richard Gott, on May 4, labeled Ponting and Roberts "punk historical jackals." Gott asserted that Churchill's use of such words as "blackamoor," "coolie," "nigger," "chink," and "Hottentot" was "common to an English (and, indeed American) of his age and class."

Gott seems to find it perfectly normal that Churchill was "clearly intrigued" by "forcible sterilization" programs that had been mandated in certain U.S. states (notably the Commonwealth of Virginia), adding in parentheses that such treatment of "the inferior" was "a favorite project, incidentally, of the socialists Beatrice and Sidney Webb"—as if this might make Churchill's behavior more palatable to the left-liberals who read the *Guardian*. Ultimately, Gott argued that since Churchill led the fight against the Nazis, he was therefore a hero of the "anti-fascists" to this day, and that anybody attacking him, must be more or less equivalent to the notorious David Irving, the anti-Churchill historian who denies the Nazi Holocaust, and who blames Churchill for unnecessarily and wrongly (in Irving's view) having mobilized Britain for war against Hitler's Nazis.

An unrepentant Anglo-Saxon supremacist

Ponting's basic contentions are amply supported by Roberts, who has even been accused by some reviewers of having rushed his article into the Hollinger-owned *Spectator* in order to preempt, and possibly limit the damage of, the Ponting book. Irrespective of the fact that Roberts has, since the article was published, been claiming that he is not unsympa-

thetic to Churchill's racist views, the material he provides is highly damaging.

Writes Roberts:

"By the standards of today—and possibly even of his own time—Winston Churchill was a convinced racist. For all his public pronouncements on the 'Brotherhood of Man' he was an unrepentant white—not to say Anglo-Saxon—supremacist. For such a zealous child of the Empire, anything else would have been astonishing. Part of the British Empire's *raison d'être* was its assumption of racial superiority. . . . Neither were Churchill's assumptions about human worth confined to ethnicity. He dabbled in eugenics. . . .

"For Churchill, Negroes were 'niggers,' Chinese were 'chinks' or 'pigtails,' and other black races were 'baboons' or 'Hottentots.' Italians were 'mere organ-grinders,' and when an Egyptian crowd attempted to burn down Shepherd's Hotel in 1952, he described them in a memorandum to [Anthony] Eden as 'lower than the most degraded savages now known.' "

According to Roberts, Churchill once asked his doctor, Lord Moran, what happened when blacks caught measles, could the rash be spotted? When Moran responded that blacks suffered a high mortality rate from measles, Churchill growled, "Well, there are plenty left; they've a high rate of production." Roberts claims that Churchill maintained a consistently racist view from the turn of the 20th century through the 1950s.

Apartheid: made in Britain

On April 18, the London *Independent* added its voice to the fray, with a feature by Africa editor Richard Dowden entitled, "Apartheid: Made in Britain." Dowden debunked the myth, widely propagated by the British government and in the British media these days, that the British are the conceptual authors of "democracy" in South Africa, and that democratic practices there were nonexistent until the British arrived on the scene. "In fact," cautioned Dowden, "the British tradition, as purveyed by both English-speaking South Africans and the parliament at Westminster, has played a less than glorious role in establishing democracy."

Dowden went on:

"It was two renowned Englishmen, Cecil Rhodes and Winston Churchill, who at crucial moments planted the seeds that were to ripen into policies which deprived black people of democratic rights in South Africa. A third, Jan Smuts—an Afrikaner by birth who became a committed supporter of the British Empire—was also an architect of laws which were later to become the framework of apartheid. Like Churchill, Smuts has a statue in Parliament Square, but in South Africa both will go down as men who destroyed rather than built democracy in the country. . . .

"Rhodes believed that the world should be ruled by the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races: One of his dreams was to force the United States of America back into the British

Empire. . . .

"[Smuts] is usually regarded as the man who represented liberal democratic values in South Africa. In fact, Smuts believed that South Africa should be a 'white man's country' and he believed in 'segregation'—which is simply English for apartheid."

Dowden asserts that apartheid was institutionalized when the Union of South Africa Act was passed in 1910, with Churchill playing a "vital role" in establishing the system. Churchill was then Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and had campaigned for years for a system of "Afrikaner self-rule" that, in practice, excluded black Africans from the right to vote.

'The foul Hindu race'

Even a newly released work that is reported to be more sympathetic to Churchill cannot escape from admitting some damaging points. Norman Rose, professor of international relations at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, in his book *Churchill: An Unruly Life*, challenges the notion of the late British leader as an opponent of the appeasement of Hitler.

According to Rose, "The convention is that he was an anti-appeaser in the thirties and opponent of [Neville] Chamberlain. Yet, in fact, he rarely opposed the Government during that period. He was certainly in favor of appeasing Mussolini over Abyssinia and was sympathetic to Franco."

Rose has also uncovered what some believe to be the most damaging racist quote from Churchill, his description of the Hindus as "a foul race protected by their pollution from the doom that is their due."

For further reading

1) Mark Burdman, "H.G. Wells and the Roots of British Social Engineering," review of *The Intellectuals and the Masses: Pride and Prejudice among the Literary Intelligentsia, 1880-1939*, by John Carey; and *The Invisible Man: The Life and Liberties of H.G. Wells*, by Michael Coren, in *EIR* Vol. 20, No. 28, July 16, 1993.

2) Mark Burdman, "What the British Taught the Nazis About Eugenics," *EIR*, Vol. 19, No. 49, Dec. 11, 1992, review of *Eugenics, Human Genetics and Human Failings: The Eugenics Society, Its Sources and Its Critics in Britain*, by Pauline M.H. Mazumdar.

3) Anton Chaitkin, "Cairo Population Conference Repeats 1932 Nazi Planning Meeting," *EIR* Vol. 21, No. 18, April 29, 1994.