Churchill exposed as racist eugenics advocate

The late Winston Churchill’s support for racism, eugenics, and/or appeasement policies toward Adolf Hitler has been the subject of several recent books or articles in Great Britain.

- The London daily *Independent* on April 18 demolished the widely disseminated mythology that the British are supporters of “democracy” in South Africa, showing that Churchill, Cecil Rhodes, and Jan Smuts were the architects of apartheid.

- The Conservative Party-linked *Spectator* magazine, owned by the Hollinger Corp., ran a feature the week of April 9 by Andrew Roberts on Churchill’s “life-long antipathy to colored people. . . . 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. . . . Neither were Churchill’s assumptions about human worth confined to ethnicity. He dabbled in eugenics, and as Home Secretary in 1906 warned: ‘The unnatural and increasingly rapid growth of the feeble-minded and insane classes, coupled as it is with steady restriction among all the thrifty, energetic and superior stocks, constitutes a national and race danger which it is impossible to exaggerate.’ ” He openly advocated enforced sterilization.

- A book by Clive Ponting to be published in May, portions of which have been pre-released, focuses on the eugenics theme. Ponting cites an 1899 Churchill letter to his cousin, Ivor Guest, saying that the improvement of the British “breed” would be his “political aim in life.” Ponting has dug up archival evidence that Churchill wanted to sterilize 100,000 “mentally degenerate” Britons, and actually sent tens of thousands of others to labor camps. According to Ponting, “He 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.”

- Norman Rose, professor of international relations at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has just released a book attacking Churchill as a Hitler-appeaser: “The convention is that he was an anti-appeaser in the thirties and opponent of 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.”

Scientists from many parts of the world.” On Aug. 23, 1932, the *Times* featured the speech of zoologist Henry Fairfield Osborne, president of the American Museum of Natural History and a close colleague of Julian Huxley. Osborne asserted that the world financial and political crisis was really a crisis of “six ‘overs’—overdestruction of natural resources; overmechanization of industry; overconstruction of means of transport; overproduction of food and other commodities; overconfidence in future demand and supply; and overpopulation, with consequent permanent unemployment for the least fitted. . . . The only permanent remedy is . . . birth selection aided by humane birth control.”

Osborne declared that the deaths in World War I, infant mortality, and diseases had not succeeded in “checking” mankind’s relentless increase; there must be “eugenically administered birth control” to correct this problem. “Eugenics,” Osborne said, “aids and encourages the survival and multiplication of the fittest; indirectly it would check and discourage the multiplication of the unfittest. As to the latter, in the United States alone it is widely recognized that there are millions of people who are acting as dragnets or sheet anchors on the progress of the ship of state.”

Osborne stated the outlook of the eugenics movement on the 10 million Americans who were then out of work, in the worldwide Depression: “While some highly competent people are unemployed, the mass of unemployment is among the less competent who are first selected for suspension, while the few highly competent people are retained because they are still indispensable. In nature these less-fitted individuals would gradually disappear, but in civilization we are keeping them in the community in the hopes that in brighter days they may all find employment. This is only another instance of humane civilization going directly against the order of nature and encouraging the survival of the unfittest.”

**Sir Bernard sends Huxley’s message**

Sir Bernard Mallet, the British Eugenics Society president who would die that year, sent the congress his speech on “The Reduction of the Fecundity of the Socially Inadequate.” He criticized the idea of making small government payments to the poor to help their children survive, since it “would provide little inducement to parents with a relatively high standard of living to increase their families, but would certainly constitute an inducement to the less desirable element of the population.”

Mallet cited the findings of the Mental Deficiency Committee, recommending action against “insane persons, epileptics, paupers, criminals (especially recidivists), unemployables, habitual slum-dwellers, prostitutes, inebriates and other social inefficient. . . . For the time being, apart from