

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

FITTING IN HITLER'S SUBHUMANS

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ."

GALATIANS iii, 28.

FASCISM envisages a world of three castes—the Germanic master-people, other semi-Aryans employed by the master-people in skilled occupations, and coloured people, unlettered, subhuman, using their muscles to produce as slaves the raw materials for the pleasure of others.

Of all those who are to revolve in their masters' iron cage, the coloured subhumans have the worst prospects in the worst possible New Order. The children of Gideon, perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water, have now just sufficient education to foresee a certain and irresistible fate should Fascism win. They at least have every reason to prefer death to such a nightmare world. From China to Palestine and on to Takoradi and Jamaica goes up the cry, "Give us arms; let us die fighting, rather than live on as slaves without hope."

Yet the reluctance to let them bear arms is greater in this war than in the last. The 'master-mind' of Germany has spread its infection successfully into the governing class of Britain. Nowhere in the Atlantic Charter do native rights appear. Missionaries are silent, trusteeship has become a formula, the *Ossewabrandwag*¹ (ox-wagon sentry) flourishes, segregation is approved, the colour bar extends, colonial development is measured by exports, and liberalism is dead.

¹ South African pro-Boer political party. M.S.

BRITISH TRUSTEESHIP

It has all happened since the last war. Down to that time the great traditions, inspired by missionaries of the type of Bishop Colenso and Livingstone and C. T. Studd, working on the conscience of the British ruling class, had established a theory of common brotherhood involving trusteeship for those rescued by the Gospel from savagery. There was slave-trading to be put down. All England joined in denouncing and ending King Leopold's inhuman tyranny in the Congo. Under Cardinal Lavigerie the Roman Church played its proper part. We lived in the age of emancipation, with Lowell's hymns in our ears.¹ The liberal governments, even to the end, gave coloured people votes, extended freedom, resisted the robbery of land and exploitation by settlers and chartered companies. In 1908 we saved freedom for ten million people and preserved the lands of Northern Nigeria. When the late war came we were on the point of doing the same for all West African lands.

That war was the turning-point. Simultaneously two tragedies occurred—tragedies for natives and for our good name. The Liberal Party vanished, and the demand for native labour developed. Since 1917 we have never had a liberal-minded Secretary of State for the Colonies save Ormsby-Gore—nor even a Free Trader. The Labour Party had no great understanding of native questions. It was familiar with wages, and otherwise disliked the labour competition of lascars in British ships. But grants for development seemed to the Labour Party sufficient remedy for any spot of trouble. That more employment is not desired by Africans seems to British labour irrational, since the worker here has long lost the conception of working for himself on his own land. So 'Congo' Morel died of a broken heart;

¹ 'In the right with two or three'; 'If ye do not feel the chain'; and so on.

and now only Creech Jones and R. W. Sorensen are left to maintain conscience in that House where Wilberforce, Bright and Dilke once upheld the doctrine of Christian brotherhood.

Nor has the liberal crash affected the House of Commons alone. A whole generation has grown up at the Universities and gone into the Services quite ignorant of the principles of freedom and political economy. Whether they call themselves conservatives or socialists, they are all intent on material progress in such direction as the white man on the spot may show to be expedient. The man on the spot is apt to consider expedient that which avoids economic competition between Africans and whites, and provides for himself cheap unskilled labour.

Charles Strachey was the last liberal official in the Colonial Office; he was got rid of amid the hardly concealed contempt of the new generation of Civil servants. The great liberal governors are gone—Lugard, Milner, Frank Swettenham, Girouard, Murray of Port Moresby, and that Donald Cameron who dared to compare Nairobi with 'the village that voted the earth was flat'. Officials on the spot resent the interfering 'ignorance' of missionaries such as Archdeacon Owen or pro-natives like myself. The purge of liberalism has gone through all the service. Liberals such as Sir Charles Orr, Sir Selwyn Greer, Charles Temple, Sir Robert Hamilton, Ainsworth, McGregor Ross, Norman Leys, Dennett and Thompson have gone with the wind; and at their desks work laboriously uninspired officials filling up forms, collecting statistics and ticking off the days till they can go home on leave.

AFRICAN LAND AND LABOUR

In South Africa and Southern Rhodesia the policy of the governments of those two settler countries is one of

political, economic and social segregation. They carefully segregate the European and the coloured races. Their object is the maintenance of political, economic and social supremacy—by the European minority over the African majority. Clamour for 'self-government' by European settlers in Northern Rhodesia, Kenya and Nyassaland is no noble desire for freedom, but voices their desire to settle the native problem as it has been 'settled' in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. South Africans desire to annex the Protectorates—Swaziland, Basutoland and Bechuanaland—for the same reason. To give a cloak of respectability to selfishness, they call segregation and subjection by the hypocritical phrase—'parallel development'.

In both South Africa and Kenya it has been frankly argued that a more liberal land policy would endanger the flow of African labour to European farms. Africans are wanted for unskilled low-paid work. Therefore they must not be allowed to compete with whites in skilled work; nor must they be able to cultivate their own land on such a scale as to be able to win independence, nor to compete with the exports of European settlers. This economic colour bar is legally enforced in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, while in Northern Rhodesia and Kenya the modern Colonial Office administrators vainly attempt to avoid the same infection. For instance, in Rhodesia Africans are precluded from driving locomotives, and 'The Northern Rhodesia Labour Party' admits no Africans to membership and demands for Northern Rhodesia the same exclusive 'self-government' as is enjoyed by the whites in Southern Rhodesia. In Kenya the same results are attained by a hut tax which forces the African out to work for the planters for wages.

FASCISM AND THE COLOUR BAR

To make them work, the Africans have not only been deprived of the best lands, but they are prohibited from buying back or even renting the lands from which they once made a living. Needless to say, the policy of giving votes to coloured people, inaugurated in Cape Colony in 1853, has been completely reversed. The whites resent as intolerable the idea that a European should ever so demean himself as to ask an African or Indian for his vote and support; nor would they travel in the same railway carriage; nor dance in the same hall; nor drink in the same bar. Nor would they worship in the same church!

This extension of Nazi racialism to South and East Africa has been winked at by the British Colonial Office ever since liberalism died. The settlers on the spot, the capitalists developing the copper belt, Hertzog and the *Ossiebrandwag* in South Africa, have found support for Nazi ideals and ideas. Africans, all uneducated, have been flung into the 'civilization' of exploitation, much as their counterparts in England 150 years ago were flung into the factory system.

South and East Africa natives have been the chief sufferers. But the same industrialization of the ignorant has been going on in Malaya and Ceylon, in Burma, Jamaica and Trinidad. Labour leaders are gaoled; communism is declared illegal; destitution pursues the landless. In West Africa there are no white settlers. But there, too (save in Nigeria), landless men and women are driven into the labour market by the comfortable conception that the tribal chief has the same rights as an English landlord! The native 'king' of yesterday enjoys the exclusive privilege of deciding on what terms his 'subjects' shall use any land which he has not yet sold to development companies. We enjoy the cocoa; the

new landless labourer experiences the fluctuations of trade and employment.

It is not too much to say that, since liberalism died, in no single one of our Colonies has anything at all been done to preserve the native on his land. Wherever the land question has been touched at all, steps have been taken to get the native off his land and drive him into the labour market. Only in Fiji and Nairobi has even the example of the Dominions been followed, and local taxation been levied upon land values. Twenty-five years of the new imperialism have grafted the curse of landlordism, and the exploitation of the landless, on to the British Colonial Empire. Burmese today fight against us and help the Japanese. If you should seek the reason, you will find it in the immense acquisitions by Indian capitalists of the land of these Burmese peasants.

'PROGRESS' REPLACES TRUSTEESHIP

This abandonment in practice of the trustee principle has been due to the growth of materialism and decay of liberalism. In Parliament, Labour has replaced the free trade Liberal Party, and while in some respects a good substitute, the Colonial land question was completely strange to them. As has been said, Labour's overriding problem has been unemployment. Labour cannot easily grasp the fact that, in Africa for instance, men need never be unemployed so long as they have land and a spade. Our tradesmen are so divorced from primitive agriculture, so far from the days when Englishmen employed themselves, that organization has become their livelihood, and capital their competitor. A bridge over the Zambesi meant to them work for the unemployed on Tees-side—not long lines of expatriated barefooted Africans carrying loads through African swamps, and dying at last far from home. Meanwhile every Secretary of State recounted

in his annual speech fine figures of exports and imports, spatch-cocked with digressions on some college at Achimota which should enable a few hundreds of these hundred millions to become almost as efficient as a white master.

The trustees failed to guard trusteeship; and an unchecked executive, purged of idealists, went on its pleasant imperial way, slightly bored by the job, disliking those they ruled, and resenting criticism. Thirty years ago they read the *Manchester Guardian*; now they have dropped *The Times* for the *Telegraph*, and the *Spectator* for *Truth*. These were they who (like Lord Jim in Conrad's novel) abandoned to the Japanese the Mui Tsai of Hongkong and the Chinese of Singapore.

FEDERATION OF THE COLONIES

How do these Colonies, where democracy has never been, come into the post-war picture?

We will assume that revolution leaves the Japanese satisfied to live in Nippon. Then, even if we do not federate with America, things can never be as before. India may be supposed able to dispense with our services. We shall hardly have the 'face' to return to Singapore or Burma as pseudo-conquerors, patronizing peoples who do not respect us any more. Should we hand over the Protectorates to the Afrikanders?—Northern Rhodesia, Nyassaland, Tanganyika and Kenya to the white settlers? Will the Dutch be as before in Java and the islands; or the French in Madagascar and Indo-China; or we in Ceylon? I hope not. I hope we shall not try to get back to the *status quo ante bellum*. One cannot twist history enough for that. The 'natives' would remember 1942 and laugh behind their hands.

No, the best hope is a federation of free peoples—with those peoples who are still uneducated in self-government,

governed as Territories, just as the United States administer Territories. We may hope such Federation will be with the Americans and the Dutch sharing the trusteeship; if not, at least set the British Commonwealth free from the colour bar and include all such peoples as wish to come in.

The difficulties of making a British Commonwealth of that sort are enormous. Is it to be supposed that South Africa will care to remain in the federation—or Ireland, or India, or Newfoundland? Even at present, when we provide the credits and are still supposedly rich, the bond is of the weakest. We have no federal Parliament, no free trade between the States of the Commonwealth, no currency stability. Ireland behaves emphatically, as though there were no connection at all. No secession would be resisted. No contributions are made to any common exchequer. Each Dominion has its own representatives abroad. Such a 'Union' is not worth belonging to: such 'Union' adds no strength to the partners.

Let us dismiss it, and figure on the chance of Federal Union with America, which is indeed the best that we can hope for. We should ever bear in mind that the request for Union with America may well come from Canada or Australia—whether we like it or not. For the reasons already given, I hope for Federal Union with the United States, and believe it to be the only way out of chaos and into security and peace. Churchill may be our best chance of endurance; he is certainly our best chance of Anglo-American co-operation after victory.

In such a Federal Union most of our Colonies would become Territories, just like Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Alaska. Others would become self-governing with Budget control and foreign affairs in the hands of the Federal Executive. These would be exactly like Britain, Australia and Canada. The

Philippines, India, Palestine, Burma, Malaya, Ceylon, Newfoundland, Jamaica, would soon be such full-fledged States.

The colour-barred Union of South Africa, the Rhodesias, and Kenya are certainly the first problem to consider. In all the other prospective members of the Federation, internal self-government means that *all* citizens have equal rights—civil and political. Could the Rhodesias and Kenya and Tanganyika remain federally administered Territories until Africans are held fit to vote? Government by one caste is not self-government. The same applies to the Union of South Africa, and makes it very doubtful if South Africa would wish to come into the Federation at all. Possibly a way out of the difficulty would be a temporary educational and property qualification for the franchise. That would follow the lines of our own British development, from a franchise which excluded, to one that included the working classes, 1832-1905. It would at least break down the colour bar.

INDIA

It is impossible, in August, 1942, to write without grave assumption on the future of India. Throughout the ultimate defeat by revolution of both Germany and Japan has been assumed. But meanwhile it is possible that the greater part of India will be overrun by Japanese armies just as have been China, Siam, Malaya, the East Indies and Burma. That will not bring about union in India unless Hindoos fight. If they do not, Moslems and Sikhs, who do fight, will dominate, and no Cripps Constituent Assembly will ever meet to decide the future government of India. That must be so, because the old Imperialism surrendered at Singapore, and neither Moslem nor Sikh forget that they once ruled and did not surrender.

It has been my good, but tragic, fortune to have been in the movement for Indian freedom almost from its inception at the first Indian National Congress in 1886. I have known, probably understood (being of like mind), every Indian patriot from those Chitpavan Brahmins, Gokhale and Tilak, to Srinivasa Sastri, Mohamed Jinnah, Gandhi, and the Nehrus. Above all, I have loved Lala Lajpat Rai of Lahore. I have lived in their houses, had their confidence, and discussed with them eternal life as well as politics. Of course I have enjoyed it. 'No tragedy there,' the reader may say—save the death of Lalaji.

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION

The tragedy has been the folly of the British garrison on the one side and the manufactured hatred of Britain on the other. The folly of the civil garrison was their quite natural inclination to favour the Moslem minority; that of the military garrison was exemplified by the massacre in the Jallianwallah Bagh. The manufactured hatred was not caused by the suppression of the Mutiny, nor by the massacre, nor by the imprisonments, nor even by the racial insolence of the colour bar. It was a political necessity to the Congress Party in order to unite Indians of all sorts—and also the only way to avoid a constructive policy which would split Indians.

It was quite natural for the British to prefer the old rulers of India to politically-minded 'Congress wallahs'. It was as natural for the English-speaking educated politicians to resent this—to call it, and see in it, a desire to 'Divide and Rule'. Divide and Rule meant 'playing up' to the Moslem Minority, and the 'fighting races'. Lord Minto promised Communal electorates to the Moslems in 1906. With their help, all Indian representative institutions above the village

Taluk and the District Boards were elected by 'Communal' electorates. Once this system was established it became well-nigh impossible to change back to representation of the people as a united whole.

As this is a *Testament to Democracy* let me explain this Communal Representation, lest other would-be democracies slide to ruin. Several separate lists of electors are drawn up: Moslem, non-Moslem, and in some provinces, Sikhs, Untouchables and Christians. So many seats in each Provincial Legislature and in the Central Assembly are allotted to each community. Moslems can only vote for Moslems, Hindoos for Hindoos, Sikhs for Sikhs, etc. There is a Hindoo Party (Congress, or Mahasaba) and a Moslem Party at daggers drawn in each Legislature, and in the Punjab Legislature the Sikh peasants hold the balance. In seven Provinces the Hindoos have a permanent, statutory, everlasting majority; in two the Moslem are in that enviable position. In the Punjab and Bengal, Sikh and other minorities hold the balance between Hindoo and Moslem. Elsewhere the minority can never get office. Co-operation is made almost impossible when the minority can never become a majority; the minority might as well be completely voteless.

Nor is that all. Suppose that in England or in America, Catholics and non-Catholics were on separate lists of electors, what would happen? The Catholics would elect the best fighters from their community, who would think, speak and act not for their country but for their community. The extremists would get the seats, the keenest denouncers of the heretics would make the loudest appeal to the largest mob. The other side too would elect the men who made the strongest appeal on the one subject on which *they* were all agreed. At present we here have to consider the feelings of all our electors. Take away the Catholics, or Jews, or women from

our electorate, and give them their own representatives, then we should all be absolved from considering the feelings of the other fellow. The bigoted extremists would be elected, and make divisions worse when elected. That is exactly what has happened in India through Communal electorates. That is not democracy, but Government of the people, by the bigots, for their own sect. So it happens that in India today all official appointments are justified not by works but by faith.

The Catholics in Britain would resent and resist any suggestion to take them out of the general electorate and put them on a special Catholic electorate—even if they were all Irish they would know that it would lessen their power. They understand the working of democracy. Not so the 90,000,000 Moslems of India, or at least their leaders. For Moslems were the old rulers, and claim to be the master race. They despise the Hindoo—cleverer and better educated. They do not wish to have to ask such fellows for their votes, or to be beholden to them in any way. Only, the majority of Moslems are converted Hindoos, not at all Mongol in race! These are the Borahs and Kojahs—the great merchants of Bombay, Colombo, Kenya and Rangoon—not the peasants of Scindh and the Punjab. Jinnah himself is a Kojah (when not an Englishman). That is why the Moslem League does not speak for a United Community, and offers obstinate resistance to any democratic advance. A great many Moslems are with Congress. But the Communal system of representation ensures power and election to all leaders! The Moslem leaders know it, and will not let their power go. They demand Pakhistan, and are merely irritated by talk of voting or majority rule, or indeed of democracy. These leaders will never accept Cripp's Constituent Assembly.

SIKH OBJECTION

For similar but for stronger reasons 6,000,000 Sikhs object. All these tall proud peasants of the eastern Punjab seem to have served in the British Army, and never do they forget that, under Runjeet Singh, they defeated that Army at Chillianwallah and Ferozeshar. They ruled the Moslem; they are the puritans of the Fifth Monarchy, with unlimited contempt for others—and with all the ignorance which goes with such contempt. If India is thrown into the melting-pot, I should conceive it possible that we might see some Maharajah of Patiala as King of a Sikh State stretching from the Jhulum to Delhi. Indeed, that would remove the Sikh objection to Indian democracy. Neither the Sikhs nor the Moslems are in the least afraid of ever being a persecuted minority. It would seem to them as laughable as it would in similar case be to the Scots. But the Sikh objection is a deadly blow to the dream of Pakhistan.

Possibly the British Government, when drafting the Cripps plan, did not realize that Congress itself was far more anxious for an effective voice in the defence of India than for any constitution; more anxious for arms in their hands than for votes. Obviously, if Congress accepts anything more than a hand in defence, they make enemies for themselves in their own camp. Even if there were no invaders at the gates, they would be anxious to be armed to resist Moslem aggression. Could anything be more dangerous to Congress than an attempt to construct a democratic constitution, and thus annoy both Sikhs and Moslems—and the native princes. Immediately, caste, creed, race and interest would be at each other's throats—all trying to get the best of the bargain for their own interest and coterie. Much better 'stay put' and a common grievance against the British. That grievance is the only thing which holds together the

Marwari merchant and the Communist, the Madrasi and the Punjabi. Fear of the working class is not absent in this land of ours; it is far greater in India, where the working class have no votes as yet, but might demand them. Brahmins are not necessarily nor naturally democrats.

So much for our offer of a free constitution! Congress says: "Thank you for nothing! We want to defend India, to help China, to help Russia, and you still keep up that old offensive attitude that 'fighting is the job for Master!'" I imagine that some of them may now be adding "Damn your insolence! You don't know how to fight! Infirm of purpose, give me the dagger!"

THE MONTAGU DECLARATION

Almost the brightest spot in our liberation history was Edwin Montagu's declaration of August 1917:

"The policy of H.M. Government is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India."

I wanted a time-table showing the exact date of each further step forward, so that the inevitable might be accepted and prepared for, both by garrison and Indians. That was not permitted, and the door was left open for obstruction, misunderstanding and charges of bad faith. But if Montagu's liberal declaration is still the policy of H.M. Government, and it would seem to be so—seem indeed to be an urgent part of our business—then there is no hope of making progress with an *all-India* constitution. Indians don't want it as a gift, and they won't have it—none of them: because

they are not agreed, not united—racially, religiously or economically. They are more afraid of each other than of the British.

H.M. Government must, however, get out of the saddle, somehow. Three hundred and ninety million people saying "In God's name, go!" is too much. That is why men of such differing political faith as Sir John Wardlaw Milne, Sir George Schuster, Sir Stanley Reed and myself have urged that we should proceed Province by Province, and allow such Provinces to federate after they are free. 'Allow' is the wrong word; when free, they can make their own terms with their neighbours or with Russia or Siam or Britain.

Start now—with Madras, where there are no Sikhs and but few Moslems; with Bombay, where neither Parsee, nor Borah, nor Mahratta, nor Guzerati require communal electorates; with Orissa, all Hindoo. In such cases you will get a number of different Constituent Assemblies anxious to do the job, not fearfully anxious to prevent a revolution. Once one Province takes the plunge, the others will begin to desire even the risks of freedom.

Let each Province start its 'Constituent' whenever it likes. There is no need to hurry them. Make it clear that under any circumstances they can do just as they like about everything after the war, that we do not propose to dictate to Indians ever any more—above all, that the armed forces will be theirs (not ours), directly the Province says "Go". Then get on with the war—bearing in mind that most Indians will help one side *or* the other. Therefore any assistance we get will 'count two on a division'.

For this reason I hope that long before this appears in print, each Indian Province will have its own Home Guard. For this reason recruiting for the Indian Army should not

be limited by the amount of equipment available, nor by lack of British officers. Men capable of leadership, such as young Rajagopalacharia, are to be found as easily in the universities and colleges of India as in England. Because we have no time to spare, such students can put three years' training into three weeks! For the only real training for fighting is fighting. Those who, on acquaintance, do not like further fighting, can be 'returned to store'. This is no time for half-measures.

From 390 million people the supply of man-power is inexhaustible; but they will be valueless without morale and the will to fight. Obviously no Sikh or Moslem, actually no Indian at all, will fight any better for being told that the British are going to clear out. His immediate reaction will be (i) that the British are afraid of the Japanese and (ii) where do I come in—and my family? If I wanted to recruit in India five millions to fight like heroes, I should start a hurricane campaign on the platform and in the Press, led by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, Pandit Nehru for the United Provinces, Jinnah for the Moslem, and somebody else for the Bengali, the Sikhs, Madrasis and Rajputs. The Government might close its ears to what they said; but might enact that every man who fought should receive, dead or alive, a free gift of three irrigated acres before the British left India. In certain quarters that might be unpopular; but it would be just, is possible, and would give the men something to fight for. They would then see exactly where they did 'come in'; and men with arms generally do get what they are promised.

JEWS AND PALESTINE

So much for India and the Colonies. There remains one further section of Hitler's 'subhumans' whose place under reconstruction is yet more important to define and to sup-

port. They are the Jews, Hitler's specially damned enemies, fit only for extermination, and now being methodically starved to death.

The dying effort of Lloyd-Georgian liberalism in the last war allocated to the Jews a homeland in Palestine; and Great Britain graciously accepted the mandate in order to carry out the 'Balfour declaration'. Those of us who had worked for and secured this settlement did so not only as an act of justice and to provide a home for the homeless, but also to provide a bridgehead whence civilization and Western culture might permeate the East. The British are bad mixers; the Jews should be the carriers of Occidental life and thought into the sleepy Orient. The new colony should be a credit to British statesmanship, and Palestine our firm fortress in time of trouble.

ONE JEWISH SUCCESS

The Jews of all the world have done their part nobly in Palestine. Five hundred thousand of the best intelligence and morality have converted a wilderness into a garden. For the first time in history, colonists from a higher civilization have neither robbed nor exploited nor exterminated the wilder native race. The Aztecs and Incas of Mexico and Peru, the Redskins on the Great Lakes of North America, the aborigines of Australia and Tasmania, the Hottentots and Kaffirs of South Africa—all have been enslaved, or exploited and gradually exterminated. Wherever settlers have come, they have taken the land by force or fraud under the plea of necessity and expediency. Only the Jews of Palestine have paid for barren lands at a blackmail price and laboured to make such lands productive. Tel Aviv, a hive of industry with 200,000 Jewish inhabitants, stands today where there were but barren sand-dunes twenty-five years

ago. Haifa rivals Alexandria and the Piræus; Jerusalem has conquered nature and become a model and beautiful city. The collective farms are as fine in spirit and in economic example as any in Russia. Above all, a despised race from Polish ghettos has become a self-respecting people; former middlemen, beating down and under-cutting their neighbours in a fight for a bare living, have become proud and successful colonists, conquering nature instead of their fellow man. They have performed this miracle in the teeth of the bitterest opposition from the British administration, both in London and in Palestine.

We might have had two million such colonists, spread from Baghdad to the frontiers of Egypt, a living fortress to defend the Suez Canal and the oil-wells of Persia and Mesopotamia. They might now be robustly hitting back at their enemy and ours. Their factories might have been pouring out munitions; their ships might have been making the Mediterranean dangerous to our enemies; 200,000 with the spirit of the Maccabees might have conveyed that spirit to comrades of the United Nations in arms. Instead, they have been hampered at every turn, disarmed and left almost unprotected from the armed Arab looters among whom they dwell. Their immigration has been stopped, their land purchases prohibited, the little money they have saved from Hitler taken from them in taxation, to supply Arabs who murder and a British administration which denies them justice.

PALESTINE ADMINISTRATION

This Administration and their abettors in Whitehall claim that all this wrecking is done 'in the interests of the natives'! I have proved a dozen times, and the House of Commons knows, that this is false. 'In the interests of the

natives'! Let the natives of Kenya and Rhodesia explain how our modern Colonial Office looks after *their* interests, how *their* land is taken without payment, how they are taxed to work, how they are educated, how their leaders are banished, how they are given a vote or a voice in their government! God forbid that we, or the Jews, should ever look after the interests of Palestine natives as the British Colonial Office looks after the interests of African natives!

Had these settlers in Palestine been British,¹ how proud we should have been of them! How the Administration would have helped them, with loans, advice and arms. How safe they would now be, both from natives and from Hitler! How safe *we* should now be in the Eastern Mediterranean! But they were not British, they were Jews.

However much the Colonial Office Administration may dislike Jews, they might at least have spared the House of Commons the hypocrisy of the last 22 years. All this sabotage of Jewish freedom and of British interests has taken place because crypto-fascism rules in the Near East and lurks in Whitehall. They don't like Jews; won't use Jews; do not accept the Balfour declaration, and are determined to break it. Twenty-five years of ceaseless struggle against Jews in Palestine has produced in the officials a state of mind which prefers Hitler and Mussolini to that cause for which we fight. They would sooner the Jews drowned in the *Struma* than landed in Palestine; that is the measure of their hate.

ARAB REACTIONS

The effect on the Arab natives is obvious. The mob of plunderers and murderers use as their slogan: 'The Govern-

¹ In "The Seventh Dominion" Col. Wedgwood expounds this theory at length. M.S.

ment is with us.' They think it; they have reason to think it. They think the Administration hates the settlers as much as they do and for the same reason—that they are Jews. But they do not love or respect us any more for that reason. Jews or English are all the same to the followers of the Mufti. The years of propaganda from Rome and Berlin have seen to that. The dictator countries have amply supplied both the arms and the arguments of hate. *Mein Kampf* can (or could) be bought in Palestine while the Government censor saw to it that criticism of Hitler, Mussolini and Franco should be properly restrained!

The Oriental mind does not understand. It takes appeasement for fear, assent for consent, the desire-to-please for weakness. The last Arab rising against the Jews (which could have been put down in three weeks and lasted 18 months) failed to make us popular while destroying the prestige of our arms. We know now that nothing will induce either the Arab or the Egyptian to fight for us. We know that the first appearance of the Storm Troopers in Palestine will be the signal for an Arab rising—in Palestine as in Mesopotamia. Twenty-five years of abject appeasement and encouragement of Arab intransigence has ended in complete failure.

POST-WAR SETTLEMENT OF PALESTINE

If the United Nations win, and if the Jews of Palestine have not been exterminated by Hitler, I know quite well what the Palestine Administration wants. They want an Arab Federation—the two Arabias, Palestine, Syria, Transjordan and 'Irak'—in the fond hope that, if not part of a greater British Federation, it will be pro-British—a sort of Federated Malay States, which can be outlined red on the map and provide employment for British advisers. The Jews,

or what is left of them, will be 'tolerated' in the way they have been up to now.

Somehow, I do not think that will come off! America would not like it. The Atlantic Charter hardly envisages such pleasant imperialism. The Conservatives, even, are becoming disillusioned about Arabs and Egyptians. The Army officers are become less cocksure. Mr. Churchill may still be in power, and has a way of frightening men of little minds. What I should *wish* would be a larger Palestine (embracing the Hauran, Transjordan and Sinai as a self-governing State of the Democratic Federal Union; such a State to be pledged to open frontiers for immigration; and Jewish police to keep order. Then the Jews would soon be in a majority, and with votes for all and single member constituencies on a general franchise, the State would develop as peacefully and justly as the State of New York. As for the rest, being something of a Turcophile I should gladly see the rest of Syria and Irak reoccupied by the new Turkey—that would at least remove those hideous veils and tarbushes with which we seek to perpetuate in Palestine the obfuscated mysteries of the Middle Ages.

Such a solution would provide a land of refuge for all Jews and solve the Jewish problem. There is no other way of doing so. But that, of course, is no guarantee that it will be done. Even when Hitler is hanged and dead, his spirit will live on in quite a number of people. I commend this solution, however, to America; otherwise America will have to take our place as Mandatory for Palestine—for as Mandatory we have utterly failed, even if we have failed through treachery.