

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

May 19, 1995 • Vol. 22 No. 21

\$10.00

Clinton builds a new U.S.-Russian alliance
British perfidy and the fall of Singapore
Prince Philip makes genocide into a religion

**LaRouche's development
policy debated in Nigeria**



Prince Philip makes genocide into a religion

by Mark Burdman

In the coming weeks, British Royal Consort Prince Philip will step down as president of the World Wide Fund for Nature-International (WWF). He is certainly not doing so out of contrition for the crimes against humanity committed by that organization during his long tenure, but reportedly for "personal" reasons. To prove his unswerving adherence to the same mindset that earlier led him to express his wish to be reincarnated as a deadly virus that would wipe out large segments of the human population, he is leaving as his legacy, the formation of a new organization that will seek to deploy the world religions as instruments for genocide.

From April 29 to May 3, the royal family's Windsor Castle was the scene of a "World Summit on Religion and Conservation." It brought together some 60 ecologists and religious figures, under the sponsorship of the WWF-U.K., the Japanese Mokichi Okada Association (MOA), Britain's Pilkington Trust, and the Manchester, England-based International Consultancy on Religious Education and Culture (Icorec). Leading speakers included Prince Philip himself, as well as the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople of the Orthodox Church Bartholomew, and Crown Prince Hassan

Church of England, whose supreme governor is Queen Elizabeth II; from May 2-3, Archbishop of Canterbury Dr. George Carey, primate of the Church of England, held private strategy sessions with participants. Individuals were in attendance nominally representing nine faiths: Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, the Baha'i faith, and Taoism.

The Windsor "summit" had been preceded by a preparatory meeting in Tokyo, Japan, at the end of March, co-sponsored by the WWF and the MOA.

WWF insiders affirm that these meetings occurred under

a "shadow" of increasingly negative attention recently drawn to the WWF, highlighted by the Oct. 28, 1994 *EIR Special Report*, "The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor." The attempt to refocus WWF activity under a new organizational umbrella is, these sources affirm, in part an attempt to "out-flank" the negative publicity, and to coordinate WWF conservationist-ecologist activities under new, apparently "religious" auspices.

ARC, U.N.O., and World Bank together

The Windsor gathering resolved to create a new organization, the Alliance of Religion and Conservation (ARC), with the mandate being, according to an official WWF press release, to "promote for the public benefit the protection of the natural environment throughout the world, in accordance with the teachings and beliefs of the world's religions, which encourage respect for nature." ARC will take over management of a number of projects that the WWF has been carrying out over the past decade, as well as launch a series of new projects. One example of a project in the first category, is the "Mount Athos Project," which was initiated by Prince Philip

personally in the early 1990s, to make that cultist center of monastic activity a model center for "environmental management" and "organic farming," as well to turn a significant section of the Athonite Peninsula into a "nature reserve." One new ARC project will be to promote "the conservation of the Taoist Sacred Mountains in China . . . creating conservation areas that cannot be developed."

The summit also discussed ways of integrating the WWF and associated groups more organically into the one-world-federalist structures of the United Nations. According to a WWF press release, participants discussed an invitation from

the World Bank "to faith leaders, to establish a dialogue with World Bank directors on the ethics of contemporary economics." Furthermore, the United Nations Environment Program "has asked religions to act as environmental monitoring agencies to assess environmental changes at the local level. In return, faiths are asking to be involved in U.N. agency policy and decision-making processes."

A 'religious' gestapo?

If that sounds like an attempt to use religious leaders as, in effect, operatives in a new environmentalist gestapo, that is fully in conformity with the royal consort's prescriptions to the Windsor gathering. He set the tone for the five days of discussions, with a speech over the April 29-30 weekend, calling for "vital action" to protect the global environment from "the dramatic increase in the world's human population." This "dramatic increase," he blurted, is "the only significant factor that coincides with the deterioration of the planet's health over the last century. . . . The key issue for the conservation of our natural environment is to find ways of protecting it from the consequences of the human population explosion."

He had the following stretched metaphor to make his point: "If you are in the process of blowing up a balloon, there is nothing to warn you that it is about to burst. We are stretching the Earth's systems like a small child blowing up a balloon. If it goes on blowing, the crucial point is, when is it going to burst?"

He insisted that humans must "interfere" to regulate the "imbalance" caused by all this, with a particular role being reserved for world religions in this effort.

Non-western, alternative ways of looking at nature

The creation of ARC is the newest, and most ambitious phase in the royal consort's campaign to subvert religious belief, to eliminate from this planet the idea of "man being made in the living image of God" (*imago viva Dei*). This idea, expressed in the Biblical Book of Genesis, is certainly at the traditional core of the "religions of the Book," Christianity, Judaism, and Islam. It is also expressed, in other ways, in strands of faiths like Hinduism. Prince Philip and his coterie of ecological advisers, such as Icorec's Martin Palmer, have long held the view that, if one wants to bring about conservationist-ecologist policies, one must *change the beliefs, or defining paradigms* of populations. Religions are seen as a crucial vehicle for doing this, because people associate powerful emotions and ideas with religious conceptions. If religions strongly uphold the idea of *imago viva Dei* or an equivalent thereof, then adherents to that religion are significantly "inoculated" from the green-ecologist disease. Conversely, if a religion puts forward a Mother Earth-worshipping conception that places man in a subordinate position to "nature" and co-equal with the animal kingdom,

then believers in that religion can be induced into all sorts of states of mind, if not actual crimes against the human race.

Prince Philip began this project in earnest with the 25th anniversary meeting of the WWF (then known as the World Wildlife Fund) in Assisi, Italy on Sept. 22-29, 1986. That gathering had been specifically conceived, by the royal consort's advisers, as a means of undermining the "anthropocentric" notions, associated with the 15th-century Golden Renaissance, that see humanity as "the paradigm of the universe" and as the "end purpose of creation." One aide to Philip affirmed at the time, that the aim of the event was to reinforce "non-western, alternative ways of looking at nature," to create "a new way of looking at the world" (see *EIR*, Sept. 5, 1986, "Prince Philip To Set New 'Satanist Covenant' in Assisi," and "Why the WWF Hates Leonardo da Vinci").

At that meeting, a "WWF Religion and Conservation Network" was created. At first, it was composed of nominal representatives of the five largest world faiths, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism. As indicated, to varying degrees, these five—especially the three "religions of the Book," Christianity, Judaism and Islam—have historically upheld notions congruent with the Book of Genesis view of "man being made in the image of God." So, the first strategy of Prince Philip et al. was to assault these religions from within.

The royal consort's holy war against the three monotheistic faiths was made even more explicit in May 1990, when he spoke before the May 16-19, 1990 "Caring for Creation" conference of the North American Conference on Religion and Ecology, and praised the "ecological pragmatism of the so-called pagan religions" as "a great deal more realistic in terms of conservation ethics than the more intellectual monotheistic philosophies of the revealed religions" (see *EIR*, June 8, 1990, p. 30).

Since the original formation of the network, four new faiths have been brought in: Sikhism, the Baha'i faith, Jainism, and, most recently, Taoism. Since all of them are known for beliefs strongly discordant with the Book of Genesis, the act of lumping them together with Christianity, Islam, and Judaism into one "inter-faith," "multi-cultural" pot, is itself a perverse means of diluting and subverting the notion of *imago viva Dei*.

'Animal lovers perpetrated the worst crimes?'

The anti-human ideas promoted by the WWF-ARC complex are congruent with those gnostic-cultish ideas which were instrumental in the rise of Nazism in Germany. It is ironic, in this light, that the Windsor Castle event would have taken place right on the eve of the commemorations throughout Europe, of the 50th anniversary of the end of the World War II in Europe and the defeat of Nazism. In Britain, it was the queen herself who led off the celebrations, with a

speech that must be seen as completely hypocritical, in view of the promotion of genocide by her husband and the Church of England.

Such ironic parallels were not lost on all individuals involved in the summit. For the event, each of the nine faiths was requested to submit a statement on its respective views on "the environment." Eight of the nine statements (see *Documentation*) were fundamentally in accordance with the gnostic views of the WWF. The one notable exception was the statement submitted on behalf of Judaism.

Authored by Israel's Rabbi Rackover, the "Judaism and the Environment" statement began with the claim that "the principles of environmental protection" are deeply rooted in Judaism and the Talmud. But then this strongly qualifying paragraph was inserted: "When approaching the subject of environmental protection, we must be careful to maintain the proper balance between protection of the environment and protection of man. The proper balance in this context is certainly not one of equality between man and nature. The relationship between man and nature is one of ownership—albeit limited. In our enthusiasm for protecting the environment, we must not forget man's interests or his role in the scheme of creation. Love of nature may not take precedence over love of man. We must avoid at all costs the error of those who were known as lovers of animals yet perpetrated the worst crimes imaginable against their fellow man."

Much of the rest of the statement was cautious in its formulations, insisting that the notion of "protection of the environment" must be dealt with in the context of numerous other "economic, social and moral considerations." It ended by saying that "the classic Jewish attitude to nature is a direct consequence of the belief that the entire universe is the work of the Creator. Love of God was taken in the broadest sense to include love of all His creations. . . . Nature in all its beauty is understood as having been created for man, and it is therefore wrong for man to spoil it."

The link of "animal lovers" to Hitler's crimes was an unmistakable warning to the "wildlife lobby" that has congregated under Prince Philip's leadership. The message was not lost on participants, despite efforts by U.S. Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg, a senior official at Edgar Bronfman's World Jewish Congress, to soften the statement and to bring Judaism more into conformity with "conservationist" beliefs. The principled position taken by Rackover contrasted sharply with the views submitted on behalf of Christianity, as can be seen in the excerpts below. Sources close to Prince Philip report that they are counting on an ongoing, and escalating, theological-philosophical offensive, by the Orthodox Church, represented by the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople Bartholomew, to weaken the "anthropocentric" content of Christianity. Were that to be successful, of course, Christianity itself would be destroyed, given the overwhelmingly "anthropocentric" message of Jesus Christ and of the New Testament in its entirety.

Documentation

For the April 29-May 3 "World Summit on Religion and Conservation" at Windsor Castle, each of the nine faiths in attendance submitted a statement on its views on "the environment." The following are excerpts from the eight statements that seek to draw a coherence between that faith's beliefs and the gnostic views of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). The views presented do not necessarily reflect the views that the faiths actually hold, but only how these beliefs were characterized. The exception, Judaism, is discussed above.

Bahai: . . . In this age of transition toward a world society, protection of the environment and conservation of the earth's resources represent an enormously complex challenge. The rapid progress in science and technology that has united the world physically has also greatly accelerated destruction of the biological diversity and rich natural heritage with which the planet has been endowed. . . . For Bahá'is, Bahá'u'llah's promise that civilization will exist on this planet for a minimum of 5,000 centuries makes it unconscionable to ignore the long-term impact of decisions made today. The world community must, therefore, learn to make use of the earth's natural resources, both renewable and non-renewable, in a manner that ensures sustainability into the distant reaches of time. . . .

Buddhism: . . . The concept of conservation and harmony with nature is intricately linked to Buddhist teachings and traditions and has been practiced for generations. . . . By living simply one can be in harmony with other creatures and learn to appreciate the inter-connectedness of all that lives. This simplicity of life involves developing openness to the environment and relating to the world with awareness and responsive perception. . . . Once we treat nature as our friend, to cherish it, then we can see the need to change from the attitude of dominating nature to an attitude of working with nature—we are an intrinsic part of all existence rather than seeing ourselves as in control of it. . . .

Christianity: The World Council of Churches said in the document from the Granvollen, Norway meeting of 1988: "The drive to have 'mastery' over creation has resulted in the senseless exploitation of natural resources, the alienation of the land from the people and the destruction of indigenous cultures." . . . In differing ways, the main churches have sought to either revise or reexamine their theology and, as a result, their practice in the light of the environmental crisis. . . . The Orthodox Church teaches that humanity, both individually and collectively, ought to perceive the natural order as a sign and sacrament of God. This is obviously not what happens today. Rather, humanity perceives the natural order as an object of exploitation. . . .

Hinduism: Hinduism is a religion which is very near to

nature. . . . Earth is worshipped as the spouse of God. . . . These days it looks as if human beings have forgotten that a particular natural condition on Earth enabled life to come into existence and evolve to the human level. Humanity is disturbing this natural condition on which his existence, along with the existence of all other forms of life, depends. . . . Hindu religion wants its followers to live a simple life. It does not allow people to go on increasing their material wants. For example, not to use anything belonging to nature, such as oil, coal or forest, at a greater rate than you can replenish it; not to destroy birds, fish, earthworms and even bacteria which play vital ecological roles—once they are annihilated you cannot re-create them. . . . “Conserve ecology or perish” is the message of the *Bhagavad Gita*. . . .

Islam: . . . People have been seduced from their roots primarily through the built-in biases of the modern education system, which is ultimately development-, consumer-, and career-orientated [sic]. . . . People who are still rooted in nature and untainted by “progress” follow the ways of their forefathers, and live through their responsibilities to the Creator as natural, unconscious environmentalists. These are the people we can learn from, but they are a rapidly dwindling minority. . . .

Jainism: . . . Jainism is fundamentally a religion of ecology and has turned ecology into a religion. . . . Jains are always ready and willing to look positively and with enthusiasm upon environmental causes. . . .

Sikhism: . . . In the matter of conservation and ecological concerns, Sikh teaching is very clear. . . . The Sikh scripture declares that the purpose of human beings is to achieve a blissful state and be in harmony with the earth and all creation. There is serious concern that the earth may no longer be a sustainable bio-system. . . . In Sikh beliefs, a concern for the environment is part of an integrated approach to life and nature. . . . Environmental concerns have not yet come to occupy a prominent place in governmental policy [in the northwestern Indian state of Punjab] or in the thinking of most people; industrial development remains of primary concern. However, a number of steps are being taken, both due to external pressure and due to initiatives from a few indigenous groups. . . .

Taoism: Tao simply means “the way.”. . . The Tao took form in the being of the Grandmother Goddess. She came to Earth to enlighten humanity. She taught the people to let everything grow according to its own course without any interference. . . . With the deepening world environmental crisis, more and more people have come to realize that the problem of the environment is not only brought about by modern industry and technology, but it also has a deep connection with people’s world outlook, with their sense of value and with the way they structure knowledge. Some people’s ways of thinking has, in certain ways, unbalanced the harmonious relationship between human beings and nature, and over-stressed the power and influence of the human will. People think that nature can be rapaciously exploited. . . .

Britain's Pacific war against the U.S.A.: the fall of Singapore

by Mary Burdman

Singapore, The Pregnable Fortress

by Peter Elphick

Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1995

441 pages, index and notes, hardbound, £20.00

The loss of Malaya and Singapore to Japan between Dec. 8, 1941 and Feb. 15, 1942, the greatest disaster in British military history, was the result of *deliberate* British policy. The evidence presented in this book, much of it only released 50 years after the events, provides strong backing for the contention, made by *EIR*'s Webster Tarpley in last week's issue, that the Pacific policy of wartime Prime Minister Winston Churchill was to draw the United States into a long-term Pacific war, by deliberately handing the British Empire's assets in this vast region to Japan. Author Elphick himself by no means makes this contention explicitly, but he condemns Churchill as the one man, above all others, who can be blamed for the fall of Singapore. If the reader takes the evidence in this book in the context of overall British imperial policy, it would be hard to escape the conclusion that Singapore did not fall, as the myth has it, due to British blundering, but that Churchill was committed to sacrificing Singapore as a pawn in a vast Asian strategic game, as Tarpley describes.

In 1941, Malaya and Singapore were the Japanese Army's gateway to Indonesia, then under Dutch dominion, and combined with the assault on the Philippines and other Pacific islands, to Australia. The strategic importance of this colony, which also produced half the world's rubber and one-third of its tin, should have meant it was well defended, but it was not. Instead, Winston Churchill, from the 1920s, played a double game. He was the biggest purveyor of the myth that Singapore Island was an "impregnable fortress," and at the same time, as Chancellor of the Exchequer and as First Lord of the Admiralty, ensured that the fortress was never fortified.

The loss of Singapore not only meant that the Japanese way south was open. It is officially estimated that some 130,000 troops of the British Empire were taken prisoner by the Japanese, the vast majority of them Indian and Australian, though author Elphick puts the figure at closer to 120,000. Many thousands lost their lives in Japanese slave-labor operations. This loss is extraordinary, especially considering that the Japanese suffered only 9,800 casualties themselves. At the same time, Australia, facing imminent invasion, in addition to the losses in Singapore, was forced by Churchill to deploy its soldiers to North Africa and Europe. India, which supplied a full *half* of the British Empire's troops, suffered a terrible famine under the British Raj during World War II.

Another indication of Churchill's perfidy, is that there was never a British Court of Inquiry into Singapore, although wartime inquiries were held into such lesser disasters as the loss of Crete. As prime minister, Churchill said to a Secret Session of the House of Commons on April 23, 1942, just weeks after the fall of Singapore, that such an inquiry "would not be good for our country, and that it would hamper the progress of the war." He claimed there would be an inquiry after the war. Yet, after he was ousted from power at the war's end, Churchill blamed the Labour Party for failing to hold an inquiry, though he himself never demanded one. Churchill was again prime minister from 1951-55, but did nothing, despite the fact that almost all the principal military leaders from Malaya were still alive.

The Japanese forces themselves were totally unprepared for the rapidity of the British collapse in Malaya. Reports sent by the Japanese commander Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita to Tokyo, which were translated by the Americans after the war, said that he was surprised by the lack of real opposition or defense works in Johore, on the southern tip of Malaya, and that he could not believe he would reach the causeway to Singapore Island without savage fighting. There was no savage fighting. General Yamashita's chief intelligence officer, Col. I. Sugita, wrote in 1966, that the Japanese had

expected their advance to be stopped long before they reached Singapore, and had the British forces used strong defense works in Johore, the Japanese might never have reached Singapore.

Sugita also wrote that Japanese forces were so short of ammunition by Feb. 14, 1942, the day before Singapore capitulated, that some troops had none at all, and Yamashita himself visited the front line to apologize to the troops and tell them to use bayonets. Japanese Lieutenant General Fujikawa wrote in his book *F-Kikan*, that on Feb. 15, "the Japanese were facing an acute shortage of ammunition. . . . Yamashita was concerned with a dwindling supply of munitions and increasing casualties, and he could not afford to let the negotiations drag on much longer if he was to avert the crisis that his armies were facing. . . . If the British had come to know about our shortage of manpower and munitions, and if they had held out for a few more days, they could have defeated the Japanese forces."

But they did not hold out.

Singapore the vulnerable

At the conclusion of World War I, the British government officially determined that the only possible aggressor it would have to face in East Asia would be Japan—despite the existing Anglo-Japanese Treaty—and therefore that Britain would require a permanent naval base in the region, which was built at Singapore. The "defense" of Singapore was conceived as sending a fleet out from Britain. However, that defense was a chimera.

Winston Churchill played a special role in this period. As Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1928, he made an important alteration in the "ten-year rule," the defense "strategy" Britain had adopted in 1919, based on the assumption that it would not be engaged in a major war for the next ten years. Instead of reviewing this rule at fixed periods, Churchill decided that it should be changed, so that the ten-year period "began" anew every day—in other words, it should be prolonged indefinitely. This policy change was denounced as "disastrous" by Lord Trenchard on March 7, 1945. The purpose of this "infinite" ten years, was ostensibly to save funds, but, as Elphick states, it caused "rearmament to be dangerously postponed." This rule led to the "near-fatal twenty-month gap between the government's realization of international danger in March 1932 and the commencement of rearmament in November 1933."

In East Asia, this policy meant that the Singapore Naval Base and the Navy were far behind in preparedness—which Churchill must have known very well. Yet Churchill was Britain's biggest purveyor—to the United States, to Australia, to India, and to the world—of the myth of Singapore as an "impregnable fortress," and that Britain considered Singapore the second pillar and "eastern bastion of her global defense strategy."

Churchill was also the purveyor of the myth, that Japan did not pose a danger in East Asia, and persisted in this until December 1941, although Japan had been, actually, at war with China since 1931. From 1925 on, Churchill was making pronouncements that there was no need to base a British battle fleet equal to Japan's at Singapore. He was assisted by Anthony Eden—later Britain's prime minister during the British-French neocolonial Suez adventure—first as secretary for the dominions in 1939, and later as foreign secretary.

This book concludes that "Winston Churchill at best misjudged the Japanese situation. At worst he may have deliberately turned a blind eye to the East, prepared to risk the loss of the Far East possessions, sacrificing them for the duration of the war in his ardent desire to get America to come into it." Part of Churchill's strategy was to depend on the "deterrent" effect of the British Fleet—a policy, later used as the Cold War "Mutual and Assured Destruction" strategy of Henry Kissinger, to risk rather than avoid war. On Sept. 10, 1940, Churchill wrote to his chief of staff, Gen. Hastings Ismay: "The prime defense of Singapore is the Fleet. The protective effect of the Fleet is exercised to a large extent whether it is on the spot or not. . . . The danger of a rupture with Japan is no worse than it was. The probabilities of Japan undertaking an attack on Singapore . . . are remote."

But in reality, London stripped East Asia of defenses. By Dec. 10, 1941, when Japan sank the British battleship *Prince of Wales* off Malaya, the whole Pacific was laid bare to the Japanese Navy.

Undercutting Australia

Part of Churchill's policy was to render Australia unable to defend itself, although Australia had entered World War II immediately after Britain did. In November 1939, Anthony Eden, as secretary for the dominions, told the Australian government that Japan would not attack, and then that Britain was "willing and able" to send a battle fleet to Singapore. Churchill, then First Lord of the Admiralty, began to pressure Australia to send troops to Europe, rather than keep them at home to defend their own nation. He insisted that, at most, all Australia had to fear were "tip and run raids."

Churchill was assisted in this by the Anglophile views of Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies, and his London High Commissioner Stanley Bruce. Churchill went so far as to tell the Australian supply minister, Richard Casey, that Britain would abandon the Mediterranean to save Australia—something London had no intention of doing. Churchill assured his prime minister, Neville Chamberlain, who was displeased with this deception, that Britain had always gotten away with such vague promises and no specific commitments before.

Then, on June 13, 1940, Secretary of State for Dominions Lord Caldecote sent Menzies a most secret message, stating that Singapore was no longer the second pillar of British

defense; its place was taken by the Middle East. Caldecote said that Britain intended to maintain its fleet in the Mediterranean. "It would be most unlikely that we could send adequate reinforcements to the Far East," and therefore Britain "would have to rely on the U.S.A. to safeguard our interests there."

Either Churchill was "blinded" on Japan, Elphick writes, "or his refusal to countenance further reinforcements for Singapore was part of a Machiavellian scheme to draw America into a war with Japan if it came." An undefended Malaya would lure the Japanese into attacking, and the United States would likely have joined the war, even without Pearl Harbor, after the Japanese assault on Thailand and Malaya. When he became prime minister in 1940, Churchill wrote in his first telegram to Roosevelt, "I am looking to you to keep that Japanese dog quiet in the Pacific, using Singapore in any way convenient." He sent another letter to Roosevelt in February 1941, admitting that British naval reserves could not stand up to the Japanese, but dismissing the possibility of a Japanese attack.

Churchill sealed the fate of Singapore in a "Most Secret" directive on April 28, 1941, in which he stated that "Japan is unlikely to enter the war unless the Germans make a successful invasion of Great Britain. . . . It is very unlikely, moreover, that Japan will enter the war . . . if the United States have come in. . . . There is no need at the present time to make any further dispositions for the defense of Malaya and Singapore, beyond those modest arrangements which are in progress. . . ."

Churchill held to this line as late as November 1941, weeks before the Japanese attack. His staff was dismayed. Maj. Gen. John Kennedy, director of military operations of the War Office in London, wrote: "We in the general staff were quite sure that the decisions he gave at this time were dangerously wrong." Chief of the Imperial General Staff General Dill regarded the Middle East as *less* vital than Singapore. In November 1941, according to the son of Field Marshal Archibald Wavell, who was Allied Supreme Commander Southeast Asia, there was a "severe disagreement in the War Cabinet . . . when General Dill wished to reinforce the Far East with aircraft at the expense of the Middle East, but the prime minister overruled it."

Churchill exacerbated the problem, by personally sending "Force Z"—two capital ships, the brand new *Prince of Wales* and renovated *Repulse*—to Singapore, instead of the promised battle fleet. He sent the ships without an aircraft carrier escort, over the strong objections of the Admiralty. The two ships arrived in Singapore on Dec. 1, 1941. On Dec. 10, both were sunk by Japanese airplanes. The result was, as Churchill dramatically wrote: "The full horror of the news sank into me. There were no British or American capital ships in the Indian Ocean or the Pacific except the American survivors of Pearl Harbor who were hastening back to Cali-

fornia. Over all this vast expanse of waters Japan was supreme and we were weak and naked."

No lack of intelligence

Churchill's decisions certainly cannot be blamed on lack of information about the real situation in Malaya and Singapore. There were sufficient warnings of when, where, and how the Japanese would attack.

There have been many myths created—after the war—as to why Singapore fell. One myth was that no British military planners thought that the Japanese could penetrate the Malaya peninsula jungles, and would only attack Singapore from the sea. However, pre-war military leaders knew that there would be no problem for an aggressor to attack Malaya by using the excellent network of roads down its west side. Intelligence gathered by the British and sent to the War Office as early as 1937 foresaw that Japan would attack both Thailand and Malaya, not Singapore island, directly.

The few successful intelligence operations were disbanded. Shanghai-born Defense Security Officer Col. Hayley Bell was dismissed in May 1939, because of his success in uncovering the extent of pre-war Japanese espionage and operations in Malaya, and predicting accurately where the Japanese would land. Both Malaya Colonial Governor Sir Shenton Thomas, and British Ambassador to Thailand Sir Josiah Crosby demanded Bell's removal.

Another case was that of Capt. John Becker, murdered in Singapore in August 1948. Becker had consistently stated that had British forces commander General Percival and others acted on intelligence available from before the war, Singapore need never have fallen. He noted the degree to which Thailand had become a "non-belligerent abettor of Japan" in 1941, and produced much evidence, including of massive Japanese shock troop concentrations in south Indo-China in August 1941, to indicate a near-term attack. His reports were destroyed.

When Malayan Civil Service Defense Secretary C.A. Vlieland attempted to inform London of the lack of defenses of Malaya in mid-1940, colonial officials blocked his reports. Vlieland later wrote: "I do not suppose Churchill's decision to sacrifice Malaya would have been shaken, for even the expressed views of the Chiefs of Staff do not seem to have had that effect." But if information had been sent, "at least it would have been impossible for anyone who read it to say he had not been told." That "anyone" was Churchill, who claimed in January 1942 that he did not know that Singapore Island had no coastal defenses!

Another disaster was the rapidity with which the British lost control of the air. A July 1941 inquiry on the loss of Crete, and many British, Australian, and New Zealand soldiers with it, concluded that the overwhelming superiority of the German Air Force was critical. Australian soldiers were promised by their government, that they would never again

have to fight without adequate air cover. The situation in Malaya led to a disastrous collapse of morale.

British aircraft were obsolete, despite the fact that already in March 1941, Malaya's Command General Staff had issued a booklet, "Japanese Army Memorandum," which listed the capabilities of Japanese fighter and torpedo-bomber aircraft, and acknowledged that the British equivalents were "vastly inferior in performance." In May 1941, a new Japanese Zero fighter plane was shot down in China, and examined by Allied forces. The information that this plane could fly much faster than any of the RAF planes in Malaya, was sent to the London Air Ministry, but to no effect. London refused to give Malaya any new aircraft.

The Empire's armies

The British Empire did not fight with British troops: India was its main source of soldiers. Despite the fact that India had been fighting for its independence from Britain for decades, the Indian Army was expanded rapidly after 1939 to defend the Empire, becoming the largest non-conscript army the world has seen. A picture published in 1991, on the 50th anniversary of the fall of Hongkong, showed a former British officer standing in front of the wall where the names of the defending soldiers were inscribed. There was one name, written over and over: "Singh." The "British" troops who fell in Hongkong were Sikhs.

The Malaya campaign demonstrated the worst aspects of

British imperial military operations. Almost 50% of the troops who fought for the British were Indian; another 20% were Australian. This situation contributed to the collapse. In addition, during wartime, training, equipment, and leadership of these troops were disastrously neglected. Many of the Indian soldiers who arrived in Malaya had never even *seen* a tank before they were attacked by Japanese tanks. (The British forces did not have a single tank in Malaya.) Untrained Indian reinforcement troops, all very young men, were shipped out to the final battles against the victorious Japanese onslaught. During the campaign, more experienced troops were deprived of their officers (who were mostly British, although some Indian officers were being commissioned after the 1920s), who were used to form new battalions for other war theaters. The older battalions were put in the hands of raw officers, most of whom could not even speak Urdu, the language of the Indian Army. Many, of course, were also racists. These bad officers were just thrown into battle in Malaya, with disastrous results.

So bad were conditions that official British documents, released in December 1993, revealed that there was concern "at the highest level" about the "loyalty" of Indian officers and soldiers in East Asia, the Middle East, and in Europe, to the British Raj. The Indian Independence League and Indian National Army both operated in Malaya, with Japanese backing.

Australian troops did not fare much better. As Australia's

Churchill's model: Scipio Africanus

Winston Churchill's incompetent military strategy can best be understood by contrasting his views with those of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

The opening of the war found MacArthur the military adviser to the colonial government of the Philippines, where he was attempting to create a military establishment which would defend the Philippine nation once it achieved its promised independence. Upon escaping from Corregidor, MacArthur did not declare "I shall return" with the intent of returning as a colonial master, but to liberate a nation that was to become a free republic. Colonies were to become sovereign nations and imperial Japan was to be reformed, its industrial capacity restored, for the economic development of the entire region.

By contrast, Churchill saw himself as the prime minister to His Majesty the King, sovereign of an empire that enslaved one-fourth of this planet. The policies of this

imperial occupation can be compared with those of the Nazi occupation in almost all respects. Churchill's models drew on the imperial traditions of Rome and Venice. One such model was Scipio Africanus, the Roman proconsul who took command of the Roman Empire following the catastrophic defeat at Cannae by the army of the great Carthaginian leader Hannibal. While Rome debated whether to mobilize another army to challenge Hannibal in the field, Scipio chose an opposite course of action—or inaction. Seeing Hannibal as another imperialist general from a rival empire, he allowed the Carthaginian to ravage most of the Italian peninsula, until Hannibal was unable to support his army. In the meantime, Scipio simply renegotiated the terms of subjugation with the people who had been ravaged by the army of Hannibal or simply were in no position to challenge the power of an even weaker Rome.

Thus Churchill saw Japan, as Japan saw itself, as another imperial power, whose occupation held in safe-keeping, so to speak, the British king's imperial possessions, until a more appropriate time would come for their reoccupation.—*Dean Andromidas*

Imperial Force Chief of Staff in Malaya, Col. J.H. Thyer, wrote of the last Australian reinforcements to arrive in Singapore: "Some had sailed within a fortnight of their enlistment. A large proportion had not qualified at a small arms course. . . . Some had never seen a Bren gun and none had handled a sub-machine gun or an anti-tank rifle. Worse still, was that some had never handled a rifle." Yet, in 1993, when files on the mass "desertions" of Australian troops in the last days of the Singapore debacle were first released, the British press was full of commentaries on the unsuitability of the "Austrian race" as soldiers.

Of course, London had little heed for the welfare of British soldiers either. While the British had not found it possible to send in a new division in enough time to have made any difference, the ill-fated 18th Division, 20,000 men, was sent to Singapore, to arrive 10 days before capitulation. The next step was the Japanese slave-labor camps.

The British also refused to raise any forces from one group in Malaya who would have fought the Japanese: the Chinese. China was already fighting Japan for its life, and the Chinese—the largest ethnic group in all Malaya—had most to suffer at Japanese conquerors' hands. But, for colonial political purposes, the British refused to arm them. Only a few units were formed, and then only at the bitter end.

The campaign

From the Japanese invasion on Dec. 8, the British campaign in Malaya was one continuous, 60-day retreat. Rumors, bad or absent commanders, leaked secret orders, lack of equipment, wrong information, panic, and headlong flight, repeatedly determined events. So many disasters could scarcely be accidental.

The British had a plan for a preemptive move into Thailand, before the Japanese struck. This plan was aborted, in part due to the intervention on Dec. 7 of British Ambassador to Bangkok Sir Josiah Crosby, a homosexual, who insisted that Thai Prime Minister Field Marshal Luang Pibul, actually close to the Japanese, was "loyal" to Britain. Crosby had the backing of the Foreign and Colonial offices. In fact, the British also failed to warn Washington, although the Japanese assault on Malaya and Thailand preceded that on Pearl Harbor by over an hour. (All the Japanese assaults in the Pacific were within hours of each other. Pearl Harbor lies on the other side of the international date line.)

Two days later, Churchill's Force Z was sunk. The ships had no air support at all, because the British had already lost the airfields in northern Malaya—with panicked personnel fleeing rumors of a Japanese attack. Strange events, including unsubstantiated reports of a Japanese landing on the Malayan coast, left Force Z exposed to Japanese airplanes.

The repeated disasters led to a complete collapse of morale among the troops. Troops were left behind as their lines of retreat were often destroyed by other British forces; many units fled so fast, that they failed to implement any denial

policy. The Japanese dubbed the vast quantities of supplies the fleeing British left them, "Churchill supplies," which included such items as newly printed military maps of Singapore Island! Airfields, railroads, and roads, all were left practically intact.

In Singapore itself, chaos reigned. There were no shelters against air attack; civilians, especially women and children, were not evacuated by the government. At the orders of the British commanders, both Commander-in-Chief Brooke-Popham and General Percival, no defenses were built on the north side of the island facing Johore until the very last moment, leaving the already demoralized troops to fight unprotected.

The siege of Singapore, Churchill's "citadel," lasted one week. Churchill himself wanted to prolong it, but at an enormous cost to human life. After everything London had done to create disaster in Malaya, on Feb. 10, as the last retreat on Singapore Island was beginning, Churchill sent an order to General Wavell: "There must at this stage be no thought of saving the troops or sparing the population. [There were 1 million civilians in Singapore—ed.] The battle must be fought to the bitter end at all costs. . . . Commanders and senior officers should die with their troops. The honor of the British Empire and of the British Army is at stake."

But the Australian and Indian forces were not so ready to die for the Empire. One reason for the rapid collapse of Singapore, was what the British commanders chose to call "desertion" by these troops. Allied Commander General Wavell stated in his report on June 1, 1942: "For the fall of Singapore itself, the Australians are held responsible." Senior British naval officer Rear Admiral Spooner wrote on Feb. 10, days before the surrender, that "the present state of affairs was started by the AIF, who just turned tail became a rabble and let the Japs walk in unopposed." An entire regiment of the Indian Army also "disappeared," defecting to the Indian National Army. British troops also fled. Elphick writes: "Excepting the special circumstances of 1917; when Czarist forces deserted to the Bolshevik cause, the Singapore experience is probably the highest incidence of desertion from any army, anywhere, at any time." How did it happen? He records one incident: An Indian Army British major reported meeting Australian soliders on the streets of Singapore, and asked them why they were not with their units. Their response was, that they had not come to fight without air cover, and were leaving. The officer told them, that that is what Indian and British troops had been doing for two months. The Australians' response was "more fool them."

The conflict with the British Empire is not over. In 1993, when the files on the "desertions" were finally released, the British press scandal-mongered for days about Australian "cowardice." But, of course, it was the leadership of U.S. Gen. Douglas MacArthur and his patriotic supporters in Australia, who drove the Japanese back from the Pacific by 1945.