

White Ferocity

This book is a CODESRIA book Project.

White Ferocity
From Non-Whites to Non-Aryans
Concealed Genocides from 1492 to Date

Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Uribe

Translated from French into English by Virginia Popper

Prefaced by Samir Amin & Louis Sala-Molins



Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa
DAKAR

© CODESRIA 2020
Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa
Avenue Cheikh Anta Diop, Angle Canal IV
BP 3304 Dakar, 18524, Senegal
Website: www.codesria.org

ISBN: 978-2-86978-723-0

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage or retrieval system without prior permission from CODESRIA.

Typesetting: Daouda Thiam
Cover Design: CODESRIA
Cover Image: Nineteenth century engraving in *L'abolition de l'esclavage* by Guy Fau
Distributed in Africa by CODESRIA
Distributed elsewhere by African Books Collective, Oxford, UK
Website: www.africanbookscollective.com

The Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) is an independent organisation whose principal objectives are to facilitate research, promote research-based publishing and create multiple forums for critical thinking and exchange of views among African researchers. All these are aimed at reducing the fragmentation of research in the continent through the creation of thematic research networks that cut across linguistic and regional boundaries.

CODESRIA publishes *Africa Development*, the longest standing Africa based social science journal; *Afrika Zamani*, a journal of history; the *African Sociological Review*; *Africa Review of Books* and the *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*. The Council also co-publishes *Identity, Culture and Politics: An Afro-Asian Dialogue*; and the *Afro-Arab Selections for Social Sciences*. The results of its research and other activities are also disseminated through its Working Paper Series, Book Series, Policy Briefs and the CODESRIA Bulletin. All CODESRIA publications are accessible online at www.codesria.org.

CODESRIA would like to express its gratitude to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY), the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Open Society Foundations (OSFs), Oumou Dilly Foundation, Ford Foundation and the Government of Senegal for supporting its research, training and publication programmes.

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	ix
<i>Preface to the English Edition: Ferocity of Whites, Ferocity of Capitalism</i> <i>Samir Amin</i>	xiii
<i>Preface to the French Edition: Gorée</i> <i>Louis Sala-Molins</i>	xxi
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxxiii
<i>About the Author</i>	xxxv
<i>Introduction</i>	1

I

The Exclusion of Non-Whites or the Institutionalisation of Barbarity

1. The Destruction of the American Indians	11
Atrocities a Little Less Repulsive	11
A Policy of Destruction	15
And Barbarity Becomes Entrenched	19
Remembrance Trampled Upon	23
2. The Annihilation of the Blacks	27
Very Similar Concentration Camp Settings	27
Blinding Similarities	29
Inevitable Destruction in the Concentration Camp Setting	34
Human Beings as a Commodity	42
The Role of the Victims	44
Prey for the Dogs	47
The Destruction of Families	48
A Well-oiled System	50
The Race of Masters and their Laws	54

3. Saint-Domingue	59
Saint-Domingue: Human Suffering at its Most Acute	59
A Predecessor and a Precedent	61
From the Champions of the Enlightenment to Saint-Domingue	64
The Conventionalisation of Atrocity	66
4. From one Continent to Another	69
A Consistent Pattern of Conduct	69
A Barbarity that Masquerades as Something Else	72
Terror Again	75
A Grisly Task	77
A Transformation that Knows no Confines	81
Manipulating History so as to Control Memory	84

II

The Ideological Weight of White Supremacy

5. From the Exclusion of Non-Whites to the Exclusion of Non-Aryans	91
Inferior and so Liable to be Exterminated	91
Conscientious, Incorruptible Scientists	95
From the Exclusion of Non-Whites to the Exclusion of Non-Aryans ...	96
Even under Nazi Rule, Germany did not Compare with the Congo or North America	99
Civilisation and Barbarity	103
6. Business Comes First	113
Anything Goes if there is Something to be Gained	113
Irresistibly Attractive Opportunities	117
If a Profit Can be made, it Can't Possibly be Bad	121
7. The Weight of Racist Ideologies	129
They Did not Know	129
Hitler was no Theorist	131
The Allies Trapped in their Tradition of Racist Domination	133
Considerations that Weighed Down Heavily on the Nuremburg Court's Statute	137
A Step to Counter Horror Seen from a Different Angle	141
The Reason they Had to be Exterminated	143

8. The United States, A Racist Tradition	147
A society that Excludes	147
Racial Violence, a Time-honoured Feature	152
Advancing Backwards	153
Legal Murders	155
At Last!	156
A Step Forward According to the Appeals Court	160
The Supreme Court of the United States Declares it is Willing to a Racial Discrimination in Death Sentencing	164
For a More Uniform Ethnic Structure	165
The Relentlessness of Prosecutors	170
Human Rights? Yes, But not for Everybody	173
9. The Consequences of Conventionalisation	181
Liable to be Exterminated at Any Time	181
Who are They?	186
The Victims of the Victims	192

III

Apartheid – A Crime against Humanity... But the Other One

10. When Nazism Becomes the Sort of Thing with Which one Can Associate	197
Very Common Commonplaces	197
Fervent Nazis who Meant Business	202
Former Nazis that you Can Associate with	203
No More Bickering	205
Zionists and Former Nazis – A Fascinating Partnership	206
Business is Business	209
Squabbles Quickly Patched up	210
11. Full Circle Back to the Exclusion of Non-Whites	215
The Exclusion of Non-Whites – an Acceptable Form of Segregation	215
Blacks, Therefore Sub-human	218
Oppenheimer Cannot Understand why the Blacks Want the “One Man, One Vote” Principle to be Applied	219
The limits of Non-violence in the Face of Barbarity	222
Civil Servants Doing their Work	224

12. Never Again! Well..., Not in Europe Anyway	229
A Prosecutor Worthy of the Third Reich	229
Preserving the Master Race	232
A Long and Difficult Struggle	236
An Inexhaustible Legacy	238
The Same Family	240
13. They did not Realize that Blacks are Humans	245
Ordinary Persecutors	245
A State Above the Law	248
Non-scientific Truths	254
Hitler's Posthumous Victory	258
The Credibility of Belated Indignation	259
<i>Conclusion</i>	263
<i>Bibliography</i>	269
<i>Index</i>	277

About the Author



Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe was born on 24 December 1951 in Montelíbano/ Colombia. She is a lawyer and essayist staying in France and writing in French. She denounces, through her historical revolutionary essays, white sovereignty, slave trafficking and indigenous massacres in colonies, in a controversial methodology, particularly criticized by some historians.

Towards the end of the 1970's, in Bogota, the capital of Colombia, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe was part of a so-called "Black Culture" group. This was where she became aware of the singularity of the position of Blacks in the history of mankind. Within an overall framework of economic domination, black workers undergo racial discrimination in addition to economic oppression. Black women, in addition to the discriminations above, also undergo gender discrimination.

For Rosa Amelia, colonialism has always been and continues to be a crime against humanity. Nazism is the negation itself of humanity; but other peoples, including Blacks, were denied that humanity well before its advent. "The Nazi policy was just the extension, on European territory, of the policy of enslavement hereto applied to other non-European peoples only."

Thus South Africa, in 1948, institutionalised (under the name of *apartheid*) what for Hitler had been only an ambition. Thanks mainly to the unfailing support of the major Western powers (United States, France and Great Britain), this crime against humanity continued for many years. It was also prolonged by the racist alliance formed between the apartheid regime and the Zionist state of Israel.

In 2001, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe's research and reflections over many years came to fruition with the publication of *La férocité blanche. Des non-Blancs aux non-Aryens : génocides occultés de 1492 à nos jours* (Albin Michel). Contrary to what had been anticipated, this publication was met with an embarrassed silence, a silence that was widely broken by word of mouth. A German version was published in 2004. At the same time, a number of pieces of academic and other research converged to assert as an axiom that the transatlantic slave trade took place because Africans had customarily since time immemorial dealt in the business of selling themselves to one another. So as to deconstruct this discourse and break down the prejudice it generates, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe published another work in 2008 under the title *Traite des Blancs, traites des Noirs : aspects méconnus et conséquences actuelles* (l'Harmattan) that focuses essentially on the following theme: a) starting in the seventh century, the Arab-Muslim slave traders changed a certain Africa into a supplier of slaves that were exported to the Muslim countries; b) the Europeans, who did not by any means put an end to the trade in slaves after Antiquity, continued to sell themselves to one another. Furthermore, as of the eighth century until the end of the Middle Ages, a certain Europe too was a supplier of slaves: Europeans were sold by other Europeans to merchants trading in slaves, who transported them to their Muslim buyers.

The demand for REPARATIONS for the crimes of black slave trading, slavery and colonial domination naturally triggered great hostility among the powers implicated in those crimes. Confronted by this rejection shared by all those that felt threatened by the very idea of REPARATIONS, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe embarked on the task of demonstrating the responsibilities of the players, the paymasters and the beneficiaries of the black slave trade and of slavery. These efforts led to the publication in 2012 of her book *Victimes des esclavagistes musulmans, chrétiens et juifs. Racialisation et banalisation d'un crime contre l'humanité* (Anibwé) which is a

contribution aimed at rectifying the fabrications and break the silences that have been built up around the topic of the black slave trade, slavery and colonial domination.

Following the criminal attacks which, beginning on November 13, 2015, struck terror and pain into us, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe, who by then was a grandmother, concerned with the safety of her children and grandchildren, developed her thoughts in a publication (2016) entitled *13 novembre 2015. Victimes innocentes des guerres (Anibwé)*. In this work intended for civil society at large and young people in particular, Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe analyses the causes and historical circumstances that have made civilian populations vulnerable and jeopardised everybody's security. She highlights elements that help to understand that in the new reality of the twenty-first century, the reciprocity of violence is such that military interventions in the South are no longer feasible without compromising the security of civilian populations in the North.

Since the publication of her first work in 2001, no sound argument has challenged the reality of the facts upon which Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe has founded her analysis, or the validity of her conclusions. She patiently, stone by stone, builds a different NORTH-SOUTH relationship.

Rosa Amelia Plumelle-Urbe has also contributed to several collective works such as *Esclavage, colonisation, libérations nationales* (L'Harmattan), *Déraison, esclavage et droit* (UNESCO), *Crimes de l'histoire et réparations : les réponses du droit et de la justice* (Bruylant, Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles), *200 years later* (Africavenir), *50 ans après, quelle indépendance pour l'Afrique* (Philippe Rey).

Introduction

There is a dynamic relationship between the destruction of the indigenous peoples of America, the annihilation of the Blacks and the policy of extermination introduced in Europe by the Nazis in the first half of the twentieth century.

In parts 1 and 2 of this work, it will become apparent that during the three and a half centuries of mass deportation and enslavement of Africans, one conspicuous feature stood out from the start, then developed and gradually became an element of culture. This was the eviction, the banishment of the Blacks from the human family, for which the white race became the golden standard on a planetary scale. To evict a group from the human family is to annihilate it. When a group is banished the victims are seen as belonging to a different species and the process of annihilating them can proceed in a climate of almost utter indifference. Eviction from the human race was a constant feature of the entire African/American genocide. But this abomination continued well beyond that genocide because it actually blazed the trail that later led to the annihilation of other human groups, including the victims of the Nazi policy of extermination.

The shift from the exclusion of non-Whites to the exclusion of non-Aryans was a process that spanned several centuries. During that time, a culture of annihilation – the corollary to the genocidal practice – grew and developed.

When the very same practices were introduced into Europe, the European cultural fabric had already integrated a well-structured discourse, supported by a frame of reference and stereotypes, accrediting the idea that inferior beings existed and could be annihilated. The widely accepted hierarchy of races and a sense of belonging to a superior group were part of the whites' collective consciousness. Their frame of reference had integrated the exclusion of human groups considered to be racially inferior. As such, the Nazis' overt racism and their calls for exclusion could not, as a matter of principle alone, generate hostility or be rejected in Germany or anywhere else in the Western world.

That is why the full thrust of Nazi propaganda centred on the “otherness” of the Jew, portraying him as a different and dangerous being that belonged to an inferior race. Although it was just theory, this discourse was sufficient to prevent first the Germans, and later many of the citizens in the countries occupied by Nazi Germany, from identifying in any way with the Jews who were persecuted, robbed, imprisoned and deported in an atmosphere of practically complete indifference. After 1945, some authors had the indecency to explain and sometimes justify this indifference under the pretence that no one could possibly imagine and hence know that these Jews – who were first outlawed from society, openly hunted down and stripped not only of their property but also of their dignity by being treated like livestock – would end up, at least those who were able to survive this horrendous ordeal, in gas chambers. This amounts to saying that, with the exception of the gas chambers, all the atrocities inflicted upon the Jews before were acceptable or at least tolerable!

In the third and last part of this work, it will become clear that not all crimes against humanity are apparently equally reprehensible nor do all victims deserve sympathy, far from it. One thing is the crime against European humanity in the setting of Europe itself. Thanks to the military defeat of its perpetrators, this crime was given a legal characterization and its victims recognized as such. The recognition turned that crime into the supreme crime, the crime of crimes. Another thing is the crime against the other humanity, the crime that took place outside and often far away from Europe. Those who fell prey to this crime lack both the power and the legal standing to be recognized as victims today, i.e. the status wielded by the victims of the Nazi genocides or their descendants.

We must remember a horrifying reality – post – 1945, when the Nazi episode came to a close, the same policy was applied elsewhere by former Nazis with the support of the allied powers, i.e. Germany’s former enemies. It is in this way that apartheid, a crime against humanity, became official in 1948 when the former pro-Nazi activists came into power in South Africa. Family squabbles were soon settled and normal racial business was quickly resumed, i.e., the exclusion of non-Whites, the only form of accepted and traditionally applied racial segregation until the Nazi adventure temporarily disturbed the routine.

It is important for the reader to remember that the relations of destruction and subservience established by the Europeans on the American continent were to determine the attitudes and relationships of

domination they imposed on all the other non-european peoples for centuries. It is commonly accepted that the desire to gain riches, i.e., the profit motive, took a great leap forward during the conquest of America. There was practically no limit to the power of money since it could be used to acquire honour, nobility, the hallmarks of dignity and respectability, public recognition and much more, all of which were already highly coveted in Western societies in the fifteenth century.

New concepts emerged and developed in pace with the new interests of the conquering countries. For instance, racial hierarchies were established to meet the ideological necessity of rationally, objectively, explaining the annihilation of other, non-white peoples in America, Africa or Asia, in any case in very remote places far, very far from Europe. In this way, while money had the power to elevate a great many causes, undertakings and situations, and to repress hesitations and misgivings, the profit – making motive itself slowly acquired a hitherto inexistent power of legitimation and justification in the mentalities of Western societies. Gradually, horror came to be measured using a hierarchy that mirrored the racial classifications established by Western doctrinaires and scientists.

Because this yardstick for differentiating crime became an integral part of the European cultural fabric, the response to barbarian deeds was inevitably restrained. Such deeds were assessed not on their face value but through the prism of what motivated their perpetrators.

When later they acquired the status of commentators and judges, how did Europeans see the atrocities they had committed? Well, historians, doctrinaires and writers defined these deeds as some of the “inevitable” collateral damage in any battle for power and riches. Consequently, those who committed these deeds, the perpetrators of the atrocities inflicted upon the victims of the conquest and of colonization from the end of the fifteenth century were never, even to the present day, ever referred to as “persecutors.” History books were to describe them as “ambitious” men, at worst greedy. Describing them as persecutors, loathsome beasts or monsters is never contemplated.

On the yardstick of atrocities, a persecutor and an ambitious man are two quite different categories. The monstrosities committed by a persecutor cannot be compared with the “excesses” or “blunders” of an enterprising man, although their deeds may be very similar in nature. In one case, we are dealing with barbarity that is inherently gratuitous, frightening, and

inexplicable which only a monster can perpetrate. In the other, we are dealing with deeds, which, although reprehensible and certainly unfortunate, are nonetheless explicable since their underlying motivation is the pursuit of profit. These are deeds committed by enterprising men who are willing to commit any crime and confront any danger as long as they anticipate deriving profit therefrom.

In the meantime, the profit-making motive gained recognition in Western societies. As the hierarchy of atrocities became entrenched and the profit-making motive acquired enormous power of justification and legitimation, Western historians came to describe the slave-trader who peddled human flesh as a man who,

“must combine the qualities of a sailor capable of ensuring the safe passage of a modest schooner over the 7,000 miles that have to be covered to twice cross the Atlantic ocean, with those of a businessman and an ambassador. He had to be clever in choosing trading posts, skillful in his relations with the African kings, firm and patient when bartering with the black brokers, cautious in transactions with the settlers and, in the event of unfortunate encounters, capable of putting up a fight with a hand gun, a sword, or even his bare fists.”¹⁷

In other words, he was a remarkable man in many respects.

Profit-making was presented as a mitigating circumstance when explaining the destruction of other peoples, and became a powerful form of justification in Western culture. This forced transformation of an ideological explanation into a standard, a truth that professes universality, formed the basis of a misunderstanding, which, in spite of the passing of time, still shapes mentalities and how knowledge is approached and interpreted. This is what perpetuates the ideological domination that enables the heirs of former persecutors to prevaricate and bend the interpretation of history to suit their own needs. So commanding is this domination that even the victims embrace what is often put forward as the only objectively valid interpretation of history.

The difficulty in adopting a more subtle approach is immediately apparent. A young woman to whom I was speaking about the unrecognized debt that white supremacy owes to deported Africans and their descendants in America that were forced into slavery replied (without a trace of hostility) that in this area responsibilities were shared because Africans had themselves contributed to hunting down and selling their own brothers. This begs the question of whether she would accept the idea of shared responsibility with Nazi Germany for the outrages committed in occupied

France because the collaborators eased matters for the Nazis? She – just as I do – construed the horrendous way in which the Nazi persecutors used their victims to speed up their own destruction as an aggravating circumstance, in contrast to the African victims whose contribution to their own destruction is construed as a circumstance that mitigates the responsibility of Europeans.

Western historians never fail to call attention to the fact that,

“it must be admitted that Africans were in part responsible for their own misfortunes. (...). Trade with the Whites brought wealth and power to Dahomey and the Ashanti community. (...) The entire trade (of human flesh) was in the hands of Africans who shrewdly played off the European powers one against the other, even entering into full-fledged treaties with them.”²

At a round table meeting dealing with “the need to do the work of remembrance,” a young man based himself on a first-hand account given by Simone Veil to explain the unforgettable trauma experienced by victims of Nazi barbarity and the necessity of remembrance, part of which is the recognition of their suffering. He read out a poignant passage of this account and we in the audience were highly stirred.

When the contributions came to an end, I called attention to the fact that in spite of the topic of the round table, the various presentations we heard had not once mentioned the destruction of the natives of America, nor the massive deportation of Africans and their banishment from the human species as non-Whites. I went back to the passage by Simone Veil which had clearly distressed the participants – a passage I was already familiar with since I had read it in the book by Jean-Michel Chaumont, *La Concurrence des victimes*:

“In addition to the awful trauma of the arrival, of the separation from the greater part of the convoy, the children and the older women and the men, we were spared no humiliation-tattooing, heads and body hair shorn, exposed naked for hours on the pretext of disinfection. Humiliation was permanent: clothed in rags, starved, exhausted by lack of sleep and gruelling hard labour, we felt we were losing our identity, that we were becoming sub-human.”³

The question I asked was: had anyone ever even once realized that for three and a half centuries in the concentration camp universe of America this indeed dehumanizing treatment was inflicted on a specifically targeted racial group, on millions of women, men and children merely because of their racial status. These people’s crime was that they were not White,

that they were non-Whites. Had any consideration been given to the trauma of these millions of men, women and children that were legally stripped, because they were black, of any human dignity and positively nailed into a state of sub-humanity that white supremacy perpetuated from one generation to the next through the centuries. I added that it was high time, at least in places of remembrance, to restore their humanity to the victims of white supremacy, for Nazi barbarity cannot be effectively condemned unless the barbarity against non-Whites that preceded and laid the foundations for it is itself formally and explicitly condemned.

Once more, I found myself in the minority. One of the speakers took the floor and, with the fine assurance of the righteous, explained to us composedly and impassively that there should be no mixing of apples and pears and one should only compare what is comparable. He took his time in explaining to us that the purpose of the Negro slave trade was not to kill the victims but to create monetary gain, the economic profit that derived from it, whereas the Nazis actually wanted the death and total destruction of their victims. He warned against the danger of playing down the Nazi atrocities, adding that one crime cannot justify another.

We had come round full circle and I was disappointed by this refrain I hear every time I attempt to explain to Western listeners that the Nazi barbarity was the extension of another barbarity – a European variation. To those Western humanists, even with the best intentions, who cannot live without the hierarchy of horror that satisfies the needs of white supremacy, I would like to say this:

“Stop considering a small part of this Earth as being the whole of the Earth, get rid of your time-honored tendency to believe that your own ideological constructions are universally recognized truths just because, as a result of being useful to you, they were unani-mously accepted amongst yourselves. Of course, might has always been right and so in spite of being a small minority, you had the power to define and impose on the remaining 80 % of mankind those interpretations that are best suited to your needs, cloaked in the mantle of objectivity and sometimes science. Take the famed profit-making motive. You bring it up at will to mitigate the gravity of the crime or even to dissolve it altogether. That is why for instance, in spite of clear evidence to the contrary, you have determined that the Nazis were not motivated by profit.”

I experienced this control over forms of expression at a round table on the slavery and the black slave trade in October 1998. I had spoken about

the “mass deportation of Africans as a crime against humanity.” When I returned to Paris, a history professor at the University of Orleans, very amicably suggested to me that “one should not use the word deportation in the case of the slave trade so as to avoid any misunderstandings.” I stared at him uncomprehendingly. He added that if I really felt that I could not forsake the word deportation in writing, then I should put it between quotes and insert a footnote specifying the connection with the slave trade. To justify his position, he went on to say:

“At the time of the slave trade, the word deportation was never used. History books and historians never use the word deportation in relation to the slave trade. Occasionally, the word importation or transportation is mentioned. The word deportation conjures up the deportations that took place in Europe under the Nazi domination and so it would be intellectually dishonest to misapply it.”

It dawned on me that we are not even allowed to call the most massive deportation of human beings in the history of mankind by its name, on the grounds that the slave traders, their descendants and their historians, at the time and ever since, never used and never authorized the use of the term deportation to characterize their doings. Are we seriously expected to follow suit simply because the perpetrators of these barbaric deeds preferred the use of euphemisms such as “trade”? This monopoly over words and their definitions is no accident. It is part of the process of manipulating history and maintaining control over its interpretation. Seen in this light the significance of legal characterization becomes strikingly obvious.

When Western historians – i.e. those who for centuries were the only ones in a position to write their history and ours – engage in research on Nazism, they very carefully sidestep the fact that Hitler simply revealed an already entrenched racist savagery that dated back well before the twentieth century, a racist savagery, a system for annihilating man which, until then, had been applied only to colonised peoples.

As for philosophers (needless to say, Western), after 1945, they set about convincing us that Nazism, Nazi Germany and the Nazi genocides cannot be understood using the conventional principles and criteria of Western philosophy. These more Cartesian than thou gentlemen enamoured of logic, cannot comprehend that because there was the genocide of American natives, because there was the mass deportation and enslavement of Africans, Auschwitz cannot be perceived from outside

Europe, by non–Europeans in the same way as it is in Europe by Europeans. And hence, while a European philosopher might wonder, in the wake of Auschwitz, “is thought still possible?” a descendant of deported Africans not remotely resembling a philosopher, might explain to the latter that Gorée, and moreover, Saint-Domingue did not disturb “philosophical thought” and so it should suffer no worse a fate from the atrocities that it quite happily lived with for as long as the victims were from latitudes very remote from those of “Philosophy.”

It is urgent and necessary for Blacks at least to be aware that the alleged difference that serves as the foundation for the paradigm shift when moving from the Afro-American genocide to the Nazi genocide is derived not from facts, but from their legal characterization and the status of the victims. Once that is accepted, it becomes perfectly clear to anyone in good faith that, in history, the definition and characterization of facts, together with their historical substance are a question of power.

The genocidal policies of European powers against Africans and their descendants in America lasted for as long as it was in the interests of the metropolitan powers to pursue them. For instance, rather than arising in relation to the victims of the genocide, the question of compensation arose in relation to those who perpetrated it. As it turned out, this aberration contributed importantly to developing a reductionist interpretation of the genocide.

In contrast, the genocidal policy of the Nazis lasted up to the point that Germany was defeated, when it was militarily crushed. In the final analysis, it was because its firepower was not up to the test that Germany found itself in the dock. This resulted in Germany having to pay the penalty for its policies, whereas we endured the same for centuries, without any of the guilty parties ever being bothered in any significant way. Thanks to this “circumstance,” i.e., the defeat of Nazi Germany, the issue of compensation did arise, but in this case for the victims of the genocide.

Notes

1. Crété, Liliane, *La Traite des nègres sous l’Ancien Régime*, Paris, 1989, pp. 63–64.
2. Ibid, p. 9.
3. Quoted by Jean-Michel Chaumont, *La Concurrence des victimes*, Paris, 1997 p. 27.