

An Urgent Warning To India

Copyright December 2002 Charles Savoie

This is addressed to all residents of the great country of India, and to those living elsewhere whose roots are in India. It is directed towards all Indians, but especially to those having influence, whether as business or government leaders or rank and file middle class. It is your duty to help yourselves, to help one another, and to help India, including the numberless poor who have no influence. Insofar as the subject matter is of interest and concern to anyone else, it is also for their consideration. This will be a brief review of the historical exploitation of India by other powers, notably by Great Britain and later by its chief partner, the United States. To those of you who are aware of all the following facts and many more not mentioned, I suggest you consider passing this on to others who aren't as well informed. After a review of some Indian history dating back many generations, it is intended that this information may serve as a background against which to consider how you wish the government of India to respond to desperate requests from British and American interests---or even demands, which will take place beginning in 2003. You see, India will be under diplomatic, political and economic siege from the West to dump hundreds of millions of ounces of silver scrap (jewelry, table ware, coins and other objects) at low offering prices to relieve a shortage apparently caused by bullion banks and a commodity users association. My purpose is not to detract from America procuring silver, but to urge that it do so by fair dealing---by allowing a free market in silver to balance supply with demand. This is only possible with higher prices. As the derivative conspiracy burns itself out, we need no Federal confiscation, no Executive Order price capping silver, and no nationalization of silver deposits---just let the free market work! However, need for silver will be overwhelming, and if India caves in to bullying,

browbeating, and threats of sanctions, it will find itself paying far higher prices to replace the silver. If you allow India to be made a charred ruin in this manner, the diseased ghosts of past injustices will have their way again.

LONDON---DECEMBER 31, 1600

Thousands of miles from India, on this date, action was undertaken in London which would cause undreamed of misery, suffering, hardship, and poverty to the people of the Indian subcontinent. This curse was to last for almost 350 years! On that date in the city the old Roman conquerors called Londinium, Queen Elizabeth I granted a royal charter to a globally minded band of businessmen who formed the British East India Company, which from that date through the year 1873 ransacked India and looted its people of many priceless objects. It would take another 74 years after that for India to become independent. The Indian Ocean and Far East trade was also called the armed trade, for when the looters failed to get what they sought after by cooperation, plundered it by force. Some earlier historical references are in order to place what was happening in perspective. Spain, who had been a fierce rival of Britain, sent its great naval armada to invade Britain in 1588. However, the British unexpectedly defeated the Spanish, because the large ships lacked the mobility of smaller English vessels, which were able to spread fire to the invading ships. This one event changed the face of global geopolitics for centuries to come. After this catastrophe for Spain, the British could truly say, "Britannia Rules the Waves." Spain, Portugal, England and France wished to colonize and conquer other regions of the world, but the British were far and away the most successful with the British Empire, later called the British Commonwealth of nations.

India was to remain under British domination until 1947--- for India, a nightmare slumber of centuries! The

Portuguese, deeply involved in the new world (Brazil) and the south Atlantic coast of Africa (Angola), were already in India before the British arrived. In due time the Portuguese were ousted because the British wanted no competitors. With the British the most imperialistic people of all history, one wonders if the Romans and Vikings left warring, exploiting and raiding genes in England. The Spanish also got to China before the British. In 1571 the Ming dynasty took China onto a silver standard for money, such silver having come from their spice and silk trade with the Spanish and the Conquistadors silver mines in Bolivia and Mexico. This was at the same time that Sir Francis Drake (1540-1596) was raiding Spanish treasure galleons on the high Atlantic seas on behalf of the British royal family. Maybe Drake's privateering wasn't so wrong, inasmuch as the Spanish mines were being worked with forced native labor. The competition with England for colonization of the world was the reason the Spanish sent their fleet to invade Britain in 1588.

BRITISH EXPLOITATION OF INDIA BEGINS

"There is nothing so bad that you will not find Englishmen doing it; but you will never find an Englishman in the wrong. He does everything on principle. He fights you on patriotic principles; he robs you on business principles; he enslaves you on imperial principles."---George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950), English dramatist.

Predating the similarly exploitative Bank of England by almost a full 94 years, the British East India Company launched an exploitative invasion of India and other regions, which was on a larger scale than all the pillaging of the Roman Empire. It was also highly active in China and what we now call Myanmar (British Burma, from which they

plundered great rubies and colored gems after 1830), Pakistan and the Persian Gulf in the west to China in the east and Indonesia to the south---a territory of millions of square miles! The company's ships first arrived in 1608 at the port of Surat. During 1615-1619 Sir Thomas Roe negotiated with Jahangir the Mughal Emperor for trade relations. Jahangir owned some 1.5 million carats of rubies, diamonds and emeralds---much of which was to be siphoned by the British Empire. Some of his titles, "Mirror of the Glories of God" and "Possessor of the Planets" seem to have been expropriated by ostentatious British Royalty. The British had already routed the Portuguese there in battle in 1612, and the East Indian spice trade, once the domain of Spain and Portugal, fell to the British, as the Portuguese were gradually eliminated from trade. The British gained trade concessions from the Mughal Empire over the years, and in 1717 the Company received exemption from duties paid in Bengal. In regions where the Company operated the condition of the people was worse than it had been under pure Mughal rule. One of many famines attributed to the greed of the Company took place in 1769-1770, during which one third of the population died of starvation. As Spanish soldier and author Miguel de Cervantes (1547-1616) said, "All sorrows are bearable if there is bread," in the famines the Indians had none. The extreme greed and exploitation of the British East India Company sounds like the comments of Gustavus Myers ("History of the Great American Fortunes," 1936, pages 196 and 201), in his comments on Marshall Field of Chicago, who exploited child labor in 11 countries---

"Boys and girls of tenderest age were mercilessly ground into dollars; their young life's blood dyed deep the fabrics which brought Field riches. He owned stocks and bonds in about 150 corporations, and he was a director of many. The history of many of them reeked with thefts of public and private money; corruption of common councils, of legislatures, Congress and of administrative officials; land

grabbing, fraud, illegal transactions, violence and oppression not only of their immediate workers, but of the entire population. He owned tens of millions of the stock of eighteen railroads. The affairs of these trusts have been shown in court as overflowing with fraud, the most glaring oppressions, and violations of law. That the company's profits were great at the very time the workers were curtailed to a starvation basis, there can be no doubt."

The British East India Company had the unique distinction of eventually ruling an entire country, and a very large one at that. The Indian Ocean was sometimes called the "British lake." Significantly, the Dutch East India Company was founded in 1602 to compete with the British, but the Dutch mainly sought out what we know as Indonesia where British activity wasn't as strong as in India. However, conflicts occurred.

HOW MUCH TERRITORY DOES BRITAIN WANT?

In 1652 the Dutch took South Africa from the Portuguese, only to have the British win the Boer War, 1899-1902, because Cecil Rhodes and Lord Alfred Milner (agents for Lord Rothschild in gaining the area's mineral wealth) and Field Marshall Earl Roberts wanted the gold and diamond mines in Transvaal and Orange Free State---actually Rhodes and Milner intended to seize Africa from Capetown to Cairo! Not to get too far afield from India, but to add breadth to the British passion for world domination, Lord Milner is said to have contributed 21 million rubles to the success of the Bolshevik Revolution which ended Czarist control of Russia ("Czarism and Revolution," 1962, Arsene de Goulevitch, former Russian general who moved to France where he founded the Union of Oppressed Peoples). Support also came from Milner's friends in New York. In 1928 Albert

Wiggin of Chase National Bank (director of over 60 corporations including Newmont Mining) teamed with Alvin Krech (37 directorships and member of Royal Thames Yacht Club, London) head of Equitable Trust in selling Bolshevik Bonds to their network, and made the difference of keeping the Bolsheviks in power! All these colonial powers were intent on elbowing the others out of the way because they all wanted an exclusive on the spoils and plunder. Centuries later the British and Dutch, including the Royal House of Nassau, would collaborate in huge scale business ventures including Royal Dutch Shell Petroleum, from a 1907 merger which allowed the resulting company to hold its own against Rockefeller and Mellon competition.

In 1661 military conflicts with Portugal were submerged because King Charles II married the Princess of Portugal, Catherine of Braganza. Charles gave the British East India Company authority to issue currency, erect forts and make war. In 1667 the British and Dutch signed a treaty to exchange Manhattan Island in the new world for Run Island in the Banda islands of Indonesia on the other side of the world, where upwards of 300,000 pounds of nutmeg was produced annually. To place things in perspective, nutmeg, as a key item in the centuries long spice trade, yielded profits of up to 60,000% (not a typo, that's sixty thousand percent---see "Nathaniel's Nutmeg" by Giles Milton, Penguin Books, 2000). So New Amsterdam became New York, after York, England. It's interesting to read about the wealthy Dutch and English families in New York and the facts as to how they collaborated as Robber Barons would make for far more interesting reading than you would imagine.

BEATING, BRIBING AND TRICKING INDIANS

Having settled matters with the Dutch on the high seas and in the Eastern hemisphere, the British East India Company went into high gear exporting Indian wealth back to merry old England---to the detriment of most Indians. India wasn't fully encompassed by the Mughal Empire; there were territories of independent and semi-independent principalities, and about 15 languages and hundreds of dialects. As British influence strengthened, the Mughal Empire faded. At the Battle of Plassey, June 23, 1757, Sir Robert Clive and his East India Company troops defeated the forces of Siraj, the Nawab of Bengal, who had been collaborating with the French. Mir Jafar, a political competitor of Siraj, assisted Clive in bribing many of Siraj's troops to surrender prematurely and, in some cases, to turn arms on their fellows. Sounds like the diabolically clever English king from "Braveheart," doesn't it? Apparently such tactics were part of British armamentarium for long centuries and they may have learned it from the Romans. At this battle in 1757 the British East India Company is reckoned as having secured what became ultimate control of India and domination over its inhabitants. Native princes gradually came under British "supervision".

The Company, of course, owned immense tracts of land and Clive took over areas claimed by the French. Clive also won rights to collect taxes in Calcutta and the Bengal region. There was an incident in 1756 which was widely heralded in Britain as totally factual, but which has had major holes poked in it afterwards. The "Black Hole of Calcutta" item happened after Siraj took over Fort William and Calcutta---a focal point of British activity. 146 British were said to have been captured, then stuffed into a locked dungeon cell, which was way too small to safely contain them. Upon opening the door the following morning 123 were said to have died from suffocation or crushing, based on the account of a survivor, John Holwell. Indian scholars later showed that Siraj wasn't on hand at the time, and that only 69 prisoners were in the dungeon. The account was

probably embellished well beyond what happened, but was widely circulated and used to depict Indians as cowardly, vicious and evil---a people who had to be ruled over. Never mind that the British were trespassing by force! Holwell might have used a line from Star Trek ("A Taste of Armageddon," February 23, 1967) had it been available to him---

"Millions of people horribly killed; disaster, disease, starvation, horrible, lingering death, pain and anguish!"

Ironically such expressions would have better described what happened to Indians at British hands, especially in an economic sense. But by no means was physical savagery omitted---not surprising since at one time hundreds of petty offences were punished by hanging in Britain, where drawing and quartering was also made a consummate devil's art. The battle of Wandiwash in 1760 ended French aspirations in India, and the British East India Company increased its spy network. In 1773 the India Bill of Lord North became law and placed India under the rule of a Governor-General (later a Viceroy) and increased the involvement of Parliament in the British East India Company, and in 1784 Pitts India Act made the British East India Company an official arm of the British government. Doubtless no difference before or after was perceptible to the Indians.

CORNWALLIS---FOE OF U.S. AND INDIA

Warren Hastings became the first Governor-General of India, and was succeeded in 1786 by General Cornwallis until 1793. This was the same Cornwallis who fought so hard to keep the American colonies under control of the British Crown, but was cornered by George Washington and his men at Yorktown on October 19, 1781. His plan seemed

to be, if you fail to maintain British control of one part of the world, go elsewhere and do so. His administration featured among other activities all intended to solidify British control, the Mysore war. To you Americans reading this---take note, we had an oppressor in common with India! For the next 50 years, the British systematically eliminated Indian rivals. In 1806 the mutiny at Vellore (incited by British interference with Muslim head gear and Hindu caste marks) was brutally put down, in the same style as that of Lord Wellesley, Governor-General after Cornwallis. (The designation Governor-General apparently came from Roman Britain, see for instance the 1966 film "The Viking Queen" in which a Roman Governor-General named Justinian defeats the natives). Wellesley pursued violent wars against Indians, and relentlessly expanded areas controlled by the Company and the Crown. In fact he doubled the revenue of the Company and later became British Foreign Minister. His younger brother, very significantly was the Duke of Wellington, the British commander who defeated Napoleon in 1815! From 1796-1805 the younger Wellesley campaigned in India, defeating native efforts at self-governance. (As with Dalhousie University, Wellesley College in Boston appears to bear the ancestral name).

In 1815 the British East India Company ran the Dutch out of Ceylon, the large island at the southern tip of India---an island with a fabulous history of producing untold millions of carats of colored gems. During the period 1817-1819 the Maratha faction, the most challenging fighters the British faced, was finally put down. During 1813-1822 Nepal was conquered. (Nor was Britain inactive elsewhere. In 1821 Sierra Leone, Gambia and the Gold Coast were amalgamated to form British West Africa, a tremendous source of diamonds and gold). James Mill, at the helm of the British East India Company from 1819-1835 expressed the view in his "History of British India" that Britain should rule over India. He felt, however, that it should first attempt to do so by obtaining their "cooperation," and that if the

British were attacked, they should then defeat and subjugate the Indians. What a position! If you want to take over a neighbor's property (upon which you are already encamped by force), ask his cooperation. Then, if he tries to use force to make you depart, beat the hell out of him and take over his property---he'll be better off for it! As a happy Englishman declared in a letter to the London Examiner, 29 August 1857---

"We owe our foreign dominions to our greatness, not our greatness to our foreign dominions. It is a marvelous tale to tell that in the short period of a century, we should have been able to achieve the conquest of many strange countries six times as populous as our home empire."

INDIA, PAKISTAN AND CHINA VICTIMIZED

Beginning in the 1830's English was used as the sole educational language in schools. The use of English in newspapers and magazines contributed to the increase of nationalistic sentiment among Indians. Farther east, In China, the Opium War of 1839-1842 was won by the British, and in addition to the tea, silk and spice trade, millions of Chinese were forced to become Opium addicts to bring more wealth to Britain. Behar province of India was called the "Garden of India" by the British due to opium cultivation (The Economist, London, 19 September, 1857). In April 1848 a battle between the British and the Sikhs culminated with the annexation of the kingdom of Punjab to British India. Dalip Singh, teenage son of the deposed ruler, Maharajah Ranjit Singh, was exiled by the Bengal army to Uttar Pradesh province and was forced to convert to Christianity. In 1849 (when Pakistan was added to British possessions) the British East India Company took the great Koh-I-Noor ("mountain of light") diamond, some 186 carats,

from Dalip Singh, although it was supposedly his "gift" to Queen Victoria, to whom it was presented in 1850 to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the founding of the Company.

Dalip Singh later embraced his ancestral religion, another suggestion that his alleged gift of the great diamond (whose history dated to 1304) to the Queen was more along the lines of a theft from him; it once resided in the Sikh royal jewel chamber at Lahore, capital of Punjab, where it was set as one of the eyes of the peacock throne of Shah Jehan.

Other sources straightforwardly state that the gem was taken as "partial indemnity for the Sikh wars." The stone, recut to less than 110 carats for more brilliance, now resides in the British Crown jewels in the Tower of London. This was only one of many world-class diamonds taken by the British from India. Offer to return any of them---you must be crazy! Another such stone was the Pitt diamond, taken from a slave in the Golconda region in 1701, and later owned by William Pitt (Pitts India Act author), who was also a British Prime Minister. Fort Pitt, named after him, became Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Pitt later sold the gem to the Duke of Orleans in 1717 for about \$650,000, and the 140-carat diamond is still on display in the Louvre Museum, Paris.

SYSTEMATIC FORCED DOMINATION OF INDIA

Lord Dalhousie, who became Governor-General of India in 1847 contrived the "doctrine of lapse" which stated that a native state was to be annexed to British India if there was no male heir upon the death (assassination?) of its ruler.

This doctrine was used to annex principalities including Atara; Nagpur; Jhansi and Hyderabad. In the Deccan region alone this "lordly" gentleman dispossessed nearly 20,000

landholders. In 1856 a region was annexed on the grounds that its ruler was "indifferent to the welfare of his subjects." What it came down to was, doctrines of British annexation were concocted and amended as needed for the pretext of bringing all of India under Crown control. When you control the game, you make up the rules as you go! Annexation of more regions went hand in glove with railway expansion carried out by Dalhousie (apparently Dalhousie University at Halifax, Nova Scotia, bears his ancestral family name, then the next thing you wonder about is connections to the British run Bank of Nova Scotia, its Scotia-Mocatta metals division, and talk of secretive silver derivatives!)

British disrespect of Hindu customs was a major factor in the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. Indian soldiers, called sepoys, under British commanders were forced to eat cow and pig fat---offensive to Hindu and Muslim inhabitants alike. The rebellion failed in part due to Indians being fragmented between Hindu and Muslim factions whereas the British were a perfect picture of organization. Queen Victoria was then gifted with an additional title, "Empress of India." Meantime, in British India, protestors and those suspected of sedition and treason were imprisoned without trial. The pretense of a trial was unnecessary since that too would have been rigged. Periodic famines occurred, as in 1874-1876 due in part to the Company seizing harvests. The Illustrated London News, May 2, 1874, has a cover depiction of the Indian famine. The British in retaliation for the uprising nixed a plan for a medical school in Punjab. Another motivation for Indian unrest was the fact that they were barred from the best jobs in the Indian Civil Service, and paid less than English counterparts for doing the same tasks. In 1858 Emperor Bahadur Shah was put on trial for sedition and treason to the Crown, and that marked the termination of the Mughal Empire in India.

SOME GOVERNOR GENERALS AND VICEROYS

Let's consider who some of those Englishmen were, their deeds, and their connections. As of 1858 the Governor-General also was the Viceroy (literally, the man in charge of India on behalf of the British Crown, or someone functioning in place of the king). Lord Amherst became Governor-General in 1823 and immediately declared war on the Burmese. On May 11, 1824, Rangoon was captured, and this led to a complete British takeover. In 1828-1833 the Governor-General was Lord William Cavendish-Bentinck, an ancestor of contemporary mega-billionaire, Gerald Cavendish Grosvenor, the Duke of Westminster, who owns over 300 acres of the choicest property in the Mayfair and Belgravia districts of London as well as immense tracts of land in Canada, Hawaii, Australia and elsewhere---spoils of the British Empire going back for centuries. His wife Natalia makes Leona Helmsley look like a garbage foraging derelict living under a bridge! His family also has a stake in the National Westminster Bank with over 100,000 employees.

You see, there's money to be made in colonialism, imperialism, and empire building! The Earl of Auckland was GG in 1836-1842 (yes, think Auckland, New Zealand!) The Marquess of Lansdowne, Viceroy of India in 1888-1893, earlier served the Crown as GG of Canada from 1883-1888.

His relative, the 4th Earl of Minto (whose family was intermarried with the Astors), was GG of Canada beginning in 1898 and Viceroy of India from 1905-1910. The Earl of Minto added to British Empire efforts during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877, the Afghan War of 1879, the British occupation army in Egypt in 1882, and raised Canadian volunteers for the Sudan campaign of 1884. The GG of India during 1880-1884 was the Marquess of Ripon, whose father was British Under Secretary for the Colonies as of 1809 and took part in plans for the War of 1812 on America.

In 1859 the GG to be became Under Secretary of State for War, due to his support for the Crimean War (1853-1856) against the Russian Czars. In 1861 he was promoted to Secretary of War, a post he held into 1865. During this time he supervised outfitting of Confederate warships in English shipyards. It should come as no surprise that Britain was keenly intent on seeing a separate nation and military power established in their former American colonies, with the intent of eventually retaking all the territory.

Confederate General Joseph E. Wheeler became deeply involved with British money powers, and played a role in implementing the imperialistic wills of Cecil Rhodes at the end of the 19th century and as the 20th century started. Ironically he joined ranks with the same class of Northern industrialists and financiers who defeated the South, for their sympathies were also with the English ruling class. The Marquess of Ripon ("Ripoff") implemented the Criminal Procedure Amendment bill in 1883, which insured Englishmen superior rights in the Indian court system. This naturally caused a backlash, and the GG acted as if Indians were behaving unnaturally. After his tenure in India, Ripon became Liberal leader in the House of Lords in 1906. Since Canada has been mentioned, it's appropriate to point out that the biggest Canadian banks---Royal Bank of Canada, Toronto-Dominion Bank and Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce; all have names reflecting the heritage of domination of the country by the British royal family.

SOME QUOTATIONS FROM THE 1800's

In Living Age, New York, October 10, 1857, page 115, we note an account of British conduct in India---

"We were told of porters pressed by the thousands to carry a Governor General's baggage, and then unpaid---of

cultivators dragged from their fields, along with their carts and bullocks, to convey the baggage and stores of the army, and so taken hundreds of miles, often without any remuneration, till their bullocks died on the road and their carts had fallen to bits---of men detained in this way months and sometimes years from their homes, and then finding on their return their wives in the keeping of the officials who had pressed them---and of organized debaucheries on the part of the governing class calculated to drive the dart deep into the native's soul. The regiment has been notorious for its outrages and infamies. All who have studied Indian questions must have long since observed that it is not on the perpetrators of abuses, but on the exposers of them that the East India Directors have always hurled their bolt."

The North American Review, April 1858, page 514, noted, "the Hindoos have been regarded as no better than a race of demons." That is, they were so depicted by British home propaganda, while this article more to the point commented that the British East India Company operated under "a cloak of darkness" and maintained a "despotic rule" under which it carried out "oppressive and cruel extractions." Continuing, on page 515 we read,

"No fear of retribution could restrain that rapacious oligarchy, always sustained as they have been by the English nobility, whose sons they enabled to accumulate fortunes in a few years, and whose ill-gotten treasure---the money wrung by fraud and torture from rich and poor---has continually been pouring into England."

If you don't favor people coming into your country and taking valuables by force, you are a race of demons---in the British view! In "The English In India" by Thomas Knox, Harpers New Monthly Magazine, March 1879, we read on page 575---

"John Bull never wearies of talking of the mission of England in the East to carry civilization and Christianity to benighted lands, and extend the blessings of commerce. But the blessings aforesaid result in putting money into John's pocket and taking it away from those whom he seeks to benefit. In the interests of civilization he does not hesitate to make war on people who prefer to remain undisturbed, and to scatter the blessings of commerce he invades China, captures her fairest city, and compels her government to rescind an edict against the importation of a poison that was killing many thousands of its subjects every year. 'It was absolutely necessary for us to have a market for our opium,' said an Englishman with whom I once discussed the Opium War, 'India would have become bankrupt without it, and we could not allow China to close her ports to the drug.'"

(John Bull was a generic name for Englishmen, like Johnny Reb for Southern Confederates). It must be reminded to the reader at this point that the Hong Kong & Shanghai Bank, now HSBC, was Britain's opium finance house for China, and that HSBC is today a Silver Users Association member---let India beware! The North American Review, March 1897, page 272, featured statements made by British imperialist Sir Edwin Arnold, Knight Commander of the Indian Empire and Companion of the Star of India concerning what he called the---

"Conscientious rule which effectively justifies our presence in India, which makes our Raj there a fact welcome to humanity and to civilization."

The term Raj meant rulership, and the article title was "The Famine In India," which the British gave some relief to, after their exploitative policies helped to cause it!

INDIA CONTINUED DREAMING OF FREEDOM

Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948) meaning "great soul," became the greatest Indian leader of modern times. He served in the British medical corps as a stretcher-bearer during their takeover of Dutch mineral assets in South Africa, a rather ironic fact in light of the fact that the British imprisoned him from 1922-1924 for inciting Indians to boycott payment of taxes on farm implements. He was rebuffed by Lord Milner, Governor of Transvaal, when on May 22, 1903, he led an Indian delegation protesting economic mistreatment of Indians there. The film biography of his life, "Gandhi" (1982) is highly rated. The Indian Association, founded in 1885, became the Indian National Congress, Gandhi's political organization and the focal point of Indian nationalism. However, due to religious differences, the minority Muslim League was also on the scene as of 1906, and the British used their differences to obstruct the movement towards independent statehood. Lord Curzon, British Viceroy of India from 1898-1905, viewed Indians as inferior and denied them representation. Curzon was a member of Parliament (1886-1898). While ruling India he partitioned Bengal in such a way as to favor the Muslim minority, his intent seeming to be to purposefully provoke the Hindu majority. He became leader of the House of Lords (1916-1924) and was a member of the British War Cabinet (1916-1919). His remark following the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, which he attended as British Foreign Secretary, indicates he knew full well the intent of the punitive Treaty of Versailles was to gall Germany into launching another war---"It is not a peace treaty, it is simply a break in hostilities."

INFAMOUS MASSACRE AT AMRITSAR

In 1919 an English missionary woman claimed she was molested on the street, whereupon General Reginald Dyer ordered his troops to force many Indians to crawl down that street on their hands and knees. He also gave the nod to random, indiscriminate whipping of Indians by British policemen. Crowds of Indians assembled to protest the harsh treatment, and also to express concern over the Rowlett Act, which gave the British occupiers "emergency powers," as if they hadn't had those already. General Dyer marched at the head of a contingent of his troops and ordered machine-gunners to open fire. As bullets struck protestors in the middle of the crowd, they ran to the sides of the square, where the gunfire followed them. Those who dove to the ground were also shot. The firing continued for at least eight minutes, only ceasing when ammunition was exhausted. The result was 379 Indians dead and some 1500 wounded. General Dyer told superiors he had put down a "revolutionary army" and that he was "obliged to teach a lesson to the Punjab." He was immediately promoted to major general but soon retired to England, where he was hailed---get this---as a "martyr" to millions of cheering Englishmen! The House of Lords passed a measure commending him, and readers of the Tory Morning Post took up a collection for him. Illustrating to what fantastic depths hypocrisy can plunge, Dyer was given a jewel-encrusted sword inscribed with the ironic tribute, "Saviour of the Punjab." Winston Churchill in a speech before the House of Commons on July 8, 1920, though somewhat critical of Dyer, said he was "not disgraced."

INDIAN SACRIFICES DISREGARDED

India made colossal sacrifices for Britain and the Allies in both World Wars. The Montagu Declaration in 1917 offered mere token independence for India, to the galling dismay of

the Indians. The British continued to resist the idea of allowing India to be ruled by Indians. Several hundred thousand Indian soldiers fought in WWI, and many thousands of names of those who perished on far-flung battlefields are inscribed on the War Memorial at the India Gate in New Delhi. Over 2 million Indian soldiers fought with the Allies in WWII, and that while British statesmen, including Winston Churchill while in the British War Cabinet, were stalling Indian efforts at self-governance. Historian Patrick French in the August 25, 1997 issue of Outlook magazine documented Churchill's racist view of Indians. In 1942 with the war raging, the Indian National Congress adopted the "Quit India" ("Leave India") resolution, whereupon its leaders were arrested. Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964), who was educated in England and first met Gandhi in 1916, and took part in the Non-Cooperation movement, founded in 1920, and was beaten along with others when one of many British instrumentalities of control (the Simon Commission---remember the game "Simon Says") was protested. Other Indian protests took place over the years, such as the Salt March in 1930, protesting the British monopoly on salt. Nehru was among those jailed by the British in 1942 after the Quit India resolution was made. Nehru persisted in his efforts on behalf of his homeland, and became the first Prime Minister of free India when the British relented in 1947. However, some hold the view that British control merely lessened and became covert. Lord Mountbatten, who was the last British Viceroy of India, was also the Allied Supreme Commander for Asia in WWII. Before leaving they partitioned the Muslim minority into Pakistan, while the Hindu majority retained India proper. The Pakistanis and Indians promptly engaged in combat in 1948, and had larger scale battles in 1965 and 1971. Tensions have remained high over the disputed region of Kashmir in the high Himalayas.

INDIAN SELF-DEFENSE FROWNED UPON

India's first test of a thermonuclear device in 1974 met with condemnation from Britain and its partner, the United States. In 1998, when India conducted 5 nuclear tests, the Clinton administration (note---a British Rhodes scholar) sanctioned India in disapproval. Nor was British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook silent---he too lambasted India for improving its self-defense capabilities. India leads its ancestral rival, Muslim Pakistan, by several dozen nuclear warheads. I see no difference between that situation, except one of scale, and that of the wild west of American history. If the bad guy had a six-gun, you better have a six-gun also. It may be conceded that right and wrong exist on all sides (Sikh-Muslim-Hindu), but as a practical reality India's motivation for self-preservation is eminently understandable. Why have Britain and the United States denounced India for desiring nuclear capability when their rival has it? Why should Clinton have granted Most Favored Nation status to China while sanctioning India? The matter of denunciation of Pakistan also on the same grounds cannot change the reality of Indian wishes for military security. In 1959 the Dalai Lama fled Tibet to India after the Chinese Red takeover of his homeland. Additionally, the Indo-Chinese border war in the Kashmir-Tibet region during October-November 1962, which China won and has held onto 15,000 square miles seized, is proof enough that India has more extensive security concerns than Pakistan alone. Pakistan has been the recipient of Chinese technology, and is often viewed as a surrogate antagonist of India for China. In April 1965 Pakistani tanks entered India, and the battles continued into the fall, then in late 1971 other battles took place between the ancient rivals. The New York Times (a media outlet favorable to British interests) condemned India as having "no sense of restraint" with regard to nuclear

weapons ("South Asia's Hair Trigger," June 4, 2002). However, New Jersey Congressman Frank Pallone took the Clinton administration to task for sanctioning India over nuclear tests in his remarks on the floor of the House on May 12, 1998---

"India shares a 1,000 mile border with China, a nuclear armed Communist dictatorship that has already launched a border war against India and maintains a large force on India's borders. China maintains nuclear weapons in occupied Tibet, on India's borders, and also maintains a military presence in Burma, another neighbor of India. China has been proven to be involved in the transfer of nuclear and missile technology to unstable regions, including Pakistan, a country that has been involved in hostile actions against India for many years; and China has conducted some 45 underground nuclear tests over the years. Mr. Speaker, I bring out these facts to help put India's action this week into perspective, to try to explain to my colleagues here and to the American people the background for India's decision to conduct these tests. I know that India's action has been met with widespread criticism, including from our own administration, but India's decision to test a nuclear explosive device should be understood in the context of the huge threat posed by China."

On the eve of British imperialist indoctrinated Rhodes scholar President Bill Clinton's 2nd summit with the People's Republic of China, Florida Senator Connie Mack remarked in the Senate---

"It is hard for me to imagine that the President would reward inappropriate actions by the Chinese Communist Party leaders while sanctioning the democratic leaders in India."

Actually India was invaded by Chinese long before these accounts, at the behest of Lord Elgin, who became Britain's

Opium ambassador to China in 1857 (from The Economist, London, 19 September, 1857)---

"As the Chinese troops accompanied by Lord Elgin himself were arriving in the Ganges it was no longer in any way needful to trust any section of the untrustworthy Bengal army."

DISRESPECTING INDIAN ARTIFACTS

India Today, March 8, 1998, featured an article concerning priceless cultural and historical artifacts illegitimately removed from India. Requests for return of those valuable items have been disregarded. In a March 1999 exhibition in London of paintings, weapons and jewelry "loaned" by the Queen, treasures stolen from India during the centuries long British occupation of India were displayed. This of course hit raw nerves among many Indians. I mentioned earlier that India was the source of many great diamonds. India would like these to be returned, but it seems a distant possibility. Diamonds from India which more appropriately belong as their national treasures, in addition to those already mentioned---but which reside elsewhere include the Nepal Pink (79 carats), the largest flawless fancy pink diamond in existence, owned in recent years by London jeweler Laurence Graff; the Wittelsbach (35 carats, steel blue); the Indian Blue (30 carats, steel blue, in the Smithsonian Museum); the Hope (45 carats, steel blue, in the Smithsonian, once owned by King George IV of England); the light blue 70 carat Idol's Eye, once owned by the Sheikh of Kashmir; the Orloff, 189 carats, in the Russian Diamond Fund; and the Dresden Green (40 carats), in the Albertinum Museum at Dresden, Germany---the largest green diamond in existence. Marcus Moses, a London jeweler who presented it to King George I in 1722, originally removed it from India. Still another great treasure was the 90-carat

Briquette of India, which came into the ownership of Eleanor of Aquitaine, Queen of England and mother of Richard the Lionheart, Plantagenet King of England, who ruled from 1189-1199. Richard left Britain in 1189 as leader of an expeditionary force of 8,000 men and 300 ships. This was the Third Crusade to the Holy Land, in which he captured Cyprus and other territories and concluded a (temporary) treaty with the great Arab leader, Saladin. It seems likely the great diamond owned by his mother came by way of the Second Crusade, the purpose of which was not merely to provide access to the Holy Land for Christian pilgrims, but primarily for the purpose of looting as much treasure as possible. A more recent report holds the stone's history isn't so ancient, but was cut in Paris in 1908-1909. However the original accounts are likelier to be correct as the briquette style is ancient, and the stone was probably re-cut (touched up) to make it more brilliant, as with the Koh-I-Noor.

Other nations are similarly aggrieved, such as Greece. The 7th Earl of Elgin (Thomas Bruce, ironically a descendant of Scottish hero Robert the Bruce), who was appointed British ambassador to Ottoman Turkey in 1799, removed himself to Athens in advance of impending hostilities with the Turks, and spent the years 1801-1804 removing over half the ancient sculptures from the Parthenon. Efforts by Greece continue to this moment to recover those sculptures. The question has been asked concerning those priceless sculptures, how would the English feel if Greeks had removed all of Stonehenge to Athens, and were refusing to return such a national treasure? His son, James Bruce, the 8th Earl of Elgin, was governor of Jamaica colony 1842-1846, then GG of Canada, 1847-1854, and became British ambassador to China in 1857---probably to oversee the opium trade---then became the Viceroy of India in 1862-1863. The 9th Earl of Elgin was also Viceroy of India, 1894-1899.

BHOPAL DISASTER---HELL ON EARTH!

Union Carbide Corporation, a member of the Silver Users Association, which since merged with Dow Chemical, another Silver Users Association member, had a chemical plant at Bhopal. During the night of December 3, 1984, 27 tons of methyl isocyanate gas leaked from the pesticide plant. The ensuing cataclysm of deaths and disabilities is called the "Hiroshima of the chemical industry" by some, and the designation is appropriate. Over 550,000 disabling injuries and diseases relating to compromised immune system functioning---chemical AIDS, and 16,000 to 20,000 deaths, several thousand within hours and over 7,000 within days of the toxic exposure, are recorded. Additionally, the water table of the vicinity is contaminated by trichloroethylene to the alleged extent of over 45 times EPA allowable standards in the U.S. Bhopal remains possibly the most toxic hot spot on earth. Attempts were made to extradite Warren Anderson, a Union Carbide executive, to India, but failed. The Indian Supreme Court fined the company \$470 million which it paid, but there are allegations that all the funds have not been disbursed. Some 550,000 claims are extant. When the company paid the settlement, its stock went up \$2, and in its 1989 annual report the claim is made that Bhopal only cost 43 cents per share. Most corporations have no more than 100 million shares authorized, so if they paid \$470 million, it would have cost \$4.70 per share---nearly 11 times the claimed amount. Was someone using fuzzy math? Or did India just receive part of the funds? It would be interesting to know, since aggrieved parties claim the funds weren't all disbursed.

A bureaucracy overseas is said to be impeding settlements with victims, and many apparently have died while waiting. Victims continue to suffer from nausea, fever, birth defects, brain damage, cancer and numbness of limbs. According to

Bhopal.net, November 14, 2002, secret Union Carbide documents reveal that the company used "unproven technology in Bhopal. It knew the risks---and took them--- in a cold-blooded decision that ended up costing 20,000 lives." An internal Union Carbide memorandum is shown dated December 2, 1973, showing that company officials, including Warren Anderson, knew of design defects and safety issues. A "savage programme of cost cutting" was ordered including routinely shutting off the refrigeration system necessary to safely contain the lethal gas. The website claims the cost of freon gas saved per day was only \$37.68! A film was finally made in 1999 called "Bhopal Express," in which company officials in the U.S. were scrambling to distance themselves and the corporation from responsibility. One of the executives says,

"The saving grace is that it happened in a third world country. Here, a life would cost \$25,000. There, it's worth \$250!"

I suppose if General Dyer who ordered the Amritsar massacre in 1919 had been at Bhopal in 1984, he would have opened fire on the wheezing Indians staggering from the noxious fumes! It has been widely pointed out that when Dow Chemical and Union Carbide merged, Dow also acquired legal liabilities including asbestos suits, and that it already had troubles of its own, such as dioxin! Allegedly as far back as 1954 Dow and Union Carbide both knew that vinyl chloride were carcinogens, yet continued to market it as aerosol propellant. Attorney William Baggett Jr. charged vinyl chloride producers with commercial conspiracy. Dow Chemical made Dursban, a neurotoxin. According to the U.S. Centers for Disease Control, every living person in the United States has a trace of Dursban in their blood. I remember spraying it in my backyard years ago as a pest control, and its peculiarly disquieting odor!

Another Silver Users Association giant, Du Pont, allegedly knew in the 1970's that chlorofluorocarbons it produced were destroying the atmospheric ozone layer, thereby giving rise to a sharp increase in malignant melanoma---skin cancer---probably the deadliest of the rapidly metastasizing cancers. A decade later, Du Pont was still producing this chemical. Earlier they were known as "merchants of death" for gunpowder production in many wars including both World wars. Evidently there are other ways of killing than with gunpowder. They know about it in Bhopal. A jury award reported by CNN on October 28, 1995, in the amount of \$3.9 million, against defendant Dow Union Carbide, was made in a silicone breast implant case. The Charleston, South Carolina Gazette, October 25, 2002, reported the story of Union Carbide being found negligent in providing a safe work environment for employees handling asbestos fibers---a practice they were found guilty of from 1945-1980. Both the consuming public and their own employees have often been at risk---especially at Bhopal---but to see how far their intent possibly reached, consider the following item! The Houston Chronicle, August 16, 2002 featured a story about "dead peasant" life insurance. Dow was being sued for taking secret life insurance policies on employees---presumably those in closest proximity to hazardous chemicals---and keeping the proceeds when the workers died! This is the company that merged with Union Carbide, which grievously wounded India with the Bhopal incident! Other companies being sued in connection with so-called "dead peasant" covert life insurance policies include Wal-Mart (lots of Chinese goods there); SBC Communications (is climbing phone poles hazardous, and being around high voltage, you might suppose); Golden Corral, a mass market restaurant chain---and guess who else---JPMorganChase! Defending against the "dead peasant" suits is the powerful Houston law firm of Baker & Botts. Daryl Bristow, a member of the defending legal team, was the litigator who represented George Bush in the contested vote counting suit in Florida. When the favors were called in at the Supreme

Court in the persons of Justices appointed by Bush Sr. during the earlier Bush administration, the son gained the White House.

Something else you should know about Union Carbide---at the time of the Bhopal disaster, one of its directors was James M. Hester---a Rhodes scholar who later became rector of U.N. University in Tokyo and a Lehman Foundation trustee. No Englishman ever lived was more imperialistic than Cecil Rhodes who by way of his Rhodes scholars said, "I am on the lookout for those who will do the governing of the nations in the years that are to come." (Review of Reviews, May 1902, page 558). Rhodes also spoke of a British led plan in collaboration with American interests who would complete a world take-over within 200 years "by the best souls" and that part of the plan included "the seizure of the wealth necessary" (page 557). I submit that the British Empire seized wealth from nearly all parts of the world for centuries; that India and China were principal victims; and that American and British interests want by some means to seize India's silver in the forthcoming Great Silver Crisis.

PROFIT & CONTROL BY FORCE IS WRONG

Nothing I've said is intended as a swipe at the British people per se. It's their leadership which needs a sweeping change.

The same could be said for America. It's undeniably clear that the ruling class of Britain has sought world domination for over 1,000 years. They probably inherited that tendency from the Romans. In the decades following Britain's loss of the American colonies, various attempts have been made to undermine this country, including the War of 1812, the Civil War, but the Federal Reserve System in 1913 made further invasion unnecessary! Many organizations exist for the purpose of uniting America and Britain in a world

government, with the United Nations as their current flagship. It is no coincidence that America and Britain--- Bush and Blair---are acting nearly as Siamese twins over the Iraq situation. Massive evidence exists that Britain involved America in both World Wars in order to preserve and expand their Empire, which was becoming shaky. The remarks of Representative Jacob Thorkelson of Montana in the Congressional Record of August 19, 1940 are instructive---

“No country has been at war so much as England and no country has brought about more suffering than the British government. This should be clear as we review the history of our own colonies, of India, Ireland, and the 400,000,000 opium addicts in China, all of which may be charged to the greed of the British government.”

What are the present intentions of Britain and America concerning Iraq? What I’m about to say is not to be taken as a view that Saddam Hussein is no different than an average Sunday school teacher. To believe, however, that the sole motive of Britain and America for wanting Hussein out is to guarantee peace in the region, takes a child’s mentality. In the August 1919 issue of Sperlings Journal we note British oilman Sir Edward Edgar saying---

“The British position is impregnable. All the known oil fields, all the likely or probable fields outside the United States itself, are in British hands or under British management or control, or financed by British capital.”

Actually that was an exaggeration, unless you consider the British minority interests in Standard Oil and Mellon (Gulf Oil). But in the sense that those combined operations made no difference to the peoples where they operated, it was totally accurate. In 1914 when Churchill was Lord of the Admiralty, the British government assumed a majority interest in Anglo-Iranian Oil, formerly called Anglo-Persian. In 1933 their oil concessions in Iran were renewed.

However, in 1951, Iranian leader Mossadeqh nationalized those holdings, claiming that \$49 million in royalties was reneged on. In response, England sent 4 destroyers and 10 warships to take positions off Iran while "diplomacy" was attempted. Conversion rights of Iranian funds in the Bank of England were cancelled, and Britain filed a resolution with the U.N. Security Council condemning Iran. The United States and Britain caused the overthrow of Mossadeqh in 1953. In 1954 Anglo-Iranian Oil was back in Iran with a 40% interest, Standard Oil had 40% and Royal Dutch Shell had 20%. The British compensated the U.S. for their assistance in removing Mossadeqh and helping Britain to install Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, the Shah of Iran, till nationalists forced him out in 1979. As with India, the British policy is rule or ruin. During WWII British troops forced Reza Shah to vacate the throne of Iran. Nor were the British inactive in neighboring Iraq, where they installed Emir Feisal as king in 1921. The view in the Arab world, and shared by many cynical westerners aware of British-American history, is that the real reason for wanting Saddam Hussein out is to grab Iraq's oil resources, which are extractable for less cost than elsewhere. Iranian voices have indicated their belief that after Iraq is taken, they will be next.

To those of you who actually believe that all the right is on the side of Britain and the U.S. simply because we are loyal citizens (subjects, I hope not) of these nations, I say---it is past time for you to wake up, grow up, smell the coffee, and see things as they are. To all intents it appears the long-standing oil interests want to re-take Iraq and Iran. In Britain, those interests are linked to the descendants of those who exploited India for centuries. My view here is in no way anti-business, but I favor only those transactions that are voluntarily entered into by all parties concerned.

Re-read the preceding sentence! I believe the view I express is the only possible way of calling oneself civilized without being a devilish hypocrite! America has been used

by Britain as her enforcer to get her way for too long. The Chicago Tribune, February 6, 1944 in an article entitled, "A Dwarf Between Giants" admitted that the British Foreign Office at that time had already been in control of American foreign policy for at least 50 years! Actually it's collaboration between the old rich of both nations.

INDIA NEEDS EVERY OUNCE OF HER SILVER!

Aside from the strong tradition of owning some silver coins, jewelry, and silver objects as a form of savings, India must have silver for all the same reasons as Japan, Britain, Europe and the United States. All nations must have silver for a better standard of living, especially as silver is necessary to electronics. Silver is a critical strategic metal for all defense related applications. Hostile China, Pakistan, and a certain commodity users association would doubtless like to see India stripped of her silver. Superconducting electrical power transmission technology requires silver. In remarks to the U.S. Senate on June 16, 1998, Connie Mack, Republican from Florida, said---

"India's commercial electricity needs are among the largest in the world, similar to China's. We have recently signed a nuclear cooperation agreement with the People's Republic of China, but maintain restrictions on nuclear power agreements with India."

In addition to the Clinton sanctions of India for nuclear tests in May 1998, other U.S. sanctions against India took place dating back to 1974 in regard to energy, space, computer and other technologies. It is as if India has been retaliated against by Rhodes scholars and their associates for daring to squirm free from the acquisitive British Empire! In writing this open letter to India I expect to change no viewpoints.

India's viewpoint is ALREADY, and has been so for many years, wisely, to retain their silver. Whenever the Reserve Bank of India has come under pressure to dump silver on the world market, domestic pressure against it turns the tide. As an Indian spokesman said in National Geographic, September 1981, page 313, it has taken India "centuries" to accumulate its silver, and that they will not "squander" silver from the domestic market for export. Voices on Capitol Hill condemning India on various issues in recent times include Representative Dan Burton (D-Indiana, recipient of Dow Chemical PAC funds); Representative Edolphus Towns (D-New York, recipient of money from PACs including Chemical Manufacturers Association; Du Pont; JP Morgan; Goldman Sachs; and Fleet Boston); and Senator Tom Harkin (D-Iowa, recipient of PAC funds from Dow Chemical; Du Pont; Chemical Manufacturers Association; and Goldman Sachs). Fleet Boston, Dow Chemical and Du Pont are Silver Users Association members and their private view is probably, they would like to get at India's silver, and do so at low prices! Will members of Congress such as these denounce India for refusing to give up her precious silver?

INDIA, WHAT IS YOUR DECISION?

In view of the facts of British history in India and many other territories; in view of the history of Anglo-American interests taking oil by force in the middle east; and in view of chemical giants who are members of the Silver Users Association having no apparent regard for the lives of Indians, what will your response be when your country is besieged by demands from American and British industry to dump hundreds of millions of ounces of your silver to relieve the shortage THEY caused by refusing to let prices gradually rise over the years? Their tools in that subversion are the derivatives activity in New York, and central bank leasing of silver. As leasing ends, you will be called on to supply the

deficit in silver---at the same next-to-nothing prices that have been enforced for many years. Never mind that if you allow your silver to be taken for token sums you will be faced with replacing it at prices which could be 50 to 1 over current rates! Do you want to read articles in the future like the one in Atlantic Monthly, October 1908, which detailed the terrible poverty, heavy taxation, sacrifices for military expenditures for Britain, and the systematic plundering of the British East India Company, of your nation? That's exactly the sort of article you'll read in the future if you allow your silver to be taken at give-away rates.

Considering that petroleum resources are about to be taken by force in the region west of India---areas which the British once controlled---don't you think it likely that some phenomenal forms of pressure may be placed on India as soon as the silver deficit fails to be serviced? What will the U.S. do, refuse to tell China to withdraw troops and weapons possibly in Myanmar on a covert basis, aimed at India, if India refuses to dump its silver? As India raises a collective voice against giving their silver to a western users association, she may expect denunciations in the same spirit as that of the British colonialist quoted in Living Age, November 14, 1857, page 438---

"Only free and voluntary self discipline goes to the very roots of character---and this course we could not give to the Hindoo."

Watch India refuse to dump her silver at distressed prices to relieve the crisis caused by the same London-New York interests who have gouged her for centuries, and their interlocking media interests will denounce the Indian people as "lacking free and voluntary self discipline!" Will you give your silver for \$4.50 per ounce to the heirs of those who looted you for centuries?

Indian silver production---all byproduct---is less than 2% of national demand, and this in an economy set to need more silver for electronics, infrastructure and defense. India is

already importing more silver than the reported average annual world silver deficits of over 100 million ounces and will likely be cut off from additional silver when the crisis ends in an unserviced deficit. Add to this the impending long term global silver price spike and the situation of 1 billion or more people worldwide desiring to return to gold and silver as indisputable real money, and the conclusion is--for India to release her silver at any price would be

CERTAIN NATIONAL SUICIDE!

Tea and crumpets and tally ho!
Off to rule the world for Britain we go!
We know what's best for all; we'll run the show!
Give in to us or be beaten down blow by blow!

Seizing India, siphoning its wealth for long years,
The Crown expected it, we sent Indians into tears,
Swarming over their land, fulfilling their worst fears,
Outline what Britain did; be targeted with jeers!

What, you have no male offspring?
So your land now goes to the English King,
Our takeover of India is in full swing,
On your knees, kiss the G.G.'s signet ring!

Indian farmers in a state of starvation,
In East India Company H.Q., total elation,
India's just another backward nation,
Forced British rule is their salvation!

Robbing India in the name of the King and Queen,
Wicked murders at Amritsar, hellishly obscene,
We could teach Marquis De Sade how to be mean,
Did we inherit Emperor Nero's vicious gene?

Morally superior are we, and entitled to dominate,
Dukes, Viceroy, Earls and Royalty, we're truly great,

For us, let the world's little people pay the freight,
Have no doubt---we'll charge them the highest rate!

For ancient treasures and great diamonds, no compensation,
Dyer murdered Indians at Amritsar without hesitation,
India may realistically entertain the expectation,
Those users will try to take her silver in desperation!

Help us fight two World Wars, we don't care,
You've no right to self-governance, we declare,
We threw your Congress in jail, causing despair,
Now we want your silver for \$4.50 an ounce---beware!

Union Carbide poisoned Bhopal with a deadly cloud,
Blame for the disaster, senior management disavowed,
Writhing, twisting, choking victims, the screams were loud,
Sixteen thousand dead victims in a funeral shroud!

Britain and America say, India needs no nuclear device,
But China and Pakistan could have India in a vise,
India cannot defend with a mere bowl of rice,
To keep your silver for defense is good advice!

Tremendous Royalty in our line of descent,
Justified us ruling over India without her consent,
Inflicting centuries of misery and torment,
We want India's silver now, to the fullest extent!

Maneuvering to take oil from Iraq and Iran,
Seizing resources by force---the London/New York plan,
Imperial Empires! Greed unceasing since time began,
U.S. silver users are India's Ku Klux Klan!

More than thirteen million square miles,
Was ruled by Lords of the British Isles,
Using American might to assist their wiles,
Another war! In the big London banks---smiles!

In nutmeg, we had profits up to sixty thousand percent,
While starvation in India was a periodic tragic event,
Our specialty? Breach of trust with fraudulent intent,
To ripoff your silver for \$4.50 per ounce, we are content!

Coercing India for silver with sanctions and blackmail,
Pressure from silver users goes off the Richter scale,
Does Dow Union Carbide want India's silver; could they
prevail?

And offer India more deadly fumes to inhale?

India, accumulating silver for hundreds of years,
Sickeningly coming at her like English Cavaliers,
Demands for giveaway silver from U.S. financiers,
Do you want to give your silver to racketeers?

