

# **KILL-KILL-KILL**

**The Massacre at Jallianwala Bagh**

**Markand Thakar**

# **Kill-Kill-Kill**

by

**Markand Thakar**

## **A Skunk Publication**

The entire contents of  
***Kill-Kill-Kill***  
writing and artwork, are the sole creation  
and authorship of Markand Thakar

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

No part of  
***Kill-Kill-Kill*** may be  
reproduced, stored in a retrieving system, or transmitted in any form  
by an electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recordings means, or otherwise,  
without the prior written consent of the author.

*Kill-Kill-Kill*

Copyright 2002 by Markand Thakar

Based on the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh as described in:

***TOPSY-TURVY -- The Irony of It All***

Copyright 1998 by Markand Thakar



Printed (photocopied) in the  
United States of America

## Argument

### (BOURGEOIS) BUSH WAR

*[Americans must not fault Papa Bush (as well as the father of any other hawkish, flag-waving and well-placed politician) for having protected his son Dubya from the deathly vicissitudes of war. Paternal love being a universal emotion, even Lincoln, along with many a Northerner with the wherewithal, bought replacements for their sons, so as not to have them chance death fighting to preserve the Union. As a consequence, some might feel that if anything good could be said about the psychopathic Hitler and his Israeli counterpart, Sharon, it would be that each had served his country in helping to murder its real or perceived enemies -- of course -- if and when called upon, so did a goodly proportion of those sixteen million American veterans, papa Bush being one of them, who served during the W.W.II. emergency years (a number that included the writer and his three older brothers).]*

In early December of 2001, when the writer left Newark Airport on a KLM-Northwest Airlines flight bound for Mumbai, it seemed that Americans were more-or-less united in their belief that those folks (members of Al Qaeda being the culprits) responsible for the destruction of the World Trade Center should be apprehended -- this, by attacking them and their supporters in Afghanistan. But, the writer was not aware of America's having any plans to invade Iraq, nor that they had any agreement to stand by as the claiming-to-have-a-right-to-be-a-nation, Palestine, was being destroyed by the claiming-to-have-a-right-to-be-a-nation, Israel. During the flight, the writer, was so oblivious of the Realpolitik, backdoor shenanigans going on in Washington, that his sole concern was with the food being served: it was an insult to the passengers -- causing him to vow to never again fly on either airline.

Although in the past he had traveled extensively throughout much of India, this time he remained in Mumbai for his entire six-month stay. It was there and then, after consulting with friends, that a decision was made to extract and rework a portion of his book: Topsy-Turvy -- that portion detailing the events surrounding the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. That atrocity had occurred in the late afternoon of April 13, 1919; the British had shot dead a thousand and wounded a thousand more unarmed Indian civilians. They were part of a large congregation of Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs who were seated in an enclosed, outdoor, one-time garden: their crime was listening to a few speechifying fellow Indians.

The intention, for rewriting the pertinent parts of Topsy-Turvy, was to zero-in-on the before, during and after doings and inputs relating to the massacre. The reasoning being: since that horrendous action had united an otherwise passive and fatalistic people in their determination to oust the Brits -- it might very well serve to remind all Indians, regardless of their religion, caste or language, that the bigotry that permeated the West at the time of the atrocity, though somewhat mitigated, still prevail. In addition, by making them more aware of the realities of Realpolitik -- they might see the need for the unity of the peoples of the Subcontinent -- if they truly have the desire to maintain their independence.

*[It becomes more and more obvious that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh took place because the victims were Indo-Caucasians, rather than Euro-Caucasian Christians. And, if evidence is required by skeptics, that this sort of rationale persists, one might look to a recent decision regarding casualties during the current war in Afghanistan. After the world was made aware of the killing by American pilots of dozens of Afghani civilians who were attending a wedding ceremony, it was brushed off as an unfortunate ancillary happenstance of war. Yet, though it's doubtful that there's any precedent for it: two American pilots are being court-martialed for having unintentionally attacked a contingent of Canadian soldiers, killing four. All of which does confirm that the racism-based mentality evinced by the Empire's defenders (regarding the relative value of the lives of non-Euro-Caucasian, non-Judeo-Christians to those of their own) -- is no different from that of the West's touters of a "New World Order".]*

\*

Despite the determination to work on the rewrite when back in the States - the jingoism emanating from the White House; the South's evangelical, fundamentalist Christians and an Israel-can-do-no-wrong media, were so obtrusive that it detracted from the writer's ability to concentrate on those horrific doings of a century past. The more he tried to work on the rewrite, the more he was struck by the similarity between the attitudes of the Empire's ruling classes and those of America's recently-formed *alliance of killer-hawks*. The colonizing Brits had broadcast self-righteous motivations, rationales, propaganda and justifications for their massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. So, as an American, born of American citizens, the writer found it most distressing to hear those folks comprising Bush's alliance of non-combatant killers proposing that America (albeit clothed in the euphemism: *New World Order*) engage in the same racist and greed-motivated murderous activities as did the colonial powers -- which, after all, did precipitate the mass murders at Jallianwala Bagh. *(Although the Brits' despicable murderous action was intended to protect England's national*

*interests, it merely hastened the destruction of their Empire. We Americans should bear this in mind, while heeding the cliché: what goes around, comes around.)*

The warmongering by the West's Judeo-Christian followers of a neo-Rhodes, racist-based doctrine should work to alert the world at large to the dangers inherent in the formation of an Anglo-American-dominated, Euro-centric *New World Order*: that reworking of the greed- and race-based old world order: colonialism. For the people of the Subcontinent, the threat of a war against the Iraqis, whether or not it comes to pass, might very-well facilitate the reunification of the peoples of the Subcontinent -- if for no other reason than their realization that it's their Indian-ness and not their religious beliefs that makes them a distinct peoples.

*[Just for the record, during the past century and even decade, far more people have been killed due to religious strife in Europe and its Near East. than in the Indian subcontinent -- and both the subcontinents of India and Europe have been, and continue to be beset by a certain amount of religious turmoil. Nevertheless, perhaps as a carryover from the Empire's propaganda days, the Western press appears intent on stressing mainly those killings occurring amongst and by non-Europeans. The Brits, as did and do all wannabe colonial powers, played one side against the other. In India it was Moslem against Hindu -- while ignoring the presence of the followers of the nation's minority religions. As a result, the most logical way that a lasting unification, albeit a loose one, could take place, would be by guaranteeing the freedom to all citizens of the Subcontinent to believe and practice as they wish -- and to ban all aggressive proselytizing. Live, and let live.]*

\*

There's no way that the writer could ever condone the killings by those religious fanatics of thousands of innocent civilians at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania. But, what does become apparent is that innumerable hundreds, if not thousands of fellow human beings now feel so degraded -- that they willingly commit suicide for what they believe is a justifiable cause. As a result, whether due to our having respect for our fellow human beings, or for our own safety, we Americans, instead of attempting to take a thousand eyes for an eye, should try to lessen the continuing economic bondage and race-based deprecation of that five-sixths or so, of all those peoples of the world who don't have European origins -- which includes most of the world's more than one billion Moslems. So we see, that at the turn of the millennium, a certain few followers of Islam felt so threatened and humiliated, that they performed a series of self-righteous, suicidal vengeful murders -- the most

horrendous being that at the World Trade Center. And from the looks of it, the short-sighted policies being invoked under the guise of establishing a *New World Order*, will certainly provide provocations for many more such atrocities..

Perhaps with some justification, parallels have been drawn between such killings of Palestinians by the Israelis – particularly at Jenin, and that of Indians by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh. But if there are similarities, they're minimal. Unlike the Palestinians, the Indians at Jallianwala Bagh were unarmed, were seated and totally unprotected – and were unaware of the potential for their being deliberately murdered. As vile and despicable as some might feel the doings of the colonizing Israelis have been, in no way can their actions against the Palestinians compare to those of the Brits -- as they went about acquiring and maintaining their colonies.

*[Although the inhabitants of the Subcontinent are amongst the few indigenous people not to have been ethnically cleansed by the colonizing Brits (their preferring to maintain the onerous White-man's burden rather than eradicate it), the same cannot be said for the indigenous Palestinians: who are being cleansed from their lands with the tacit support of America: My country 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty.]*

\*

**PREFACE**  
**COLONIALISM**  
**ADVANCED GUNPOWDER-BASED WEAPONRY**  
**GREED, RACISM, RELIGION-BASED BIGOTRY**  
**&**  
**The Ascendancy of the West**

Evidence of man's inhumanity towards man is so common that without ample publicity, the brutal killings of untold millions of innocent civilians and servicemen would, at most, glide by with but a fleeting comment. This holds true, especially when differences of race, religion or ethnicity are touted as a means of rationalizing conveniently-made-legal, greed-based, government- and multinational-sponsored, death-dealing activities.

Of course, there are exceptions. Despite there being indisputable evidence that the horrific mass murdering of those many millions of ethnic Jews had taken place, there are some, and not only ignorant skinheads, but intelligent, well-educated folks who either deny its occurrence or, due to the Holocaust's being publicized ad nauseam (often for unrelated, self-serving purposes) ignore Germany's depraved doings: a perfect example of the negative effects of puffery-overkill.

Meanwhile, the massacre by the Nazis of some half a million Gypsies (an Indo-Caucasian, Indic-language-speaking peoples) is played down -- when not totally ignored. Although, those very same Christian folks who (for their having stood by as those millions of ethnic Jews were being annihilated), go about atoning for their guilt, by looking the other way as the ethnic cleansing of Palestinian Moslems continues. And, in the absence of a moral right, it would seem that might makes moral the taking of Arab lands (if so, had the Nazis won the war, they too would have been considered morally right).

*[It's quite possible that the Israelis believe that their very same Almighty God who, for whatever His reasons, allowed for the horrors afflicted on those millions of Jews, by certain of Europe's Germano-Slavic Christians, has also given the world's surviving Germano-Slavic Jews and their progeny the same God-given right as was claimed by the Bible's original, Semitic Hebrews -- which was the right to steal for themselves a promised land -- only in the current instance, it's being stolen from those residents of a thousand years who happen to be Semitic Moslems.]*

*[All denominations of Christianity, Islam and Judaism (regardless of the genetic make ups of the individual adherents, believe that a goodly portion of the history of their origins coincides with that of the peoples of the Bible: its in-the-beginnings, the flood and its begetting. Much of that history was acquired by the Semitic-Hebrews from Egypt's and Asia's ancient non-Semitic civilizations -- all of which was first written in Greek, from the perspective of those seventy Greco-Hebraic rabbi scribes -- some twenty-two hundred years ago.*

*[It should also be noted that the lands which fostered those ancient Asian and African cultures, from which much of the Bible's scripture was derived, are the very same lands which Europe's and the Near East's well-armed, Judeo-Christian and Muslim colonizers invaded and plundered. Why? Because those followers of the Judeo-Christian-Muslim God, considered the lands they stole to be theirs -- all in accordance with their particular version of Him -- and which was the promised-land payoff for their abiding by their contract with their faith-based interpretation of the will of their My-God-is-the-One-and-Only God.]*

During the early years of their rapacious colonizing of the New World, Iberian Catholics, due to their belief that the natives were inhuman (since they believed the inhabitants couldn't possibly be related to Adam and Eve) treated the indigenous folks in those new-found lands as beasts of burden -- murdering or enslaving them at will. *And, it was not until the passing of half-a-century, that it was decided that the Amerinds were, in fact, human.*

Notwithstanding their eventually being considered human and even after being baptized, Amerinds were still being economically, when not physically, enslaved or murdered by colonizing Euro-Caucasian peoples -- this, in order to facilitate their taking and maintaining control over their promised lands (Moslem invaders differed from their Judeo-Christian counterparts in only one respect, but quite an important one, if defeated foes converted to Islam -- they were treated more or less as equals). However, it should be noted that it's also true that until the recent past (going back to W.W.II and earlier) many less-than-well-to-do Euro- Semitic- or Indo-Caucasian followers of one or the other Judeo- Christian- Moslem religions were, in their own countries, treated no better than colonized folks were in theirs. However, today, if one looks at the world in general, Moslems (for whatever the reasons, and they themselves are certainly not without fault) appear to be the only folks who are being systematically persecuted.

Within a century or so after the initial violation of the Americas by Europe's Iberian Catholics, North Europe's Judeo-Christian colonizers, being



law-abiding folks, began trading (deceptively? A case of beads for all of Manhattan) for land with North America's Amerind peoples (who had no concept of property rights); being so gullible, Europeans, although they considered Amerinds somewhat human, believed them to be of a decidedly inferior sort. And, so, since the Bible's God had promised a land to the Hebrews (a people whom all God-fearing Christians, Jews and Moslems held to be their very-own ancestral forbears), they claimed their stealing of another's land (no matter where in the world it occurred) was willed by their My-God-is-the-One-and-Only God. After all, the land He promised to the Semitic Hebrews had also been occupied when their God gifted it to them. *That many of Europe's own Germano-Slavic Jews considered themselves to be more worthy of consideration as being as one with the Semitic Hebrews -- may very well have added to the past and continuing animosity that persists amongst those three God-sharing peoples.*

\*

## The Atheist's Lament

**Marx and Engals got it all wrong.  
Religion is not the Opiate of the people -- it's their LSD.**

No One to blame,  
Nor thank for fame,  
For we have no Gods:  
He, She, It or They,  
Who bade us do those beastly things,  
To gain that honor for our name.

When no God(s) around,  
For belief profound,  
To bless our deeds so awful,  
Done to give us lasting glory,  
Or gain a leg-up on some others,  
Then evil doings by Atheistic beings,  
Or by a medley of 'God(s)' adherents ,  
All remain -- for non-believers,  
Shameful acts forever.

For when there's no God for folks to claim:  
*"It was but the bidding of The All-Knowing: He, She, They or It,  
That I've accomplished;  
It was but the will of my God Almighty;  
It was an obligation of my faith:  
To obey my Lord: the Supreme One --  
Or glorified Manifold-Presence,  
And do those wretched deeds,  
Now deemed evil --  
Even by the God-fearing ones."*

*"Amen."*

***Atheists -- be brave. You have only your religious holidays to lose!***

## THE AUTHOR'S NOTE

### Kill-Kill-Kill

**Based on the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh as described in:  
*TOPSY-TURVY -- The Irony of It All***

*Though likelihood for war and peace,  
is often ever present,  
And peace on earth acclaimed in song --  
It's war that gives us glory.*

**Vengeance may be sweet.  
But to quote Mahatma Gandhi: An eye for an eye leaves both parties blind.**

My friend Mohan Jain and I had gone to the Alliance Francaise, in Mumbai, to see a documentary about the horrifying deaths of four thousand Indians and the crippling effects on many tens of thousands more -- which occurred in 1984 at Bhopal (all due to the criminal negligence of a based-in-America, multinational corporation: Union Carbide). However, since we were late for the first screening, we decided to hang around an hour or so for the next viewing. It was at a close-by restaurant where, to pass the time we had gone for snacks, that we ran into an acquaintance of my friend, Mohan (both had been involved in one or another aspect of film making). We sat together reminiscing on the significance of the infamous Bhopal affair and kicking around just how such a well-known subject could be presented so as to have a present-day impact -- or even a *raison d'être*. It was then that I mentioned that I had, a few years back, authored and illustrated a book, *Topsy-Turvy*, that focused on a far more egregious killing: the deliberate mass murder of a thousand unarmed Indian civilians at Jallianwala Bagh -- by the ever-so-civilized Brits.

As we spoke, it became apparent that Mohan's friend, being a Punjabi, was well versed in the happenings at Jallianwala Bagh. And, so, after the screening, and before we went our separate ways, it was agreed that he'd stop over at my hotel and pick up a copy of my book.

\*

The audience that had come to see the documentary on Bhopal was rather large – especially when considering the circumstances under which it was being shown: there had been little or no advance notice. Yet, a turn-away crowd showed up for its screening. And, though it had a fine beginning, by faltering badly as it advanced, it disappointed a rooting-for-its-success audience. As a consequence, it seemed obvious that the only reason for its having such a large turnout (two sitting-in-the-aisle audiences, each numbering about one hundred and fifty adult and obviously concerned Indians), was the film's subject matter. And, so, during lunch the following day, when Mohan's friend came by and after kicking it around for a few hours – the possibility arose that there might be the makings of a film based on *Topsy-Turvy* (since the book centered on Jallianwala Bagh). The logic being, that if the unintentional killing and maiming at Bhopal could attract a good-sized audience of intelligent and concerned Indians, it seemed more than likely that there'd be a far greater audience for a screening of a suitable presentation of the causes and effects of the outrage committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh.

A few days later, the three of us met for tea at the Samovar in the Jahengir art gallery. And it was then agreed that a dramatization of the book's somewhat original reasoning (based on well-researched data) for the depraved attack by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh, could serve a just cause: that of reminding all Indians – regardless of their religion, caste, language or whatever, that they're one people. All of which, if suitably presented, just might have the effect of helping to reunify a now somewhat-divided nation.

*[Despite its death toll being four times as great, the Bhopal disaster didn't provoke the same emotion-laden effect as did the slaughter at Jallianwala Bagh -- no doubt, because the release of the deadly gasses at Bhopal was not seen as a deliberate act -- but merely the unfortunate consequence of the need for corporations to maximize profits -- for the benefit of their shareholders: all of whom are said to be poor, aged widows -- rather than greedy wanna-be or wanna-remain millionaires. Nevertheless, there were many Indians and other fair-minded individuals the world over, who noted that, because or despite the prevailing Money-Is-My-God attitude manifested by multi-national corporations, the well-being of the West's citizenry has been routinely (at least in more recent times) taken into consideration when industrial plans are made. So, whether due to altruistic concerns; the fear of lawsuits or jail terms -- it's highly unlikely that similar conditions, such as those that allowed for the disaster at Bhopal, would have been tolerated in either West Europe or the States. (One need only take into account the publicity surrounding the plight of nine coal miners -- all of whom*

were saved, to see its confirmation – it occurred during July of 2002 in Pennsylvania, USA)]

The rationalizations spouted by Dubya Bush and his administration, for a war-time, eye-for-an-eye retribution against Afghanistan (for the horrific attack on the World Trade Center) were said amen-to by an always-obliging middle-America when appeals are made to its xenophobia and seconded by America's pro-expansionist-Israel media and Bible-belt Christian Fundamentalists. However, since only a minuscule number of Afghans were even-remotely involved in the depraved attacks (which were planned and carried out by members of a relatively small and isolated group of Islamic religious fanatics, many thinking folks, which included a goodly number of all Americans, felt that the Afghans were being singled out because they were neither Euro-Caucasians nor Judeo-Christians. And it was this belief that most-likely (due to its casting a new light on the disaster in India -- the result of race-based, managerial malfeasance by the American Corporation Union, Carbide) contributed to the feeling of vulnerability by Indians -- and in turn accounted for the good turnout to see the Bhopal documentary.

*[One hopes that all the world (Bible thumpers included) will take heed of Gandhi's observation that the taking of an eye for an eye ultimately leaves both parties blind. What's so preposterous, is that this tit-for-tat nonsense has been authorized, as being fitting and proper (according to the Judeo-Christian, My-God-is-the-One-and-Only God's earthbound advocate: the Egyptian, Moses. Nevertheless, should all those folks who accept that Book (or the vengeful utterance of any religious leader) as representing the will, if not the word of their God, desist from carrying out such a vile and hateful mandate, a peace on earth might yet be attained.]*

\*

The demand for financial retribution (running into millions of dollars by the families of each individual killed) due to the horrific attack of 9/11, from almost all those even remotely responsible for causing or allowing for its having happened, no doubt stimulated a concern in India for the dependents of those heedlessly killed and maimed as a consequence of the fatal burst of poisonous gas in Bhopal.

Although the devastating carnage at Bhopal was generally accepted as having resulted from the greed-born negligence of the officers, management and dividend-demanding stockholders of the US-based, multinational corporation: Union Carbide, the American courts refused to allow the kin of the deceased and those forever physically and mentally incapacitated, to seek redress in the United

States (nor has the extradition of the then-presiding CEO, Warren Anderson gone forward -- so that he could stand trial in India).

*[Perhaps, those still-suffering Indians might have had their financial well-being and health restored, had India's politicians been as forward in condemning all those responsible for the killing of those thousands at Bhopal, as were so many of America's Congressmen and members of the Bush administration in the aftermath of 9/11-- of course they were also motivated by pressure from the pro-Israel lobby and a desire to obtain the votes of the generally-racist voter (who can now even be found lurking amongst any one of the still more-or-less de facto segregated peoples -- apparently some are eager to be part of America's not-so-silent bigoted majority).]*

All of which caused the writer and his Indian friends to see evidence of the same type of Euro-centric, Judeo-Christian hypocrisy surrounding the Bhopal affair that the Brits displayed in the aftermath of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. No doubt, it also accounted for the film on Bhopal being shown, in Mumbai, at the Alliance Francaise, rather than the American Center or the British Consulate.

That religion cum race were significant considerations for the Christian Brits before they embarked on the massacre of those thousand Hindu, Moslem and Sikh civilians at Jallianwala Bagh is self-evident. Moreover, those same considerations were behind the malfeasance by Judeo-Christian Americans that led to the deaths of four thousand innocent civilians at Bhopal; the slaughter of eight thousand Moslems in the outskirts of Srebrenica by Serbian Orthodox Christians (while Netherlands's Judeo-Christian "peace keepers" stood by as it took place); the killing by Israeli Jews of untold thousands of Palestinian Moslems (for their refusing to cede their land); and the three thousand residents of America (the overwhelming majority of whom would be considered followers of one or the other Judeo-Christian faiths) who were killed on 9/11 by Islamic religious fanatics.

*[In Bhopal, the release of poisonous gas also caused the maiming and impoverishment of some hundred thousand innocent Indians -- all of which many Indians now believe justifies their demands for monetary compensation (comparable to that being doled out to those unfortunate Americans so adversely affected by the horrific attack of 9/11).]*

\*

We now return to the question of just how to adapt the book, *Topsy-Turvy*, so as to present the premeditated murdering of a thousand Indo-Caucasian Hindu,

Moslem and Sikh civilian men and boys at Jallianwala Bagh -- committed by the honorable Euro-Caucasian, Judeo-Christian Brits, in such a way as to help reunify the Indian people. What adds to its difficulty is that the massacre took place over eighty years ago, so, although most Indians are aware of its having occurred, it's lost much of its relevance. And, since the kind of reception the dramatization, whether as a movie or play, receives in the West affects so many modern-day Indians, the fact that outside of India, virtually no one knows it ever happened, and those few who do, couldn't care less, must be taken into consideration.

Today's Indians, by and large, are aware of the deliberate murder of those thousand unarmed, civilians at Jallianwala Bagh, but few are aware of its true significance. Meanwhile, a goodly number of India's better educated youths (and those not so youthful), few of whom have any idea of the massacre's whys and wherefores, go about denying every aspect of their Indian heritage: often in the belief that it will further their chances for material gain -- either with an international organization in India, or abroad. This has also led them to turn a blind eye to the intrinsically racist nature (one that's been exacerbated by the xenophobic response to the horrific events of 9/11) of the average resident of one or the other of the conglomerate of West-oriented nations.

*[During the last hundreds years of the colonial period, when some of the worst of England's horrific acts of both commission and omission took place, as many as some fifteen million Indians met death due to the British occupation (justified by Bible-based greed cum racism): a number that dwarfs the one thousand massacred at Jallianwala Bagh. So, why the big hullabaloo? The answer is quite simple. If one were to consider just what the outcry in the West would have been had the Brits, in 1919, sent troops into Ireland to shoot to kill the seated members of an audience of unarmed civilians -- an act that would have resulted in the murders of a thousand Irish men and boys -- when their only crime would have been: that they were listening to Catholic politicians decrying Britain's reneging on her WWI agreement for Ireland's home rule, the reason for the hue and cry, at the time in India, due to the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, becomes obvious. From this it's easy to see, that besides greed -- that hallmark of colonialism -- there was no apparent rationale for the British massacre of those civilians at Jallianwala Bagh, other than -- because those murdered were Indo-Caucasians seeking home-rule, rather than Euro-Caucasians -- they, the Brits, could get away with it.]*

With so many of India's most ambitious and brightest either accepting or denying the West's complicity in the past depredation of the Indian subcontinent,

how can one expect modern-day Indian youths to give any consideration to the killing, almost a century ago, of a mere thousand unarmed and seated Indian civilian men and boys. Although all they need do is open their eyes to see the abundance of evidence, worldwide, confirming the continuing practice of rooted-in-greed; religion-cum-race-based, premeditated murdering accomplished by the followers of one or another My-God-Is-The-One-and-Only-God religions -- they prefer not to.

\*

In India, it's rare, indeed, for any Westerner to come across an ambitious Indian who's not intent on leaving India to find his fortune in one or the other nations dominated by Judeo-Christian, Euro-Caucasians. And, it shouldn't surprise anyone that a goodly portion of India's young men and women (having been bombarded with the sales pitches of the movers and shakers in the consumption-driven economies of the West) yearn to partake in those much-advertised goodies – and live in consumer-gratifying lands.

*[It should be noted, that the wealth of virtually all those West-controlled former colonies: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and America (to which so many Indians are drawn) had been acquired as a direct result of the money-motivated and racially-rationalized murder and enslavement of indigenous populations and the stealing of their land -- much as had been attempted in the past, with a certain amount of success in India.]*

\*



## **Moneytheism: The worship of The Calf-of-Gold**

### **But Melted Down.**

*[While in the process of editing this work, the author stopped to write the following piece. Since it seems most relevant, it's been added below in its entirety.]*

Some years back, I was visiting with a couple living in an artist's loft in Tribeca, that real-estate-enhancing-name given to the area just north of where New York's WTC once stood. The lady was an artist, and her companion: a college professor. I had known the lady for decades: when she was still married to an MD (both of whom were born Christians and non-New Yorkers) who was involved in research. Her latest companion spent his early years in India -- his father had been serving as a Christian missionary. While discussing his childhood, I mentioned that many Indians whom I came across, when discussing the more-recently-proselytized Christians (over the last hundred years or so of the British occupation and four hundred years of that of the Portuguese in Goa), referred to them as, what I had always thought was a well-known, but nevertheless denigrating term: *rice- Christians*. What amazed me, was that neither the lady, nor the missionary's son had ever heard the term. And, even more astonishing, was that the folks at WNYC (the New York station for a not-for-profit, nationally-broadcast radio network) were apparently also unaware of such a term -- and to whom it could apply.

More often than not, those folks proselytized by Christian churchmen, besides rice, were being fed a healthy dollop of anti-India propaganda (disparaging her religions, culture, food, clothing, history, art, marriage and funerary practices -- plus, you name it). In almost every instance, the teaching by missionaries (besides the language and a glorified, unstained history of the colonizers) was that nothing worthwhile existed in India before the arrival of Europe's rapacious colonists. And, all the major cultural accomplishments of Indians were either ignored, denied or ridiculed by the missionaries. Meanwhile, the Christianizing indoctrination of Indians, continued by claiming that all the

wonders of the Judeo-Christian world (which, much like Topsy -- “just grewed”) were being graciously bestowed on India’s heathen masses -- by the religious arms of their benevolent, racist, greed-motivated, colonizing subjugators.

*[Just for the record, it should be noted that much of the West’s accumulation of its vast amounts of capital came about at the expense of the militarily-acquired and economically-enforced subjugation of colonized peoples: their forests were despoiled and mineral deposits plundered; their land stolen and farmed by cheap or unpaid indigenous labor; and, most notably in the Indian subcontinent, their maritime, manufacturing and merchandising industries were deliberately destroyed -- transferring their value-added doings to the West -- which was, of course, the desired result of the colonizer’s mercantile policies. These policies so obviously benefited England, Holland and France, that it was the greed-based cause of both WWI and W.W.II -- with Germany, Japan and Italy being major players trying to supplant them -- or, in the case of Japan and Italy during WWI, allying themselves with the West’s entrenched colonizing nations -- as a means, like vultures, of joining in a frenzied feeding.]*

In the late afternoon of August 19, 2002, WNYC broadcast a program that gave air time to a man who, by inference, was presented by the station’s lady moderator as a typical, born-after-independence educated Indian -- one, it was asserted, who represented the view of all such folks with Indian ancestry. The moderator (an avowed liberal -- as are all folks employed by WNYC) appeared amused by the “Indian” gentleman’s kissing-up-to-the-West, disparaging view of India and her people -- which the gentleman implied was that of all well-informed, modern-day Indians -- which by inference included all those individuals considered NRIs [*non-resident Indians*: a post-colonial designation used to bestow either ridicule or respect (based on the resident Indian’s feeling of envy or scorn) on those disoriented, self-exiled Indians and anyone with Indian ancestry who had themselves, or whose ancestors emigrated from their mother country]. In doing so, the Indian gentleman -- by denying (perhaps due to his ignorance) the ongoing injustices inflicted on the progeny of African-Americans and Amerinds -- disputed their right to claim and attempt to collect reparations for the past violence to, and horrible indignities inflicted on their ancestors.

When not traveling abroad, I listen to WNYC for its objectivity. So, I was dismayed by its projecting the opinion of the referred-to gentleman as representing that of all individuals with Indian lineage. The gentleman had a Portuguese name, which indicates, to anyone familiar with India, that he and his parents were virtually sure to be Goan and Roman Catholic. None of which, on the face of it, would make him anything other than an Indian (NRI or otherwise).

However, after having spent close to three years (over the course of a dozen years) traveling extensively in India -- it was apparent to me, as an American with an educated Indian father (a Hindu, who, shortly after the turn of the century was to become the founder of some three generations of born Americans -- four of whom served during W.W.II), that the Indian gentleman was spouting typical, Judeo-Christian- missionary cum catechismal-Catholic propaganda: which was that Indians were not only sinners, but ignorant infidels -- until they were brought the benefits of Western culture.

The inducement to Asians to convert to Christianity, as previously stated, was often with bowls of rice (or its equivalent: employment or schooling of sorts). An added incentive was given in Goa -- which was colonized by the Portuguese during the years when the inquisition was in full force. There, the cruelty was imposed upon those Indians who had remained in areas under Portuguese domination -- which added to their motivation to convert. And, while England was persecuting Irish Catholics at home, in India they supported, militarily, Portugal's continuing occupation of Goa -- which, in turn, supported the conversion of Indians to Catholicism. It must also be noted that (due to the inequities of India's caste system) an overwhelming number of those converted came from the underclasses and untouchables. Nevertheless, besides Hindus, a goodly number of Christians as well as Sikhs and Moslems (all of whom claim to be classless) have been known to maintain their distinctions of caste. *[It should be noted, that although Jews in India were never persecuted for their religious beliefs by either Hindus or Moslems, no sooner had they convinced the Israeli's that they were, indeed, Jews -- virtually all left India for the Promised Land. (Although many claimed that their ancestors had arrived in India as a result of the massacres in Palestine by Julius Severus in 137 AD. -- their physical makeup had them looking no different than other Indians.)]*

\*

No doubt the individual at WNYC responsible for programming (this was not a frivolous, random phone-in) the gentleman's spoutings: those of the rice-Christian's rationalizations for denying any debt to India's ancient pre- and post-Bhuddo-Jain-Hindu-Moslem-Parsi-Sikh culture (while glorifying the results of his ancestors' subjugation by the West's colonizers' spouting a well-scrubbed and never-was version of Europe's Judeo-Christian society), was ignorant of all things Indian. Otherwise, he/she would have realized that the opinions of India's one billion peoples are at least as diverse as those of Americans: who number less than a third of a billion. Moreover, when any of us (as Americans) ever speak on WNYC, even as "call-ins", the station's listeners are routinely made aware, indirectly when not directly, of just who the speaker is -- thereby allowing the

average intelligent listener to judge the potential for bias of a speaker. It was not done in this instance.

There is, of course, another possibility which is even more troubling -- and that's that WNYC wanted to be controversial. And, if that's the case, then those individuals involved should be ashamed of themselves. For, not only have they stirred-up potentially injurious-to-Indians sentiments: perhaps enough to match the xenophobic, bigotry-based murders and insults that have continued in the aftermath of 9/11, but by allowing the Indian gentleman to spout his nonsensical, greed-based rationalizations (without explaining his bias) for the racist-based destruction of the lives and culture of the ancestors of the nation's Amerinds and African-Americans, it serves only to give logic to the argument by bigots intent on denying the rights of all those peoples who continue to suffer as a result of the West's past, and continuing rapacious activities -- activities engaged in by both past and present followers of the world's truly universal religion: *Moneytheism*.

\*

## Jallianwala Bagh

--

## Who Cares?

By publicizing the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, a reality will be given to the greed-motivated and racially-rationalized, century-long, death-causing activities of the Brits -- all due to their attempt to maintain their empire. And, since their doings also benefited all those nations with a Judeo-Christian, Euro-Caucasian controlled government, it might very-well put many expatriates (those who deny their debts to India) residing in those countries, as well as a goodly portion of well-off, educated resident Indians, in a double bind. By their having benefited disproportionately from the economic effects of the rapacious doings of British (and Portuguese) colonialism, they might very-well consider themselves to be nothing better than cannibals. This, since they're prospering is the result of the killing and enslavement of non-Euro-Caucasian peoples -- which often includes their own ancestors.

Whether they deny the truth, or acknowledge it -- by remaining abroad, India's expatriates could be damned as deserters. And, so, those wishing to leave India, along with all those who've already left, have no desire to be reminded of the significance of the dreadful happenings at Jallianwala Bagh. As a consequence, some have been heard to dispute the fact that the massacre ever happened, and if it did, they say those murdered must have deserved it. Why? The Brits could never have done such a cruel thing. (It's something that Neo-Nazis and post-W.W.II German's have also said about the massacre of those millions of Jews: "Germans could never have done that!") Those Indians leaving India (like virtually all immigrants who've left their homelands for greener pastures) wish only to see the good in the West, and what it can offer them -- while bemoaning the end of a non-existent idealized past in *the old country* that they've abandoned -- all the while ignoring the greed-motivation for their having migrated. (*Interestingly enough, later generations always seem to idealize the homelands from which their ancestors escaped. And, in doing so, again deny reality. The old country was never as good or as bad as is claimed.*)

Nevertheless, the fact that a relatively small segment of India's billion-plus people (those with a self-loathing or a zeal to get rich) will be put off by a reappraisal of the causes of the horrific massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, need not

now be considered. What is pertinent, is that the unity of Indians that earned them their independence, was due to their having been made aware of the horrors committed at Jallianwala Bagh. It brought about the peaceful ousting of the Brits, and the reestablishment of the pride of her people in nationhood. Of course, those untold thousands of Indians directly affected by the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh can never be made whole again: physically, mentally or economically. However, it's just possible that a dramatization of the behind-the-scenes doings that led to the premeditated murders and maimings, at Jallianwala Bagh, of those thousands of Indo-Caucasians (Hindu, Moslem and Sikh), all due to the despicable greed- and racially-motivated actions of the colonial Brits, may very-well have the potential to reunify a now somewhat-divided nation.

\*

Its potential to help reunify India's diversity of peoples, is what gives this project (the dramatization of the clandestine involvement by the Brits in perpetrating and then covering up the horrors committed by them at Jallianwala Bagh) its *raison d'être*. So, the only question that need be answered is whether or not there really is, in India, a heartfelt desire to see a truly unified India. And, if there is such a desire, is it sufficiently broad-based so as to include a substantial portion of India's more intelligent, aware, economically-secure and better-educated citizenry? The question requires a positive response, since, as already noted, there appears to be an urge to flee the Subcontinent by a goodly portion of those very folks who have the potential to deal successfully with India's many seemingly impossible-to-solve problems. However, it's just possible that the current manifestations of hate crimes and insults, in America, directed against Indians in the aftermath of 9/11 (due to the existence of an always present subliminal xenophobia), will make them think twice before emigrating -- it may also make a project based on Jallianwala Bagh more pertinent.

*[Indirectly, Americans have benefited greatly as a result of India's exporting those professionals -- virtually all of whom had received all or most of their education in India -- at India's expense. However, should the rash of bigotry-based insults, and worse, directed towards Indians continue, those with pride will probably return or remain in India. And, that can only benefit India (and add to the Bush-caused, long-term harm to America's economy and her reputation as a fair-minded world-power.). However, it must be noted, that not only Indians, but the members of every large immigrant group -- all of whom, have supplied relatively cheap labor to one or another segment of America's workforce, have routinely faced a bigotry-based resentment by the progeny of earlier migrants -- exacerbated by their real or imagined loss of employment.]*

Surely, there's more than a sufficient number of Indians who are disturbed by the growing regional, ethnic and religious divisions that now afflict their nation. And, assuming that resurrecting the horrors of the past can have the effect of making Indians think of themselves as one people, the question that arises: How can the massacre that occurred at Jallianwala Bagh be presented to accomplish the desired result -- which is to facilitate the unifying of the Subcontinent's peoples? If it's to be a film based on the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, should it be presented as a straightforward documentary? Probably not. Documentaries on the Indian independence movement have been made before -- and those on file with the Films Division of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in Mumbai are excellent.

Nevertheless, since a film based on the accounts described in *the book, Topsy-Turvy*, would include a fairly original interpretation of the happenings at Jallianwala Bagh, there's a good possibility that it would serve a useful purpose -- provided it's presented in a manner capable of appealing to a wide-ranging audience. So, it's of little consequence that documentaries on Jallianwala Bagh have been done before, but what is, is that a substantial portion of today's educated middle-class, whether or not Indians, and few, if any others, wherever they reside, will be willing to sit through a straightforward representation of the atrocity. To do any good, the dramatization must be capable of attracting a sizable audience, and these days, that means it must make for a pleasurable experience. Perhaps, if sufficient financing is found, it could be presented as a spectacular feature film (though, surely not like "Gandhi" -- where the massacre was depicted as if it were a disrupted Sunday picnic).

So, if it's to be entertaining and yet maintain its impact, should it be presented as a tragedy or a comedy? A tragedy probably won't sell -- the overwhelming majority of film goers, Indians included, want to get away from all thoughts of adversity. If a comedy, what on earth can be funny about the massacre of a thousand innocent, seated, unarmed men and children? Surely, there's nothing humorous about that. But humor is what it must be if its to draw an audience -- albeit, it must be **Black** humor. And, it can be readily derived from the actions of the Brits. After all, the British press and citizenry, along with England's House of Lords, all lauded the general who oversaw the killing of those thousand seated, unarmed civilians -- and, at the same time, England's lower-level gentry accepted the lieutenant-governor (who had masterminded that massacre) as one of their own. And, isn't that a joke -- of the first order?





# **KILL-KILL-KILL**

## **The Massacre at Jallianwala Bagh**

Jallianwala Bagh. How could it happen? What kind of input could so motivate supposedly civilized followers of one or the other of the my-God-is-the-One-and-Only-God persuasion, to knowingly and deliberately order and participate in the calculated massacre of some thousand innocent-of-any-wrongdoing men and boys. All of which occurred in the afternoon of April 13, 1919 during a relatively impromptu gathering of Indian civilians: Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs -- none of whom were armed. Estimates, as to the number of people attending the peaceful gathering at Jallianwala Bagh (an open-to-the-sky, yet confined space), varied from as few as six thousand to at least twenty thousand -- virtually all of whom were seated (Indian fashion) when the unannounced firing by British troops began.

Jallianwala Bagh, for Indians, much like Pearl Harbor for Americans, will forever remain prime examples of an infamous government's treachery. The British and Indians, as were the Japanese and Americans, were engaged in negotiations with the purported intent to settling their differences peacefully. However, the obvious intention of both the Japs and the Brits was to stall the negotiations long enough to enable them to inflict a decisive murderous blow against an unprepared and therefore defenseless foe.

The perfidious attack by the Japs on December 7, 1941, against a lax military caused the death of some three thousand American servicemen, and brought about America's entry into W.W.II. The killing of those taken unaware, albeit well-armed, US servicemen, was to rudely awaken the American public to the realities of Realpolitik. Translated it meant: It ain't how you play the game,

winning is all that counts. And, though in sports that might mean a head butt, bean-ball pitch, or even a knee to the crotch, in the world of international diplomacy it means resorting to premeditated murder -- on a grand scale.

No doubt, had Japan's sneak attack on Pearl Harbor resulted in her winning W.W.II, the Jap strategy would have been openly acclaimed for its brilliance -- as was the conquest of Troy due to the Greeks ruse involving the Trojan horse.

The morality of war being what it is, despite Japan's having lost the war, her sneak attack on Pearl Harbor is, nonetheless, praised for its success and daring by military strategists.

There's no attempt to make less horrible those deaths said to have been inflicted on the Trojans by the Greeks, or the very-real murders by the Japs of Americans at Pearl Harbor. After all, those folks were every bit as dead as were the unarmed Indian civilians massacred by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh. Nevertheless, despite the Greek, Jap and Brit perpetrators all being equally guilty of resorting to a sneaky and perfidious means to accomplish a murderous, greed-motivated end -- that's where the comparison ends.

At Jallianwala Bagh many thousands of unarmed Indian civilians were seated listening to the non-violent exhortations of speechifying leading citizens concerning the deportation of Dr. Kichlu (a Moslem) and Dr. Satya Pal (a Hindu): the two most prominent supporters of Indian home rule in the Punjab and expounding on the duplicity of the British -- who had reneged on their quid pro quo *Gentlemen's Agreement* for home rule with India's law-abiding leadership. Implicit in this *Gentlemen's Agreement* was that Indians, in return for their military and financial assistance during WWI -- would acquire the benefits of a self-rule similar to those granted to the Empire's other colonies: those with populations composed primarily of British origin: criminal or not.

*[India had contributed substantially to England's survival during WWI: 70,000 Indians gave their lives -- and in addition, half-a-billion pounds sterling (that's the equivalent of something like a hundred billion dollars in today's turn-of-the-millennium money) was wrenched from a people already impoverished as a direct result of Britain's prior military-supported, century-long occupation.*

*[Brits' being law-abiding gentlemen who would, of course, keep their word -- rather than openly disavowing their agreement, cunningly, no sooner did the war end, passed the Rowlatt Act: a law intended to prevent any possibility of their*

*losing absolute control over India, her people and her economy. It did this by allowing for the arbitrary application of martial law against any Indian -- for any action deemed potentially disruptive of Britain's total rule over the Subcontinent - - the determination, of which, was left to the whim of any one of a plethora of British officials. And, it was this: the enactment of the Rowlatt Act, that had brought about the meeting at Jallianwala Bagh.]*

The Brits, having enacted laws to cover just such an event, claimed a legal and moral right to have murdered those innocents -- in the name of national interest. This allowed them to stand tall as they hid behind the legal niceties of the self-serving laws enacted by them to make lawful their subjugation, through the use of the most-advanced weaponry, of a non-threatening alien peoples. If the Japs were considered murderous sneaks for their attack on Pearl Harbor, with some justification, then just what should world public opinion consider the British for the atrocity committed by them at Jallianwala Bagh..

*[What's most bothersome is that many of the writer's fellow Americans are supporting similar activities by Israelis (their proclaiming martial law, and then deliberately murdering anyone a trigger-happy soldier claims to have been threatened by). And, they're being armed with America's most-advanced weaponry.]*

If this were but an isolated instance of British government-supported treachery, it would be bad enough. But, the Brits had committed untold tens of thousands of deliberate hands-on murders, as well as some thirteen million deaths due to famines caused and intensified by British greed and the interests of the Crown. Britain's massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, thanks to Mahatma Gandhi, just happened to be the atrocity made known beyond India's borders.

\*

## Raten Devi -- A Night in the Killing Ground

Raten Devi, widow of Chhaju Bhagat spent the night of April 13, 1919 in the Jallianwala Bagh -- where the *Conspiracy of Death* was carried out by British troops. A legally imposed eight PM shoot to kill curfew had been posted by the Brits immediately after the slaughter; this effectively caused the non-walking wounded at the Bagh to writhe in agony while awaiting a slow and painful death - and the dead to lie untended. Raten Devi's experience as she remained with her dead husband throughout the night, was related by her and translated into English. Her description of what took place can be found on a wall in the Martyrs Museum at the scene of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, which is located in India's northwestern Punjabi city of Amritsar. Her account is quoted below in its entirety:

*"I was in my house near Jallianwala Bagh when I heard shots fired. I was then lying down. I got up at once, as I was anxious because my husband had gone to the Bagh. I began to cry and went to the place accompanied by two women to help me. There I saw heaps of dead bodies and I began to search for my husband. After passing through that heap, I found my husband. The way towards it was full of blood and of dead bodies. After a short time, both the sons of Lala Sundar came there, and I asked them to bring a charpai [cot] to carry the body of my dead husband home. The boys accordingly went home and I sent away the two women also. By this time, it was 8 o'clock and no one could stir out of his house because of the curfew order. I stood waiting and crying. At about 8:30 PM, a Sikh gentleman came. There were others who were looking for someone amongst the dead. I did not know them. I entreated the Sikh gentleman to help me in removing my husband's dead body to a dry place, for that place was overflowing with blood. He caught the body by the head, and I by the legs, and we carried it to a dry place, and laid it down on a wooden block. I waited up to 10 PM but no one arrived there. I got up and started towards Katra Ahluwalia. I thought of asking some students from the Thakurdwara to help me to carry my husband home. I had not gone far, when some man sitting in a window in an adjacent house asked me where I was going at that late hour. I said I wanted some men to carry my husband's dead body home. He said he was attending a wounded man, and as it was after 8 PM nobody could help me then. Then I started towards Katra and another man asked me the same question. I made the same appeal to him, and he gave me the same answer. I had gone hardly more than three or four steps, when I saw an old man smoking and some people sleeping by his side. I repeated the whole of my sad story to him with hands folded. He took great pity upon me and asked those men to go with me. They said it was ten o'clock, and they would not*

*like to be shot down. That was no time to stir out -- how could they go out so far? So I went back and seated myself by the side of my husband. Accidentally I found a bamboo stick which I kept in my hand to keep off the dogs. I saw three men writhing in agony, a buffalo struggling in pain, and a boy about twelve years old, in agony entreating me not to leave the place. I told him I could not go anywhere leaving the dead body of my husband. I asked him if he wanted any wrap, and if he was feeling cold I could spread it over him. But he asked for water, but water could not be procured in that place.*

*“I heard the clock striking at regular intervals of one hour. At two o'clock, a Jat belonging to Sultan village, who was lying entangled in a wall, asked me to go near him and raise his leg. I got up, and taking hold of his clothes drenched in blood, raised his leg up. After that, no one else came till half- past five. At about six, L. Sundar Dass, his sons and some people from my street came with a charpai, and I brought my husband home. I saw other people at the Bagh in search of their relatives. I passed my whole night there. It was impossible for me to describe what I felt. Heaps of dead bodies lay there, some on their backs and some with their faces upturned. A number of them were poor innocent children. I shall never forget the sight. I was all alone the whole night in that solitary jungle. Nothing but the barking dogs, or the braying of donkeys was audible. Amongst hundreds of corpses, I passed the night, crying and watching. I cannot say more. What I experienced that night is known only to me and to God.”*

*Raten Devi, widow of Chhaju Bhagat*

\*

## Jallianwala Bagh -- The Players

*[As Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, O'Dwyer's bigotry-based manner of governance, discreetly endorsed by London, served to make for the racist climate that allowed for the murderous actions taken by British troops under the command of the morally-deficient (as all good professional soldiers must be), duty-bound General Dyer. To avoid confusion, keep in mind that "O'Dwyer" was the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, and "Dyer" was the alcoholic and mentally-unstable low-ranking general serving with the British occupation forces in India. Dyer was officially under the command of the Commander and Chief of the Army in India, Munro. Although Munro decried Dyer's murderous action at Jallianwala-Bagh -- not for moral reasons, but for his poor judgment, he still promoted him -- while making sure to station him and his troops incommunicado in the far-off reaches of the northwest regions of the Subcontinent. Nevertheless, once the horrors of the atrocity committed by General Dyer and his troops [albeit, acting under the orders (implied or otherwise) of London by way of Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer] became public, Munro relieved the general of his command and forced him to retire.]]*

**Michael Francis O'Dwyer** was born a Catholic in Barronstown, Tipperary, Ireland on April 28, 1864, the sixth son of fourteen children. He was, as was his father, a loyal British subject, one antagonistic to the aspirations of his countrymen who yearned for an Ireland free of Protestant Britain's military domination. Notwithstanding O'Dwyer's having been born within twenty years after the first of Ireland's exacerbated-by-British-greed famines, he accepted, as a proper function of the military arm of the British Empire, the wanton application of lethal force in suppressing his countrymen's passive-resistance to the indignity of their being economically and politically disenfranchised, if not enslaved.

If O'Dwyer were to succeed in England's Judeo-Christian Victorian world, it was imperative that he show no resentment for the inferior status forced upon his fellow Irish Catholics. His being an ambitious man, he, apparently of his own free will, condoned and actively supported the rapacious tactics of the Brits in Ireland. No doubt, his understandable insecurity, as an Irish Catholic in the service of the Crown, led him to constantly prove both his value and loyalty to England -- which in turn, like a well-trained lackey, had him anticipate the desires and needs of his perceived social betters. This, combined with the need to feed his oversized ego -- one possessed by many aggressive, physically- and ethically-small men, gave him need to constantly reinforce his overblown concept of self.

For the megalomaniac O'Dwyer, this required his demeaning those over whom he gained power .

All of which contributed to the making of O'Dwyer, the little-big-man martinet, into a very useful, and if necessary, expendable player in the sordid game played by England's Empire builders and maintainers. He was an obedient and willing tool of the Crown -- and, as are so many ambitious men intent on raising their status in society, a bigot. All of which contributed to making him hostile towards all those folks involved in the home-rule movements -- especially those in India, which threatened the very existence of the Empire that he so wanted to be a part of. Apparently, by the time the Brits placed him in the lieutenant-governorship of the Punjab, he had convinced them of his ability to carry on much as they, his Englishmen betters, had when they were ruthlessly squelching the demands for home rule made by his fellow Catholics in Ireland.

\*

With there being a dearth of qualified Britishers willing to fill the needs of England's occupation of India, the youthful Michael Francis O'Dwyer, having passed the required civil service test, was sent to the Subcontinent. Obviously the Brits had their reasons for shipping so many Irish Catholic, civil servants and military men out of England. There was no need for the Brits to overly tax the loyalty of Irish Catholics by requiring them to engage in the subjugation and wanton murder of Ireland's freedom fighters -- when their services could be utilized in the Subcontinent.

At the time of O'Dwyer's youth, and for decades to come, Irish Catholics were but second-class citizens of the United Kingdom; their rights were greatly curtailed, and their loyalty to the Empress-Queen -- the anti-pope head of the Church of England, was under constant scrutiny. Ireland itself, while O'Dwyer was engaged in his nefarious doings in India, was under the direct control of Protestant England. It was not until well after his involvement in the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh that the predominantly Catholic section of partitioned Ireland attained its home rule. And, to this day Catholics do not have one-hundred percent equality in England.

\*

In his unquestioning adherence to the then-prevalent-in-England concept of the inviolability of the British Empire, O'Dwyer went about aping the attitude of England's landed and in-constant-need-of- money aristocracy towards those considered inferior by reason of their class, ethnicity, race, breeding, religion and whatever. And, it was his single-minded attempt to become part of the British

upper class that motivated O'Dwyer's every action over the course of his quarter-of-a-century rise from a position of obscurity to become, during England's military occupation of the Indian subcontinent, Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab. It was as Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, that O'Dwyer's bigotry-based manner of governance, calculatingly endorsed by London, served to make for the racist climate that allowed for the murderous actions taken by British troops under the command of the not-overly bright, morally-deficient duty-bound General Dyer.



**General Dyer**, promoted and honored for his having inflicted the blood-bath at Jallianwala Bagh, stated he would have continued firing into the originally seated-Indian-fashion gathering for more than the ten minutes he did, had his men not run short of ammunition. Estimates of those unarmed civilians present at the gathering were never less than six-thousand, nor more than some twenty thousand. The British, while reluctantly acknowledging that more could have been killed and three times as many wounded, begrudgingly accepted responsibility for the murder of 379 unarmed Indian civilians, men and boys at Jallianwala Bagh. However, independent estimates of those who died as a direct result of the murderous barrage of gunfire by the Brits: one that the general-commanding believed was to teach the heathen a lesson they'd never forget, was something on the order of a massacre of a thousand folks.

\*

Whether from guilt, or due to the realization he had been made the scapegoat for a nefarious plan that failed, General Dyer became paralyzed two years after having ordered the murders of untold innocents. There were those who said he died a blithering idiot. Was it due to: a remorse-caused alcoholism? the last stages of syphilis? dementia praecox? Possibly not, but, if for any of those reasons, it would give a logic to the actions taken by Dyer, who as a good soldier with his limited intellect, could be excused for blindly following the covert directives of Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer -- the megalomaniac who effortlessly convinced the simple-minded and equally-racist General Dyer of the propriety of his conducting the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh.

*[It's ironic that the non-military-government-official O'Dwyer's bigotry-based, good-soldier perception of duty (shared by General Dyer) that was utilized by his well-born superiors in London, as a means of strengthening England's control over India, would result in the catalytic incident that would lead inexorably to the destruction of the British Empire. The racism manifested by the Brits' massacre at*



*Jallianwala Bagh united all Indians against British rule. It became obvious, to even the most ardent Indian supporters of the Empire (and there were many) that England had no intention of ever ceding her total control over India's economy and the lives of her people. Home rule would never come to the Subcontinent as long as the English, regardless of how despicable the means, thought they could maintain their absolute control. For Brits, such as O'Dwyer, the need to wallow in depravity would not deter them in their attempts to serve their country's national interest -- which, for him, meant the maintaining of a militarily-enforced stranglehold over the lives of all the people throughout the Subcontinent.]*

\*

Duplicity, a standard tool of diplomacy, was utilized most effectively by the minions of Britain's wealthy and landed upper classes, both at home and in their colonies. The passage of the Rowlatt Act, which only pertained to India and her people, was obviously a racially-rationalized, deliberately-demeaning attempt to justify their continued absolute control over all of India. As previously mentioned, it subjected all Indians to the arbitrary application of the rules of martial law for any act deemed detrimental to the good of the Empire, at the whim of any one of a number of minor British officials. The purpose of the Rowlatt Act was twofold. If Indians had willingly accepted its implementation, which the Brits had every reason to believe would not be the case, it would effectively end India's ability to so much as request home rule. Unless totally blinded by a belief that they could do no wrong, the Brits must have known that Indians would never willingly accept the Rowlatt Act, with its inherent indignities -- indignities inadvertently, if not intentionally, made part and parcel of it.

*[It should be noted, that to this day, perhaps as a means of justifying the empire's immoral past, a condescending attitude towards all Indians prevails amongst a surprisingly large number of Brits -- and from every social and economic class. Although this condescension extends to both Catholics and Jews, in no case does it compare with that shown towards Indians -- perhaps because it was in India that they have the most to feel guilty about. However, there is a famous Indian author who, perhaps to counter that of the Brits, tries to out-condescend them -- and exhibits his attitude of superiority when writing about everyone -- Brits and Indians included.]*

The Brits' in-your-face passage of the Rowlatt Act, makes obvious the conclusion that they were hoping for a violent reaction to its enactment. England, with her WWI war machine pretty much intact and ready for use (airplanes were used by them to bomb and machine-gun unarmed civilians in the aftermath of the passage of the Rowlatt Act) was gambling, with a marked deck; they knew there

would be a major anti-British reaction in India to the passage of the Rowlatt Act, and they hoped it would be sufficiently violent to rationalize a massive military countermeasure.

\*

*[Japan, that island nation located at the eastern end of the Indo-Eurasian land mass, has been derisively called Japan, Inc. to stress its company-store attitude in its dealings with her own people and the world at large. Yet, despite the fact that England, its counterpart on the opposite end of the Indo-Eurasian land mass, was no different, it's still being admired for its militarily-enforced, artfully-made-legal, company-store policies -- policies enforced by threat of death, which required all peoples throughout the Empire to subordinate their lives for the benefit of England's national interests, i.e., those of the wealthy and landed, Judeo-Christian, British powers that be. Nevertheless, it was the wanton, racially-motivated disregard for human life during the "disturbances" (what the London Times called the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and the subsequent murders by British troops to kill off those protesting it), the result of British duplicity in their dealings with India, that was to spell the death knell of the sun-never-sets-on-it, short-lived British Empire -- its status as an empire and a major world power having existed for little more than half a century -- and even then, only with America's help.]*

*[The warped morality employed by London, one derived from a self-serving interpretation of the Old Testament, led them to believe they could rationalize the racist, greed-motivated act of barbarity perpetrated by them at Jallianwala Bagh. However, since that atrocity was to unite the Indian people in ridding themselves of foreign rule, any benefits for the Brits resulting from their having inflicted it, were at best short-lived. Britain's believers in a One-and-Only Judeo-Christian God might very well consider the loss of India and the subsequent destruction of the Empire as proof that their God does, indeed, work in mysterious ways. And, Dyer's years of insanity and the execution-style, retaliatory murder of O'Dwyer, might very well give substance to the cliché: what goes around comes around.]*

*[In America, we can observe those ardent, the-public-be-damned, bottom-line-motivated PACs (Political Action Committees) representing the likes of the tobacco industry, maintain that cigarettes are not responsible for the deaths inflicted by its products. Rather than lessen its profits, and while fully aware of the potentially murderous qualities of its products, it goes about spending billions of dollars on ads to have folks buy them. Likewise, the Brits deliberately stressed, magnified and played upon India's caste system and religious rivalries in an attempt to increase the riches of London's wealthy entrepreneurs. And, like the*

*drug-selling, tobacco industry, England's empire builders claimed innocence of any malignant intent -- blaming the naive recipients of their bigotry-based, money-rationalized sales pitch, for their reacting to it.*

*[During the mid-Eighteen hundreds, England had conducted wars to force the Chinese to import opium from British-owned sources. They rationalized their murdering (with their then-recently-acquired superior armament) untold numbers of "yellow-skinned" folks, as a legitimate means of forcing an open-door policy on the Chinese: one intended to enable the Brits to export thousands of chests of opium, as payment for England's imports from them. Well over a century later, Colombian drug cartels could be heard using the Brits' rationale by claiming the maintaining of their cocaine industry is an essential part of Colombia's economy. And, it most certainly is: it enables them to pay for the manufactures they import from the nations they sell their coke to. (It must be noted, that the poppy-growing areas fostered by the money-is-my-God Brits, are still responsible for supplying the raw material for much of the world's opium. The ill aftereffects of the greed-motivated domination of the British Empire have still not dissipated -- and, one wonders if the ill effects of a more modern-day colonialism: a new-world order, will ever go away).*

*[It would be difficult to find one manufacturing nation that doesn't sell war-making goods to offset the cost of their imports, as well as a means of making her wealthy citizens richer. So, how can we Americans condemn our tobacco industry for their claiming that: by their catering to the "free-will" demands of American citizens for their killer tobacco products, they are bettering the American economy -- with specific benefits accruing to farm laborers, cigar-store clerks, advertising men and women, stockholders, doctors and morticians?*

*[Murder, Inc. or Mafia, would be just as appropriate names for those organizations claiming they've operated within the boundaries of the law, such as: the former (and present-day wannabe) colonial powers and the international tobacco cartel -- as they were for the handful of equally greed-motivated, immigrant, Jewish contract-killers and Italian gangsters to whom the names, Murder, Inc., and Mafioso were first applied.*

*[The parallel rationalizations for the actions of the colonizing Brits (and their successors: those fostering a new-world-order), the Colombians and the tobacco industry can be summed up by expanding on the NRA's (America's National Rifle Association) claim that people have the right to kill animals as a sport -- which is debatable -- while brushing off the use of firearms by criminals and lunatics as an unfortunate coincidence. No thinking person should find fault with the right of*

*citizens to bear arms (it's the only protection they have against an oppressive government), but by blocking the enactment of laws to prevent their use by the very young, the feeble-minded and known criminals, the NRA shows it's merely a question of money. Which, of course, is just what the motivation was for the colonizing Brits, the tobacco industry, the Colombian drug dealers and is for those touting "The New World Order".]*

There was no end to the nefarious means the British used in their desperate attempts to maintain their absolute control over the peoples and economy of the entire Subcontinent. Nevertheless, despite all their previous efforts, the past benefits accruing to the Brits as a result of their having engaged in a century of underhanded divide-and-rule tactics, were negated when they indiscriminately killed those civilians at Jallianwala Bagh, the murdered having but one commonality, a darker skin and different religions than their own.

As a consequence of the massacre, Indians throughout the entire Subcontinent were to come together in a united effort to oust the Brits. To replace their then-failed, divide-and-rule tactics that played on the ethnic, caste, income and religious differences of India's heterogeneous population, the Crown's loyal subjects resorted to the use of a mendacious, worldwide campaign to defame an entire people.

The Brits had been prepared for either the acceptance of, or a revolt against, the passage into law of the Rowlatt Act. However, due to Gandhi's efforts, neither consequence was realized. Frustrated, the Brits sought a means to counter Gandhi's influence, both in India and abroad, where he had gained the respect of the world at large. It didn't take long for the honor-bound Brits to come up with a means they thought capable of destroying the reputations of both Gandhi and that of the Indian people -- thereby enabling them to maintain their stranglehold over the Subcontinent.

The means they decided on was a propaganda campaign on a scope never before engaged in. It's more than probable that England's deliberate, deprecatory, racism-based propaganda campaign, which was intended to dehumanize a subject people -- set the standard (the most obvious to come to mind) for that used by the Nazis against Jews; Japs against anyone not Japanese; Protestants of North Ireland against Catholics; Israelis against the Palestinians, Al Qaeda against America; and after 9/11: Bush & Co. against Islam

Although the Brits' dissemination of mendacious and denigrating, racist propaganda didn't prevent Indians throughout the Subcontinent from gaining their

independence, it did serve to proliferate the racist concepts about Indians that still prevail amongst those prone to believe such debasing propaganda -- a fact that many Indians migrating to or visiting Europe and America have discovered to their dismay. (The xenophobia exhibited by an appreciable minority of Americans in the aftermath of 9/11 -- as exacerbated by the doings of Bush's Republican administration has made them even more aware.)

\*

It was Gandhi's home-rule movement, impelled by the moral principles of Satyagraha (truth force), which he juxtaposed with deceitful England's thou-shalt-not-murder-unless-in-the-name-of-national-interest policies (policies adhered to by Iraq, Israel and America under the Bushes -- as well as by others, though less publicized) such as those they carried out at Jallianwala Bagh, that proved to be the Brits' undoing. Gandhi's ability to jar India's masses out of their fatalistic acceptance of foreign rule, without resorting to the violence so desired by the Brits, was to herald the end of the British Raj -- and the beginning of a new and free India -- albeit, a British sponsored partition that's hardly trouble-free.

<>

*[The Old Testament's tale of the Egyptian, Moses, leading his charges to the Promised Land, gave the Brits, much as it did the Hebrews, the strength and moral conviction to steal a country along with the labor and wealth of its inhabitants. For the Brits, India was the most profitable of their promised lands. To wring the most profit from, and attain their ascendancy over that nation it was necessary for them to contribute to the untimely deaths of some fifteen million Indians. This, as a direct consequence of deliberate murderings and their callously contributing, in at least three instances, to the starvation of thirteen million people.]*

*[Supply and demand being what it is, the starvation deaths of a million Irish Catholic were caused by the same motivation as that by the Brits in India: as the price of still-available food rose, and with the impoverished Irish unable to pay for it, the food was exported to make a killing -- no pun intended. What was not paralleled, however, is that the Brits apologized for their million-death-causing actions in Ireland, but not for the thirteen million Indians who lost their lives due the identical greed-motivated activities by those Brits in India.]*

*[Despite the Brits' having caused the deaths of those millions, there was still a huge supply available of reliable, cheap labor. But, this was a mixed blessing for*

*India and her people: it precluded the Brit's need, or willingness to settle India with England's social rejects. The Judeo-Christian Brits content to look to their God to justify their going about the business of methodically draining the Subcontinent of its wealth -- without the need to attempt to ethnically-cleanse it of its indigenous peoples. The Brits had another reason for not introducing British settlers. And, that was their experience in America -- where the colonists refused to buckle under the king's rule, and ousted them instead, albeit, without the help of the French, it wouldn't have happened..*

*[Though it's common practice to attribute to the One-and-Only God the written contents of their holy books, as well as those uttered in His name by His earth-bound vicars and prophets, it's a well-known fact (but seldom, if ever acknowledged by those catering to the religious needs of run-of-the-mill believers) that much of the Bible stems from an adaptation of Egyptian, Sumerian and Harappan lore and wisdom -- later emended by Mesopotamian, Greek and Hebraic prophets, poets, scholars, madmen and fools. All of which eventually culminated in the original version of the Old Testament -- one written in Greek, in which the concept of racism was given its basest of meanings as justifying the stealing of an unworthy people's land.*

*[A self-serving interpretation of the Old Testament had imbued the Brits, much as it did the claimed-direct-ancestors of the Pharaoh's former slaves, with a rationalization for stealing an alien people's land. Nevertheless, once that very same racism became instilled in their psyche, it became the driving force behind the Brits' every self-serving action. When knowledge of the massacre (that they committed at Jallianwala Bagh) became public, their ability to justify it proved to test their resourcefulness. However their very success in convincing the British public of the righteousness of the massacre proved so offensive to virtually all Indians that it jarred them out of their Karma-accepting lethargy.*

*[With the subsequent loss of India, there was to be no British Empire. Reruns of 1930s movies, the likes of "Kim", "Sabu the Elephant Boy" and "Gunga Din", were to act as reminders for every Englishman, from the presiding monarch to the slum-dwelling, Cockney child, that they were relieved of the onerous task of bearing the "white-man's burden".]*

For six years, ending seven months after the end of WWI, Michael Francis O'Dwyer reigned as the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab. And, for all his having near-unlimited authority in the administration of that Indian Province, he was but one of many second-rung representatives of the British Crown; as such, Michael Francis O'Dwyer was an expendable pawn: one to be sacrificed, if so

required to further the interests of the Empire.

O'Dwyer was known to the Viceroy and his administrative staff in Simla, and every Lieutenant Governor, Administrator and Resident of every other geographical sub-division of the Indian subcontinent, for being a reactionary, bigoted, narrow-minded, egotistical, pompous ass. This, obviously, made him eminently qualified for the job he was required to do on behalf of the Empire. It also made him a fitting symbol of the racist aspect of the British Empire. And, it was as such that he was murdered, his death a telling omen of the imminent end of that money-driven Empire -- the dominant power of the *Old World Order* -- *for the better part of a century*.



## The Execution of Ram Mohamad Singh

More than twenty years had elapsed since the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh when, on March 13, 1940, O'Dwyer was shot dead at Caxton Hall in London. A middle-aged man, a resident of Mornington Terrace, N.W., London, calling himself *Ram Mohamad Singh*, to indicate he was acting as a representative of all Indians: Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs, felt compelled to avenge that premeditated atrocity carried out against the Indian people -- a barbarity accomplished with O'Dwyer's connivance, and then defended to the satisfaction of England's wealthy and titled gentry. No doubt, to the unworldly folks of India, the fact that those deliberate murders of a multitude of unarmed civilians could be rationalized in the name of profits, was most disconcerting.

On March 26, 1940, the late, knighted-for-his-service-to-his-country Sir Michael Francis O'Dwyer: the man thought most responsible for the carrying out of the heinous act of barbarity at Jallianwala Bagh, was eulogized in a memorial service attended by hundreds of prominent members of British society. To blame O'Dwyer for his racist attitudes and demeaning actions against Indians would be tantamount to faulting a pit bull for its attacking and killing a man -- the result of its having been trained in a manner calculated to enhance its vicious potential -- for the intended benefit of its master.

\*

British justice was swift for O'Dwyer's executioner. On June 5, 1940, after a jury deliberation of one hour and thirty-five minutes he was found guilty of murder; thereupon the presiding judge, *after first prohibiting the press from publishing the defendant's final statement to the court*, sentenced him, under the name of Udham Singh, to be killed on June 25, 1940 --- without further ado. However, the words of Udham Singh's court-appointed, English lawyer's praising of the court for: *affording his unworthy client all the benefits of British justice*, were duly published in *The Times of London* -- that staunch supporter of Empire.

In retrospect, at least from an historical point of view, and for the very Empire he was conditioned to protect, Michael Francis O'Dwyer, as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab was the wrong man in the wrong place at the wrong time. Nevertheless, for India, his race-based murderous actions served as the catalyst that helped rouse the Indian people out of their accepting, born-of-fatalism lethargy.





## Montagu-Chelmsford Report

In late 1917, Edwin Montagu, the British Secretary of State for India, *a supporter of whatever it takes to preserve the affluence of those landed and wealthy Brits who controlled the Empire, and who also claimed to be a liberal -- which he was, at least for his time*, was in India working with the Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford, to determine the means of complying with England's avowed commitment to home rule for India (albeit, excluding international matters). Howsoever, since both Montagu and Chelmsford had been indoctrinated with the self-serving concepts commonly found lurking in the psyche of most middle- and upper-class Englishmen (as well as a majority of Anglophiles, worldwide): that of an Anglo-Caucasian, Judeo-Christian, racial and moral superiority over all other peoples, despite their much-publicized assurances of a new policy that would lead to autonomy for India, they could only recommend, in their 1918 report addressed to the British Parliament, a degree of home rule that was such in name only. If that were not affront enough, in the rules the Brits promulgated, based on that Montagu-Chelmsford report, the approval of even the minutest action authorized by a selected-by-the-Brits, Indian assembly, would be subject to an arbitrary interpretation by the British government residing in India -- moreover, even that limited legislation, allowed to be enacted by Indians in accordance with those rules, would still be subject to a Brit veto -- but even that was considered too liberal for the Brits in London to be enacted into law.

In late 1917 through early 1918, the idea of an appreciable degree of home rule for India had been bandied about by the Brits. However, in short order it became a case of giving lip service to the concept of Indian autonomy -- this, in an attempt to placate what they wished to believe were the demands of but a non-representative vocal minority of elitist Indians. Nevertheless, by dangling the carrot of home rule before the Indian intelligentsia, the Brits were able to maintain, and even further India's support for England's WWI war effort.

The naiveté exhibited at that time by so many Indians who should have known better than to take the Brits at their word, was soon replaced with one of complete distrust. Until then, the duplicity displayed by His Majesty's loyal servants, had been accepted as a normal part of Brit governance. The Brits, in attempting to give a legitimacy to the laws enacted for the governance of India, had allowed certain Indians, primarily those educated in British jurisprudence, and decidedly non-revolutionary types, to vote on laws the British Government in India wished to enact. On the face of it, it would cause one to question why all the hullabaloo about home rule for India. The answer is simple: the number of Indians

voting was limited by law -- their number had to be less than the number of the British Government in India's representatives. If that were not enough assurance to the Crown that their will be done, the Indian votes were merely advisory, and had no effect whatsoever on whether or not a law was enacted. Accordingly, every controversial law passed by the Government of India, whether or not opposed by the Indians present, was said to have been approved by a unanimous vote.

\*

## **“An Act to Cope With Anarchical and Revolutionary Crime”**

### **Referred to as: The Rowlatt Act**

The British government in India, to counter even the slightest degree of true home rule, enacted laws intended to subject each and every Indian to the application of martial law -- in their own homeland, at the whim of just about any Britisher in the military, judicial or administration of the Government of India (the then wholly-owned subsidiary of the Brits). The law was stated to apply to any individual or group of Indians arbitrarily deemed to be acting hostile to the interests of the Crown.

And so, while denying home rule -- within six months after the end of WWI, England's legalistic betrayal of the Indian people: the Rowlatt Act, that deliberately-demeaning-to-India piece of legislation, was enacted into law.

Protests to the enactment of the Rowlatt act were made by even the ultra conservative Indians who were serving as the designated-by-the-Brits representatives of all the Indian peoples (Jinnah, the future leader of the new state of Pakistan, being amongst them). All but one, a more-royalist-than-the-Queen toady, cast votes (albeit, only token) opposing its passage. Moreover, their speechifying for each Indian's allotted fifteen minutes was duly noted by the British majority -- who, nevertheless, voted to enact it.

Even if the Brits were still unaware of the antagonism that the passage of the Rowlatt Act would engender, all they had to do was read the independent, Indian, English-language newspapers. And, in event that still didn't convince them, they could have consulted their Criminal Investigating Department, which functioned in India much as the KGB and the Gestapo did in Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany -- and they, being only too aware of the deep-seated resentment to its enactment, would have advised them of the anger its passage into law was sure to engender. It's clear that the British Government of India had full knowledge of the consequences of their enacting the Rowlatt Act. There was never a question of the hostility that its passage would generate amongst Indians. The obvious intention of the Brits was to foment an uprising.

*[It's just possible that when first contemplated, the Brits assumed that Indians, after a spate of grumbling indignation, would fatalistically and apathetically accept the insults inherent in the Brits fallacious claims for the need for the Rowlatt act. But the rioting immediately after its passage, in Mumbai (then Bombay), caused them to revert to plan A: incite a rebellion -- big, but not too*

*big.]*

It was as a consequence of the enactment by the Brits of the law : *An Act to Cope With Anarchical and Revolutionary Crime* -- invariably referred to as the *Rowlatt Act* -- which was calculated to rationalize welshing on their home-rule agreement, that those many thousands of unarmed, Indian civilians had gathered at Jallianwala Bagh. On April 8, 1919, O'Dwyer, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab (Jallianwala Bagh being the outdoor space located in Amritsar: a leading city in the state) ordered the arrest and deportation (actually carried out three days later) of Dr. Kichlu (a Moslem) and Dr. Satya Pal (a Hindu): both were amongst the most prominent supporters of Indian home rule, neither man advocated the use of violence; both men had spoken out against the duplicitous Brits' racism-based justification for the passage of the Rowlatt Act. It was to discuss the deportations of those two men, as well as the Rowlatt act, that Gandhi was en route to Amritsar (a destination he was prevented from reaching). Despite Gandhi's inability to be present, a meeting was held. The place selected was Jallianwala Bagh, and as a peaceful gathering sat listening to less formidable speakers, the massacre by British troops was to take place.

Since no similar laws were enacted in either England itself, or any of her colonies populated by the dispersed progeny of England's underclasses; to Indians it was obvious that greed-motivated racism was the major factor in India's being singled out for the subjection to laws of such a demeaning nature. Until then, the West's concept of racism was alien to Indian culture. (Though, the concept of caste was equally vile -- it was home-grown and had a different line of reasoning.) It was the passage of the Rowlatt act that made individuals from every religion, caste and class realize that it was their being Indian that sanctioned its enactment. Finally, it dawned on Indians, that no matter what the intellectual, economic or social level of any Brit or any Westerner for that matter, he was held in higher esteem than any member of the world's oldest continuous civilization -- that of the Indo-Aryan-Dravidian: a root supplier (for better or worse) of much of what did and still does pass for modern-day world *culture*.

That racism played its part, most notably as a means of rationalizing (as the white-man's burden) their military occupation of India, and ensuring the loyalty of British troops as they performed the most heinous atrocities, such as their murdering Indian soldiers for refusing to slaughter their fellow Indians during India's first war of independence (self-servingly designated as "the Sepoy Rebellion" by the Brits) -- by tying them to the face of a cannon and then blowing them to smithereens. However, the underlying culprit for the passage of the Rowlatt Act was Old Testament racism-rationalized greed. Just about every action

of a murderous and rapacious nature undertaken by the Brits, as a Judeo-Christian nation, was intended to protect or increase the wealth of their movers and shakers. This held true, whether it was to rationalize their century-long monopoly of the African slave trade or their murder of Amerinds by deliberately exposing them to smallpox (to which the Brits knew they had no immunity), as well as their massacre of untold Irish Catholics. *Perhaps “cherchez la femme” holds true for the reasoning behind the activities of Frenchmen, but not for the Brits -- in their case look for the buck.*

Those lands colonized by Britain's flotsam and jetsam had been granted home rule, yet India was not. That all the Crown's colonies were controlled by the very same London moneyed interests, no doubt, tells why. The indigenous population of the Subcontinent had a long-standing involvement in trade and manufacturing -- one that dated back to an era before there ever was an England. So, despite England's deliberate attempts to deny Hindu and Moslem men of commerce the ability to compete with London's money men or those belonging to one or another minority group sanctioned by them (who, being politically insignificant, couldn't threaten British rule), there were still Indians, both Moslem and Hindu who had been able to accumulate considerable wealth -- thereby proving their entrepreneurial skills. All of which made the Brits fearful of losing their stranglehold over India's economy -- in event home rule were to be granted to India.

Those colonies granted home rule, were a different story. There, England's moneyed interests had no fear of losing control over every aspect of their economies -- those lands had been colonized, almost exclusively, by a people long used to their working-class status -- and, at the time, had little or no entrepreneurial skills or experience in commerce. Moreover, as was the case in London, despite the then recent reforms, the newly formed parliaments in those colonies were controlled, for the most part, by a few wealthy, upper-class members who had both blood and commercial ties to the powers that be -- back in England. Accordingly, by their realizing that there would be little or no threat to London's retaining political and economic control over those colonies -- England's Parliament, however begrudgingly, granted them home rule.

*[An article in the Bombay Chronicle of December 29, 1915 made mention of the nearsightedness of the attitude that England maintained in her dealings with India; it made mention of the opinion held by America's Andrew Carnegie, one no doubt arrived at due to the accumulation of wisdom acquired over his, then, eighty years of living. The article read: He (Carnegie) makes no secret of his conviction that if India and England part company, the blame will not lie with*

*India.]*

Whether it was due to racist considerations arising from their having been indoctrinated with that pernicious Judeo-Christian belief in their racial superiority, or merely good old-fashioned greed, despite England's WWI wartime promises, India was not granted home rule.

## Mohandus Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948)

There appears to be little reason for doubting that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh was instigated by the topmost British authorities. The British, due to their well-organized spy network, knew full well of Gandhi's being en route to Amritsar, where he was expected to address a large gathering. Moreover, the Brits were well aware of Gandhi's commitment to passivity as the sole means of obtaining a degree of self-rule for India (an autonomy similar to that granted the so-called *white* colonies -- those lands colonized by England's underclasses.

Nevertheless, despite the calming effect his presence was sure to have (never had there been violence associated with his leadership), and since the Brits claimed to have had cause to believe the crowd could turn violent (for which they were marshaling large contingents of troops in and around Amritsar), their preventing Gandhi from traveling there can only be viewed as part of an unprincipled grand plan: one that would allow them to expand on their initial: teaching-the-infidels-a-lesson slaughter at Jallianwala Bagh (that enclosed area in Amritsar where the massacre was to take place). Planning for a possible violent reaction to the blood bath inflicted by British troops on the congregation of unarmed Indian civilians, which would allow them to rationalize the murdering of untold additional Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs -- which would, besides assuring their militarily-enforced stranglehold over India's economy and people, facilitate their "honorably" renegeing on their agreement regarding home rule. With WWI over, there was no longer any reason for the Brits to curry favor with *trouble-making* Indians.

*[Found in the Archives of India file: Home -- Poll -- A -- Aug. 1919 -- 261-272, in a telegram sent by the British Secretary of State for India to Viceroy Chelmsford on Aug, 12, 1919 -- page 29: "... I have never yet heard of an instance of Gandhi's appearance in any part of India having anything but a tranquilizing effect." In the same file can be found the following by Montagu which, due to his choice of words : "... why restrain a man who is not misbehaving?" indicates the condescending mindset (when referring to an Indian of even Gandhi's stature) by one counted amongst the more "liberal" Brits.*

*[That Gandhi was deliberately prevented from going to Amritsar, lays bare the fact that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh was a calculated well-planned, politically-motivated strategy. It wasn't because his presence at the meeting would foment rebellion, but rather that, even if unharmed during the intended bloodletting, just the fact that he was there would cause an uprising of such a*



*magnitude that it could be impossible to control.]*

Since the blood bath at Jallianwala Bagh was a premeditated affair, Gandhi was deliberately detained by the Brits when en route to Amritsar. Although the condescending attitude towards all Indians quite naturally also applied to Gandhi, his person couldn't be handled in quite such a cavalier fashion as others. Gandhi was venerated by millions of his countrymen, and the consequences of his death, if caused by the Brits, would have been catastrophic. It would have resulted in an uprising far greater than planned for, one with a momentum capable of sweeping away the Empire.

Keeping Gandhi, the adored-by-the-masses man of peace, away from the intended killing field in the Punjab, was the solution to the Brits' problem -- for if the man of peace were killed, or even present during the massacre, it would be next to impossible to rationalize the murder of all those unarmed Indian civilians. After all, one of the primary reasons for the massacre by the Brits was to teach the Indians a lesson: by showing them how merciless they could be if crossed -- much as the Nazis did, with telling effect at the town of Lidice, when they murdered every male from the age of puberty on.

The Brits had no intention of having Gandhi martyred during their ten-minute reign of terror at Jallianwala Bagh -- and thereby ignite India's second war of independence -- one so emotionally-charged and broad-based that this time, India, despite lacking modern arms, could still win -- or at the very least make England's continued occupation untenable..

Nevertheless, despite the Brits' preventing his martyrdom, by keeping him out of harm's way while the massacre took place, Gandhi, by proclaiming, in its aftermath, that all Indians murdered at Jallianwala Bagh were *martyrs to the cause of freedom*, pinpointed the cause of the massacre, and then, by using his ability to air worldwide the carrying out of that atrocity, he converted the massacre into the beginning of the Brit's last-ditch stand to maintain the Empire. In doing so he had used Jallianwala Bagh as the unifying factor that led to his successful campaign to rid the Subcontinent of foreign rule.

✱



## THE STORY OF MARY FORBES, AMERICAN

### The Lady Who Threatened an Empire

*[When in New Delhi during the winter of 1996/97, the writer spent six weeks at the National Archives of India, reviewing files left behind by the British in the aftermath of India's having finally ridded herself of foreign rule. Although the purpose of his research was to delve into the whys and wherefores of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, when scanning the index book covering the files of correspondence completed in March of 1919 -- the month the Rowlatt act was passed, he came across a description of a file that he found intriguing: **Miss Mary Forbes**: Steps taken to remove her, companion to the ex-Rani of Mandi, from British India in accordance with section 3 of Foreigners Act of 1864, and arrangements made for her passage to San Francisco.]*

\*

The doings of this Miss Mary Forbes were such that they required action be taken, over a two year period, by: American Consul-General J.A.Smith Esq. in Calcutta; the Director, British Central Intelligence Department in India; Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer of the Punjab; the Superintendents of Police throughout India; the British Secretaries to the Government of India for both the Home and Finance Departments, and the Foreign and Political Departments; the British Legal Remembrancer; and the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal -- amongst many others. Moreover, the magnitude of her offense was such that I found thirty-five pages marked *CONFIDENTIAL* dedicated to her doings in her dossier: HOME-POLITICAL -- B, MARCH-1919 Nos. 260-273. Moreover, the correspondence in the file gave every indication that all departments referred to had their own comparable files dedicated to the dastardly deeds of this lady.

For Miss Mary Forbes's villainous treasonable actions, the Legal Remembrancer (official British practitioner of jurisprudence) felt internment in a concentration camp would be appropriate under the Defense of India Rules of 1915.

*["The Defense of India Rules" was a denigrating piece of legislation begrudgingly accepted by Indians as a result of England's claiming they were necessary as a result of the exigencies-of-war. Nevertheless, in the aftermath of WWI, and prior to that law's lapsing, the Brits did a cosmetic job on it, and reenacted it as: "The Anarchical and Revolutionary Crimes Act, 1919" -- which was decried for its obvious intent to insult the Indian peoples. It was to discuss the*

*deportation of Dr. Kichlu and Dr. Satya Pal for their opposition to that law, better-known as the Rowlatt Act, that caused those many thousands of Indians to gather at Jallianwala Bagh -- where the massacre took place.]*

The Punjab Legal Remembrancer believed deportation, as called for under the Foreigners Act of 1864, was inappropriate -- he felt the lady, when back in the States, might possibly say things against the best interests of the Crown. To which sounder minds amongst the Brits countered that whatever Miss Forbes would say could hardly have any effect in America because it was a *nation with many such "crackpots"*.

*[Despite the Brits' opinion of Americans, it didn't stop them from hiring spies to keep tabs on Indians (many of whom were Sikhs living in California) in America; though American authorities, at least in the States, were not known to do the bidding of the Brits (at that time) in denying equal rights under the law to Indians -- Canada, however, which was still under the direct control of England, did deny those rights to Indians. Whether or not the Brits had a direct hand in labeling Indians as non-Caucasians under the terms of the restrictive immigration laws enacted in America in the early 1920's, is a point of conjecture. However, with all the foreign news entering America at that time still provided by British-controlled sources, the likelihood of their having played a role in its determination is great.]*

And what, pray tell, was the nature of Miss Forbes's heinous crimes? The lady wrote personal letters deploring British hypocrisy. In an effort to gain world support for their war against Germany, the Brits had claimed they were fighting for the rights of the common man (sound familiar?). What Miss Mary Forbes said, was that America should call England's bluff and refuse to support the Brits in their WWI war against the Germans (her letters were written in 1917 and 1918) unless England promised to give home rule to both India and Ireland. Moreover, she suggested that after the war America be given protective custody of Germany's colonies, claiming that America (at least at that time) showed her good intentions by assisting the citizens of the Philippines in attaining self-government.

In addition, Miss Forbes sent excerpts from readily-available Indian newspapers, with covering letters, to the American Consul-General in Calcutta -- which that gentlemen turned over to the Brits, claiming her actions, i.e., by her, an American, sending clippings from a newspaper and writing to the American consulate, were treasonable acts against England; *he also stated that his receiving them was a nuisance.*

\*

According to the sketchy biography of Mary Forbes that unfolds in their correspondence; she was Baptized in the Lutheran Church, at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; her mother was an American; her father was a Dublin Irishman who migrated to America -- presumably in the aftermath of the famine years -- with his brothers, and all of them took out papers of naturalization; she said she was born in India, but where and when she didn't divulge. The entire background of Miss Forbes appears to have been met with much skepticism by the Brits. Nevertheless, since her assertions of being an American citizen (she never claimed British citizenship as a result of her being white and born in India) was accepted by both the American consulate and all the various and sundry British authorities, her being an American must have been obvious.

Although very little of what Miss Forbes told of her background appears to have been verifiable: either by the Brits or the American Consul-General, her status as companion to the ex-Rani of Mandi was never questioned -- but just what were her job qualifications and duties in that capacity, were not discussed in the *CONFIDENTIAL* report.

\*

On May 3, 1917 the Chief Secretary to the Government of Punjab, was to describe Miss Forbes as a "capable high-minded lady all of whose actions were actuated by worthy motives." A year later O'Dwyer, the Honorable Governor General of the Punjab was to advise the Secretary that what had been said needed modification. It seems apparent, as we shall see, that O'Dwyer had a penchant for *modifying facts* -- whenever they were in conflict with what he thought were the best interests of the Crown.

There's absolutely no evidence that the lady was a spy or agent for any foreign government, and no inferences to that effect were to be found in the British government's dossier on her. Moreover, no attempt was made to deport her until after Germany's defeat in WWI became a sure thing. And, though Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer and his Legal Remembrancer in the Punjab were gung ho for the use of draconian measures against the lady, the British Viceroy's Government of India in Simla felt no need for such harsh treatment -- preferring to accomplish their ends in a gentlemanly manner. Accordingly, with the imminent end of the war, the Brits resorted to *clear-the-line* telegraphic correspondence in an attempt to ensure her deportation. This, was an obvious attempt to get the lady out of India before the preordained passage of the Rowlatt Act -- and the subsequent prearranged massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. *There were, however, conflicting reports as to when, on what ship and even if the lady was*

*ever deported.*

\*

Evidently, as far as the Brits were concerned, what Miss Forbes was really guilty of was of being quite brilliant, if not prescient -- at the very least she was intuitive as to the realities of British hubris, hypocrisy and double-dealings. Her words in favor of maintaining the integrity of Turkey and against the land grabs by America's WWI allies were no different than those of America's idealistic President Wilson -- words that were ignored by America's WWI allies. And her statements regarding the British intention to destroy the power of Islam were to prove correct. Moreover, a pamphlet, she may or may not have written, advising Moslems to refuse to kill their fellow Moslems, the Turks, unless the Brits agreed to abstain from the dissolution of Turkey, then the world center of Islam -- was merely mimicking what was being bandied about throughout India by her Moslem population.

As to England's intention to divvy up Turkish territory, it had already been manifested: in 1917, Balfour, speaking for the Crown as if in full possession of Palestine (which was not obtained until 1920), accepted money from the Rothschilds in return for the Crown's acceptance of the concept of a Zionist presence in Palestine. (In later years his comment was to be aggrandized into: The Balfour Declaration.)

Miss Forbes was also guilty of making statements to the effect that a nation's peoples, stressing those of India and Ireland, have a right to self-determination -- a belief espoused by America's Presidents Wilson and FDR, and the founders of the United Nations a quarter of a century later -- and one that is spelled out in the American Declaration of Independence some one-hundred- and-fifty years earlier and was then basic to the American ethos (though, in more recent times, it's been somewhat diluted).

Miss Mary Forbes also wrote, in personal letters, in which she stated that England would end up dominating America. She's proved partially right there; the Brits, whether directly from London, or indirectly in concert with her fellow followers of the Judeo-Christian religions residing in the primarily-*white* colonies of the Empire-past, have investments in America that far outweigh that of all other nations combined. Moreover, the Brits continue to influence, if not determine, America's foreign policy in most areas where the Empire once held sway -- all to the continued benefit of London's, and their fellow-traveling money men.

\*

The insightful statements by Miss Mary Forbes's disparaging the intentions of the Empire, though within the smallest of circles, worried the money's-my-God British patriots of her day -- as did her anti-colonialist views, which were based on an equality of all peoples. Nevertheless, since there was nothing particularly original in what she said, the British Government of India must have had much more weighty reasons for wanting her deported. Her expressed opinions, though conflicting with the concept of goodness espoused by that era's defenders of Empire (a breed much like England's more-recent, in-search-of-an-empire-to-defend Tories: Winston Churchill and Margaret Thatcher), would hardly be sufficient cause for the major effort expended to deport the lady. But what was, was that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh was in the works -- and witnesses hostile to the British occupation of India, were not wanted.

## The Malignant Pawn

In late 1917, Lieutenant Governor Michael Francis O'Dwyer succeeded in convincing England's Secretary of State for India, Montagu, that the Punjab had special problems. The problems were such that the carrying out of even the slightest degree of home rule: the opening up of the Government of India to meaningful participation by Indians, would be folly. For O'Dwyer, that Irish Catholic, wannabe member of the English ruling class and racist martinet, the very concept of any degree of home rule for Indians was an anathema.

Whether or not he truly believed Indians were incapable of self-government is debatable; however, that he was convinced they were an inferior people, is not. However, one need not have the wisdom of the Buddha to realize that he couldn't very well rationalize the violent suppression of his fellow Catholics, back in Ireland, by their and his Judeo-Christian British masters, if Indians obtained home rule first. *Ireland was not to attain home rule until three years after the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh.*

O'Dwyer had already given evidence of being a deranged martinet in fear of losing his ego-building, near-limitless authority over the lives of a subject people. The ruthless means authorized by him, in the Punjab, as a way of surpassing the demands for money and troops made by London in support of their WWI war with Germany (a war intended to prevent Germany from sharing in the rapacious game of colonizing militarily-weaker nations), was intended to ingratiate himself to his Anglo-Saxon betters back in England. In addition, it gave sufficient proof of his, O'Dwyer's, psychopathic antagonism towards Indians in general -- and by extension, towards India's aspiration for a form of self-government on a par with that granted to her *white-Protestant* colonies.

Whatever his rationalized reasons, the motivation behind O'Dwyer's drive to excel was his need to establish his I'm-no-run-of-the-mill-Irish-Catholic credentials. And, in doing so, he spent the better part of his six-year tenure in the Punjab carrying out an autocratic, demeaning-to-Indian-pride policy. No evidence appears that O'Dwyer's demeanor had ever been challenged by his superiors: the Viceroy; the Secretary of State for India; the Government of India at Simla; the India Office in London or any of the houses of Parliament (though most were aware of it). Obviously, the Lieutenant Governor was doing the job he was deliberately selected to do. His final act in that capacity was to arrange, on the Empire's behalf, for the blood bath at Jallianwala Bagh -- which was carried out by British troops under the direct command of the mentally-unstable General Dyer.



The initial report received by Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer detailing the massacre, advised him that British troops were used to carry out the premeditated murders of as many of those innumerable thousands of unarmed Indian civilian men and children gathered at Jallianwala Bagh as they could. Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer upon hearing that General Reginald Edward Harry Dyer had used British troops to carry out the massacre, damned General Dyer for his being an incompetent fool. For murdering those innocents? Hell no! He was damned for his use of British troops rather than Indian troops as planned for.

There can be no question that the murders were premeditated. General Dyer acknowledged in a deposition that he deliberately ordered his men to fire, without warning, into the peacefully-assembled crowd -- and that he had them continue to do so for ten minutes. Despite the original confirmed report that General Dyer had ordered fifty British soldiers, on command, to fire into that peaceful gathering, the written report dictated by Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer, days later, was to state that no British troops were present, and only Indian troops did the firing. As the days passed on to weeks, British claims as to the character of the troops employed and the number of civilians they admitted to having murdered changed constantly.

Good soldiers are paid to do as they're told -- no more, nor less. And, it's not the intention of the writer to fault the British officers, including the unbalanced General Commanding Dyer and the enlisted men who did the massacring -- although, all were worthy of censure and surely none would be worthy of the praise of the British House of Lords for having ordered or obeyed the command to fire to kill a mass of unarmed and seated civilians. It should be noted, however, had the Brits murdered unarmed civilians some twenty years later in a nation with whom they were at war, each and every one of them would then be guilty of war crimes -- and crimes against humanity.

As to Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer, the man seen as the guiding hand behind the massacre, he was merely the expendable hatchet-man selected by London to follow their tacit instructions -- those intended to set the stage for the violent put-down of Indian aspirations for home rule (in event the murderings didn't cow the Indians into complete submission to British authority). It seems that even the possibility of the enactment of the essentially-meaningless and ever-so- limited form of self-government proposed in the Montagu-Chelmsford report, caused London's greedy money men to fear the eventual loss of India, which would have meant the end of the British Empire -- ergo, Jallianwala Bagh.

O'Dwyer was the ideal fall guy to head the plot intended to protect and further the economic well-being of the Empire. In addition to his reputation as a martinet and bigot, his being Irish and a Catholic, made O'Dwyer the ideal sacrificial lamb in event their plan failed -- or drew too much adverse publicity. In which case, the Brits could claim the nefarious deed, the massacre, was the doing of an Irish Catholic madman -- and no Englishman need have his reputation tarnished.

O'Dwyer had given every indication that he believed it a moral obligation to serve the interests of the Empire, and that its very existence was ordained by God. While treating all Indians as inferior people, he was outspoken in his disdain for all educated Indians -- especially those versed in the law (interestingly enough, conservative Republicans in America hold a similar view of educated, liberal, non- Anglo-Saxon-Protestant lawyers). Despite the fact that all the laws enacted by the Brits in India, much like those established by the Nazis in the nations they conquered and colonized throughout Europe during W.W.II, were intended to subordinate the dignity of colonized peoples to the economic benefit of an alien nation, the megalomaniac, O'Dwyer, resented any intrusion on his authority caused by appeals to those laws. To O'Dwyer: only those Indians servile to his dictatorial will (as the representative of the Crown), were *good Indians*; poor Indians were dirt; rich Indians, were money grubbers; and Indian intellectuals, whether or not lawyers, were considered uppity and potentially traitorous subversives. (The more things change, the more they remain the same.)

*[The Andaman Islands penal colony was England's answer to France's Devils Island. Although there were a few outspoken British critics of England's morally bankrupt policies, no Englishman in London of the stature of an Emile Zola, was to be heard denouncing the doings of the British regime in India. But, there were those who were outspoken in their support of any and every action, no matter how heinous, carried out by the Brits in India.]*

The publicized proposals and enactment into law of the Rowlatt Act, all before the Montagu-Chelmsford report could be acted upon, confirmed O'Dwyer's belief that all was going according to plan. Parliament and the British government in India were laying the groundwork for the kind of disturbances required to give them a moralizing rationale for him to carry out his part in their sub rosa plan. It's doubtful that he was fully aware of the whys and wherefores for his having been chosen to head this nefarious endeavor. Nevertheless, as the cat-paw of the British Government, he was most successful in ensuring, at least momentarily, the retraction of the home rule agreement England had with Indian leaders -- that it eventually backfired, is another matter.

Despite being aware that home rule had only been granted to the Empire's Protestant *white* colonies, Indians, for all their having lived with a caste system that was part of their culture, were incapable of conceiving of the kind of racism inspired by the self-serving, Judeo-Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. Nor, for that matter, were they, with the exception of the likes Tilak and then Gandhi, fully aware of the overall economic implications for the Brits in event India gained a meaningful home rule.

By deliberately adding insult to injury (by offering India a limited-to-the-point-of-being-nonexistent form of home rule, and then executing the Rowlatt act as a means of negating its effect in event it became law), the Brits planned to maintain their absolute control over India's internal economy and the political lives of her people -- this, in addition to the absolute control of all matters involving the military and international affairs that she maintained in her *white* colonies. "*An Act to Cope With Anarchical and Revolutionary Crime*", the Rowlatt act, gave the Brits the right to apply martial law against India's civilian population at their whim (which gave them the arbitrary right to kill on sight), and incarcerate any Indian deemed a threat to British authority, without benefit of trial, or a right to contest the action.

There is a point here that Indians demanding home rule didn't consider, and that, for obvious reasons, the Brits didn't want publicized. At the time the *white* colonies gained home rule, their economies and tax revenues were all under the direct control of the same London bankers, wealthy entrepreneurs and landed gentry as those benefiting from the British occupation of India. Australian-born progeny of the original transported settlers, under their home rule, had no more control over their economies and tax revenues than did Indians -- the powers that be in London controlled the parliaments in all the *white* colonies. For England, not only was home rule in those colonies no threat, but, the belief that they were masters of their own fate served to make those former pariahs of British society into willing servants of the Crown.

In the sense that any career government worker can be considered intelligent, Michael Francis O'Dwyer, a member of the British civil service, could be judged bright -- and, as a result of his having been perceived as a man more royalist than the Queen (a common-enough phenomena to make the term a cliché) he was continually being promoted. Due to his real or feigned loyalty to the Empress-Queen Victoria and her progeny, he uncomplainingly bore the *white man's burden* -- the responsibilities of administering the British laws devised to facilitate the milking of their cash-cow, India.

It was the wealth extorted from India that enabled England's Parliament, controlled by its greed-motivated, money-made gentry, to run the Empire without the interference of their nominal rulers: the progeny of the renamed, yet still German, house of Windsor -- whom they welfared-off with a life of leisure -- as a means of preventing their interfering with the running of the nation. The payoff to British royalty for their good behavior was, and still is more than sufficient to allow them a life free of the problems of commerce, and continues to this day to support them in lives of indolence, disturbed only by an occasional trip to the races, a bout with a fox, an inspection of the guard, or a dispute with the press.

## Cultural Baggage

*[Every voyager to an alien land, regardless of the class or price of his ticket, carries with him a weightless item of an indeterminate size: his cultural baggage. It passes undetected through the most sophisticated and powerful X-ray machines: with the vast majority of travelers' being ignorant of its very existence. But, like his shadow, it tags along, wherever he goes --- becoming visible only when its owner is subjected to outside stimuli. Now, just as the circumstances under which a light is cast adds another dimension to the conception of a shadow, one both physical and metaphysical, such as: the sun's rays; moonbeams; the flickering light of a campfire or candle; the beam of a headlight, spotlight or flashlight, so, too, does foreign travel stimulate the display of the many facets of a person's cultural baggage.]*

*[Observing a cast shadow, and then determining the source of its two-dimensional shape, would hardly test anyone's cognitive abilities. Furthermore, during the course of our lifetime, virtually everyone learns to judge the significance of any particular shadow. Should one: ignore it? be amused by it? frightened by it? enthralled by it? intimidated by it? That all depends on the why, when, where, how and to whom the shadow appears. Now, as complex as this may sound, worldwide, the reactions to a shadow by all but the most-intellectually challenged, are governed by such or similar considerations.]*

*[The outward display of one's cultural baggage, though superficially akin to that of one's shadow, connotes a multi-dimensional source. And, as such, both its causes and manifestations are exponentially greater and far more varied than the causes of, and the reactions to, a particular shadow. Obviously, the inputs that determine the size and shape of one's cultural baggage are of a complex nature: its having been formed by a lifetime of subjectively-accumulated components: book knowledge, experience and environmental exposures.]*

*[To what degree the contents of a traveler's cultural baggage manifests itself, tends to increase in direct proportion to its owner's ignorance of the history and culture of the country being visited. Moreover, the more the traveler's conception of morality and culture differs from theirs, the less his ability to mask the contents of his own cultural baggage. Remarkably, these attitudes begin to grow more manifest from the time the future world-traveler decides to make his trip, until they become full-blown once he clears customs and enters into direct contact with the alien people in their alien land. At that time, the true nature of the inputs to his cultural baggage is revealed --- to everyone, although not necessarily to its*

*owner. These now-exposed biases carried in the visitor's cultural baggage (having been muted in the past by their having been in tune with the majority of the people he surrounded himself with), are not by nature evil. Everyone, during the course of his lifetime, has been laid open to a wealth of mundane, and at times powerful and overwhelming influences -- that of: friends and family, education, sex, race, religion, nationality, avocation, vocation, profession, media, environment, death, to name but some of the more obvious.*

*[Every experience, from traumatic to fleeting, makes its proportionate contribution to the essentially unique psyche of each and every one of us. All these various influences combine to program our culture-bound, knee-jerk responses to any given set of stimuli. The accumulated contents of one's cultural baggage reveal themselves in every imaginable way when in a foreign land. The visitor can have any one or a combination of a wide range of responses: delight; fright; awe; rapture; repugnance; proud association; obsequiousness; inferiority; impatience; boredom, acceptance; superiority; understanding resignation; and you name it. The owner of this amorphous piece of Pavlovian luggage produces a different set of reactions with each encounter with a different peoples -- which, in turn, is re-affected by their response to him. And, in the unlikely event that there is such a person, as one with no cultural baggage, he would have to be a truly unique individual, and probably a babbling idiot to boot.]*

Having been on the receiving end of bigotry, has the potential for making it the single-most influential component in one's cultural baggage -- and it reached its potential in the makeup of that sacrificial lamb, O'Dwyer, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab. His cultural baggage, as an Irish Catholic serving under Anglo-Saxon, Protestant masters, was filled with the effects of a subtle, yet constant barrage of bigotry which had him constantly trying to demonstrate his allegiance to the Empire -- all in an effort to prove to both himself and his masters that he belonged.

It's more than likely that he'd have vociferously denied it; nevertheless, it's obvious, that as the culprit left holding the bag for the massacre, he must have been aware of his role as an underling within the British scheme of things. Although originally commended for his participation in the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, once the full horror of it all became public, both he, O'Dwyer, and the provincial General Dyer, were singled out for censure by the very same, self-righteous maintainers of Empire who had instigated the matter in the first place. Nevertheless, the wily O'Dwyer's disavowal of his having participated in the massacre was accepted by the Viceroy in Simla and the Parliament in London. Having been in cahoots with each other in bringing the massacre about, and with

O'Dwyer having the ability to name names, they had no choice. However, the run-of-the-mill General Dyer, was a whole other story.

No doubt, O'Dwyer and Dyer were disconcerted when hearing that their active participation in the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh (which from their point was a dutiful and well-intentioned, patriotic act in support of the Crown) was being publicly condemned for the heinous crime it was. Until the news of the massacre leaked out of India, the *Times of London* made but a passing reference to: "*their being casualties due to the disturbances taking place in India.*" However, once the hullabaloo had run its course, Britain's *free* press and the sitting peers of the realm elevated those two participants in the murderous conspiracy, to the stature of national heroes -- for their part in preventing Indians from gaining home rule.

The two gentlemen, O'Dwyer and Dyer, had been the pawns mobilized to bring about an incident that would give the British the opportunity to squelch, once and for all, Indian opposition to England's continued despotic rule. Whether or not alcohol played a part in their warped sense of duty, or they were morally dysfunctional is arguable, nevertheless, their mental state leading up to the massacre was probably no different from that of any Nazi running a death camp. However, what is not subject to conjecture is that both those gentlemen planned and participated in the premeditated shoot-to-murder firing into the peaceful gathering of those thousands of seated-Indian-fashion, unarmed civilians at Jallianwala Bagh.

\*

## Stratagem

That vicious act perpetrated with the tacit approval of England's topmost, official representatives of the crown, as witness the vote in England's House of Lords that not only exonerated the participants in the massacre but lauded their actions, was intended to either cow the Indian people into a state of continuous submission, or goad them on to a controllable state of open revolt.

India's recently discharged veterans of WWI (Indian troops quadrupled in number to some 600,000 during that war) were, for the most part unemployed, and with but meager compensation when discharged, were, as civilians, showing signs of discontent. Moreover, even the Indian troops still on active duty, virtually all of whom had, in the past, been staunch supporters of the crown, were showing signs of unrest due to the Brits' renewed display of contempt towards Indians and their way of life. *General Dyer, prior to the massacre, was said to have doubts as to the loyalty of Indian troops; apparently he couldn't fathom why so many of those troops might not be supportive of British rule.*

In event the killings at Jallianwala Bagh didn't have the effect of intimidating India's middle class into abandoning their attempts to obtain a meaningful home rule, the Brits were prepared for the most obvious contingency - a violent reaction to the atrocity: one supported by Indian troops, recently discharged veterans and macho youths. And, judging from the presence of aircraft armed with machine guns and bombs (both of which, without cause, were used against Indian civilians in the Punjab during the *disturbances*), the main objective of the massacre may very-well have been to infuriate Indians to the point where they would unthinkingly engage in reciprocal barbarous actions against all Europeans -- rather than have them cowed into acquiescing to British domination.

Since the Brits managed to inspire sufficient indignation amongst their citizenry to fight a war (1739-1741) against Spain due to the claimed loss of one of Jenkin's ears, it was obvious that it would not have taken much for the Brits to find an equivalent excuse for murdering untold numbers of Indians. The obvious intention of the Brits was to entice a fired-up Indian crowd, equipped with their inferior weaponry, to attempt to take on the Brits with their well-disciplined, still-intact-from-WWI Army, with its tanks, bomb-dropping and machine-gun-carrying planes, mustard gas and howitzers. The Brits wanted that showdown in the well-founded belief that they were sure to win (not a particularly original tactic -- one in practice to this day) -- one that would result in the complete annihilation of the no-longer-needed Indian military, and the subsequent



unquestioned submission by the Indian people to British authority.

In effect, what the Brits wanted was a reenactment of India's first attempt at evicting them in 1857, which the Indians called their *First War of Independence* and the Brits called the *Sepoy* (*a Brit corruption of the Hindustani word for soldier: sipahi*) *Revolt*. Then, in the aftermath of the Crimean War, as in the aftermath of WWI, Indian troops, no longer needed, were being unceremoniously discharged and given next to nothing in compensation. But, the main reason for the 1857 war was the burgeoning resentment, in both the Moslem and Hindu communities, resulting from their well-reasoned concern for the growing loss of both their ethnic and religious identities. (Evidence of which, can readily be seen in every major city on the Subcontinent.) Nevertheless, the Brits circulated a story that it was due to the use of pig and beef fat to lubricate the paper shell casings then in use, which had the effect of denigrating Indians before the West for their seemingly irrational actions -- and served to obscure the true reasons for India's reaction, which was caused by England's attempts to make Indians into their obedient lackeys, much as they had done to their own British lower classes -- both at home and abroad in her *white* colonies.

*[India's 1857 war against the Brits was not a total loss for Indians, in fact, it may very well have prevented India from becoming another Sri Lanka: a country that's lost much of her unique identity -- and well on her way to becoming little more than another tropical tourist trap for the bored with life, vacationers.]*

In America, at the end of W.W.II, veterans received fairly decent benefits: free college educations plus living expenses; discharge bonuses; job preferences; unemployment benefits; medical coverage; and even free burial plots --- all in a somewhat successful effort by the ensconced wealthy "Real-Americans" to prevent the recently-discharged, lower-echelon serviceman (the vast majority with lower middle-class backgrounds) from making a concerted effort to get involved in politics. In the minds of Britain's powers that be, home rule for India in 1919 was its equivalent, in both cases politicizing the people was considered threatening to the well-being of the ensconced moneyed folks. However, to protect their interests, the Brits, instead of offering meaningful benefits to the Indian people (in effect, as in America, sharing the pie -- however disproportionately) as a means of restraining their democratic aspirations, they resorted to mass murder and terrorism in an attempt to maintain their absolute control over India's economy and her people.

*[In post-W.W.II America, as in most western nations, the sop of a little socialism was successful in preventing the people from asserting themselves politically. In*

*fact, it was so successful in America, that the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act: the most comprehensive piece of union-busting legislation ever passed by a government priding itself in its democratic tradition, was enacted in the post-W.W.II years, overriding President Truman's veto -- apparently Congress approved only his blunders.]*

The Brits, being racist for the most part (the better educated amongst them, when conditions require, tend to be quite good at hiding it), as well as conservative of their wealth, resorted to the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh to squelch the aspirations of the citizens of India. Always willing to sacrifice the lives of British commoners, they fully expected that a sufficient number of them would be murdered by Indians in retaliation for the atrocities committed by the Brits, to enable them to justify their destroying, once and for all, any opportunity for India to ever attain a meaningful home rule -- which they believed, with some logic, would be tantamount to granting India outright independence -- and the dissolution of the Empire.

\*

Gandhi had assumed a kernel of decency lie hidden within the greed-motivated psyche of the Brits, and tended to attribute the indignities, and worse, arbitrarily bestowed upon Indians, to the malignity of individual Brits. Even after their passing the Rowlatt Act, Gandhi maintained his belief in the basic decency of all mankind, even the Brits. Accordingly, he was dismayed by the calculated-to-terrorize tactics employed by them when they went about their premeditated mass murderings at Jallianwala Bagh.

Gandhi, perhaps due to the highfalutin idealist talk about the fairness of British law that he had acquired as a student in England, had initially misjudged the British as to the lengths to which they'd go to maintain their total control over India. It hadn't dawned on him, that the enactment into law of the Rowlatt Act was intended to repudiate their agreement for home rule: either due to the docile acceptance by Indians of its demeaning intent, or by provoking Indians into an emotionally-charged, physical reaction against British, as well as all other European civilians -- thereby enabling that hoped-for reaction to gain the "civilized" West's support for a murderous retaliatory action against all Indians by British troops. Soon, Gandhi, working on the assumption that rational people don't, as a rule, act irrationally, began to comprehend England's true intentions. Therefore, the massacre that took place at Jallianwala Bagh made him fully aware of the extent that the Brits would go to, in their efforts to insure their military, political and economic control over India. Accordingly, he did everything he could to maintain a peaceful, yet persistent, resistance to British authority.

The massacre and the enactment of the Rowlatt act were part and parcel of the same plot. The Brits, at the end of WWI, for its time, had a well functioning war machine at their disposal, and had every intention of using it to destroy any idea, on the part of Indians, that they would attain home rule. If Gandhi still had any doubts as to England's intentions, the fact that within days of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, British warplanes strafed and bombed an unarmed gathering of Indian civilians at Gujranwala, must have convinced him of their determination to retain their tyrannical control over India -- at any cost: whether in the lives of Indians or those of Britain's underclasses -- which could easily run into the millions: mostly Indians. It was then that Gandhi, much to the consternation of the money-is-my-God, cunning Brits, managed to convince the Indian people, which included many of the more militant, that independence could not be obtained by armed resistance, and that he, Gandhi, had a better way -- and the only way.

It was Gandhi's ability to convince the Indian masses that Satyagraha was the only way to go. And it was due to his efforts that the *disturbances* never reached a level of violence, no matter how warranted, that would have allowed the Brits to resort to the kind of savagery against Indians used by them in 1857.

*[The end of the Crimean war in 1856 and the resultant availability of British troops for duty in India, allowed for England's ruthless retaliatory murders of Indian troops during their first attempt at ousting the Brits. For the Brits, at that time, having their troops so readily available was probably an unpremeditated and serendipitous event for them -- but the lesson they learned from it was not forgotten: by them -- or by Gandhi, for that matter.]*

The Brits now realized that, by 1919, no amount of effort expended to prevent the rest of the world from being made aware of their Empire-maintaining doings, if accomplished by resorting, on the same scale, to the kind of murderous barbarities employed by them in 1857, would be successful. Both the means of communication and the morality of greed-based murder was thought to have changed much during the intervening sixty years. As a consequence, they couldn't prevent their involvement in similar heinous actions from being made known throughout the world -- thereby soiling their reputation as gentlemen. Consequently, they needed an excuse of major proportions to murder on the scale they believed necessary to maintain their stranglehold over India's economy and her people. Maintaining control of another people's lives and their land, against their will, requires the employment of a degree of cruelty only barbarians, colonial powers and supposedly-civilized religious zealots appear willing to employ.

\*

## PRECEDENTS

### Lidice

Lidice comes to mind when looking for actions similar to those perpetrated by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh. There, the deservedly reviled Nazis would hypocritically claim the exigencies of war as an excuse for their murdering all the adult males out of Lidice's tiny population of some four hundred souls (Christians all) -- though that hardly made their actions moral, or their victims any less brutally murdered. The circumstances behind the massacre at Lidice were that Czechoslovakians, during W.W.II, reacting to the humiliation and ordeal of being conquered and occupied by the Nazis, murdered the German commanding officer. The subsequent retaliatory murderous response by the Nazis was effective in convincing the natives in all of colonized-by-Germany Europe that Nazi retaliation for such acts would be swift and lethal. The reaction to the atrocity committed at Lidice was to serve its intended purpose; Europe became far more accepting of Germany's rule than India ever was of Britain's -- and India's resistance movement didn't have the benefit, as did Europe's W.W.II underground, of official American moral, financial and military support. While the executions carried out at Lidice were deservedly publicized worldwide as an example of Nazi bestiality, the British, who committed a crime exponentially more heinous against Indians at Jallianwala Bagh, continue to be praised (even by some modern-day Indians) for their gentlemanly behavior.

During W.W.II, the Nazis, never having made any claim to being fair or democratic, made no attempt to rationalize the atrocities they committed. They invaded virtually all of continental Europe -- with the sole intent of colonizing it and subjugating it to Germany's will. All of which (including barbarities matching those of the Nazis) England had accomplished in order to rule over her sun-never-sets-on-it Empire. If nothing else, the Nazis were far more forthright and less hypocritical about their nefarious intentions than were the West's colonizing powers -- who, while claiming to be fighting Germany for the sake of freedom, did not fully relinquish their own military and economic stranglehold over their non-European-controlled colonies, nor did they even appear to cease the murderous actions required to maintain their control over a majority of them, until decades following the end of W.W.II. And, even this was hardly from an altruistic change of heart, but rather because colonialism had become too costly to maintain. The moneys required by the Western powers to maintain their control over the people and economies of their colonies caused colonialism to lose its *raison d'être*. As a result, in the aftermath of W.W.II, Europe's, ever-so-moral, Judeo-Christian, colonizing powers graciously bestowed independence on the vast

majority of their colonies. *[Yet, for reasons too numerous and complex to consider at this time, America has, all too often, attempted to replace the inequities generated by Europe's former colonizing nations (the West's W.W.II Allies) with a euphemistically-dubbed: yet equally-greed-motivated and rationalized-by-racism "New World Order".]*

### **The Black Hole of Calcutta**

Though the horror perpetrated by the Nazis at *Lidice* -- a relatively minor incident as war crimes go -- can be found in English language dictionaries and encyclopedias, it's rare to find a listing under Jallianwala Bagh, and even then it's almost always a fleeting mention that makes light of the atrocity committed by the Brits -- talk about the need for victims' rights. Moreover, an otherwise insignificant incident that occurred in Calcutta over two hundred years ago, is still used as a classic example of Heathen cruelty; this, as a result of its having been used extensively by the Brits as a racist rationale for despotic colonialism. It can be found listed under its own name, or under both the *History of India* and *Calcutta* -- as if it were a significant event in its own right. It's the infamous *Black Hole of Calcutta*.

In 1756 the English were defeated in Calcutta by the local Mogul ruler. Some sixty Brits who were unable to escape in time were confined overnight in a cell 18 feet by 14 feet. The quarters were cramped, the average space per person being slightly in excess of four square feet, and this required most to stand. In the morning, only twenty-one (21) *brave* Englishmen came out alive -- the survivors, in a spate of fright-induced hysteria, had panicked -- trampling and suffocating the weaker members to death. This rather minor episode in the history of man's inhumanity to man was later blown up out of all proportion by Macaulay, that renowned super patriot, literary figure and propagandist in defense of Empire, as proof of Indian barbarity.

Macaulay, who wrote of the Black Hole incident well over fifty years after its occurrence, was never known for his accuracy. However, this didn't deter England's propaganda machine from popularizing his fantasized and melodramatic description of the incident (and may have encouraged the use of it): Macaulay had more than doubled the number of Brits imprisoned -- and made the cell into a dungeon little larger than a telephone booth. All of which was used as an excuse for resorting to the most barbarous means at their disposal to extract India's wealth and ship it off to London. That little bit of vicious propaganda didn't stop with the end of Empire; well after its demise, Macaulay's description of the Black Hole of Calcutta was required reading in freshman English-lit

courses at New York's Columbia University City; moreover, many encyclopedias and dictionaries continue to disseminate Macaulay's preposterous nonsense, using whatever aspects of his fiction that satisfies their particular agenda.. The result is that even to this day, it's difficult to find anyone educated in English who isn't familiar with the phrase: the *Black Hole of Calcutta*, and who didn't associate it with the mass murder and torture of virtuous Englishmen by the barbaric Indian Infidel.

## **The Rule of Law**

England's general policy was to retain all the benefits resulting from the vilest doings of her subjects -- and then disown the culprits and publicly denounce them and their actions -- in event a hue and cry ensued -- if and when the crimes were made public. Although this is not a unique policy and is used in varying degrees by all moralizing colonizers, the Brits were masters of it. The Brits had it so perfected that they managed to rationalize, or separate themselves from, the criminal doings of their Empire builders -- while maintaining their gentlemanly demeanor -- and retaining possession of their ill-gotten gains. The Brits followed this policy with precision in the aftermath of the wanton murders at Jallianwala Bagh, the one-time bagh (garden) that they turned into a killing ground.

Eventually, after a thorough and relatively unbiased investigation of the Jallianwala Bagh murders by the British authorities -- the results were accepted by even the most staunch supporters of colonialism, past and present -- it was determined that some one-thousand, unarmed, Indian civilians, men and boys, were killed as a direct result of the British opening fire, without warning, into the seated crowd, and that at least a thousand more were severely injured.

Early on, after the scope of the murders seeped out of India, and reached the world at large, London finally questioned the Brits in India about the massacre. Originally, the British government in India admitted to a casualty count at the killing ground that totaled but ten percent of the casualties that a subsequent London-controlled commission reluctantly admitted to. And, although the Brits in India never did state publicly the details of what transpired behind closed doors: before, during and after the massacre, they did cease issuing the most egregious lies about it. Nevertheless, the one aspect that was continuously changed, in an obvious attempt at obfuscation, was the composition of the military detail chosen to perform the murderous deed. The initial report to Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer was from British sources who advised him, under no uncertain terms, that General Dyer had used British troops to carryout the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh.

Since the official British inquiry in the doings were held in camera, the damaging evidence as to the magnitude of high-level British involvement in the conspiracy that led to the massacre was denied to the public. Moreover, that information, plus the details as to the actual makeup of the contingent of troops engaged in the killings, and the names of the British officers and officials who



participated, directly or indirectly, in the planning and carrying out of the atrocity, were intentionally deleted from the published version of the official report on the massacre (the last two sections of the seven-section document were made illegible in the copies presented to the Indian members of the British-controlled Government of India).

\*

Within hours after the massacre, a curfew had been imposed by the alcoholic and obviously mentally disturbed General Dyer; and was enforced by patrolling, motorized, British troops armed with truck-mounted machine-guns. As a result, the next of kin of those murdered at the bagh were denied the opportunity to heal and comfort the non-walking wounded, and the right to retrieve their dead. As for the Brits, they left the bagh immediately after their ten minutes of continuing murderous fire, never bothering to succor the wounded, let alone take a body count of their kill.

*[The Nazis, for all their barbaric actions, were not hypocrites, they were exactly what they claimed to be: murderous and inhumane -- and intent on enslaving all non-Germanic peoples. Not so the Brits, by holding to the claim of being Christians, it was incumbent upon them to find a moral justification for their greed-motivated bestiality. Being far more cunning as perpetrators of their atrocities than were the depraved Nazis, Britain's money men and landed gentry, like high-ranking Mafioso and America's corporate crooks, hired expert legal advice to make certain that their base doings would appear lawful -- and if found to be illegal, that their acts couldn't be traced back to them. And, especially for the Brits, should all else fail, and their complicity in the barbarous doings of their hirelings be uncovered, they would conveniently fabricate a moralistic, Bible-based rationale for their actions -- one that shifted blame from themselves, for even the most dastardly of their deeds, onto the victims.]*

*[Patriotic Americans cannot morally justify much that took place in Vietnam. And, surely no excuse can be made for the massacre of those 350 Vietnamese (that death toll included many women and children) committed by American troops at My Lai. Nevertheless, the massacre at My Lai was not a calculated event, but rather part of an indiscriminately murderous and vicious counter-guerrilla action, one that was part of an internecine war of attrition, in which some fifty thousand Americans and innumerable Vietnamese lost their lives. It was a filthy war -- and My Lai was a horrible episode, but one which Americans, once the horrors of it were made known, made little attempt to justify.]*

*[The doings of the US Army in the aftermath of the slaughter was another story. Its attempts at covering it up, the dismissal of charges of murder against all the participants but one (the lowest-ranking officer, Lieutenant Calley, a platoon leader), and the army's denials, obvious rationalizations and outright lies bear a striking resemblance to the after-the-fact actions taken by the Brit military.*

*[But that's where the similarity ends. Even America's most outspoken hawks, were shamed by the action. No member of the participating troops was made a hero for participating in the massacre at My Lai, and the entire trial, albeit of but a handful of those responsible for its being carried out, was open to public scrutiny. The opposite was true in England in the aftermath of the Jallianwala Bagh murders. ]*

The Nazis made no bones about it -- they were retaliating at Lidice for the deliberate murder of their commanding officer by a people whose lands were but recently invaded. All successful and wannabe colonial powers do and continue to resort to the meting out of such or similar summary retribution as a means of terrorizing a defeated peoples into complete submission. The totalitarian actions of British troops towards the citizens of those nations invaded and occupied by England, were no different than those of the Nazis. In both those instances, the citizens of Europe under the Nazis, where it was said they were occupied, and those of the Indian subcontinent under the Brits, where it was called colonialism, the people were living under conditions of servitude. However, in the West, the Germans were said to occupy a country (which was bad) and in India, it was euphemistically termed colonization [which, as far as many in the West (and even some in India) are concerned, was good].

\*

## Laying the Groundwork

*[The United Kingdom of England and Ireland in 1800, was, in part, an attempt to pacify the Irish by making them believe they were as one with the Brits. The intended pacification, in such a benign manner, was not the commonplace practice of England's money men. The Brits' willingness to resort to the most barbaric and loathsome means to protect and increase their wealth are too numerous to keep mentioning, so why did they change their time honored manner of pacifying the citizens of the Emerald Island? Since it's always a question of money where the Judeo-Christian morality holds sway, the reasoning becomes obvious. England's industrial revolution was in progress and the Brits were motivated by the need to increase the supply of cheap labor. (Although, some would consider that it was an attempt to prevent the Irish from declaring their independence -- a la her American colonies.)*

*[The formation of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland eased the way for Ireland's peasantry to join England's labor force of working poor -- then composed of a conglomerate of Anglo-Saxon, Welsh and Scottish laborers. Moreover, by recruiting Catholic Irishmen as a means of filling the lower echelons of her overseas government and industry and the ranks of her armies of occupation, England accomplished the dual purpose of ridding Ireland of a potentially-troublesome, lower middle class (always the majority of folks involved in violent uprisings), and by shipping them overseas, instead of English troops, allowing troops thought more reliable to the Crown to stay home and maintain order amongst the poor in the United Kingdom of England and Ireland -- with emphasis on Ireland.]*

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, Indians were led to believe, that upon Victoria's assuming the title of Empress of India (at which time she proclaimed Indians to be citizens of the Empire), that they would be sharing in it as equals. Perhaps Indians were confused as to just what being a citizen of the Empire really meant. With the exception of the well-to-do, the wealthy and the landed English gentry, all others, which included a majority of Anglo-Saxons, Scots, Welsh and Irish residing in Britain, as well as in the colonies, were all treated as second-class citizens, if not worse. And, though the House of Commons was touted as being representative of the people, that was hardly the case -- it only represented the more prosperous middle class; and even their actions were subject to a veto by the House of Lords.

\*

Prior to the massacre of 1919, India's middle class would have gladly accepted a form of home rule even more limited than that enjoyed by its counterpart in Great Britain. However, they were not yet aware of the obstacles to their attaining home rule that were being erected. The big-buck Brits had, much as they did when spreading the hokum about parity with the Irish when establishing the United Kingdom of England and Ireland, had no more intention of offering true equality to Indians than they did to Irish Catholics. The Brits used religion to rationalize the continued subjugation of the Irish, and in India they used a combination of both the religion and skin pigmentation as a reason for denying them true equality. In doing so, the Brits played the racist card, whereby all but a handful of Indians, no matter what their social status, education, inherited title or wealth, were treated as inferiors to virtually all Europeans. Nevertheless, until the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, many amongst India's middle class self-deceptively ignored or were unaware of the inherent racism in Britain's policy towards India and her people. All this was to change when the *civilized* Brits deliberately massacred a thousand unarmed civilians -- because they were Indian -- and in an obvious attempt by England to cower a nation into submission. It was a wake-up call for even the most Anglophilic Indians.

\*

Once the first inkling that the extent of the carnage deliberately inflicted on those defenseless civilians at Jallianwala Bagh had spread beyond the Subcontinent, the British Government of India, could no longer feign ignorance of its occurrence. So, in response to a request for information about it by the British Secretary of State for India, stated that there were two hundred casualties (in military parlance that means the total of wounded, missing in action and killed -- and, as such, the number should have been ten times higher). Months later, after the full impact of Britain's Jallianwala Bagh atrocities finally found their way past the censors in India (the Brits attempted to keep all forms of communication under their direct control), England's Parliament, yielding to world-opinion, decided to delve into the details surrounding the massacre. And, under continued questioning, the British Government in India finally acknowledged that, by casualties, they meant killed. Still later, they came up with a figure of under four hundred killed. and an indeterminate number of wounded. However, independent estimates of the casualties exceeded a thousand dead, and at least that number wounded. (*After viewing the area, and noting the location of the bullet holes on the two buildings still standing -- even those estimates seem conservative.*)

Although the initial British attempt to keep the true extent of the atrocity from spreading beyond the borders of the Subcontinent proved futile, by a clever use of misinformation and rationalization, they were quite successful in

diminishing its impact. In recent times, the only reference in the West to the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh can be found in a trivialized scene (it resembled a disruption of a Sunday picnic in the park) in the mega-movie "Gandhi" -- in which Kingsley portrayed the Mahatma as an activist half-Buddha half Christ. Though small in relation to the number of Jews and Gypsies killed by the Nazis (some six million civilians) and that at Srebrenica (where Netherlands "peace keepers" allowed a massacre of some eight thousand Moslems to take place -- in order to obtain the release of some thirty-odd fellow Hollanders), when the calculated killings in 1919 of those seated, unarmed Indians were carried out by the Brits, it was one of the first mass-murderings of civilians to be made public worldwide -- as well as throughout India. And, it was this awareness that worked to unify Indians throughout the entire Subcontinent. The significance of the atrocity committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh, goes far beyond the Indian subcontinent, where it brought about the eventual ousting of the Brits. It propelled Gandhi into a greater-than-life figure -- one who influenced the fate of the colonized and marginalized peoples throughout much of the world. By adapting Gandhi's means of ridding the Subcontinent of the West's rapacious colonizers, such ethical leaders as Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King were to free their people from oppressive and arbitrary rule.

Only when made fully aware of the magnitude of Gandhi's accomplishments can the man's greatness be realized. He single-handedly managed to counter the effects of Britain's long-established, Gestapo- cum Goebbels-like, internally-directed inquisition and externally-aimed propaganda: the dissemination of outright lies and gross distortions of facts that were being deliberately and calculatingly spread, on a day-in, day-out basis, by England's well-financed propaganda machine. And last, but hardly the least, he managed to guide India's diversity of peoples to act in a manner that averted the military confrontation with the British Army -- a confrontation that was so ardently desired by the likes of a Winston Churchill and his contemporary maintainers of the Empire *uber alles*, one they might morally meet with their most-modern war machines.



## The Conspiracy

When aware of the world in which Gandhi functioned, one must admire his ability to discern its makeup, and then deal with its depraved materialism. Despite a torrent of malicious and potentially devastating propaganda, Gandhi, no doubt the century's preeminent and most-influential spiritual and political force, against all odds, led and guided India, with its ancient culture and great diversity of peoples, in a successful effort to rid his country of foreign rule. This, he accomplished through a series of confrontations with the representatives of a militarily-enforced, despotic government. For all of England's highfalutin gentlemanly talk, it functioned as the principal stockholder of *The British Empire, Inc.* -- which, in turn, responded to the demands of their greed-motivated directors, with their bottom-line mentalities. The Empire had no moral restraints in its covert use of a for-it's-time-superbly-equipped military. In addition, it maintained an all-encompassing, up-to-date spy system; it also had a well-organized, censorship cum propaganda organization at its disposal.

*[Until recently, neither of the two men most deserving of an award for their contribution to the peace of the world: Mahatma Gandhi nor Jimmy Carter had been given one. Mahatma Gandhi, the twentieth century's most dominant and influential peace-promoting figure, was not given the prize: the Norwegian judges deemed it too political an act to honor him with the Noble Peace Prize. However, by finally (in October of 2002) giving it to Jimmy Carter -- A Gandhi-like figure (though surely not of his stature) -- they made up, to some degree, for what was perhaps their most flagrant politically-based slight. One can't really fault the judges in Norway for making their determinations based on the moral values of a Euro-centric, Judeo-Christian people -- after all, that's what they are.]*

It was against this formidable opponent, The British Empire, that he, Gandhi, with his deceptively-simple spiritual and trusting naiveté, had managed to sway world public opinion in India's favor. He accomplished it by circumventing Britain's Gestapo-like tactics to make the world aware of such post-WWI atrocities as the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and the bombing and strafing by British airmen of unarmed civilians at Gujranwala. Perhaps those murderous actions were too horrid for a modern-day West to contemplate -- mass murders on that scale tended to be committed in wartime, with soldiers killing soldiers -- thereby making mass murder capable of being rationalized by the phrase: *all's fair in love and war.*

Nevertheless, for all the negative fallout resulting from the massacre at

Jallianwala Bagh once the full extent of England's barbarities were made public in the West, world opinion was far more moved by the Brits' actions taken against Gandhi and his followers a decade later during their *march to the sea*. The Brits had a salt tax in place throughout the Subcontinent, and Gandhi, ostensibly to avoid paying that tax (a tax that fell primarily on the poor), began his journey to the sea. As he walked along, more and more Indians joined him in his peaceful trek -- intent on obtaining salt directly from the sea. Gandhi was aware that no other government, anywhere in the world, would interfere with their citizens' right to sun-dry their own sea water as a means of obtaining salt for whatever purpose, let alone for their private use. Yet this is just what the Brits did. And, Gandhi had made sure that the world would be made fully aware of the degree of barbarity that the Brits were willing to apply -- as a means of insuring their ability to drain every last penny from India and her people.

Gandhi and his followers were well aware of just what the consequence of their actions would be. (Keep in mind that these were the same Brits who massacred a thousand unarmed Indian civilians a decade earlier, without warning, for merely congregating at the bagh.) However, Gandhi, having arranged for worldwide news coverage to publicize the march and the expected reaction to it by the Brits, rightfully concluded that the Brits would refrain from resorting to the murderous tactics they had employed at Jallianwala Bagh. Nevertheless, they brutally rained down blows upon his followers for what, in the eyes of the world, was the exercising of a God-given right. It was this action that compelled the smug citizens of those nations benefiting most from the inherent immorality of colonialism, to come to terms with the enormity of the actions required to maintain the *white-man's burden*.

Those folks claiming membership in a civilized world were forced to face up to the reality that the Brits, and by extension all colonial powers, were but rapacious and tyrannical oppressors. The near-total breakdown of the old colonial system, as well as the end of legalized racism worldwide, was the direct result of Gandhi's actions -- and it would have been rare to find a leader of a formerly-colonized nation, or of an oppressed underclass, that failed to acknowledge Gandhi's contribution to their regaining their independence and pride.

*[The actions of the British in building and maintaining their empire were every bit as barbaric as those of their contemporaries: the Nazis during Germany's subjugation of Europe; the apartheid government in South Africa; Japan in China; Holland in Indonesia; France in Indo-China; Russia in Poland; America across her fruited plains; Spain and Portugal in every land they settled in; and, as ethnic cleansing, on and on until this very day in where Asia's far west and*



*Europe's near east meet. Now then, although the horrific actions by the peoples involved in such conduct were, for the most part, acknowledged and half-heartedly and usually hypocritically mea culpa'd, and then, occasionally after a degree of monetary restitution, rationalized away, only the Judeo-Christian Brits were, and still are, universally admired and praised for having engaged in their murderous activities -- and, even their century-long engagement as the exclusive suppliers of African slaves (the right for which they fought a war with Spain) has largely been ignored. Yet, it was the profit from their despicable doings that is the root source of that nation's wealth. Perhaps it was the grand scale in which it was accomplished that accounted for their acquiring their well-scrubbed history.*

*[Society has always admired the big-time and successful crook -- and mourned his comeuppance. Or, perhaps, wealthy nations, as well as opulent individuals, can clean up their reputations by using their ill-gained riches to buy the public's support for their doings. Money can buy the services of top-notch publicity men who have the ability to fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time (though thankfully, not "all" of the people all of the time -- thanks Abe) -- much as the wealthy murderer can hire the most competent criminal lawyers to convince a jury of his innocence.]*

The Brits were in a double bind. They wanted to get rid of Gandhi; yet, being well aware of his influence amongst India's masses, they were fearful that any harsh treatment of him would trigger a major, grass-root revolt against European domination. Accordingly, they treated him with a certain amount of what might pass for respect: and refrained from ridding themselves of his exceedingly troublesome presence as they had done, and continued to do, to so many of India's other popular (but less known to the West), independence-minded leaders. With far less provocation, they were sentenced to years of hard labor in the Andaman Islands penal colony --- when not put to death.

Racism's being a key ingredient of Judeo-Christian colonialism, it should surprise no one that those few Euro-Caucasians who spoke out in India's behalf on matters of home rule or outright independence, were merely requested to quit India. And, in event they ignored that request (as in the case of the outspoken supporter of Indian home rule: the English publisher, Horniman), they were shanghaied out of the country. (*The English lady Annie Besant couldn't very well be physically removed from India by British gentlemen: her being a woman: a well-connected one at that -- one having a worldwide reputation as an intellectual with integrity. As a result, for years she remained a minor irritant for the Brits in India.*)

Both Horniman and Annie Besant were fine, decent people -- intent on mitigating the brutal racist policies that the Brits relied on to maintain their stranglehold over India's economy and her people. Yet, when considering that upper-class Brits and well-placed Euro-Caucasians risked little if anything for speaking out (even in India) against Britain's despotic rule, one must recoil in disgust at their lack of involvement. Moreover, with but few exceptions, despite their having been made well-aware of the horrific actions taken by the Brits in support of their Empire, they willingly accepted, with racist pride, the rationalizations for the continued existence of colonialism -- and ignored, condoned and often applauded the atrocities committed, in the name of the Crown, to maintain it. *Adolf Hitler did not grow up in a vacuum -- nor have those Serbs- and-Israelis-can-do-no-wrong Americans.*



## Moses of Jerusalem

*[The following is but a short synopsis of the overall contents of a file of 43 pages. Nevertheless, it should be sufficient to allow the general tenor of the high-handed manner of British governance to come through. The bigotry-based application of their laws for Indians, as well as for the particular individual concerned, embodied the biases inherent in the attitudes of their countrymen in Parliament.*

*[The House of Lords, despite the restrictions placed upon it in 1911, which detracted from their absolute veto power over legislation passed by the House of Commons, maintained much of its former ability to sway public opinion. The peers continued to rubber-stamp any actions taken by the British Government in India -- with the only condition being that their doings be performed in the cause of enhancing the wealth of England's wealthy. Of secondary concern was that those doings be rationalized, whether morally: especially if claimed to uphold the honor of British womanhood, or legalistically. And, so, whether in times of peace or war, the British Raj was assured that his doings in India, no matter how heinous, could win the support of the House of Lords -- and, in turn, the support of a peer-controlled press. All of which worked to convince hoi polloi in England of their own virtue -- in taking on "the white-man's burden".*

*[During both WWI and W.W.II, and for a period thereafter, the Brits dropped the two-party system. At which time, tight censorship was maintained on any matter deemed to conflict with the welfare of the state. Questions of propriety, in any actions claimed taken in defense of England's purported national interests were handled by a coalition cabinet, more or less in secret -- and never publicly debated. There was a catch to this, for despite the British Government of India's being pretty-much autonomous as far as Parliament was concerned, it still had to answer to public opinion, if and when news of their most nefarious activities reached the outside world.*

*[A case in point was the holding of an inquiry into the legality of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh (it took place several months after the atrocity was committed, and then only after the full scope of its horror managed to leak out of India) by members of England's House of Commons. Parliament's response, as is the wont of all governments, was to set up a commission to investigate the matter. When the horrors of the massacre were confirmed, the legal grounds for having committed the carnage were duly debated in the still-coalition-controlled House of Commons -- with nary a mention of any moral issue. Nevertheless, with a show of grief, accompanied by the shedding of a profusion of crocodile tears -- for the need to have done deed -- the matter was finally talked to death. Meanwhile, back*

*at the House of Lords, the demented General responsible for having ordered the murder of those thousand unarmed civilians was honored for his deeds -- and acclaimed a hero. ]*

There were numerous telling incidents to be found hidden in the old British files retained at the National Archives of India. Since the purpose of the search was to discover the whys and wherefores of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, a certain file was requested: Home-Poll-Deposit 10 of July 1916, titled: *LEGISLATION FOR DEALING WITH ENEMY SPIES UNDER THE DEFENCE OF INDIA (C.L.A.) ACT, 1915*. The act was the precursor to the Rowlatt Act of 1919. The file had originally been compiled by the Army Department, Legal and Judicial, and was marked SECRET. It was on the second page that the writer came across: "The case of this Moses, a Turkish Jew ...".

Moses of Jerusalem: a Turkish Jew named Ainech Meyer, alias Moisha Alter ben Zedec Gershens, was arrested in Peshawar *a city taken by the Brits in 1848 as a result of England's war of expansion against Afghanistan*. At the time of his arrest he confessed to being a spy, and was then duly interned. The means used to wring the confession from him were not stated.

He had confessed to having been in the pay of a man named Eitinguer, the Turkish interpreter to the German Consul in Shanghai. Moses was to communicate with Eitinguer at Shanghai, in coded Yiddish (a German dialect), giving him certain information about British dealings with Indians -- none of which appears to have had any military or strategic significance. However, the confession he had made, as to his being a spy, was confirmed by the interception at Calcutta of a communiqué he made in Yiddish -- to Shanghai.

*[Calcutta had a "Jew Street". The British allowed Jews to reside in the "white" part of the city, but, for the most part, they were ghettoized, nonetheless. The Brits had fostered unlimited immigration of Englishmen into the American Colonies, which was a major factor contributing to their losing them. Once stung, twice shy. Having paid dearly for their having forcefully encouraged British migration to America, they reversed that policy in India, and actively discouraged it there. Nevertheless, in order to avoid an over-reliance on the very competent Hindu and Moslem traders and merchants -- Jews and Parsis, having no political base to speak of in India, were often given preference in those matters.]*

The British Army pressed repeatedly for Moses of Jerusalem to be tried under the rules of a court marshal. The proof of his guilt was irrefutable; and, with the forgone conclusion that the trial would find him guilty, he could be legally

executed as a spy -- with much fanfare -- which, the army believed, would act as a deterrent to other would-be spies. However, since the army also wanted the ability to threaten immediate execution of a suspected spy if he didn't divulge the extent of his doings (the implication being that the penalty of death would be waived in event he confessed), it was in a double bind. Nevertheless, the army still wanted the option of trying a confessed spy under the rules of court marshal.

Although spies are routinely and legally executed by the army when caught in the act of spying (under the rules of that oxymoron, a moral war), in other instances, such as in the case of Moses of Jerusalem, they must first be given a trial. The legality of the matter was kicked around for a period of three months; extracts of the internal correspondence debating the pros and cons of the army's request to try him by court-martial were contained in this file of forty-three pages. The final result was that permission was granted to the army to try him by court marshal.

The attitude displayed by the Brits in their dealing with "this Moses of Jerusalem", was obviously one of condescension. And though their attitude was tinged with a bit of anti-Semitism, it's obvious that until the insanity that betook Nazi Germany during W.W.II, there was no way to compare the kind of treatment that Europe's Germano-Slavic Jews received at the hands of Europe's Christians with that routinely handed out to folks who had a greater degree of observable skin pigmentation than did their Euro-Caucasian brethren.

Comparable mitigating words, such as those of the Brits' Legislative Department: "He (Moses of Jerusalem) appears to be an enemy subject spying, though his spying was of a futile kind," were not to be found in files covering Indians who were imprisoned or executed in accordance with British law -- for offenses far less significant than even the ineffectual spying in wartime committed by Moses of Jerusalem. Individual Indians, whether in the Subcontinent or East Africa, were routinely murdered or incarcerated by Brits with nary an ah, yes, or no.

*[The West's more powerful nations established rules to spell out the niceties required of them during their innumerable wars against each other. Those rules of war, no matter where in the world they took place, were honored only when European nations of relatively equal power were engaged in killing one another. However, in their own countries, against their own people, there were no international rules -- nor were there any rules governing their treatment of citizens of nations colonized by them. In both those instances, no matter how great the atrocity, their doings were considered an internal matter, and no one else's business. And, despite the recently enacted international laws intended to*

*prevent “crimes against humanity”, when atrocities are committed by militarily powerful or politically connected nations against their own people or those colonized by them, the natural law: that might makes right, takes precedence. On the other hand, when easily defeated nations engage in similar vile behavior, the moralistic Western nations will, on occasion, eventually attempt to put a halt to it.*

*[As to the rules of war, they’re quite meaningless when a major power or an affiliate engages in wartime practice in contravention to those rules -- it’s only the losers that risk being penalized for their transgressing those niceties of war that spell out the proper way to murder one another. What boggles the mind is that the religious leaders of all the major Monotheistic faiths accept the immorality inherent in those rules of war. Rules that have been promulgated by adherents to a belief in the commandment: “Thou shalt not kill!”. Those rules of war spell out the legal way for people to kill one another as they go about attempting to further their nation’s interests -- and not only in acts of self-defense, which is normally justifiable, but in wars of aggression as well.*

*[Those rules of war, at the time of their enactment, pertained to Europeans who were engaged in one of their innumerable military attempts to steal each other’s homeland or foreign possessions. However, when those same honorable folks were engaged in protecting their ill-gotten gains (the colonies) from the inhabitants of the lands stolen by them through intrigue and force of arms, there were no rules. Although this might be considered beating a dead horse, this does illustrate the hypocrisy of the moralizing, landed and wealthy, Judeo-Christian Europeans who used the self-serving laws enacted by the very governments they controlled to legally kill according to their own rules. Thereby, giving themselves the ability to rationalize every heinous action taken by their underlings to preserve the source of their wealth.*

*[Around the turn of the millennium, especially in India, there’s been an attempt to aggrandize colonialism -- by stressing the benefits accruing to all once-colonized people due to their ancestors having been victimized by the greed-motivated, militarily-oppressive and rapacious, modern-day colonial powers: the British, French, Portuguese, Spanish and Dutch. It must be noted, however, that the British Empire’s movers and shakers were the most astute at hiding behind their self-made and self-serving laws -- laws that allowed them to perform the most atrocious actions against defenseless peoples -- whether in Great Britain or abroad. As stated elsewhere, it’s not that other nations didn’t and don’t engage in actions at least as vile, it’s just that they weren’t quite as hypocritical. The British, to this day, continue to defend their past money-is-my-God actions -- after all, they did, out of the kindness of their heart, take on “the white-man’s*

*burden".]*

Though the final determination of the case against the admitted-spy, Moses of Jerusalem, was that he was indeed subject to a trial under marshal law, whether or not he was shot for his war-time crime as a foreign, enemy agent and spy, though surely important to him, is not the point here. What is, is that the massacre by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh, which entailed the killing of a thousand unarmed Indian civilians, and wounding a thousand more, was committed by the Brits without so much as a warning, let alone a trial -- even such a meaningless one as that required by their laws that they gave to the admitted spy Moses of Jerusalem.

## Get Gandhi

Gandhi realized the way to rid India of the Brits was to maintain worldwide support for India's right to self-rule. Gandhi was, as are most Indians, a pacifist by nature, although he may have stressed it as a Realpolitik necessity. Realizing that the Brits wanted a military confrontation -- one, due to their overwhelming military supremacy, they had good reason to believe they would win (*much as Bismarck reasoned when he enticed Austria to declare war against Prussia*), Gandhi convinced his Indian followers of the futility of an armed conflict with them [*Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King and Arafat (before his authority was undermined) all adhered to Gandhi's methods*]. The Brits, while duplicitously attempting to instigate an armed revolt by Indians -- one which was bound to fail, committed numerous stupid PR blunders, which Gandhi was quick to pick up on. Nevertheless, unless they were aired throughout the world, they'd go unnoticed and, much like the results of the proverbial tree in the forest that no one hears or sees falling -- to the world, it would never have happened.

\*

A significant portion of the cultural baggage of virtually all upper-class Brits consisted of class-privilege, racism and sexism -- women, at least upper-class Euro-Caucasian women, were treated as, and were accepted as, frail things whom English gentlemen must treat with respect. Gandhi was well aware of this, and having mastered the art of playing the Brits like a yo-yo, he willingly also accepted the help of women (of whom, a few were well-placed, American and British) who were attracted to India's cause to free herself from foreign rule and oppression. Both Gandhi and the ladies were well aware of the sexual confusion in the minds of British gentlemen (as to how they can deal with English ladies), therefore by Gandhi's accepting their assistance, he believed the women would suffer little or no ill effects for helping him.

Nevertheless, once those fairly intelligent and well placed Euro-Caucasian ladies joined his entourage, the gentlemanly Brits, being reluctant to cause a confrontation with the women by attempting to deport them, countered the effects of their presence by insinuating that some kind of sick sexual relation existed between the frail, ultra-vegetarian Gandhi and any youngish woman who was attracted to his and India's cause. It should be noted that at the time the fragile Gandhi was turning sixty and had been celibate for decades.

*[The defamation of America's liberal presidents for their real or invented sexual adventures, though also instigated by conservative money men in fear of losing*



*their ill-gotten gains, was at least directed against young virile men. It should be kept in mind that the low-to-no-protein-eating, vegetarian Gandhi was living in the pre-Viagra era.]*

Britain's policy of defamation by innuendo directed against Gandhi and his followers, was a major part of their attempt to prevent him from leading the assault on England's militarily-enforced, political and economic stranglehold over the lives of the Indian people. They failed, Gandhi and India won.

\*

As we've seen, in the aftermath of WWI the Brits wanted Indians to remain in a state of servitude, and if they refused to accept it (which was more likely to be the case) the Brits intended to foment a mini revolution by the Indian military, another *Sepoy Rebellion*, if you will. In addition, to end, once and for all, India's attempts to attain any meaningful degree of independence, they wanted India's men of military age (but not an overwhelming number) to join in the uprising. They wanted enraged Indians (in responding to the wanton slaughter of unarmed Indian civilians) to retaliate against equally-vulnerable Brits and other Europeans -- and if women were included in an attack by an agitated Indian crowd, so much the better. In this way, armed with the then most modern military equipment, British troops (in preparation, tens of thousands had but recently been shipped to the Punjab) could counter the emotionally charged reactions by the Indians, with a murderous retaliation -- all under the guise of old-fashioned, British indignation, one based on a Judeo-Christian, eye-for-an-eye response that relied on a broad interpretation of what was an acceptable military reaction against, at most, a poorly-armed civilian population.

The wealthy Brits in London, as always, with hypocritical intent tried to justify their most horrendous deeds by claiming that they were both morally and legally appropriate. However, they were shrewd enough to realize that if they were to attempt to expel Gandhi, it would result in an all-out, emotionally-charged, violent outburst against British rule -- an outburst that, even if suppressed, would destroy their ability to profit from their rule of India. Moreover, it would enable Gandhi, as martyr, to encourage world support for the very independence they were attempting to prevent.

As a consequence, the Brits attempted to destroy Gandhi's influence by merely jailing him for one or another infraction of their company-store rules. Gandhi countered this by fasting while in his cell. The movers and shakers of the Empire Brits, fearing that it would lead to his death, and that it would be

attributed to them, satisfied themselves by placing him under house arrest. Gandhi had put himself in a win-win situation, whether he lived or died India would gain her independence.

*[It should be noted that Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer (a cog in the Empire's money-making machine) had recommended Gandhi be sent to the Andaman Islands penal colony. That his views were ignored gives ample proof that London was aware of the sycophant's intellectual limitations -- which also convinced them that he was the man best suited to arrange for an act so horrendous in magnitude that it would undermine Gandhi's ability to calm an incensed nation.]*

The fear of harm's coming to Gandhi, if attributable to the Brits, resulted in his being free to thwart their plans; he convinced the vast majority of South Asians that non-violence was the only way to go. He was well aware that, although an all-out emotionally-charged revolt against British rule could possibly destroy the Empire, the number of Indians killed in the process would be enormous. *[No doubt the number would have dwarfed the loss of the twenty million lives that a well-armed Russia (with American material support) suffered when ousting Nazi Germany's W.W.II armies from their homeland.]*

What to do? pondered the perplexed Brits. By design, or giving the devil his due, by chance, an American, Katherine Mayo, a competent author known for her scandalmongering, was approached by the Brits to write about India. Her credentials were perfect for the job: she was amenable to the chore of destroying the aura of goodness that surrounded Gandhi; she was a racist; a good Episcopalian Christian; a supporter of the Empire and all that it stood for; and she was not British. And, whatever she wrote would be assumed to be based on objective observations. Moreover, she fit the bill as the perfect foil to counter the effects of that outspoken woman who supported home rule for India, the internationally-known Theosophist and humanist, Annie Besant.

Annie Besant was a very proper English woman, a product of the Victorian era. She had fallen in love with India, her religion, and her people, but never wavered from her allegiance to the Crown. For her, India would always be an integral part of the Empire, albeit, with home rule. Gandhi, however, realized that the Brits were as fearful of home rule for India as they were of her outright independence; it was obvious that they had determined, with much justification, that either way they'd lose their stranglehold over India's economy. As a result, Gandhi became convinced that meaningful home rule would never be freely offered to India -- which led to his calling for a peaceful defiance of British rule. And, it was this eventually led to India's complete independence. Gandhi knew

where he was going, and, although he respected Annie Besant's brilliance, unbiased nature and overall decency, it was obvious to him, that her cultural baggage: that of an educated, Victorian Englishwoman, was such that it would never allow her to take part in the destruction of England's mercantile empire -- which, without India, both Annie Besant and Gandhi, as well as the Brits, realized would most assuredly be the result. They, much like Winston Churchill, who admitted as much to FDR at a later date, were well aware that a truly independent India meant the end of the British Empire -- which, of course, is just what happened.

Despite her total allegiance to the Crown, Annie Besant's belief in reincarnation (a basic aspect of Hinduism) and her staunch support of home rule for India, put her on a collision course with British interests. She seemed to have a vision of a grand alliance, somewhat resembling America, but with the states replaced by colonies in a commonwealth of nations of equals, with London at its center. Something the Brit powers that be were dead set against.

Annie Besant, even after the passage of the Rowlatt Act, actually believed that the British Parliament, that representative of England's landed and wealthy, would, of their own volition, grant India the same home rule as it had to the *white* colonies. She was convinced, that in event Indians were granted the same rights as those permitted to the members of the *white* colonies, as limited as they were for all but the well-placed Englishman, the Crown would retain India and earn it the undying loyalty of all Indians. And, at one point, Gandhi might have agreed with her; but, by their reneging on their WWI promises, he realized India would never attain true home rule unless they ousted the Brits, once and for all -- ergo, his campaign for India's total independence.

\*

The muckraker, Katherine Mayo, claimed to be a tenth generation American. And, if true, it would be safe to assume that her, no-doubt-redemptionist ancestors were loyal to the Crown -- which may account for (besides monetary considerations) her willingness to slander an entire nation, and its spiritual leader. Perhaps the lady was just a bigoted hack selling her wares to the highest bidder (as is the wont of all such ladies functioning in the world's oldest profession), which could also explain why she wrote the vicious diatribe against a people wanting to free themselves from oppressive British rule -- an oppression far greater than that caused by the litany of crimes committed against Americans by the Crown (as described in Thomas Jefferson's American Declaration of Independence) which were sufficient cause for the residents of the

American colonies to revolt against British tyranny.

*“He [the German reigning monarch of England: King George III] has abdicated Government here [in the 13 American colonies], by declaring us [the citizens of the colonies] out of his Protection and waging War against us. He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation. He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.”* <sup>(1)</sup>

*[By the early part of the twentieth century Americans didn't consider England to be much of a competitor -- but the reverse didn't hold true. In the aftermath of WWI, the last thing the Brits wanted was America (with her advanced, for those times, ideals of democracy and the rights of individuals) to be involved in the peace negotiations involving Germany and the divvying up of Turkey's holdings. As a result, for a year after America's entry into WWI, England, then the foremost maritime nation, stalled supplying ships to transport American troops destined to join the Allied cause in France. That this prolonged WWI, and resulted in untold thousands of additional deaths of British and French troops, many of them from their colonies, mattered little to the Brits.*

*[American troops suffered greater combat casualties, as well; the delay had them facing a stronger German foe (who also suffered greater casualties than had American troops entered the war earlier). Nevertheless, when the Boches, having concluded a favorable peace with Russia, moved their formidable Eastern-front army to France, and then launched a successful offensive -- which turned the tide of war in Germany's favor, the Brits, fearing a German victory, finally made the ships available to American troops.*

*[Britain's deliberate delay in supplying transport had caused a concentration of American troops in Stateside army camps -- which became fertile breeding grounds for the epidemic-causing influenza virus -- which resulted in the deaths of ten times as many Americans in the States as the number of American soldiers killed in battle (53,513) during WWI.*

*[Of course, that was not the intention of the Brits. However, over a century earlier, their nefarious doings to put an end to the American Revolution were deliberate: they attempted to spread the then-deadly smallpox virus amongst the*

---

1

AN EXTRACT FROM THE U.S.DECLARATION of INDEPENDENCE Excerpted from Compton's Interactive Encyclopedia.  
Copyright (c) 1994, 1995 Compton's NewMedia, Inc. All Rights Reserved

*colonists. For the most part, citizens of the Indo-Eurasian land mass had developed some immunity to small pox, but Amerinds and Negroes who were exposed to it were almost sure to become infected., and then die a horrible death. That same awareness, of just how low the Brits would stoop, that helped stiffen American resistance to British rule, had, in the aftermath of Jallianwala Bagh, a similar effect on India's diverse population.]*

The Brits' having decided against risking an all-out, uncontrollable revolution by attempting to ship Gandhi off to the Andaman Islands, chose to take advantage of his non-violent preachings. And, why not? It made the cost of dominating India cheaper -- at least in the short run. However, they were still fearful of his influence on India's Indo-Caucasian masses, as well as on Euro-Caucasians, wherever they resided. To negate that ability, they turned to a subtle form of propaganda -- one intended to counter his power to sway public opinion -- if not in India, though some in India are, to this day, still affected by that British propaganda, than in that former troublesome colony, America.

The British had always been wary of America's ambivalence in accepting their rationale for imperialism (although, by the turn of the millennium, under the euphemism, "New World Order" -- the two countries appear to be in tune). America's post WWI fling with Indian mysticism only added to the Brits' concern: making more urgent the need to destroy Gandhi's reputation -- this, as a means of nullifying the effects his humble and benign presence had on American public opinion: one that favored independence for the Indian people. By the end of WWI, America's growing world stature, democratic pretensions, unregulated press and vast immigrant population could be a problem for the Brits. But, by appealing to a willingness of a sizable number of Americans (until the 1950's racism was legal and rampant in the States) to accept racist rationalizations for all the problems of the world -- the Brits felt they could, at the very least, influence the government in Washington to take a neutral stance on colonialism and the means necessary to maintain it.

To accomplish this, they attempted to counter Gandhi's bigger-than-life moral presence in America, as well as worldwide. In doing so, they colluded in the writing and publicizing of a piece of scurrilous and demeaning propaganda designed to destroy, once and for all, the perception that Gandhi, Hindus and, by inference, all Indians in general, were normal human beings -- no different than any other peoples. In reading the 1927 reviews of the book they sponsored, one would have to say that they certainly succeeded in spreading their malignant views.

By conniving with the literary hack, Katherine Mayo, the Brits assisted in the dissemination of her rationale for England's rape of *Mother India*. This, in the belief it would justify their continued military occupation and subjugation of the Indian peoples. The book did succeed in convincing those who needed no convincing -- of the great burden England had undertaken. The Times of London loved the book, and the ever-Anglophile New York Times gave it a full front page, plus two additional columns in its Sunday Book Review, finding "much to be admired" in it. On the other hand, the scholarly Yale review said of the book, "An offensive and distorted picture of India.." However, no matter what the reviews, the perception that they, the Brits, had subsidized the writing, publishing and publicizing of a vicious diatribe such as *Mother India*, indicated to all knowledgeable folks just how low self-righteous Englishmen were willing to stoop in order to retain the Empire. (If the reader discerns a parallel between England's attempt to spread the smallpox virus in her colonies in America, and their subsidizing the slander of India and Gandhi, it's not an accident.)

An Indian: C.S. Ranga Lyer, a member of the powerless, meaningless and British-controlled Indian Legislative Assembly, wrote *Father India*, one of the books defending India against that vicious piece of anti-India propaganda by Ms. Mayo. It's still possible to run into a well-to-do, upper-class, educated Indian who gives every indication that he's sucked up all the gentlemanly traditions of India's former British lords and masters. And, in his book, Mr. Lyer comes across as having been just such a *chap*. He treats the author gently, as if she were a lady, and attacked her more for being an American (which is just why the Brits collaborated with the lady in the first place), than for being the hireling of the Brits. Moreover, Mr. Lyer's response, sponsored by crocodile-teared Brits claiming to be defending Indians, Gandhi and the nation, served two purposes: it lessened the esteem so many Indians had for America and her people; and, it gave additional publicity to the lady's book -- thereby enhancing Ms. Mayo's attempts at destroying the image of both Gandhi and all Indians -- as well as all colonized peoples worldwide. In addition, Lyer's stress on her being an American, lessened America's democratic influence in India. All told, the response to *Mother India* seemed very much a win-win situation for the Brits, or so they thought at the time.

Through the astute manipulation of a more than willing free press (up until 1934 European news agencies, such as Reuters, London, monopolized the sourcing of all foreign news printed in American newspapers), and old-boy agreements with fellow colonial powers and like-minded, bigoted Americans, along with their sponsoring and publicizing such malignant, racist tracts as "Mother India", the Brits believed, with some justification, that, despite the bad

post-Jallianwala Bagh publicity they could continue to control the destiny of a good part of the world -- and India in particular.

Nonetheless, for all their cunning and calculating, the Brits, and possibly the world at large, were still unaware of what has become a publicity man's truism: *It doesn't matter what is stated about a client, as long as they spell his name right.* And, Gandhi's name was spelled right. And, *despite the vast amount of publicity the defamatory book by Mayo had received, within a few years after its publication, New York's depression-era Mayor, the honest Fiorello La Guardia compared himself with the dhoti-clad Gandhi, by saying: "We're the two richest men in the world. Why? Because we both possess everything we want and need." Had Gandhi been steeped in the Euro-centric, Judeo-Christian culture of greed, he could have been the greatest and richest adman of them all.]*



## Continuing Disturbances In The Punjab

Originally, only occasional and nebulous references were made to the *continuing disturbances in the Punjab*. And, no mention of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre was to be found in the *Times of London* until months after it had occurred: the result of a commission having been formed in response to the spread, regarding it, of uncontrollable adverse publicity. Despite all the efforts of London and the British government in India, knowledge of the atrocity had spread beyond India. Even in the immediate aftermath of WWI (with its poison gas warfare) the crime committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh was considered so outrageous, that their attempts to prevent its being made into a cause celebre proved futile.

Nevertheless, in short order, outside of India the Brits managed to obfuscate, if not totally eradicate all knowledge of the massacre. And, even in India, where all educated Indians seem to be aware of its having occurred, some [especially Goan Catholics and Anglicized Christians (most notably in Calcutta, where they still pay homage to Queen Victoria at her memorial)] choose to ignore its having taken place: opting instead to accept the nonsensical, face-saving claims by Englishmen that the killings were: not committed by British soldiers, and even if those soldiers were, indeed, British, the murders committed, if there were any, had been provoked or unintentional. It must be noted that the original report from Amritsar by British officers, mentioned only that British troops were involved, and secondly, in sworn testimony General Dyer said: "I ordered the shoot-to-kill firing into the seated and unarmed gathering, and I would have had my troops continue firing had they not run out of ammunition"

*[Since it was established from those still intact and available British documents that Dyer entered Jallianwala Bagh with fifty soldiers (the claims by the Brits of their identities changing day to day), and that on the day before the massacre, General Dyer had, along with one hundred and fifty soldiers acknowledged as being British, patrolled the streets of Amritsar -- it's a no-brainer to conclude that the general (who was quoted as stating that he "couldn't rely on Indian troops!") had used men from amongst his trusted British troops to carry out the massacre.]*

Many Indian youths, influenced by all the Euro-centric materialist propaganda currently (around the turn of the millennium) permeating the Subcontinent, have gone so far as to repeat the rationale currently being bandied about that, if it did indeed happen, it was a misunderstanding -- because no Englishman would ever have ordered his men to murder innocent civilians. In comparison to the Brits, the Nazi head of propaganda, Goebbels, was an



incompetent, rank amateur.

\*

Just prior to the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, the civilians in attendance (all unarmed) were seated in what can best be described as an informal and relaxed lotus position (as is still the norm, throughout India, for similar gatherings). They were engrossed in listening to a speaker condemning Britain for having reneged on her quid pro quo war-time agreement, which was to offer India a meaningful form of home rule; and, who instead enacted into law the racist-based, greed- motivated, freedom-restricting Rowlatt act.: *An Act to Cope With Anarchical and Revolutionary Crime*.

India was finally getting the picture: England's promises of home rule to India, which were intended to mitigate the protests against the massive drain of Indian resources during WWI, was just another bare-faced lie made by the representatives of Britain's racism-nurtured empire: the lie was rationalized away as having been executed in the name of expediency, and in the name of national interest.

*[During WWI, over a million Indians were sent overseas, 600,000 as soldiers -- 70,000 of whom died fighting England's war. To get an idea of what this meant, America had fewer men killed in battle during that same war. Yet, spread throughout America, any number of well-earned memorials honoring those men can be found.*

*[India Gate, one of the uglier structures the British financed with Indian money, was erected years after WWI in New Delhi -- then used exclusively by Europeans and acquiescent Indians. It was intended to commemorate Indians who died in the war; and, it was done in an obvious attempt to mitigate the negative effects of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. Although Indians: from every caste, class and religion, had become disillusioned with the British Raj (after realizing the denigrating role, as citizens of the Empire, that they were required to play), the erecting of the monument was only intended to placate the anxieties of the more militant segments of the major religious groupings. The ambivalent attitude the Brits had towards Indian military men was never more obvious: not willing to trust them completely on the one hand, yet, attempting to make them one-of-us, on the other.]*

\*

Within a few years after the massacre and General Dyer's forced retirement, the then ex-Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer was to use the British

justice system to exonerate the mentally unstable General Dyer, and indirectly himself, for the cold-blooded murders of those thousand unarmed Indian civilians at Jallianwala Bagh. Allowing British courts to rule on the guilt or innocence of those two gentlemen, could best be likened to using Nazis judges at the Nuremberg trials to determine whether or not a German, during W.W.II, committed war-crimes.

The judgment's clearing General Dyer of responsibility for the atrocity caused Indians, throughout the Subcontinent, to become ever so aware of their status, as citizens of the Empire -- which was that of chattels. The emotions engendered amongst most Indians ranged from hatred to disgust, with even those most supportive of the Empire, disenchanted with the Brits. Ergo, in their foolhardy attempt to stem, if not reverse, the tide of massive support for the independence movement, the dedication of India Gate to the "loyal" Indians who fought and died during WWI in support of England (in a war intended to determine which European power would dominate India, and the world in general). Nevertheless, as is the usual result of internecine wars, both parties, in this case the coalition of Europe's Allies versus that of the Central Powers and Turkey lost, while the relative outsider, America, remained intact -- thereby, in the minds of thinking folks throughout the world, becoming the latest contender for dominating the peoples of every nation: as leader of the New World Order.

*[Despite the monuments honoring America's WWI heroes, there's no question that America's veterans of WWI got screwed, otherwise there would never have been a march on Washington demanding their unpaid bonuses -- which, incidentally, had them routed and disbanded by America's future W.W.II hero, General Douglas MacArthur, with the help of saber-drawn cavalry. However, that's a far cry from the massacre committed by the Brits in response to the gathering of unarmed Indian civilians, that included Indian veterans of WWI -- whose crime was to participate in a discussion on Britain's reneging on her WWI home-rule commitments to India.]*

As WWI dragged on, 100,.000,000 British pounds sterling (comparable to about what fifty billion US dollars would buy in India today) was extorted from the Indian people by England's government in India -- and then donated as a gift to England in support of her war against Germany. This was in addition to their century-long, routine, taxation-without-representation, militarily-enforced, continuous expropriations of India's fast-dwindling wealth. To add insult to injury, England's post-WWI demands on Indian resources were increased to help pay off her wartime borrowings.

The result of India's resources (financial, natural and labor) being systematically wrenched from her people and shipped off to London, was that India's economy never fully recovered from the rapacious effects of colonialism. The enormity of the drain on India's economy can best be seen when comparing just the WWI *gift* made to England, to the total cost to American taxpayers for deploying half-a-million troops with the most advanced weaponry developed to date, in successfully denying Iraq a dominant role in the Gulf -- all of which cost the U.S. (even when adding the somewhat coerced donations from Germany and Japan) only a fraction of the amount extorted from India's economy to finance England's WWI effort to maintain her domination over continental Europe and her colonies..

In the aftermath of W.W.II, when the colonist Germans retreated from their predatory occupation of Europe, the countries ravaged by them were given billions of dollars in American financial aid (The Marshall Plan). Yet, after British troops were withdraw from their rapacious occupation of the Subcontinent, what was left behind was a partitioned land drained of its once vital economic base.

*[In recent years, many Indians, in anticipation of the British Queen's visit, were heard to request that she apologize for the dastardly deeds committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh. Which, on orders of her masters in Parliament, she refused to do. However, Indians, instead of their having been so damned gentlemanly in requesting an apology, should have demanded hundreds of billions of crores in rupees from the Brits as reparations for the rape of their land and the direct cause of the deaths of many more than a dozen millions of the Subcontinent's peoples. After all, for half that number of killings, the Israelis (less than five percent of the number of the Subcontinent's peoples), received at least fifty billion marks from Germany, and America's politicians have given her at least twice that amount in dollars -- and they're still demanding -- and receiving more.]*



## Gaining Respect

*[In times of war and national emergency, democracies elect leaders capable of evoking a patriotic fervor amongst the less-intelligent and less-knowledgeable of the electorate. This, in an effort to encourage hoi polloi by playing the bigotry card -- as a means of enticing them into sacrificing their lives in the belief that, by their doing so, they will preserve the integrity of their nation, religion, race, class, women, rulers or whatever. Nevertheless, once need for the support of the common man ceases -- whether it's his life, his money or his vote -- usually after a lapse of time sufficient to allow for the memory of his deeds and sacrifices to fade away, the influential, old-money folk always manage to reassert their political and economic control over the nation, and her people.]*

The democratic hoopla spouted by the British Parliament in London during WWI, was not only intended to bulldoze the members of England's own miscellany of underclasses (as well as those in her *white* colonies) to willingly give up their freedom and lives to defend the privileges of London's moneyed and landed upper crust, but was also aimed at India. Though, in India's case, the Brits' intentions were to mislead her *trouble-making, educated, upper-middle classes*, into believing that they would receive the same benefits of home rule that had recently accrued to their counterparts in the Empire's *white* colonies.

\*

Montagu was the British Secretary of State for India during the latter years of WWI, and for a few years following it. At the time, he was considered a liberal. However, by the end of the twentieth century his conception of democracy would place him somewhat to the right of an Ollie North. Montagu was sent to the Subcontinent, and when there, he conferred with many of India's most-outspoken advocates for home rule. By doing so, the Brits succeeded, until the end of WWI, in maintaining India's support in manpower and rupees for England's war against Germany and Turkey.

Perhaps it would be an oversimplification to sum up WWI as a war between colonizing nations: the goal of the original parties involved was to maintain possession of the lands they controlled, while attempting to seize the lands controlled by the other. In the course of doing so, the former enemies, England and France, joined forces in an attempt to contain Germany. Preventing the industrial giant that Germany had become, from dominating all of Europe, while threatening to oust England and France from their colonies, was a primary reason for WWI. England believed, with good cause, that had Germany succeeded in her conquest of Europe, she would have replaced her as the dominant world

power. Due to America's entry into the war, Germany's WWI dreams of world conquest were temporarily squelched -- and her own colonies were taken over by one or another of America's Allies. Turkey, the other major Axis power, suffered an even greater loss than Germany. When America's former avaricious Allies divvied up Turkey's Muslim Empire, Britain (most appropriately) got the lion's share. And, in one of those not-so-difficult-to-foresee quirks of fate, within a generation, once-proud citizens of Turkey (then Islam's source of self-esteem) were turned into despised servants and manual laborers in Germany -- the land of their former Axis partners.

Montagu's advertised mission was to gather the kind of information that would enable England's Parliament to enact legislation leading to Indian home rule. Which, judging from his diary, he believed was Parliament's true intention. That same kind of liberal talk, and that's all it ended up being, was also intended to placate that fair-minded and naive, American idealist, President Wilson. Wilson's attempts to input his ideas of democracy into the peace process, once the war was decisively won, were completely ignored by America's WWI allies: France and England -- who, along with America's other WWI allies: the Japanese and Italians, went about seizing as much of the lands previously controlled by the Boches and Turks as they could get away with -- which included a significant portion of the world's populated acreage -- all in the altruistic attempt to add to their *white-(and yellow)-man's burden*.

In obfuscating the true reason for their exacting retribution from the defeated enemy, the claim was made that it was but fair compensation. Mosaic, eye-for-an-eye retribution, a.k.a. vengeance, was considered a far-more-acceptable rationale for acquiring the lands of their defeated enemies by those folks adhering to a Judeo-Christian morality -- than to admit that their acquisitions were motivated by the sin of avarice.. (At least the Japs weren't hypocrites.)

*[Although vengeance is not considered one of the seven deadly sins by the Roman Catholic Church -- and greed is, it was definitely not considered to be an acceptable course of action by the turn-the-other-cheek original adherents of a Buddheo-Christian doctrine. Both Jesus, at least for mortals, and Buddha rejected vengeance, since it's nothing less than a form of self-righteous retribution -- more often than not exacted in the name of one or another of the Gods -- by a person or people claiming to have suffered injury. ]*

Whether motivated by revenge or cupidity, England's demeaning demands on Turkey destroyed her as a world power -- as well as the stabilizing influence (perhaps intentionally) in the Near East. This was to result in the deaths,

throughout the Levant and Near East, of untold millions of mostly Moslems. While at the same time, demands on post-WWI Germany's economy by the French (here they were the main culprits), set the stage for the likes of a Hitler to come to power by playing the bigotry card as a means of rebuilding the egos of a defeated and humiliated German people.

*[The Nazis didn't implant the concept of a master race in Central-Europeans; its post WWI manifestations had its origins in the readings of the Old Testament that led to the Protestant Reformation. Later, Bismarck, inadvertently or by design, in his successful bid to unite a group of disparate petty states and free them from Austrian domination, created a near-indelible German identity that enabled him to mold them into a major world power. For, in no time, those newly-made pure Germans, despite their having numerous racial and ethnic inputs and speaking in a multitude of dialects, and with a history of having murdered each other over their religious differences, became convinced that their newly-formed fatherland was destined to rule the world.]*

*[The notion that Imperial Germany in WWI and W.W.II was motivated by the contradictory utterance of a battery of her verbose, middle-class, posturing philosophers, is nonsensical. Germany's demagogues, as do those of every nation, select the philosophy that best serves their ends. That men of action, regardless of their motives, adhere to any particular philosophy, much as a sous- chef follows his bosses recipes, is merely a self-deluding fantasy perpetrated by eggheads and academicians to give reason to their own existence. Unwittingly, Bismarck was to lay the foundation for Hitler. Looking to the near-unreadable writings of Germany's ponderous philosophers to find the roots for Germany's willingness to follow Hitler is sheer nonsense. Demagogues like Hitler pick and choose one or another form of scripture according to their needs.]*

*[By the end of the nineteenth century, for a significant majority of Germans, educated or not, their belonging to a 'master race' had become an integral part of their cultural baggage. Nazism needed little encouragement by Hitler to grow in a soil already seeded and fertilized by the notion implanted in Germans by Bismarck, that its citizens were a unique people, a notion later expanded on -- whereby they begin to consider themselves members of a master race (a "chosen people", so to speak). Perhaps it's merely an ironic twist of fate that the very people most adversely affected, percentage-wise, by Nazism's claims of racial superiority had, themselves, fostered a similar belief amongst their own conglomerate of obviously disparate people who also claim to be unique -- but rather members of a people chosen of God, rather than of a master race. In both instances their claimed uniqueness has been employed to rationalize their use of a*

*military supremacy to lord it over another peoples. In addition, though not always with such odious results, it might just be further proof of the overlapping of Judeo-Christian and Germano-Slavic thinking.]*



## Parallels between Independence Movement in Ireland and India

During and immediately after WWI, those thinking folks amongst both South Asians and the Irish, realized the commonality of their plight -- at least insofar as their relationship with the powers that be in London was concerned. This realization may or may not have the motivation of those Irishmen ranging from the likes of Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer down to the Irish soldier serving as batman to an English officer, for their reasons for resenting Indians. However, the majority of Indians, being unaware of the social differences existing in the West, lumped the Irish in with all the Brits who soldiered in India -- liking them or not, as one. The common cause expressed by educated Indians and Irishmen was based on their realization that neither people had the ability to defend themselves against colonial England, with her overwhelming military superiority. And, so, if nothing else, at the time of the Irish mutiny in India (a half-hearted, failed attempt to take over an ammunition dump that resulted in the death of two men), a tenuous bond existed between Indians and Irishmen -- one based on that age-old adage, *the enemy of my enemy is my friend*.

\*

England's original attempts at the conquest of Ireland began when all were Catholic, which was centuries prior to the conflicts in Ireland between Catholics and Protestants. Irish attempts to remain free of England's domination date back to at least the twelfth century, when God's vicar residing in Rome, Pope Adrian IV granted the Catholic King of England, Henry II, overlordship of Catholic Ireland. And, in 1169, England's Catholic, Anglo-French rulers of the time, much like their centuries-later Protestant Anglo-German kings, all claimed to be empowered by the very same One-and-Only God to steal, with the use of God's gift of superior arms, the lands of Heathens, as well as those of fellow Christians - no matter what the denomination.

Never a people to let an opportunity to further national interest go by without taking full advantage of it (five centuries having elapsed), in the aftermath of the massacres committed by Cromwell against the Irish Catholics, the English gentry, after enlisting the aid of Catholics to oust him, were to bring in the Dutch Protestant William of Orange (of William and Mary fame) to counter Papal influence. He accelerated the settling of North Ireland with Protestants and proceeded to kill off protesting Irish Catholics. *Over a century later, and shortly after the establishment of the United Kingdom in 1800, the Protestants in what is now North Ireland, began their marches celebrating the defeat of the Catholics by the Protestant Anglo-Dutch King William --- and they've continued on through*



*the end of the twentieth century -- the cause of continuing strife between Irish Catholics and pro-Brit Judeo-Christians.*

As the result of a combination of events that took place over the course of eight centuries of conflict -- which culminated in England's inaction and greed-motivated doings during Ireland's famine years -- the democratic influences on Irishmen who fled to America (where Negro slaves were being freed) greatly exacerbated the resentment of British rule -- all of which were to lead to a change in British policy towards their Irish Catholic troops.

*[After the American Constitution was amended to give full rights of citizenship to Negroes -- women in America stepped up their demands for the right to vote, as did the Irish for their nation's independence. However, both the vote for woman in America and Irish self-rule were to take the better part of a century before being realized.]*

With the establishment in 1800 of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland, Irish troops had been actively recruited to fill the army's ranks. However, ever since the 1860's, when America's Irish immigrants encouraged the infiltration of the British Army -- with a view of breeding dissension in the ranks - - Irish Catholic troops were shipped out to the colonies -- notably India.

\*

In America, a close relationship existed between the post-Irish-famine movement of the Fenians and the Ghadr movement of the early twentieth century: which protested the exclusionary policies in England's white colonies against Hindus (then a general designation for all South Asians, regardless of their religion). The Brits' hostility to Indian migration into Canada might very well have been due to their recalling the Fenians' earlier attempts (at the end of America's Civil War) to impose their political will over that country (at which time, to counter it, Protestant England emphasized the religion of the Catholic Fenians) and where Indians were involved, to keep them from migrating out of India, they played the racism card .

Though unsuccessful in taking over any part of Canada (either physically or politically), Fenian activities in 1867 were to bring about the confederation of Canada -- something the Brits had tried to avoid -- fearing a united Canada meant losing their absolute control over the territory. Nevertheless, since a divided Canada left her open to inroads by America-based adventurers, of one sort or another, the law establishing the Dominion of Canada was passed by the Brits. The effect was such that England controlled just about every aspect of Canada's

dealings with the outside world: immigration, censorship, customs, her war- and treaty-making ability, as well as all her people's other worldly activities. The Brits used that control to curtail Indian migration into Canada, and then to refuse them passage from, or by way of Canada, if and when they attempted to return to India. By putting a stop to the activities of the Ghadr movement, with its demands for Indian independence, the Brits were attempting to prevent a repeat of their problems with the Fenians of a half-century earlier. Protestant Anglo-Canadians, almost all of whom were from the poorest and lowest social strata of English society, had been easily convinced, on racial and religious grounds, to join in stifling the Ghadr, Indian-independence movement. *It had worked for the Brits earlier to help them fend off the Fenian invasion, and to keep the French Quebecois in their place.*

Into the twenty-first century, despite a lessening of their bigoted attitude towards South Asians, there remains, amongst the lower-class Canadians, a residue of the Brit-sown, racist attitudes that motivate their hypocritical approach towards India, her people and her doings. One can't blame the lower-class citizens of any western-hemisphere nation, what with their being fated to live as second-class citizens (often earning little more than subsistence level incomes) for resenting Asians. It's only recently that those Christians, due to their atoning for their real and perceived guilt for the massacre of those millions of defenseless people during W.W.II, have begun to accept the inclusion of Jews into everyday society (though this has been made palatable for many Christians by the rationales afforded by a slight yet still present, sub rosa, anti-Semitism) -- all of which made for their acceptance, despite their being a more prosperous, better-educated and highly motivated people. However, when observing the economic advances now being made by the far better educated, more intelligent and equally motivated Indians (the result of America's immigration policy affecting all Indians, whereby almost none-other than professionals and their families are permitted to immigrate) they must again face the reality of their socio-economic condition -- with a concurrent resentment of those newcomers, in this case Indians, who are far better off: socially, education-wise and economically, than they.

\*

British policy for both Ireland and India had been that of their standard, divide-and-conquer. This, by playing one identifiable sub-group (according to their race, ethnicity, political leanings or religion) against the other. However, due to the deliberate insult to Indians as a whole, caused by the enactment of the Rowlatt Act, virtually all Indians, regardless of their age-old differences, were to unite in their demands for home rule. So, it was India's reaction to the enactment of the Rowlatt Act that caused the Brits to deviate from their time-proven policy

of divide and conquer -- ergo, their indiscriminate massacre of Hindus, Moslems and Sikhs at Jallianwala Bagh.

Then with their typical hypocrisy, in an attempt to blame the victim for the commission of a crime, the Brits made the claim of bigotry against Gandhi. They accused Gandhi and his co-liberators of using racial hatred against the Brits -- when they spoke out against the massacre of those thousand unarmed civilians at Jallianwala Bagh -- solely because they were Indian.

*[The English, in the years leading up to WWI had treaties with the Japanese, whereby the Japs agreed to assist England in event India revolted against their rule. Perhaps America should look to England for reparations for the Japanese sneak attack that killed those thousands of American servicemen at Pearl Harbor. The Japanese were merely following Britain's deceitful policies, which were accepted without an ah, yes or no by the very moral, Judeo-Christian West. To protect and expand the financial interests of the Crown, the Brits resorted to the most heinous of activities -- yet, they managed to convince a so-called civilized world that their actions were both fitting and proper.]*

*[For the half-century leading up to W.W.II, the Japs chose to adopt the Brits modus operandi for their own use in attempting to build their empire; and in many of their endeavors they proved most adept at imitating the West -- that of British duplicity in their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Nevertheless, despite their own initial success, the Japanese failed militarily -- and now they appear to be failing economically in their attempts to build and maintain a wealth-based empire for themselves. Part of the reason for Japan's failure is that they lack the finesse of the Brits. The Brits knew how to rationalize their doings -- this by shrewdly enacting laws legalizing their actions, no matter how heinous. However, when all else failed, the Old Testament's "eye for an eye" morality could always be called on to maintain their self-righteous demeanor. A case in point, is the after-the-fact attempt at justifying their massacring those thousand unarmed Indian civilians: After the enactment of the Rowlatt Act, a few youths pushed a young English woman off her bike; she was unhurt, and was accompanied to her home by Indian adults -- though the episode was not quite as horrible as the loss of Jenkins' ear, it was more than adequate for the British press to make the massacre of those thousand Indians but fair retribution.]*

\*

## **The Irish Mutiny -- James Daly**

In reading an article in the magazine *History: The Connaught Rangers Mutiny -- India 1920*, by Thomas Bartlett, a professor of Irish History at NUL, Dublin, the writer's belief was confirmed, that a symbiotic relationship existed between India and Ireland insofar as England's pattern of double-dealings was concerned. *However, in America, an antagonistic attitude towards Indians can be discerned in those recent immigrants' coming from Ireland's least-educated, lower-middle-classes -- an attitude, no doubt, carried over from their experiences in England, where they were probably placed in direct competition for jobs with far-more-success-oriented South Asians.*

Post WWI Ireland was involved in much the same social turmoil as post WWI India -- and with the war over, the Brits wanted to rid Ireland of as many potential revolutionaries as possible. (At the time, in an effort to squelch demands by Ireland's Catholics for home rule, the Black and Tans were committing their outrages.) The Brits believed they were getting double duty -- by ridding Ireland of potential troublemakers, and then by using them to suppress their counterparts in India.

The results of all this was most unfortunate for the Irish Catholic youth, James Daly, who, due to his ineffectual involvement in an insignificant near-mutiny, on November 2, 1920, became the last soldier in the British Army to be executed in peacetime. He had been one of the many Irish youths whose enlistment had been encouraged by the Brits for duty in India -- where Indian civilians, much as in Ireland, were reacting to England's wartime double-dealings regarding her promises of home rule.

At first glance, there appears to be no direct connection between the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and the Irish mutiny -- which took place a little more than a year later. The British Government of India, having failed (due to Gandhi's intervention) in their attempt to provoke Indians into reacting violently to the atrocities committed by British troops and pilots (in the aftermath of the massacre, the Brits continued their murdering by bombing and strafing gatherings of unarmed Indian civilians), decided it would be prudent to discharge their Indian troops as fast as they could. (During WWI the number of Indian troops had quadrupled to 600,000.) Ergo, the influx of fresh Irish troops who were thought more willing to fight for the Crown (at least in India) than the Indians.

※

The article by Thomas Bartlett mentions, and then dismisses a comment by one of the leaders of the Irish mutiny, a Private in the Connaught Rangers, Joseph Hawes, in which he stated: "We were doing in India what the British forces were doing to [us in] Ireland." Bartlett then went on to say that no other connection was made between India's and Ireland's independence movement. Maybe so. But, what's obvious, is that the Irish troops were in a double bind. They were, of course, aware of the machine-gunning and bombing of unarmed Indian civilians in the wake of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh -- and Hawes had made them fully aware that the British attitude towards Irish civilians at home was no different than their attitude towards Indians. And, Hawes's mentioning the obvious similarity between the suppression of the Irish to that of Indians, was significant enough to have been quoted in the recently-declassified documents -- on which the article by Bartlett was based.

England's policy of shipping out her macho Irish youths to India must have seemed a Godsend. By their execution of the one Irish youth found guilty of mutiny while in service in India, the Brits were able to prove to the world that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, as well as their continuing murders of Indian civilians, and even the wholesale slaughter, in the past, of those surrendering Indian soldiers in the wake of their 1857 attempt to oust the Brits, were not racially motivated. The Brits, by executing the one Irish-Catholic soldier, had satisfied themselves, if not the world, that they were equal opportunity murderers. Nevertheless, by the continued acceptance, in the West, of their bigotry-rationalized governance of India, they managed to preserve, to some extent, a tattered Empire for a couple of decades.

Within a few years of Daly's execution, Ireland got her home rule, albeit, sans the northern segment of the island nation. Evidently, the massacring of a thousand Irish at a clip, as a means of maintaining their stranglehold over Ireland (as they did at Jallianwala Bagh to prevent home rule for India) would have caused even the members of the British House of Lords to find it difficult to justify.



## Intrigue

The martinet O'Dwyer, had attained his position as the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab despite, or perhaps indirectly because of his being an Irish Catholic he had had to prove his worth to his Anglo-Saxon, Protestant *bettors*. By hook and by crook he had managed to join the peripheral members of England's dominant society; and his need to be part of it was so obvious to the Empire's movers and shakers, that it convinced them that he was just the man to micro-manage the kind of despicable doings deemed necessary to insure their unconditional control of India.

\*

In 1917, Dyer, after being thrown from his horse (while drunk?) had been hospitalized and sent back to England to recuperate. A year later, due to his reputation as an ask-no-questions, obedient-to-the-chain-of-command good soldier, he was returned to his post in the Punjab -- where O'Dwyer was serving as Lieutenant Governor. Dyer's return to India was due to London's unwillingness, due to the exigencies of WWI, to send a more competent general. There was also a very positive reason for their shipping him back. Being aware of both his limited intellect and his racist attitude towards Indians, they realized he was just the man to carry out the kind of nefarious scheme then being put into motion.

WWI, though not yet won, but with the realization that it would soon be over, London's money folks decided to get back to their wallet-filling concerns. India's being the greatest source of their revenue, and well-aware that India's wartime support would no longer be needed, they were determined to put a stop, once and for all, to India's demands for home rule.

The Brits had laid the groundwork for putting-Indians-in-their-place by sending Judge Rowlatt (a staunch defender of colonialism and a respected party hack) to the Subcontinent in an effort to manufacture a good excuse for their reneging on their agreement for India's home rule. Colonizing nations, in order to maintain an uncontested authority (which hasn't changed by much -- if at all), treated any protestation by a subject people, when reacting against their enslavement and the theft of their land and wealth, as a revolutionary act being committed by terrorists. And, so, the British good-old-boy Rowlatt, proceeded to enumerate every trivial instance of a criminal act involving Indians that he could unearth -- a few instances of public disorder were found -- and of those few, most occurred ten years earlier, in 1907: in response to the partitioning of Bengal. All



of Rowlatt's doings were to rationalize the British Government of India's continuing its wartime restrictions on Indian freedom -- which, in a show of patriotism, India's all-but powerless legislators had reluctantly agreed to, but as a temporary wartime measure.

The legalizing hokum initiated by the Brits for the moralistic rationalizing that led to their passing the Rowlatt Act, was ample proof that even before Rowlatt's heralded impartial investigation began, its enactment into law was a done deal. Therefore, even though there were repeated pleas by the most conservative Indian legislators (that powerless group of hand-picked proper-Indians) to reconsider their plans for its enactment (since it was obvious to all, that it would lead to a violent reaction), that the Brits ignored them, and that the Rowlatt Act became law -- should come as no surprise .

\*

London, had surreptitiously hatched their plans intended to squelch any aspirations Indians had for attaining a meaningful degree of home rule. To execute their designs, they connived with Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer and the British government in India -- all parties having given ample proof of their willingness to carry out the nefarious doings that would be required of them.

At the bottom of the chain of command was the alcoholic General Dyer. His immediate superior (though not in military terms -- but only in this particular venture) was O'Dwyer, that preposterous little man with an insatiable ego that fed on racism. It was that quality that had rendered him so useful to the Crown, and had earned him the Lieutenant Governorship of the Punjab.

No doubt, London believed the clandestine operation would go well. Both these gentlemen were rabid racists with killer instincts. They were beyond doubt the two most despicable high-level Brits then functioning in India -- which is saying a lot. Colonial powers, including those claiming to be functioning democracies, in their attempts to maintain their strangleholds over dependent nations, as well as their colonies, always manage to come up with a sufficient number of such depraved men and, in this era of equal opportunity, women.



## Deception

In reaction to the Brits' in-your-face passage of the Rowlatt Act, there were major displays of resentment throughout India -- in Bombay some eight Indian civilians were killed by English troops, as Indian troops refused to fire. Yet, the response by Indians to those murders committed by the Brits didn't result in the massive revolt needed to justify the employment of the kind of devastating retaliation London had believed necessary to *put the Indians in their place*.

Before circumstances could warrant the kind of retribution-rationalized mass murder of Indians contemplated by London: one sufficiently great to thwart all ideas of independence, the Brits felt it necessary to enrage a large-enough number (yet, one small enough to ensure that the entire Subcontinent didn't rise up in protest and cause it to become an impossible to control land) to such an extent, that, in retaliation, they'd attack and kill a considerable number of Brits -- thereby, in an eye-for-an-eye retaliation augmented by a rationalized righteous retribution, London could use unrestrained military force to quell all future opposition to their continued repression of the Indian people.

Even in the Punjab, where resentment had been building for years (due to O'Dwyer's London supported, if not ordered, demeaning racist policies towards its inhabitants), and where the Brits expected the revolt to begin, the response to the killings in Bombay were primarily those of vocalized outrage. And, so, the ante was upped, and the Brits' contingency plan was put into effect.

On April 8, 1919, O'Dwyer ordered the arrest and deportation of Dr. Kichlu (a Moslem) and Dr. Satya Pal (a Hindu): the two most prominent supporters of Indian home rule in the Punjab. Neither man advocated the use of violence (although, had they done so, one could hardly fault them) when speaking out against the Brits' racism-based rationalizations for the passage of the Rowlatt Act.

The carrying out of those orders to remove the two Indian gentlemen from the Punjab was delayed to give sufficient time for large contingents of both British and Gurkha troops to arrive in Amritsar. By the 11th of April the 125th British Infantry and the 216th Sussex Regiments plus 100 men from the London Regiment arrived from Lahore. In addition, three hundred Gurkha troops armed with Kukris were diverted into Amritsar.

It was then, after the arrival of some thousand or so British troops at

Amritsar, that the arrest and deportation of Dr. Kichlu and Dr. Satya Pal took place. This deliberate blow to Indian pride was believed, by the Brits, capable of stirring a mini revolt, by a resentful Punjabi populous. As was expected, there were some acts of violence resulted in the death of five British men: soldiers and civilians (a fraction of the number of Indians already murdered during that period by the Brits). In addition, as previously mentioned, a young British woman was pushed off her bicycle (she required no medical attention, and was escorted home by Indians) -- nonetheless, it was made a cause celebre by the British press which blew it up into an "assault" -- loaded with sexual implications).

*[The insignificant happening regarding the lady (confirmed, as such, in their secret files) was used by the Brits much as they had the questionable episode involving Jenkins' losing an ear; in that instance, Jenkins' missing ear was used as an excuse to justify their fighting that eponymous war -- one that resulted in their obtaining the exclusive rights to the African slave trade -- that, which formerly belonged to the vanquished foe: Spain.]*

In the late afternoon of April 11, 1919, the just-arrived General Dyer, with an escort of 150 British troops (not an Indian soldier amongst them), toured Amritsar to assess the situation -- at which time, he observed a city at peace.

Nevertheless, in the belief that the initial response, by Indians in the Punjab, to the calculated arrest and deportation of Kichlu and Satya Pal, as restrained as it was, would be sufficient to rationalize their committing an outrage such as that ordained by London, O'Dwyer and Dyer made their final arrangements to carry out their mission.

A meeting Gandhi was expected to attend had been hurriedly called to discuss the deportations of Kichlu and Satya Pal. However, he never made it; while en route to Amritsar, the British authorities boarded his train, and forced him to return to Bombay. A certain Hans Raj, a shadowy character of unknown origins, wormed his way into the confidence of those Indians planning the meeting -- and it was he who had convinced the organizers to hold their meeting at Jallianwala Bagh. The general shape of the bagh was that of an oblong trapezoid measuring 200-plus yards by about 150 yards. equal to between six and seven acres. It had been a private garden (bagh), and as such had limited access: the main narrow entrance was located on the shortest side (that the entrance turned out to be too narrow for Dyer's machine-gun-carrying vehicles to pass through -- was fortuitous for the those Indians attending the meeting -- for if they could have entered, thousands more would most-certainly have been murdered). Towards the far end of the bagh, there was a padlocked, wooden double door to

one side, and on the other, a narrow passageway led out of the Bagh and into an equally-narrow street.

*[The fact that the Brits had a spy system functioning throughout India, as well as worldwide, that puts to shame that of the C.I.A. and the K.G.B. gives credence to the claims by survivors, that the man who called himself, Hans Raj, had, upon Dyer's entrance with his British troops, raised his hand and then surreptitiously left the bagh just before the shooting began -- thereby convincing many Indians that he was a British-paid provocateur cum spy.]*

When the final episode was being planned, General Dyer was advised by Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer that no troops from the Irish Catholic regiments would be available to him; Dyer found no fault with that. Due to the disturbances in Ireland, there was a question of their loyalty to the Crown -- which meant, even if the Irish troops were to comply with his orders to fire into the seated Indians, they'd not feel honor-bound to keep mum about it. Logically, he concluded that using Indian troops, as O'Dwyer had insisted he do, seemed foolhardy. Indian troops had already proven, in Bombay, their unwillingness to kill their own, and since he had never been made aware of the overall scheme, rather than use Indian troops and jeopardize his ability to carry out his mission, he ignored O'Dwyer, who after all was a civilian. Dyer had considered using Gurkha troops (Hindu-Rajputs who had long since emigrated from India to Nepal), but decided not to test their loyalty, and using his prerogative as General Officer Commanding, selected a number of British officers and men from amongst the 150 troops who had accompanied him from Lahore, and who had served as his escort on his tour of Amritsar on the 11th of April. (No first-hand account appears to have been written by any British soldier, detailing even one of the infamous actions the British military was known to have performed -- it becomes obvious why Dyer decided to use only his trusted British, non-Irish Catholic troops to carry out his barbarous mission. *(Even after WWI, it was a German who gave the only meaningful soldier's account of it.)*)

The Gurkha troops, though unquestioningly brave when facing armed adversaries, were not known to be ruthless in their use of their Kukris when dealing with defenseless civilians. So, General Dyer reasoned, after issuing them rifles, that if they refused to obey his command to shoot to kill, his primary mission (as conveyed to him by Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer): the massacre of the defenseless "heathens" -- which was intended to teach them a lesson, would end in failure. As a result, Dyer stationed the unaware Gurkha troops outside the killing ground with but their traditional Kukris in hand -- thereby securing the bagh's main passageway. This served the dual purpose of protecting the rear of

the British troops stationed within the bagh, and ensured the troops' quick and unhampered departure once they completed their maleficent mission -- a mission believed by General Dyer to be the intimidation, by this horrific example, of an entire nation into submission to the rule of the noblest of men: the powers that be in London, whose most-obedient servant he was.

Besides his rifle-armed British troops, General Dyer had at his disposal British-manned machine-guns mounted on armored vehicles. Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer had advised the general to station them outside the narrow entrance to Jallianwala Bagh. The intention being, that in event Indian troops refused to obey his orders to shoot to kill the unarmed civilians, General Dyer was to have his machine-gunners turn on them (for mutinying) as they left the Bagh. The problem that arose for the conniving Brits, was the result of the Lieutenant Governor's not being totally candid with General Dyer. For, unbeknownst to Dyer, if by machine-gunning the Indian troops it fostered an uprising by a goodly portion of them, it would be so much the better. London, and their chief henchman, O'Dwyer, being well aware that even in India, where her people were known for their passivity, when outraged, they could engage in intense outbursts of uncontrollable violence -- and that's just what they were hoping for.

\*

Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer, in his own words, is quoted in the File: Home -- Poll -- B-513 -- Jan 1920, marked CONFIDENTIAL on page four: "*At 3-0 A.M. on the morning of the 14th [of April 1919], I received at Lahore a very hasty report from the [British] District Magistrate (he was not with General Dyer when the firing took place) that the meeting had been dispersed by force, and that the death casualties were estimated at about two hundred. One or both of the gentlemen who brought in the report by motor informed me that British troops had been used, and that there was no [British] civil officer with General Dyer at the time. This caused me serious anxiety. ...*"

\*

Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer remained in Lahore, which was an hour away from Amritsar by motor car. On the day following the massacre a messenger arrived there who confirmed his earlier telephone conversation with the British District Magistrate in Amritsar: at that time he advised that, "*The massacre had been carried out by British troops.*" His initial response, had been one of dismay; Dyer, the fool, contrary to plan, had used British and not Indian troops to accomplish his mission. Miracle of miracles, within a matter of days, conflicting official reports were wired to London from the British Government of India that stated: only Indian troops (90) were used; only Gurkha troops (50) were

used; only segments of Gurkha, Sindi and Sikh regiments were used; only Gurkha troops (50) were used but there were also several British officers present. In Parliament many months later, one MP stated, without contradiction, that half the troops were Indian and half British -- obviously, the politically-inspired decision: to split the difference between the truth and the lie, was meant to appease the consciences of the members of both houses of the British Parliament, and an attempt to regain their touted reputation for fair play. *Anyone for cricket?*

*[The British never released the complete report giving the results of their forced-by-public-opinion investigation into the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh: most of which was held in camera. Two out of seven sections of the official report were deliberately obliterated, and never made public. Nevertheless, based on the known facts involving their mass murder at Jallianwala Bagh, it's safe to say that the sections of the report destroyed and never aired, would have been far more damaging to the image of the Brit as a gentlemanly sort, than any deductive conclusions necessitated by their denying access to the full report.]*

Independent sources estimated that the number of unarmed, unresisting civilians who were killed at Jallianwala Bagh was more than double the 379 souls that the Brits finally acknowledged having murdered. The British government in India initially advised London that there were a total of two hundred casualties and then, after some delay, ungraciously conceded that those were the number killed. Thereafter, they were to use the term *death casualties* to make up for their prior attempt to lessen the scale of their murderous doings. Eventually it became obvious that the total number of casualties should have been numbered in thousands. The number of *death casualties* was eventually raised by the Brits in India to 379 -- the result of pressure from London. Parliament, by putting on a show of concern about the massacre, in an attempt to distance itself from the heinous act, felt confident that the undercount of those murdered, would appear legitimate.

*[Militarily-powerful nations that rely on such horrendous terrorist tactics (such as that committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh) against people unable to defend themselves, will eventually have to answer to posterity for their monstrous doings. In the end, England lost, and Gandhi's seemingly-docile India won. The Empire has been broken up into independent pieces, and all the king's men, along with the likes of Churchill and Thatcher, couldn't put Humpty Dumpty together again. Nevertheless, there are those in America who feel that England has made puppets of Reagan and the Bushes, in a somewhat successful attempt to maintain a bit of the Empire's former stature. The flip side to that, is that there are folks in England who believe their leaders have merely become toadies of the American*

*right (much as the Portuguese obeyed the will of the Empire Brits, in their attempt to maintain the insignificant colonial power that remained to them after their loss of Brazil).]*

Poor, simple-minded Dyer, he actually believed the massacre was intended to be a straightforward sort of military maneuver. Lieutenant Governor O'Dwyer had convinced the general that, since history was full of accounts of soldiers' being called upon to kill off troublesome civilians (as a means of warning the citizenry that, if they didn't accede to the demands of their rulers, the same fate would befall them), his, Dyer's carrying out the massacre would be both legally and morally proper. And, so, the general, having been assured that the massacre was what generals were paid to do, set about carrying it out. *[Much as armies execute mutineers, and authoritarian governments routinely incarcerate and murder civilians thought potentially troubling -- all in an attempt to instill fear in the rest of the population -- Dyer (as did O'Dwyer and London), though it would be a step further, had no doubts about the morality of his firing to kill those unarmed, seated civilians.]*

Now then, for the Brits to benefit from their having committed the mass murders at Jallianwala Bagh, they faced a dilemma: if the dastardly deed were to serve its intended purpose, which was to either cow the Indians immediately into giving up their demands for home rule or to have them react to it in a murderous rage (one sufficiently savage so as to enable the Brits to retaliate with a moralizing, unrestrained vengeance), then the horror of it all had to be brought home to all Indians. However, if news of the atrocity were to reach beyond the borders of the Subcontinent, to the so-called-civilized West, it could detract from the prestige of the Empire. The obvious solution for the Brits, which they attempted to apply, was to allow word of the atrocity to spread within the Indian subcontinent -- and, then, at the same time, make every effort to prevent news of the atrocity from reaching the outside world.

Their having followed that tried and true *modus operandi* in every nation colonized by them (which allowed for their building and maintaining their empire), had served them well in the past. However, this time they goofed. The Empire's movers and shakers were incapable of realizing just how much the world had changed since India's first major attempt, sixty years earlier, to rid themselves of British rule. No longer could the Brits (with the use of superior weaponry) engage in the barbaric, criminal activities required to maintain control over their military conquests, without their actions being subjected to public review. They were in the process of losing their absolute control over the content of all the news entering and leaving post-WWI India.



Nevertheless, the Empire's movers and shakers being a resourceful people, unable to play down the horrendous nature of the action they perpetrated at Jallianwala Bagh, they resorted to that old standby, racism. Accordingly, with an assist from a most understanding press, played on and probably exacerbated the from-time-to-time-dormant, racist tendencies that still prevail in the Judeo-Christian West, as a means of justifying the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh. In more recent times, even in America, where we rightfully pride ourselves on our freedom of the press, newspapers routinely ignore, play down or lie about activities that, if made public, could prove harmful to their particular economic, political, religious, ethnic or whatever, selfish interests. *All the news that fits does not get printed* -- even in the States.

The same WWI that brought about the development of radically-improved implements of war (which gave the Brits continued military supremacy over the Subcontinent) also accelerated development of long-distance communication. It made it impossible for the Brits to maintain the total control over the news coming into, going out of and circulating throughout India. Radio became such a threat to the Brit governing classes that by 1925 they made it a government monopoly in England, and by 1927 in India's main cities. Nevertheless, despite a huge spy system and their also controlling the use of telephones and telegrams, the Brits' attempts to censor all means of communication became an impossible task.

*[Government control of the media is a standard tool of oppressive governments. And, when leaders of so-called democracies attempt to control the media's freedom to write or speak the truth, you can bet your bottom dollar that they're engaging in one sort or another of criminal activity.]*

London's movers and shakers were distressed by their inability, at least at first, to use the law to rationalize the mass murder committed by British troops at Jallianwala Bagh. Their concern was not with the fact that the murders had been committed, but whether or not there were laws in place that could possibly be used to justify their having committed them.

It was months after the atrocities in the Punjab had taken place before any direct reference to the very-real murders committed by British troops was printed in the prestigious *Times of London*. Until then, when mentioned at all, the massacre was included in the catchall phrase: *measures taken to deal with the ongoing disturbances in the Punjab*. Once the cat was out of the bag, Britain's *free press* went about convincing a more-than-willing-to-be-deceived xenophobic

British public (by printing what could at best be considered misleadingly-inaccurate details), that the confessed murderer, General Dyer, was a maligned hero.

Shortly after the massacre, General Dyer had been *promoted for his having accomplished it*. Then, after the lapse of a year, and after they finally acknowledging the authenticity of their depraved attack at Jallianwala Bagh., the Brits ordered the recall of their cat's-paw. General Dyer. However, in no time, the prominent Tory newspaper, the Morning Post, sponsored a collection for the benefit of the general who ordered his British troops to murder until they ran out of ammunition: it brought in donations totaling twenty-six thousand pounds sterling (that sum, in twentieth-first century dollars, would have made him a millionaire).

*[Seven decades' having lapsed since the British massacred those seated, unarmed civilians at Jallianwala Bagh, the Chinese Communists, in full view of the world, moved tanks and armored personnel carriers against Chinese pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square. The demonstrators were Chinese students and workers. For a month, they had been in open rebellion against the Chinese Communist regime, and were defying the imposition of martial law then in effect for two weeks. The Chinese, however, unlike the Brits, could not appeal to the racist tendencies of the West, in order to justify their deliberate killings of a large number of confrontational Chinese civilians. As a result, the massacre was rightly denounced by a shocked democratic world. Nevertheless, in the West, even in the years surrounding the new millennium, this same type of murderous activity (more often than not with racist overtones), when carried out in support of near-totalitarian, quasi-democratic regimes, is being routinely ignored -- if not rationalized as being necessary. When one realizes that the leaders of those regimes are supported by the West for no other reason than that their leaders' go about squelching liberal movements while maintaining their own apparent predisposition for capitalism -- does put the horrific aspects of the happenings at Jallianwala Bagh into proper perspective.*

*[There should be no room for doubt as to why the massacre took place -- and how the Brits, with the additional ammunition provided by their playing the racist card, were able to convince their own people, along with what passes for a civilized world, that the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh either didn't happen or, if it did, was warranted. One need only peruse the pages of the London Times's New York namesake, or listen to a respected ultra-rightist's propaganda broadcast, to realize just how a major, influential voice can manipulate, distort and deny the facts, as a means of molding public opinion to serve the needs of a self-serving*

agenda.

*[After having begrudgingly acknowledged that the massacre actually took place, the much respected British press colluded in making the Indians responsible for the entire incident -- sort of blaming the seated, unarmed civilians for sitting in the way of British bullets. It reminds one of the rationales so many Germans were making for their having exterminated all those Gypsies, Jews and invalids -- if they hadn't been in their country, it would never have happened.]*

*[Perhaps mirth is uncalled for here, nevertheless, the British press's attempts to blame the victims for the carnage that befell them at Jallianwala Bagh, though no joke, is reminiscent of the tale of a New York Catholic priest's driving his car so fast he couldn't stop in time to avoid rear-ending the car in front, one waiting for the light to turn green -- and the Irish cop who, in questioning the priest asks: "Now tell me Father, how fast was that car backing up when he hit you?"]*

Though rarely exaltingly publicized when accomplished with the cold and calculated efficiency of the Brits' massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, mass murderings committed in the name of national interest, isn't now, nor was it then an unheard-of strategy. Such tactics are routinely resorted to by those governments supposedly functioning in a democratic manner -- to defend its carrying out of oppressive policies: those invariably of an economic, racial, or religious nature intended to enhance the privileges of the dominant segment of society -- at the expense of all others. Being aware of the unfairness of it all, and fearing the loss of their privileged status, those who have it, when all else fails, have been known to kill if necessary to retain it. Since those speaking out against that unfairness are most feared, yet not wishing to make martyrs of them, they are jailed or banished. When an oppressed people believe there's no alternative, the better-off amongst the underclasses advocate revolution. In India, due to Gandhi's influence, the revolution was of a peaceful nature.

*[Though a fairly commonplace occurrence, most non-wartime murders sponsored by so-called democratic governments, such as those recently committed against the surrendering Peruvian hostage-takers (obviously ordered by Peru's Japanese president in support of the economic interests of Lima's Japanese businessmen), pale when compared with the deliberate and calculated, economically-motivated atrocity committed by the Brits at Jallianwala Bagh.]*

*[The fact that when the Japanese president of Peru realized he'd be prosecuted there for his malfeasance while in office, that he fled to Japan -- where he was welcomed as a citizen, inadvertently, made the internment, during W.W.II, of*

*American citizens of Japanese ancestry, a less deplorable act.*

*[Even in one of the most democratic of nations, the USA, President Cleveland, in 1894, ordered Federal troops to quell a strike against the Pullman sleeping-car manufacturer by its employees: the company had arbitrarily reduced already low wages by as much as 20 to 80 % -- while the rent deducted from the salaries of most workers, all those who lived in company-owned housing, remained unchanged. On the excuse that the strike prevented the delivery of mail, American soldiers were ordered in to shoot to kill American strikers -- and they succeeded in doing just that. Meanwhile, the social reformer, Debs, was jailed for his participation in that strike; and, a quarter of a century later, President Wilson was to have Debs jailed again, this time for speaking out against America's involvement in Europe's WWI. (By the end of the twentieth century, conservatives, though without the risk of incarceration, were heard to voice Debs's sentiments regarding the wisdom of Wilson's involving America in that first war to end all wars.)*

*[Union-busting was, and still is, throughout the world, a commonplace occurrence. And, in America, the nation that still offers the most opportunity and freedom to more peoples of a greater diversity of backgrounds than any other nation, little more than a decade after the British massacre at Jallianwala Bagh, and close to a half century after the killings at the Pullman plant in America, the car manufacturer Ford hired murderous, head-bashing goons to put down a strike by union members at its factories. But, keep in mind, that at the time, this was not an isolated incident, but was a nation-wide practice.]*

Not willing to tax the reasoning power of the dull-witted General Dyer, who had been selected as cat's-paw by O'Dwyer and the go-betweens of Viceroy Lord Chelmsford (the forgetful folks in New Delhi, have allowed a street to remain named in honor of the gentleman), was understandably never made aware of just what his part was in the total plan to eradicate, once and for all, any hope amongst Indians of ever attaining their economic and political independence. The British Government of India had intended to have only Indian troops commit the massacre. Why? To insure one of two outcomes: that the troops would be completely alienated from the people as a result of their participation in the horrible deed; or, in event they refused to obey their orders to fire into the congregation of civilian men and boys, the British-manned machine-guns mounted on the trucks stationed outside the entranceway to the bagh would be trained on them: legally murdering them by claiming they were in a state of mutiny. Obviously the Brits were hoping that such an action would foment another *Sepoy Rebellion* -- a general revolt by Indian troops which could then be

put down by the build-up of British troops armed with the most advanced weaponry -- developed during WWI to counter the advanced-weaponry produced by Germany.

Dyer was quoted as saying he would have used the machine guns inside the killing ground had the armored trucks carrying them not been too wide to gain entry. Dyer, as General Commanding of the operation, and not having been in on the overall strategy, had taken the directive for the placement of the machine guns, as well as for the sole use of Indian troops -- as advisory only.

Nevertheless, despite his ignorance of the ultimate purpose of his murderous duties at Jallianwala Bagh, General Dyer fulfilled his mission of death -- as he saw it to be -- with all the coldness of a drill sergeant ordering his men to stand at attention. In carrying out his nefarious task, he believed he had contributed to the cause of empire: sufficient to enable him to overcome his provincial background. By having ordered his men to murder those heathens at the Jallianwala Bagh killing ground, he was convinced he had proven his worth. And, he obviously did. In London, the House of Lords, in exonerating him, went so far as to laud him for his outstanding performance -- he had shown he really belonged, and was one of them.



## THE PANCHATANTRA

*[The writer, had been afflicted as a youth with numerous attacks of bronchitis and, since it was during the Great Depression -- that pre-antibiotic, pre-TV era of middle-class poverty, he was often bed bound with nothing to do. It was then, but only on rare occasions, and as a special treat, that he was told one or another morality tale from the Panchatantra.]*

The Panchatantra is the oldest collection of fables extant, and is the original source of the animal fables later attributed to and popularized by the fictional Aesop and La Fontaine. Their origins in India date back to at least the middle of the second millennium B.C. -- however, it was not until 200 B.C., that they were written down in India in a Sanskrit related language, and many variations of those tales now exist.

Had the planners and plotters of the massacre at Jallianwala Bagh been more interested in absorbing the wisdom passed down by India's wise men, instead of attempting to destroy their accomplishments and enslave the Subcontinent's modern-day inheritors of that culture, they would have refrained from the error of the *Raja who befriended a monkey*, which they committed by entrusting the carrying out of their nefarious project to the likes of the mentally-unbalanced General Dyer. Moreover, in retrospect, it's impossible to believe that any but deranged men could have been party, in any manner or means, to such a diabolic scheme. However, on into the twenty-first century, certain deranged leaders, even in democracies, have managed to find people who would carry out similar atrocities: ones that entailed the potential mass murder of untold unarmed civilians -- all as a means of maintaining their stranglehold over a subordinate people.

### **Better to Have an Intelligent Enemy than a Stupid Friend**

Once upon a time there lived a wealthy raja who had a magnificent castle situated in the midst of a boundless expanse of lush greenery. As was his wont, he would stroll through this garden with its vast assortment of tame and friendly animals roaming freely throughout the grounds. Songbirds sang and peacocks strutted about, proudly displaying their glorious plumage, only to be overshadowed by the luxuriant colors bursting forth from a limitless array of flowers in full bloom.

One day, in the course of his peregrinations, he came across a handsome

monkey. It was quite tall and stood erect. The monkey appeared bright, and seemed to understand every word the raja uttered. The raja, taking a liking for him, allowed the monkey to accompany him wherever he went.

Eventually, he decided to show his faith in the monkey by entrusting him to act as his bodyguard. He thereupon outfitted the monkey in the finest of silks; his turban was encrusted with jewels; his cummerbund was woven of strands of silver -- and from it dangled a golden-hilted sword. The monkey loved the raja for having befriended him and for having given him such an imposing outfit. The monkey followed the raja wherever he went -- always trying to find ways to show his gratitude for the kindness bestowed upon him by his lord and master.

As was the raja's wont, when out for his afternoon stroll, he would rest and take a nap in his garden under its great, widespread banyan tree; and the monkey would then dutifully stand guard over the raja. As luck would have it, one day, as the Raja was sleeping, a bee alit on the raja's forehead. And, lo and behold, the monkey unsheathed his sword and sliced the bee in two. So, while the monkey's quick action allowed the raja to escape the annoyance of the bee's presence and the possibility of being stung by it, the raja was beheaded in the process.

\*

### **The tale of the Potential Enemy**

Four merchants dealing in precious gems were traveling in the foothills of the Himalayas when they were accosted by a well-groomed gentleman who requested that they allow him to accompany them; he claimed to be on a pilgrimage to the source of the Ganges, and thought it would be safer for him if he were to accompany them through the bandit-infested section of the road that lie just ahead. The merchants were not keen on having him along; with good cause, they feared he might be a brigand. Nevertheless, being seasoned travelers, they believed, should their fears prove founded, by keeping an eye on him they could thwart any attempt he might make to steal their jewels. .

That evening the merchants sat around discussing the means of protecting their possessions. They took into consideration that the stranger might turn out to be a thief, as well as the fact that the following day's journey would take them through that portion of the foothills known to harbor bandits. Accordingly, they decided to swallow the gems. However, unbeknownst to the merchants, the stranger, who may very well have been a thief, and whom they had thought was

fast asleep, had, with eyes closed and snoring loudly, listened to their plans.

The next day, as they wended their way through the most dangerous section of the road, they were accosted by a large band of robbers. The bandits had a mynah bird who was known to always speak the truth, and it told the leader that the merchants possessed jewels. Finding nothing of special value after they completed a thorough search of the merchants' belongings, the bandits prepared to leave, and allow the merchants to continue their journey. However, when the mynah bird repeated his claim, the bandits did a far more thorough search, stripping them in the process. And again they found nothing, but the bird persisted in telling them of the merchants' having jewels in their possession. This time the bandits decided they must kill the merchants and cut open their stomachs, for the bird had always spoken the truth, and therefore, the merchants must have swallowed the jewels.

The stranger, who may or may not have been a thief, but who had claimed to be a pilgrim, realized that in event the bandits found jewels in the stomachs of any one of the merchants, which he knew they would, then they would, assuming he too had jewels in his stomach, most assuredly, no matter his protests, also kill him.

Thereupon he pondered the situation; obviously both the merchants and he would die once jewels were found in one of their stomachs. What to do? The merchants had been very kind to him, and since he realized he would die in any event he decided to ask the bandits to kill him first. The bandits did as he requested, and finding nothing let the merchants go. But still the all-knowing mynah bird persisted -- and so, for the bird's ability to know and speak the truth, the bandits, believing it had caused them to kill a man for no apparent reason, slew the innocent-of-any-wrong-doing mynah bird.

And so the moral voiced in the Panchatantra was: *better to have an intelligent [potential] foe, than a foolish friend*. However, one might add another moral, one which the ancient authors of the *Panchatantra* had chosen to ignore, and that's that by telling the truth as honestly as one believes it to be -- is a dangerous and thankless endeavor.





## ADDENDA

### **Censorship and Capitol Punishment**

**Censorship:** Sentencing of Indians in British East Africa -- May to June 1915  
abstracted from: **Home Poll Deposit June 5, 1916**

Bishendas R Sharma -- Mombasa -- Imprisonment with hard labor for 14 years --  
Charges: Having in his possession publications containing seditious  
articles.

Ibrahim -- Kampala -- Two years rigorous imprisonment --  
Charges: Sending letter ... calculated to promote ... bad feelings against  
government. Spreading ... alarmists reports calculated to cause  
despondency amongst H.M.'s Indian subjects...

Bahashankar Karsenji Bhatt -- Mombasa -- seven years rigorous imprisonment --  
Charge: having in his possession publications containing seditious articles  
likely to promote disaffection or bad feelings.

Khimji Hira -- Mombasa -- 6 months rigorous imprisonment --  
Charge: same as above.

Savale ... -- Mombasa -- to suffer death by hanging ... --  
Charge: circulating or having in his possession seditious publications.

Uma Shankar Ghellabhai -- Mombasa -- 1 Year rigorous imprisonment --  
Charge: having in his possession a compilation or publications containing  
seditious articles ...

