

CHAPTER II.

The Real Nature of the Disorders.

1. In order to arrive at a correct conclusion regarding the real nature of the disorders of April 1919, it is necessary to bear in mind the circumstances existing in the beginning of the year 1919, in the country generally and in the places where these disorders broke out in particular. These circumstances have been fully stated in paragraphs 2 to 8 and 19 and 20 of the chapter on Causes in the Majority Report, in which chapter, subject to a few reservations as already stated above, we entirely agree. For four years and more the resources of India, like those of the other members of the British Empire, had been strained to the utmost in the prosecution of the war. A large effective army had been supplied, the Punjab itself making a substantial contribution of 400,000. India has raised three war loans, and contributed £100,000,000, as its quota to the Empire's war expenses. Besides the direct contributions in men and money there were indirect contributions of a substantial character in various ways. The prices of necessaries of life and other commodities of daily use had increased immensely owing to the war, pressing very heavily on the middle classes and people of limited means. People with fixed moderate incomes were most hard hit in this direction, and among them were the subordinate railway officials who were therefore discontented. Curtailment of facilities of travelling and of import and export of merchandise had also created considerable hardship. The operations of the Defence of India Act and the rules thereunder and of the Press Act had encroached upon the ordinary standard of liberty.

2. While the war was on, all the restraints and hardships, though felt bitterly, were suffered patiently, because of the common purpose of winning the war. But the people generally had hoped that the defeat of Germany and the successful ending of the war for the Allies would immediately end the abnormal conditions and bring into existence a happy and prosperous era. After the Armistice was concluded in November, 1918, the prevailing abnormal conditions, instead of vanishing, became aggravated, particularly in relation to high prices. The ordinary people naturally became discontented with their lot. There was widespread famine in the country owing to the failure of the monsoon of 1918, and the prevalence of influenza and other epidemics had resulted in a very heavy mortality. The new Income-tax Act and the more searching methods of enquiry in relation thereto as well as the interference with

trade conditions already referred to had made the trading community restless.

3. The war had also created throughout the world a new outlook of freedom and liberty, and the same had visibly affected India. The Imperial Government had, as early as August 1917, made a declaration of policy by which the attainment by India of Responsible Government by successive stages was put forward as the goal and the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy, having gone round the country and ascertained the views of the public as to the manner in which that policy was to be given effect to, had published the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme. Great expectations were thereby raised, and when it was said that the Government of India were likely to suggest modifications therein of a somewhat illiberal character, that news had caused considerable irritation. The conclusion of the war has also brought forward the thorny question of the terms on which peace was to be concluded with Turkey ; and the Muhammadans in India were apprehensive that those terms would be severe.

4. The above statement describes the factors that were influencing the minds of the people throughout the country, including the Punjab and the other places where these disorders took place.

5. Some of the above factors were more potent in the Punjab than elsewhere. As already observed, the Punjab had supplied by far the largest number of combatants as compared to the other provinces in India, and it is quite natural that owing to casualties amongst them, war-weariness would be more pronounced in the Punjab than in any other province. Similarly, the restrictions on traffic must have been more seriously felt by the producer of the Punjab which every year exports a large quantity of food-stuffs. Lahore, Amritsar, Gujranwala, Wazirabad, Hafizabad, Sangla, Chuharkana, Akalgarh, Aminabad, Kasur, Patti, Khem Karan, came under the special income-tax and the increase was very large, ranging from 100 to 200 per cent. The seizure of wheat stocks under the Defence of India Act to stop speculation and reduce the price of grain to the poor was also naturally disliked by the traders affected thereby. Then the Punjab Government under Sir Michael O'Dwyer had for various reasons come to be regarded by the educated and politically minded classes as opposed to their aspirations. His speech in the Imperial Legislative Council in September 1917, was regarded as an attack on the educated classes and created considerable resentment. At the next meeting he expressed regret that his speech had hurt people's feelings. During his administration orders had been issued prohibiting politicians like Mrs. Besant and Mr. Tilak from entering the Punjab and reports of the proceedings of certain meetings had been prohibited publication unless they had been censored. He had objected to the Hon'ble Dr. Sapru, the Hon'ble Mr. Banerji and the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya being invited to attend the conference that was held at Lahore to support the reforms-proposals of the nineteen members of the Indian Legislative Council. Several newspapers had been prohibited entry into the Punjab ; and the Press Act had been put into operation more vigorously there than in any other province. The

Hon'ble Mr. Thompson, Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government, said that the late Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab wanted the atmosphere of the place to be as calm as possible during the war, and that all these measures taken by him in regard to the Press and political agitation must be regarded as war-measures. In referring to these measures, we must not be regarded as attempting in any manner to pronounce judgment as to their merits; we are referring to them only with the object of noting the fact that in consequence of them there was considerable feeling existing in the minds of the educated and thinking classes in the Punjab.

6. On the 18th January, 1919, what are popularly known as the **Rowlatt Act.** Rowlatt Bills were published and were introduced in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 6th February, 1919. The bills evoked almost universal opposition in the country. They were opposed by almost all the Indian members of the Imperial Legislative Council, of all shades of political opinion in the country. It was felt in India that, when she stood steadfastly by the Empire in the War and had thereby proved her right to be treated as an equal member of the Empire, repressive legislation of this character was being hurriedly passed while the Reforms Scheme for instalment of Self-Government had not till then materialised. But the main objection to the legislation was that the Executive were being clothed thereby with considerable powers uncontrolled by the judiciary. When an amendment moved by the Hon'ble Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji for the postponement of the bill to the September session, pointing out that there was no harm in so doing as the Defence of India Act was still in operation, was negatived, considerable feeling of resentment was created. In stating the above facts we must not be regarded as in any manner expressing any opinion on the question whether the introduction of these measures at this juncture was unwise or with regard to the merits of those measures; it will be outside the scope of our reference to do so. We have stated these circumstances only with the object of taking note of the fact that the introduction of the Rowlatt Bills did create considerable resentment throughout the country. This opposition, shared in as it was by people of all shades of political opinion, was genuine and not a factious or artificial one as was suggested by some witnesses before us. One of the Rowlatt Bills was finally passed in the Legislative Council on the 17th March, 1919, and received the assent of the Viceroy soon afterwards. The agitation against the measure increased, and demonstrations of various kinds were made to secure the repeal of the measure. It appears that at any rate in the Punjab there were afloat a considerable number of misrepresentations of the provisions of the Rowlatt Act but it was not suggested that any known or recognised leaders were responsible for these misrepresentations. Although these misrepresentations were current for a considerable time Government had not taken any definite step to explain the Act to people at large; it was not until after the *hartal* of April 6th that the Punjab Publicity Board took steps to distribute copies of it in large numbers.

7. While the bill was still before the Legislative Council, Mr. Gandhi joined the agitation against the bills, which thereby received a great accession of strength. On the 1st March 1919, the *Satyagraha Sabha* was established at Bombay, and it was announced that those taking the *Satyagraha* vow would civilly disobey the Rowlatt Act and such other laws as a committee of the *Sabha* may from time to time name. We are in agreement with what is stated in paragraphs 13 to 18 of the chapter on Causes in the Majority Report as regards the *Satyagraha* movement, its progress and the nature and effect of the doctrine of civil disobedience stated by Mr. Gandhi as part of the *Satyagraha* doctrine. There was a *Satyagraha Sabha* established at Delhi and there was active propaganda in support of *Satyagraha* but the *Satyagraha* movement as such does not appear to have made appreciable headway in the Punjab; and we do not think that the disorders that took place there could be attributed to active presentation of the *Satyagraha* doctrine by organisations working in the province itself.

8. The question that first arises is whether these events were in the nature of a rebellion as commonly understood, that is, a rising for the purpose of turning out the British Government and were the result of an organised movement for that end. It was stated before us by some officials that these disorders were in their view the result of an organised conspiracy throughout the country to turn out the British Government, and it was said that such organisation was connected with the ferment in Egypt and the machinations in Afghanistan. One witness even suggested that it was connected with, if not financed by, the Russo-German Bolshevik organisation. The views were based on inferences from the nature of the occurrences themselves and no evidence in support of them was forthcoming. The Hon'ble Mr. Thompson, Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government, admitted in his examination before us that there was nothing more than conjectural connection between the disturbances in the Punjab and the ferment in Egypt, the machination in Afghanistan or the Bolshevik influences. He did not wish the Committee to draw any inferences in this connection from the facts placed before us by him. The following is an extract from the examination of Colonel A. J. O'Brien, Deputy Commissioner, Gujranwala, regarding his statement that the unrest was organised from outside :—

Q. So according to that, the organisation that you refer to was in the Punjab, outside Gujranwala?

A. I don't say that. I say that it was certainly outside Gujranwala.

Q. Was it outside the Punjab or inside?

A. That I cannot tell you.

Q. You cannot say where the organisation was?

A. No, I have no information.

Q. You do not know whether there was any organisation at all.

A. No.

Q. And then why do you say here "it was organised." when you never knew whether there was an organisation at all or not?

A. As I said, it was only my assumption. I don't think that the Gujranwala people would have started it off of their own accord, therefore I assumed that it must have come from outside.

Q. You assumed the existence of an organization without any evidence at all? You never made any enquiries?

A. It is not for me to take into consideration every individual thing outside my own district.

Q. Colonel, you have made a statement, and surely you must base that statement on some material?

A. I am like our friend this morning (referring to a non-official I did not expect to be cross-examined).

Q. Therefore you thought it did not matter if you made that statement and it would not be challenged?

A. I was asked to give my opinion by the Punjab Government and I gave it.

9. On the evidence before us we are of opinion that there was no rebellion in the sense we have mentioned nor any organisation for that purpose; further that there was no organisation even for bringing about the disturbances and the atrocities which were committed by the mobs seized by the frenzy of the moment. The Punjab Government in their case presented to us take the view that the disturbances cannot be rightly attributed to an organisation for that purpose but must be referred mainly to local causes. They say "In many cases the *hartal* of the 6th April owed very little to a direct organisation of public men." "The movement against the Act working up to the general demonstration of the 6th was not of itself of an exceptional character. There was not as far as can be ascertained any general intention of carrying it beyond political agitation and passive resistance." "For the disturbances that ensued we must mainly look to local causes." Speaking about Amritsar where the worst disorders took place, the Punjab Government say "that certain local factors resulted in turning what started as a protest in force against the deportation of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal into mob-violence marked by murder, pillage and incendiarism."

At Lahore, they say, the disturbances followed the reported arrest of Mr. Gandhi and the news of the outrages at Amritsar. Speaking about the town of Gujranwala, they say "Actual disorder was due rather to the desire to emulate the outrages of the mob at Lahore and Amritsar rather than to any long premeditated organisation for violent ends." As regards the disturbances in various places in the Gujranwala district, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Joint Deputy Commissioner, Sheikhpura, says in his written statement, "Crowds flocked down to meet every train that passed through and the wildest rumours were afloat. The

outbreak was immediately preceded by the *Baisakhi* festival. A large number of Sikhs and others went to Amritsar. Some of them were shot or wounded there, and the wildest tales came back of Government oppression, which further inflamed the population, particularly against Europeans." Of Kasur they say that "it is safe to exclude any suggestion that disorders were long premeditated or due to an organisation to that end." As regards Gujrat they say "the record of the disturbances in this district discloses no evidence of organisation. Such trouble as occurred was confined practically to two days, and with the exception of the deliberate derailment at Malakwal, reveals little concerted action to cause a serious breach of the peace.....; but the nature of the course taken by the demonstration does not suggest that there was at any time ever any danger of outrages so grave as those which occurred at Amritsar and Gujranwala."

10. It is also beyond doubt that the principles of *Satyagraha* as enunciated by Mr. Gandhi inculcate the doctrine of no violence and that the *Satyagraha* vow enjoins abstention from violence. Although the effect on the masses of the propaganda of civil disobedience connected with *Satyagraha* was likely to create an atmosphere favourable to violence, it cannot be said that the promoters of the *Satyagraha* movement themselves intended that violence should result. The official evidence is unanimous in saying that the local leaders at Delhi, including *Satyagrahis*, were taken by surprise at the actual violence that occurred and did their best to assist the authorities in the restoration of law and order. Jiwana, Inspector, Criminal Investigation Department, has the following record in his diary "I personally called on Dr. Kitchlew as the follower of his views. I am not known to him in any capacity. It was necessary to sign a form regarding passive resistance and the manner in which it was to be resorted to would be according to the instructions of Mr. Gandhi to be received later on. He gave me a form which I attach herewith. He advised that no violence or force should be used."

11. Mr. Orde, Superintendent of Police, Delhi, was specially charged to make enquiries about the Delhi disturbances with the particular object of bringing to light the extent and methods of organisation believed to be responsible for the disturbances and its connection, if any, with similar outbreak in the other parts of the country. His conclusion, arrived at after full investigation, is that the rioting at Delhi was not the outcome of a conspiracy against the British *raj* but the natural consequence of economic hardships and political unrest. He further says that it was never intended by the members of the *Satyagraha Sabha* or others that their activities should result in violence. He adds that he could find no connection between the Delhi disturbances and the disturbances in other places. Similarly, Mr. Guider, who was specially deputed to conduct an investigation into the Ahmedabad disturbances said that he could find no organisation behind those disturbances, and that there was no connection between the Ahmedabad disorders and the disturbances in other places. Mr. Tomkins, Deputy Inspector General of Police,

Punjab, who, it appears, was placed on special duty to explore the organisation underlying the disturbances came to the conclusion "that behind and beneath the disturbances, there was no organisation such as could not be seen by any one following political developments in India during the last few years." In his view, the disturbances were more or less spontaneous, bred by political unrest. The marked differences as regards certain essential features in the disturbances at different places also negative any common design. While in Amritsar and Ahmedabad the mobs, when they lost self-control and started on their nefarious work, brutally assaulted and killed Europeans and destroyed Government and public property, it was quite otherwise in Lahore and Delhi. During the disturbed time of the 10th of April and the following days, there was no determined attempt at Lahore to molest Europeans or attack banks or public buildings. Similarly, in Delhi, throughout the period of the disturbances from the 30th March to the 17th April, there was never any attempt made to damage Government or public buildings or any attack on Europeans as such.

12. If there was no organised or concerted attempt to bring about these disorders it follows that there was no organisation for a rebellion, and we think that it is not a correct description of these disturbances to call them rebellion in the sense we have indicated above. The first circumstance that invites attention in this connection is that in no place were the mobs provided with any fire-arms or swords or other weapons of that character. The evidence further shows that at no time was any attempt made by the crowds to obtain arms by raiding the houses of license holders or the ammunition shops in the disturbed areas. Lieutenant-Colonel Johnson told us that there were 1,700 license holders in Lahore civil area. The question was put to him "Am I right in supposing that if the people of these provinces had been bent on rebellion that (possessing arms) would have been the first thing they would have done?" His answer was "I say that is my opinion. I think you are right." In several cases in the beginning of the disturbances, they had not come armed even with *lathis* or sticks. When this aspect was put to some official witnesses, they said that it was a 'ridiculous' rebellion. At Amritsar when the crowd first started to go to the Deputy Commissioner's bungalow they were bareheaded and barefooted and had no sticks; and it was after they had been turned back by the firing that some of them armed themselves with sticks and pieces of wood from a shop near the railway station. This appears from evidence of Mr. Miles Irving, Jivanlal and Dr. Fauq. Moreover, no serious attempt appears to have been made to get the rural population to join in the disturbances. The official evidence is unanimous that the rural population, as a whole, had nothing to do with these disturbances. Lieutenant-Colonel Smithers, who, in charge of a mobile column, visited various places in the district of Lahore, says in his report to General Beynon: "My impression as regards the loyalty of the district was that outside the larger towns the country folk seemed contented. They were at the time busy in cutting their crops and did not appear interested in anything else. Most outlying villages had not even heard of the Rowlatt Bill. I never heard Lahore

mentioned in the district I traversed except that they had heard of riots there."

An examination of the progress of events in Amritsar and other places shows that the *anti*-Government or *anti*-British form that the disturbances took was a sudden development at the time. The Punjab Government testify to the fact that on the 30th March and 6th April when the *hartal* took place and on the 9th April which was the *Ram Naumi* day there was no hostility or even discourtesy shown at Amritsar to Europeans who moved freely through the crowd. On the other hand, when Mr. Miles Irving accidentally came across the *Ram Naumi* procession, a special mark of respect was shown to him. Further, when, on the news of the deportation of Drs. Kitchlew and Satyapal, the crowd assembled and tried to proceed to the Deputy Commissioner, they passed the banks and came across some Europeans but did not molest them. And the deplorable events in the city followed and did not precede the firing on the crowd at the Hall Gate Bridge. We mention this latter circumstance not as affording any excuse, much less a justification for the atrocities committed by the mob; but only as showing that the *anti*-Government and *anti*-British outburst was not previously designed, but was the result of the frenzy with which the crowds became seized at the moment. Mr. Miles Irving, the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar, said "I cannot point to any fact existing before the 10th of April to suggest that in the beginning of April, there was any plot on the part of any stratum of society in Amritsar to encourage violence against Europeans or upset the Local Government by violence."

Q. Would it be consistent with the facts as you know them to regard the outbreak of the 10th of April as the case of protest against the deportation of Drs. Satyapal and Kitchlew which spontaneously developed into mob violence marked by murder and incendiarism?

A. I think that is a very good account. It spontaneously developed, it flared up in a moment. I do not think people went out with that design.

It is not incorrect to say that at Gujranwala, Kasur and other places the violent acts committed by the mob were more or less the result of a sudden determination to resort to such acts. In the town of Lahore itself the actual happenings in the way of destruction of life and property were of so trivial a character that it would be a misnomer to describe them as acts of rebellion. In fact, there was no damage done to any property, Government or private, and there was no attempt to attack Europeans as such.

13. There is no doubt that in some places there were serious riots and the mobs committed destruction of life and property in consequence of and as a mark of resentment, however unjustifiable, against Government and their conduct richly deserves the severest condemnation; but their intention was not to put an end to the British Government nor were the means adopted by them calculated to effect that. Their acts may amount in law to waging war under the Penal Code, but it was not rebellion in the sense in which it is ordinarily understood.

14. In this connection, it may be useful to refer to the behaviour of the people of the Punjab for some years preceding these events, in order to realize the improbability of their entertaining the idea of rebellion against the British Government. In the year 1914-15, soon after the war began, a considerable number of emigrants came to the Central Punjab from the United States, Canada and the Far East. They were infected with revolutionary ideas and were in deep plot, encouraged and helped by Germany. They had bomb factories both at Lahore and Amritsar, and they committed a large number of outrages, murdered officials and wrecked trains and communications. They printed and distributed considerable revolutionary literature and their declared object was *Ghadr, i.e.*, revolution. At that time the country was depleted of its Indian forces and it was an anxious time. On this emergency, the people of the Punjab, including the educated classes, actively ranged themselves on the side of law and order and those revolutionaries were put down and a large number of them were brought to justice. About 28 people were hanged and one hundred transported. In January and February 1915 organised disturbances on a large scale took place in South-Western Punjab, and a considerable number of murders and dacoities involving much destruction of property were perpetrated. The peasants were the aggressors in this disorder and some of them said that the British Government had come to an end and that they owed allegiance to the German Kaiser and the Amir of Afghanistan. On this occasion, too, an overwhelming majority of people remained loyal and almost all the respectable people helped the Government very much to restore order. The disorder was put down and a large number of offenders, about four thousand, were arrested and severely punished by capital sentences and sentences of transportation for life being passed on them. We have stated the above facts, as deposed to us both by Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Mr. Thompson and as mentioned in the Government administration reports. On both these occasions the people of the Punjab, if they had a mind to rebel against the Government, had opportunities thrown in their way for this purpose. Sir Michael O'Dwyer in his speech in September 1917 in the Indian Legislative Council said as follows :—“Hon'ble members are doubtless familiar with the serious dangers which menaced the security of the province during the first two years of the war, the *Ghadr* conspiracy and other real and covert movements, engineered by the King's enemies within or without India, with the object of subverting the Government, but, perhaps they are less familiar with the action, the prompt, vigorous and decisive action taken by the people of the Punjab, Muhammadans, Sikhs and Hindus, to range themselves on the side of law and order and to stamp out sedition and anarchy. There was no hesitation, no sitting on the fence, no mawkish sympathy with red-handed crime, no insincere apology for so-called misguided youths pursuing noble ideas, no subtle distinction between evolutionary and revolutionary patriotism.” Further, the province, in the words of the Punjab Government, “made a response unequalled by any other part of India to the appeal for recruits and subscribed so freely to the War Loans that the province

ranked third in the list of contributors." Sir Michael O'Dwyer, in a speech made in the Punjab Legislative Council in April, 1917, said that he had every reason to rely on the people's loyalty and proverbial common sense, and acknowledged that "since the war began the people of the province, so far from doing anything to embarrass the Government, have rallied enthusiastically to its support." Speaking of the press he said that it had on the whole maintained a correct, loyal and helpful attitude. Referring to the various political and other associations in the province, he said that as a rule they had conducted their discussions and propaganda "with a sobriety and restraint befitting the anxious times." We think it extremely improbable that after the successful termination of the war, out of which Britain emerged more powerful than ever before, the people of the Punjab with their practical common sense would so suddenly abandon their sturdy loyalty that had actively asserted itself during the dark days of the war and think of starting a rebellion.

It was suggested that military efficiency of the British army in India was in the beginning of the year 1919 much less than that of the British army in 1914, 1915 or 1916, and General Hudson explained this to us. This is quite true, but it is too much to assume that the people of the Punjab understood or were influenced by this factor in starting a "rebellion." It may be useful to see what the district officials and others in close touch with the population have to say in this connection.

15. Mr. Kitchin, the Commissioner of Lahore and Amritsar, said that there was no *anti*-British feeling before the 10th of April and Mr. Miles Irving expressed the same view. Mr. Bosworth Smith, Deputy Commissioner in charge of Sheikhpura Sub-Division, said "There was no *anti*-British or *anti*-European feeling to any appreciable extent with the exception of the *Ghadri* movement which was exotic; the indigenous population was neither *anti*-British nor *anti*-European all these years." Lieutenant-Colonel O'Brien said that there was nothing to complain of before the 6th of April and that the people looked perfectly loyal; he says he was told that some people read outside newspapers of an objectionable character. Captain Godfrey who had worked as a missionary for many years in the Gujrat district and has, as he said, opportunities of intimately knowing the people, deposed that people were quiet, loyal and law-abiding and showed no *anti*-British feeling. The happenings of the 14th came as a surprise. Lala Khan Chand, *tahsildar* of Kasur, said that he did not observe any *anti*-Government or *anti*-British feeling amongst the people of Kasur, nor any seditious movement. Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, I.M.S., of Amritsar, said that the people were loyal and that he did not see signs of unrest or disloyalty. He said that there was political agitation going on from the beginning of 1919 but that he did not consider it a disquieting sign.

16. While there was no organised or concerted action to bring about the disorders and those disorders themselves were not in the nature of a rebellion, that is, done with the intention to overthrow the British

Government, the Punjab Government and its responsible officials and the military authorities had from the start persuaded themselves that they were the result of an organised and preconcerted rebellion ; and they began to deal with the situation on the footing of there being a state of war, the towns in which these disorders had happened as being in rebellion and the whole population of these towns being rebels. And it is indeed on that footing that at any rate some of the measures taken by them can be explained. When the General Officer Commanding, the 16th (Lahore) Division, was informed about the disturbances at Delhi and thereupon took precautions about possible disorders at Lahore, the entry is made in a book headed a " War Diary " ; and all subsequent events have been recorded in that book. No such title seems to have been adopted by the military authorities of Delhi and Ahmedabad although the events at the latter place were as bad as, if not worse than, the incidents at Amritsar. When intimation was first received at the Government House, Lahore, at 12-15 (noon) on the 10th April about Amritsar, the entry recording it was made in a book, headed the " Government House War Diary " and subsequent events were entered therein. A similar ' War Diary ' seems to have been kept for Lahore beginning from the 10th April. Similar books seem to have also been kept for Kasur, Gujranwala and other places. Sir Michael O'Dwyer stated to us that he did not know that such Diaries were kept, and said that he would certainly not have approved of the title. In any event, it shows to a certain extent how some of those surrounding Sir Michael O'Dwyer looked at the matter. Mr. Kitchin, the Commissioner of Lahore, said that in April he had formed the opinion that there was a revolutionary movement behind the disturbances, though he had since modified his opinion. The same opinion was evidently held by General Beynon, Lieutenant-Colonel O'Brien, Mr. Bosworth Smith, Mr. Miles Irving and other officials. Sir Michael O'Dwyer himself in his written statement before us gave expression to the view that there was a widespread organisation. In his oral examination, he said as follows :—

Q. In your statement at page 10 you indicate the view that there was an organisation—a widespread organisation—on the 15th April. Your suggestion is that the whole country was involved. Do you still adhere to that or not ?

A. There were similar and simultaneous outbreaks in various parts of India as far apart as Bombay, Ahmedabad and Calcutta.

Q. Here the suggestion is that these disturbances at Ahmedabad and Calcutta and Bombay were part of one organisation. Do you adhere to that suggestion or do you wish to modify it ?

A. I still think there were certain people connected with those parts who were behind this organisation. I will not say it for certainty, but I think there were certain phases which showed that unless there was an organised movement all over the country and there had been some organisation, all this could not have occurred simultaneously. But I have no positive proof of this.

Q. Where was this central organisation ?

A. I have no proofs of it. But I am strongly inclined to believe that it did exist. There was some organisation.

Q. There was some central organisation directing these ? Certain phases of them. There was some common agency which worked out certain phases of the occurrences that took place ?

A. Yes ; that is what I believe.

Q. You have no evidence in support of this ?

A. I cannot give it. As I say, I left the province directly after those disorders were put down and did not have the opportunity of investigating the matter further.