

BRITISH CONDEMN SLAUGHTER IN INDIA

Commission Declares General Dyer's Troops Fired Too Long on Amritsar Mob.

DEPLORES ORDER TO CRAWL

Native Members, in a Minority Re- port, Censure the Punjab Government.

LONDON, May 25.—The findings of the commission appointed by the British Government to investigate the causes of the unrest in India, with the attending disorders, were made public today. The incidents investigated included the Amritsar affair, in April, 1919, in which a slaughter occurred when a crowd of natives in the Jallianwala Bagh inclosure at Amritsar was fired upon by troops commanded by General R. E. H. Dyer, then in command in India.

The commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Hunter, submitted two reports, a majority report by the five English members and a minority report by the three Indian members. An official summary of the two reports given out by the British Government reads in part:

"With the exception of the Jallianwala Bagh and certain minor incidents, both the Indian and English members generally agree in justifying the firing done by the police and the military. They agree in pronouncing unfavorably upon General Dyer's handling of the Jallianwala Bagh meeting and upon certain of the orders passed in the course of the administration of martial law. They further agree in exonerating the Government of India from all blame.

"Regarding Amritsar, the English members hold that the outbreak was anti-Government at every stage, hostility to the Government quickly merging into antipathy for Europeans as such and culminating on April 10 in the brutal murder of five inoffensive persons and savage assaults on others. The Indian members think that the anti-European sentiment developed subsequent to the firing on April 10, but do not dissent from the view that the firing was necessary.

Declare Dyer Made "Grave Error."

"The English members approve the action of the authorities prior to April 13 considering it impossible that de facto martial law could fail to result from the happening of April 10. But while admitting the difficulties of the situation, they consider that General Dyer's conduct at the Jallianwala Bagh is open to criticism in two respects, first, in that he fired without warning, and second, in that he continued firing too long. They do not believe that the mob would have dispersed if warned, and considered that firing would have been necessary in any case. They consider that General Dyer, through a mistaken belief that continued firing would be justified by the effect produced in other places, committed a grave error in firing too long.

"They find no grounds for believing that this action saved the situation and averted a second mutiny. But they do not think that General Dyer can be blamed for not attending to the wounded, as they are not convinced any one was exposed to unnecessary suffering for want of medical attention.

"This opinion is not shared by the Indian members, who, while agreeing in the condemnation of General Dyer's action, take a graver view of the whole incident, stigmatizing his conduct as inhuman and un-British."

The official summary points out that the English and the Indian members differ as to the precise nature of the disorders and as to the justification for the policy pursued by the Punjab government. The English members emphatically state that "open rebellion" was the only suitable description of the disturbances, while the Indian members declare that such a term implies a rising for the purpose of turning out the British government, which was not the intention of the rioters.

The English members assert that the declaration of martial law was justified, while the Indian members censure the Punjab Government "for persuading itself rather easily that martial law was necessary. They declare that martial law was proclaimed when the situation offered no justification for it.

Agree as to Delhi and Bombay.

"Both the Indian and English members," continues the official summary, "are in complete agreement respecting events in Delhi and Bombay, holding that the measures taken by the authorities were reasonable."

The official summary notes that the English members regret that the administration of martial law should have assumed such an intensive form and they condemn certain of the orders issued as injudicious. They object, for instance, to General Dyer's orders that any one desiring to traverse the street where Miss Sherwood, a British subject, was brutally assaulted, should crawl. The orders passed in Lahore against students are condemned as unnecessarily severe.

"On all these matters," adds the official summary, "the Indian members take a more serious view, considering these orders and some others unjustifiable, calculated to humiliate Indians, to punish alike innocent and guilty and to foment racial bitterness."