

Episode, Tragedy or Massacre: The Jallianwala Bagh (1919) in Historiography

Sukhdev Singh Sohal

Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar

Historiography on the Jallianwala Bagh massacre (1919) is rich in diversity. The imperialists described the Jallianwala Bagh massacre and associated happenings as 'disturbances', 'episode' and 'tragedy'. The nationalists followed these categories and also focused on 'carnage' and 'massacre' depending upon the constituency they were addressing. However, the public always preferred to call it the massacre. Recent attempts, during centennial commemoration, have further reinforced the latter viewpoint. This is an attempt to delineate the conceptual grid around which the Jallianwala Bagh massacre is remembered and constructed in academic and public spheres both in history and literature.

The centennial commemoration of Jallianwala Bagh Massacre (1919) has brought in focus shifting sands of metaphors deployed in historiography describing its form and features. Broadly, the terms like incident, event, episode, tragedy and massacre are deployed to comprehend the depth of the catastrophe that unfolded on the fateful day of 13th April 1919 at the Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar. There is more confusion than clarity. Human beings remember through words and concepts which carry weight and make an impact on the mind. Remembering and forgetting are human and historical functions and are mutually inclusive. Both memory and history are complementary. Memory is often owned; history is interpreted. Memory is passed through generations; history is revised. Memory is often coalesced in objects, sites and monuments and history seeks to understand contexts in all their complexity. However, the relationship of memory to the past is ultimately emotional not intellectual.¹ When memories are repressed, it leads towards 'compulsion to repeat.'² Carl Becker in 1931 defined history as 'the memory of things said and done.' Memory is fundamental; without memory there is no

knowledge.³ Finally, the repetition is worked through which is remembering. Remembering, in fact, liberates.⁴ Historiography is a form of discursive remembering. History seems to be a public enterprise. Thus, churning within historiography unfolds layers within historical experience.⁵ It is concerned with eruption of our knowledge of the past, as well as our irruption into it.⁶ Historiography has evolved around these concepts and there is a trend in which scholars are following the popular perception of the Jallianwala Bagh as a massacre.

The British historiographies of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre center on the notion of Winston Churchill that the massacre was 'singular and sinister (in) isolation'. The Indian historiographies go halfway to the British brutality and the other half to the Churchillian myth of it being 'un-British'.⁷ This was one of those 'rare occasions' when Winston Churchill was 'in line with nationalist sentiment' in India.⁸ Nationalism is 'the product of collective imagination constructed through remembrance'.⁹ Trauma and tragedy imprint our memory more than happiness. Human beings revisit, remember, reinvent, reconstitute and reconstruct traumas and tragedies in the new situation with a view to reconcile the past and the present. There is a teleological trajectory attached to massacre with the beginning of decolonization. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre of 1919 at Amritsar is one such historical juncture that has engaged scholars, students and common people not only in the Punjab but also in India and across the world. The present attempt is to delineate the conceptual grid around which the Jallianwala Bagh massacre is remembered and constructed in academic and public spheres and commemorated on its anniversaries over the last one hundred years.

I. Conceptual Context

The Jallianwala Bagh massacre is a historical site of memory which is articulated in terms, concepts and categories. It had been memorialized immediately and stands as testimony of horrendous happenings. Historians position their narratives around a grid. Lord Edwin Montagu, the Secretary of State for India, initiated the Debate in the House of Commons on July 8, 1920 and reminded the House that the entirety of General Dyer's actions evolved around the 'theory of terrorism' and 'frightfulness', 'perfectly exemplified in the character of its most notorious manifestation, General Dyer'.¹⁰ Lord Curzon of Kedleston, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Lords, was more categorical in

the Debate in answering the question "Did General Dyer save India?" by replying back that 'you do not any more save India by a massacre at Amritsar than you defeat the Bolsheviks or save Russia by a massacre at Odessa or Warsaw'. He reminded the House of 'Clemency' Canning in the context of the 1857 Rebellion.¹¹

Massacre means 'indiscriminate killing in numbers of the unresisting or defenseless'. There are other concepts depicting such a situation: carnage refers to 'widely scattered or heaped up corpses of the slain; butchery or killing of men rudely and ruthlessly as cattle are killed in the shambles; slaughter refers more to the process and carnage to the result'.¹² The term massacre began appearing from the eleventh century CE onwards.¹³ A crowd is a servile flock that is incapable of ever doing without a master. Men gathered in a crowd lose their force of will. Crowds are only 'powerful for destruction'. There are criminal crowds, virtuous crowds and heroic crowds.¹⁴ In the 1890s, 'the era of the crowd' began as the voice of the masses had become preponderant. The psychology of the crowds became essential for the statesmen who wished not to govern the crowd but also not to be much governed by them.¹⁵ The dumbing down of the crowd reflects a growing intolerance towards 'social noise' of the lower classes.¹⁶ Moreover, plebian noise was perceived as 'instances of savagery and, at most auxiliaries of rebellion'.¹⁷

In fact, the colonialists in India categorized the violent developments as 'disturbances',¹⁸ and as an 'episode',¹⁹ the loyalist Lord Sinha, the Under Secretary of State for India in the House of Lords, further diluted it down to 'an incident',²⁰ the nationalists brought in the concept of 'tragedy',²¹ there were others who applied concepts like 'massacre'.²² The Jallianwala Bagh was converted into a memorial and a place for political pilgrimage. The memory lingered on. In the beginning, its collections were tardy and picked up within a month.²³ However, Valentine Chirol argued that General Dyer by his action created in the Jallianwala Bagh, a place of 'perpetual pilgrimage for racial hatred'.²⁴ Moreover, the events in Amritsar (1919) quickly became a 'referendum' on violence and empire.²⁵ Keeping the political economy of colonialism apart, it is 'a psychological state rooted in earlier forms of social consciousness in both the colonizers and the colonized'. It represents a certain 'cultural continuity' and carries a certain 'cultural baggage'. The ideology of colonialism is still 'triumphant' in many sectors of life.²⁶

II. Contemporary Perspective

On April 16, 1919, *The Tribune*, Lahore reproduced from *The Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, a pro-British Anglo-Indian paper, an account of the 'Jallianwala Bagh incident'.²⁷ *The Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore, gave details about the riots on 10th April at Amritsar and Lahore. It reported that 'on 13th April illegal meetings were dispersed. One meeting was announced and about 6000 people attended. This meeting was held in defiance of the law. It was dispersed by a small force of Indian troops. The casualties were heavy but quiet had since prevailed in the city (Amritsar)'.²⁸

Motilal Nehru on September 17, 1919 in Allahabad addressed a public meeting and referred to the Jallianwala Bagh as a 'tragedy'. In his Presidential Address to the delegates of Indian National Congress at Amritsar on December 27, 1919, only four days after the Government of India Act (1919) received the royal assent in London, Motilal Nehru further toned down his pitch by avoiding even 'tragedy' to the happenings of what he called 'the most shameful barbarities'. He dwelt eloquently on the minds of Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer and referred to 'the shooting in the Jallianwala Bagh'. His entire Address revolved around constitutional reforms and responsible self-government.²⁹ M.K. Gandhi struck 'a more conciliatory note' and argued that 'these reforms can be used as a stepping stone to full responsible government'.³⁰ M.K. Gandhi, during the Congress Inquiry Committee proceedings in Amritsar, was categorical and 'very strong about not recording such statements at all because they exposed the witnesses to serious risks, and he would say that we had no right to do so even in the name of patriotism'. One would see 'frightened faces of men and women as they appeared before the judges of the Congress Committee'.³¹

In September 1919, K. D. Malaviya finalized the draft of a book which was published in 1920. He reached Amritsar in mid July 1919. He visited the Jallianwala Bagh complex and counted 167 bullet marks on the walls. His account uses terms like 'the Jallianwala Bagh outrage'. 'Amritsar disturbances', and 'tragedy' were in common usage in official circles and press. He mentions 'indiscriminate carnage', a new entry, and voices his opinion that it was "cold blooded disregard of the sanctity of human life amounting to butchery", almost calling it a massacre. The work is set in a broad paradigm of 'rebellion'.³² In 1920, Pandit Pearay Mohan, an advocate of Lahore and Assistant Editor of *The Tribune*, Lahore, published

his book *An Imaginary Rebellion and how it was Suppressed* which was promptly banned and all the copies were confiscated. It provided a graphic account of the anti-Rowlatt agitation turning into 'spontaneous popular fury'. He blamed the Punjab system of administration that evolved since the 1850s producing the authoritarian personality of Sir Michael O'Dwyer.³³

The work was published on 12 May thus coinciding with the beginning of the Uprising of 1857 and before the Parliamentary debate in England which took place in July 1920. It provided an indictment on the administration of Michael O'Dwyer and martial law under General Dyer. He traced the course from loyalty to rebellion. Referring to Lord Hunter who put the question to General Dyer not consulting the Deputy Commissioner who was a civil authority, General Dyer replied that 'there was not any Deputy Commissioner to consult. I did not think it wise to ask anybody further'. There was no martial law in the Punjab. He mentions 'the terrible Jallianwala massacre' and blamed Michael O'Dwyer who 'pursued a systematic campaign of ruthless repression'.³⁴ B.G. Horniman, Editor, *the Bombay Chronicle*, was dragged from his sick bed and packed off to England for covering the Punjab during the Rowlatt Satyagraha. In May 1920, he published a rejoinder to the Hunter Committee's Report which sought to justify the misdeeds of Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer. He was the first to bring Jallianwala Bagh (1919) to the world's attention. He used the concept 'Amritsar Massacre' which was only 'the Punjab Disturbances' in official parlance. He also reminded the British of German atrocities and frightfulness and put forth that General Dyer introduced 'Dyarchy' in Amritsar.³⁵ For B. G. Horniman, General Dyer's 'Prussian mind', conceived the idea that time had come to act without rules or regulations.³⁶ Dyer admitted that he could have opened fire with machine guns and had higher casualties. In his parlance, the participants had turned into 'rebels' and he was going to 'punish them' and 'reduce the morale of the rebels throughout the Punjab'.³⁷

In 1921, Mr. Alfred Nundy, published an account *Indian Unrest 1919-1920*, wherein he put forth that the might of the Empire, reinforced with all the latest scientific improvements of warfare, was put to crush the assembly at the Jallianwala Bagh.³⁸ The Amritsar Massacre elicited a wide reaction in England both in the press and the Parliament. He referred to Col. Wedgewood in the British Parliament who argued that 'nine-tenths of the people of England are innocent of any kind of connection and

countenance of the deeds of men responsible for the frightful horrors of the Punjab'. Michael O'Dwyer was condemned in most extravagant terms and credited with being the author of calamities with which the Punjab was inflicted; there was an outcry that he should be impeached for an accumulation of high crimes and misdemeanors.³⁹

The meeting in the Bagh had sixteen to twenty thousand people, 'a sort of pinhole, more congested than the mythical Black Hole in which was enacted the most horrible massacre of modern history'. Some five to six thousand were killed outright.⁴⁰ In 1921, Valentine Chirol, the British historian, visited Amritsar where 'the deliberate bloodshed' at Jallianwala marked out April 13, 1919 as a 'black day in the annals of British India'. Furthermore, he set his work in the context of a 'clash of two civilizations' and put forth that 'the Punjab tragedy had far-reaching effects in shaking the confidence of the Indian people in the justice and even in the humanity of British rule'.⁴¹ Michael O'Dwyer, Lt. Governor of the Punjab, was categorical regarding 'the Punjab Rebellion of 1919' yet opaque about the nature of the massacre at the Jallianwala Bagh. He defended General Dyer and compared Punjab with the Malabar Rebellions. He settled with 'disturbances' 'disorders' which was the official position. He further called it an 'episode' and General Dyer's actions as 'firing'.⁴²

V.I. Lenin closely followed the events in the Punjab. He referred to 'the increase in the brutal terrorism of the British, who with ever greater frequency resort to massacres (Amritsar), public floggings'.⁴³ The slaughter in Amritsar only intensified the indignation of the Indian people.⁴⁴ In March 1922, Sir Sankaran Nair wrote the book *Gandhi and Anarchy* wherein he critiqued Mahatma Gandhi's Non-Cooperation movement. He also devoted a chapter entitled "Punjab Atrocities". In 1923, Michael O'Dwyer sued Sir Sankaran Nair for libel. Sir Nair had put forth his view that Michael O'Dwyer as 'a single individual had the power to commit the atrocities in the Punjab'. Two points followed: (i) On 13 April 1919, General Dyer committed an atrocity; and (ii) The plaintiff (O'Dwyer) was responsible.⁴⁵ Nair mentioned in his *Autobiography* that 'if it is necessary those innocent persons should be slaughtered at Jallianwala Bagh and two together (Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer) may butcher the people of Jallianwala Bagh, the country is not worth living in'.⁴⁶ At same time, the Punjabi writers responded to the massacre through their poetry. In 1920, Nanak Singh wrote *Khooni Vaisakhi*. In 1924, Feroz Din 'Sharaf' wrote *Dukhan De Keerne* (Wails of Pain) and in Urdu a three act

play *Zakhmi Punjab* depicted the agony. All these were banned by the British.⁴⁷

In 1925, E.J. Thompson wrote *The Other Side of the Medal* about the Mutiny of 1857 in the context of the Amritsar massacre highlighting the brutality of General Dyer whose 'brute order' was perfectly in tune with the real spirit of the imperial system by which India was governed. General Dyer represented the British mind set indoctrinated in the Mutiny fixation. The ghosts of Cooper (in 1857) and Cowan (in 1872) presided over Jallianwala.⁴⁸ E.J. Thompson noticed 'Indian irreconcilability' in his work. He considered the Jallianwala Bagh massacre 'the working of the Mutiny trained or Mutiny-obsessed mind'. He made a categorical assertion that 'irreconcilability lies somewhere at the back of the mind':

"We can hold India still if we are prepared to shed sufficient blood; but the outcry over Amritsar has shown that we are not. More merciful than our fathers, we are not willing to wade through another Mutiny into a renewal of our lease, and we are disillusioned and weary from the war that has finished".⁴⁹

E.J. Thompson, knowing the gravity of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, made two pertinent points: (i) no more Mutiny letters be published as publishing of similar documents by Indians would be proscribed as fomenting racial hatred; and (ii) England must 'atone as a gesture as the British cannot afford to perpetuate their feud'.⁵⁰ Edward Thompson met two pro Dyer persons who had visited Amritsar. The first called it 'Prussianism and felt it necessary' and the other called it 'sheer massacre'.⁵¹ In his study of 1934, Edward Thompson and G.T. Garratt mentioned 'slaughter at Amritsar' and had an entry of Jallianwala Bagh massacre in the Index. A.B Keith recollects the 'rioting on the 10th April in which several Europeans were disgracefully murdered'. On the 13th April 'the episode of Jallianwala Bagh' led to 'dispersal by the orders of General Dyer with the loss of 379 killed and over 1208 wounded'. However, 'the episode unhappily cast a dark shadow over the inception of the reforms and brought racial feeling out far more bitterly than at any time since the Mutiny'.⁵² In 1930, American philosopher and historian Will Durant reflected on the gory details of shooting a virtually "imprisoned mass". The massacre lasted for ten minutes. A reign of terror followed. The news of this "barbaric orgy of military sadism" was kept from the world for half

a year.⁵³ In the same vein, George Dunbar, in 1936, noticed 'civil disobedience developing into uncontrolled excitement' and 'mob violence spread rapidly that led to the tragedy of the Jallianwala Bagh at Amritsar'.⁵⁴

Mahatma Gandhi in 1927 preferred to call it a 'tragedy' which 'paled into insignificance in my eyes, though it was the massacre principally that attracted the attention of the people of India and the world'. He further elaborated that 'some irate young Punjabis held him responsible and threatened him with assassination if went to the Punjab'. His visit to the Punjab was postponed again and again as the Viceroy would say, 'not yet'.⁵⁵ However, for Lala Lajpat Rai 'the massacre of Amritsar and the Martial Law atrocities were the outcome of the mentality' of Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer.⁵⁶ In 1929, within a decade, Jabez T. Sunderland, an American journalist, reflected about the truth of 'the Amritsar massacre' He questioned that the 'terrible facts of the massacre and other atrocities were hushed up'.⁵⁷ In 1930, R.G. Pradhan referred to "the Jallianwala massacre" which was followed by "other excesses on the part of the military authorities, all deliberately intended to overawe and terrorize the people".⁵⁸ In 1936, Jawaharlal Nehru underlined 'massacre' as the relevant category to describe the happenings. He writes about 'horrible cruelty and inhumanity' and 'hundreds were done to death and thousands grievously wounded' in the Jallianwala Bagh. As the expectations of the great reforms ran high after the War, the Punjab had 'the horrible massacre of Jallianwala Bagh'. In fact, the very word 'Amritsar' had become a synonym for massacre. It is 'not difficult' to understand it.⁵⁹ In 1940, Rajni Palme Dutt, noticed "unprecedented fraternization between the Hindus and the Muslims" during the Rowlatt Satyagraha. In April 1919 extraordinary measures of repression followed in the Punjab. The news of 'massacre' only crept through even to the leaders of the Congress Committee four months later and for nearly eight months all news of it was officially suppressed and withheld from the Parliament and the British public.⁶⁰

III. 1969: The 50th Anniversary

It was the first opportunity in independent India to go back to the Jallianwala Bagh. However, in 1951, 1961 and 1966 three Anglophiles Nirad C. Chaudhri, Prakash Tandon and Khushwant Singh commented on the Jallianwala Bagh respectively. All failed to characterize the nature

of happenings while detailing the miseries and sufferings of the people trapped in the complex.⁶¹ However, in 1987, Nirad C. Chaudhri revisited the issue. He called it the 'Amritsar episode', and 'shooting' in which General Dyer shot down a defenseless and fleeing crowd.⁶² In 1961, Leonard Mosley, writing about *The Last Days of the British Raj*, initially refers to 'the Amritsar massacre' but soon settles down to 'Amritsar shootings' which turned most of the Indians into 'resentful and mistrustful minions'. He considers it the greatest 'recruiting poster for the Congress' ever to be waved before the Indian people, and they joined up in the thousands.⁶³ Other British historians such as Percival Spear and David Thomson, in 1965, implicitly began admitting it as 'massacre' though not at the place of depiction of the happenings at Amritsar but elsewhere in the text.⁶⁴ In 1969, Durga Das, a prominent journalist, editor and familiar with the city of Amritsar, penned down his views. He had covered the Hunter Committee (he calls it Commission) proceedings. His account, though brief, negotiates between the term massacre, in generic way, in fact referring to the speech of Winston Churchill, and tragedy and even episode as his terms of preference. Being a contemporary to the massacre much was expected but little has been delivered after such a lapse of time.⁶⁵

The first substantive work came from V.N. Datta, prominent historian and celebrated author of *Amritsar: Past and Present*, who discussed the firing at the Jallianwala Bagh and called it the 'tragedy of Amritsar'. In fact, he referred to 'the massacre' but only in reference to C.F. Andrew and V.I. Lenin.⁶⁶ Within this template, V.N. Datta took to the task in *Jallianwala Bagh*.⁶⁷ Its first impression without any characterization evokes a concern in the mind of a reader despite the fact that he has given prominence to Labour politician Colonel Josiah C. Wedgewood participating in the Debate of the House of Commons on July 8, 1920 reminding that "a shrine (be) erected there and every year there would be processions of Indians visiting the tomb of the martyrs and Englishmen will go there and stand barefooted before it...whenever we put forward the humanitarian view, we shall have this tale thrown into our teeth". Certainly, it had become more than a Bagh and the author acknowledges the relevance of the metaphor of massacre in his Preface. A chapter has been devoted to the massacre but both Jallianwala Bagh and massacre float freely and do not jell together to form a conceptual construct. Finally, the author settles with "the Jallianwala Bagh as an episode and tragedy". Moreover, the

Index provides little help in locating terms such as episode, tragedy and massacre.⁶⁸

However, in 1969, Research Scholar Raja Ram of Panjab University, Chandigarh wrote a doctoral thesis which was published as *The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: A Premeditated Plan*, thus locating the massacre as 'the Great Massacre'.⁶⁹ He claims that 'the British officials indulging in this massacre was to strike terror in the whole of the Punjab and thus break the morale of the people' thus broadening General Dyer's perception to the British officials.⁷⁰ The 'premeditated plan' hinges on the position of Adjutant General Hudson taken on April 9th that actually the Army was expecting trouble only on April 13 for which troops were being dispatched to Amritsar. A similar position was taken by General Beynon. Nothing serious was expected on April 10. Moreover, General Dyer watched and did not react to the crowd of five thousand at the Hindu Sabha School.⁷¹ The evidence of the plan is emerging in phases. Michael O'Dwyer called a meeting of top officials in Lahore on April 9. It was an unofficial meeting and no notes were allowed to be taken. At the meeting, Brigadier General Dyer was verbally instructed 'to teach Indians the lesson that revolution was a dangerous game' and avenge the deaths of the five English civilians.⁷² In a popular publication of the National Book Trust in the year of the 25th anniversary of Indian Independence, three historians from a left perspective dwelt on the 'massacre of Amritsar' in which about one thousand were dead and several thousand wounded. The purpose was to 'strike terror into the whole of the Punjab'. However, they then move to 'the Punjab tragedy' which brought Gandhiji into the forefront of Indian politics.⁷³

In 1974, two Russian scholars L.V. Mitrokhin and A.V. Raikov contributed a paper on "New Revelations about the Amritsar Massacre" and situated it in the colonial system of administration. It widened the gulf between the colonial regime and the Indian people and gave impetus to an anti-imperialist struggle in India.⁷⁴ In 1975, Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre published a popular work *Freedom at Midnight* mainly concerned with the Partition of India. They are silent about the nature of happenings in the Jallianwala Bagh on 13 April while giving details about 'firing' and killing and wounding of 1516 people. However, they refer to 'jolly good thing' of General Dyer and call it 'a turning point' in the history of Anglo-Indian relations.⁷⁵ In 1977, Helen Fein, American anthropologist, published her book *Imperial Crime and Punishment: The Massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and British Judgment (1919-1920)*. Her

hypothesis is that the colonial rulers excluded the ruled from their own domain of moral obligation. The Amritsar massacre may be seen as the last assault in a cycle of collective defense by the British and Indians. It was 'a prototypical instance of a collective repressive punishment inflicted by the British in Black and Asian colonies'.⁷⁶ In 1981, Alfred Draper, a British naval officer turned journalist, felt that some official sources were determined to suppress certain aspects, while some official files were still closed to the public. His work entitled *Amritsar: The Massacre that Ended the Raj* provides gory details of the slaughter General Dyer set in motion as he was 'totally absorbed' in directing fires. The bodies were heaped on each other like carcasses in an abattoir.⁷⁷ In 1983, Sumit Sarkar, the Marxist historian of prominence, published a standard text on modern India which immediately assumed huge popularity having a subaltern perspective. Nevertheless, the account of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, though dwelt in detail, yet remains free floating and without conceptual rigor. It sounds more like a colonial description than a Marxist analysis of the British Empire. However, he does mention 'Punjab horrors' without description.⁷⁸ Philip Mason in his *The Men who Ruled India*, takes up both Michael O'Dwyer and General Dyer without even mentioning Jallianwala Bagh. General Dyer was more concerned about the 'order' and he 'dispersed the mob' killing and wounding more than one thousand. Nevertheless, both O'Dwyer and Dyer talked about 'the Punjab Rebellion'.⁷⁹ In 1988, Stanley Wolpert published a fictionalized version of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.⁸⁰ In the same year, Peter Heehs in a popular Oxford paperback series briefly refers to the 'Amritsar massacre' and 'ten nightmarish minutes of the sound of rifles' and firing 1650 rounds and killing 400 and wounding 1200 showing 'terrible accuracy'. He calls it 'reign of terror' and 'Punjab atrocities'.⁸¹ Interestingly, at the national level, in the popular standard work of the team led by Bipan Chandra and chapter contributed by Mridula Mukherjee, no category is deployed to characterize the killing of innocent people in the Jallianwala Bagh. It mentions shooting and firing and concludes with 'wrong inflicted' on Punjab and 'happenings' at the Jallianwala Bagh.⁸² Surprisingly, Professor J. S. Grewal skipped the Jallianwala Bagh massacre in any conceptual category in his standard work *The Sikhs of the Punjab*.⁸³

IV. 1994: The 75th Anniversary

The Punjab History Conference held at the Punjabi University, Patiala, called on scholars to contribute papers on the Jallianwala Bagh. The proceedings were put in the form of a volume with new papers and an introduction by V. N. Datta. It also reprinted B. G. Horniman's *Amritsar and Our Duty to India*.⁸⁴ Interestingly, V.N. Datta states that he was asked to write an introduction 'to the volume on Jallianwala Bagh massacre', yet the massacre as construct is absent in the title of the volume. However, he considers the Jallianwala Bagh massacre as 'an event of great historical importance'. He further reminds that no British historian has produced a monograph on the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, not even any historian from the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. Its impact was so profound that it changed the course of Indian politics. Moreover, the massacre marked the 'parting of ways with the British'. Moreover, V. N. Datta concludes that it was 'a revengeful act perpetrated as a reaction against the 10 April events', thus going close to the idea of a premeditated plan.⁸⁵ There are 19 papers in all including Introduction. Only three of them carry massacre in their titles, seven prefer to call it a tragedy and the other eight just Jallianwala Bagh or Amritsar in explaining the nature of horrendous action on April 13, 1919.⁸⁶ M. L. Ahluwalia dwelled upon Jallianwala Bagh as a tragedy or massacre and after much argumentation and documentation settled in favor of 'episode'.⁸⁷ Interestingly, Raja Ram, after putting forward massacre as its nature in 1969, reverts back to 'tragedy'. He delineates factors responsible for what he calls 'the heinous massacre of Jallianwala Bagh' and then skips his own work on the Jallianwala Bagh massacre for the reasons known to him.⁸⁸ In 1995, Thomas R. Metcalf briefly referred that "constitutional change (in the form of India Act of 1919) came linked with the explosive upheaval of the 1919 Amritsar massacre".⁸⁹ In 1996, the Punjab State University Textbook Board, Chandigarh published *Who's Who: Jallianwala Tragedy* edited by Gursharan Singh and Balraj Saggar. In its preface, Professor Gursharan Singh, Director of the Board, revolves around four categories such as tragedy, episode, incident, and event. He refers to the massacre in relation to General Dyer.⁹⁰

V. 1999: The 80th Anniversary

In 1999, Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi decided to publish proceedings of a seminar held on the 75th anniversary of 'the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre'. The volume was edited by V.N. Datta and S. Settar, the Chairman, ICHR. V.N. Datta in his Preface moves to the concept of episode yet entitles his article as "perceptions of the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre". He argues that the Jallianwala Bagh 'episode' could be 'lifted to a higher altitude and seen how historians and other writers have perceived it'. It is a historiographic perspective in the broader context rather than focusing on the nature of massacre explained through conceptual categories.⁹¹ However, it shares commonality with a volume produced by the Punjabi University, Patiala. The volume has sixteen contributions from prominent scholars. Surprisingly, there are only two papers having massacre in the title coming from V.N. Datta and Atlury Murali from Hyderabad and about eight focusing on tragedy, two on Jallianwala Bagh and others on Calcutta, imperial terrorism and crime control and surveillance in Punjab.⁹² Satya M. Rai moves from 'tragedy' in the main title to 'the great tragedy and dwells upon impact of massacre' thus relegating to lower levels and even puts massacre in inverted commas.⁹³ Surprisingly, Gursharan Singh delineates imperial terrorism in the Punjab and dwells on brutality in Amritsar but hesitates to call it a massacre and goes on to conclude as the Jallianwala Bagh thus robbing it of its nature of any form.⁹⁴ Kamlesh Mohan focuses on tragedy as a catalyst of Indian consciousness and skips massacre as a category to define General Dyer's deadly doings.⁹⁵ Similarly, J.S. Grewal and Indu Banga conclude it as 'a tragedy for those who sympathized with the sufferers and for the colonial rulers as well' thus putting both on the same level and avoiding mentioning massacre as a category.⁹⁶ K.L. Tuteja's 'purpose is to attend the issues involved in the Jallianwala Bagh massacre' and concludes that 'the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy was made an icon in the nationalist discourse of anti-colonial struggle'.⁹⁷ The ICHR volume has a symbiotic relationship with the Punjabi University volume. Six contributors are common to both: there are ten different scholars in the former and twelve in the latter. Moreover, the central theme of these volumes remains 'tragedy' as the dominant characterization of the Jallianwala Bagh. However, the former volume includes an index with the entry 'Jallianwala Bagh massacre/tragedy' and the latter volume is without an index. In 2001, Ian Copland, under the Seminar Studies in

History series, published a general work meant for students. It refers to 'General Dyer's crime at Amritsar' without providing details of any sort to the extent of wiping it free of narrative.⁹⁸ In 2003, Niall Ferguson in his work on *Empire* commented on India in 1919 that 'India was Ireland but on a vast scale; and Amritsar was India's Easter Rising' creating nationalist martyrs.⁹⁹ In 2005, Aitzaz Ahsan, Pakistani legal eagle and politician, questioned 'universal ideas' of the British that 'justified the unprovoked massacre of an unarmed gathering of civilians at the Jallianwala Bagh'. The British 'lost nerve' at Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar.¹⁰⁰ By this time the concept of massacre was more in usage. Jim Masselos refers to the 'massacre' of Indians and 'punitive measures unparalleled' in British India. Villages were strafed from the air.¹⁰¹

VI. 2019: Centennial Commemoration

In 2012, Nick Llyod, revisited 'Dyer and the Jallianwala Bagh' as after 90 years, the Amritsar massacre maintains its 'sinister reputation and degree of confusion and mystery about what exactly went on in that fatal walled garden'. He considers it as 'one of the most emotive and contentious events' in modern Indian history. The massacre was 'the logical outcome of a failure of intelligence'.¹⁰² Rajmohan Gandhi in his 2013 general history of the Punjab calls it 'massacre' and 'stern censorship enforced by O'Dwyer kept India in the dark about the massacre'. Stories of 'the massacre passed by word of mouth sparked demonstrations, including violent ones, to which O'Dwyer and his officers reacted in a manner that again recalled 1857'.¹⁰³ Amandeep Bal has put forth centrality of Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew in the Rowlatt Satyagraha that culminated into the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.¹⁰⁴ The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was an 'ill-judged exercise of force'. The massacre illustrated 'the deficiencies of British administration' and destroyed 'confidence in British good faith'. The Indians realized that British rule depended on 'nothing but force'.¹⁰⁵ The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was 'no act of insane frenzy but a conscious, deliberate imposition of colonial will'. It represented 'the worst that colonialism could become'.¹⁰⁶ In 2017, Mark Condos reversed the notion of 'garrison state' and brought in the concept of 'insecurity state' and put forth that the Jallianwala Bagh massacre is remembered 'as one of the most brutal and evil acts perpetrated under the colonial rule'.¹⁰⁷ In 2018, Kishwar Desai published *Jallianwala Bagh, 1919: The Real Story*. The Jallianwala Bagh 'massacre', to her, remains 'the most heartbreaking

episode in the history of Indian freedom struggle' and then moves to the 'killings' and onwards abandoning massacre or any concept as an operative category.¹⁰⁸ The work starts from the month of April 1919 in the running mode of a novel. The entire operation culminates into 'killings'. There remains free play of the Jallianwala Bagh in the text.¹⁰⁹

Kim A. Wagner has situated the massacre within the deep context of the colonial mindset and the local dynamics of Indian nationalism. It was 'the bloodiest massacre' in the history of the British Empire and is reduced to 'a pure symbol of colonial violence' as 'a spectacle'.¹¹⁰ The work goes back to E.J. Thompson who in 1925 charted out 'three shadows of the Mutiny': 1857, 1872 and 1919. He has broadened its space from the Jallianwala Bagh to the Amritsar Massacre. He provides gory details of the massacre when firing had become 'a pure spectacle of brute force in which the rebels were perceived as undifferentiated mass'. The shooting was not simply a means to an end but an end in itself. The massacre is commemorated not in its own right but as 'the catalyst' of the freedom movement.¹¹¹

Parminder Singh has further expanded the scope of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre by linking it with the peoples' movement against the British Empire.¹¹² It is situated in a broad historical context since the Annexation of the Punjab in 1849, the War weary conditions, the Rowlatt Act and Satyagraha within nationalist paradigm. The author provides details of the massacre and its aftermath and situates it in the colonial context. It expanded the scope of the national movement.¹¹³

The Tribune (Chandigarh), having its office in the provincial capital, Lahore, experienced the unfolding of developments in 1919. In 2019, it issued a commemoration volume entitled *Martyrdom to Freedom: 100 Years of Jallianwala Bagh* edited by Rajesh Ramachandran. It provides the latest opinions of scholars and contemporary responses to the situation from its archives. In his Foreword, N.N. Vohra, President, The Tribune Trust, situated the volume around the paradigm of 'massacre' and 'carnage' as 2019 marks 'the century of the *annus horribilis*'.¹¹⁴ Bhupendra Yadav follows the template set by N.N. Vohra by undertaking different narratives, broadly subaltern and nationalist, of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. He links its continuity with the present times and charges of sedition against activists.¹¹⁵ The volume contains conversations of Nonica Datta with her father V.N. Datta, the celebrated author of the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre. He positions himself with the metaphor of massacre and calls it 'a well-planned conspiracy'. The 1919 massacre changed the

political complexion of Punjab.¹¹⁶ In fact, *The Tribune* called it a 'tragedy' and rest of the contributors in the volume follow this pattern.¹¹⁷

The proceedings of a Seminar at the Guru Nanak Dev University in 2019 has been published in the form of a commemoration volume. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre has been finely historicized in thirteen papers reflecting on its various facets. While the majority of the contributors focus on the massacre, Kamlesh Mohan's emphasis is on 'tragedy'.¹¹⁸

Shiv Kumar Gupta has brought out an edited volume with essential articles of historical significance. It revolves around different concepts like the Amritsar Massacre, 'deliberate bloodshed' and 'horrifying tragedy', 'rebellion' and 'frightfulness' thus broadening the scope of the volume.¹¹⁹ Rakhshanda Jalil in an edited volume has incorporated literary responses in prose and poetry.¹²⁰ Contemporary poets and writers from different walks of life penned their feelings. Sadat Hasan Manto in his short story considered 'the ghastly Jallianwala massacre enacted to avenge the death of Europeans'.¹²¹ Nanak Singh's *Khooni Vaisakhi*, banned at that time, has been published with a view to understand contemporary literary response to the massacre. This is timely and telling as Nanak Singh says:

"not a sign of mercy unleashing such horror: How badly
were you drink, O Dyer?
You Tyrant! Until the end of time you'll be called; The
Murderer that you are, O Dyer."
Says Nanak Singh, "Which holy book allows; For innocents
to be butchered like this, O Dyer".¹²²

The centennial commemoration activated scholars, public persons and institutions to revisit the massacre at the Jallianwala Bagh. In these seminars the dominant trend was in favor of massacre as a relevant category.¹²³ The vernacular papers underlined the character of the massacre.¹²⁴ Popular Punjabi magazines took out special issues on the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.¹²⁵ The British press, though selective, was equally clear about the massacre.¹²⁶ The regional state governments also displayed advertisements on this occasion giving preference to massacre over the commonly applied category of tragedy.¹²⁷ In 2021, Gurmeet S. Rai edited a coffee-table book which includes a paper entitled "13 April 1919, Jallianwala Bagh". It provides a historical description of the city of Amritsar and the events leading to the Rowlatt Satyagraha. General Dyer headed to the Jallianwala Bagh to 'quash an insurrection in the making'.

The residents of Amritsar slept unaware of the 'scale of the massacre', which was 'unprecedented' in nearly two centuries of European Empire building in the subcontinent. News of the massacre was received with horror and grief by the Indians. However, the paper focuses on the Jallianwala Bagh more than the massacre with gory details and its consequences. It skips other terms such as 'episode', 'tragedy', and 'disturbances'.¹²⁸ The term massacre is scattered in the entire volume including the index. The Jallianwala Bagh continues to be a grim reminder of the 1919 tragic incident of mass brutality at the hands of General Dyer.¹²⁹ In 2022, Sukhdev Singh Sirsa and Sarabjit Singh of All India Progressive Writers' Association edited a multi-lingual volume entitled *Jallianwala Bagh: Remembrance & Resonance*. It contains 36 papers including the editorial note. The majority of the scholars focused on the concept of massacre while some of them preferred just Jalianwala Bagh.¹³⁰ There are a number of scholars such as Jabez T. Sunderland, L.V. Mitrokhin and A.V. Raikov, Alfred Draper, Stanley Wolpert, Pierce A. Grace, Derek Sayer and Nick Lloyd,¹³¹ who have tried to shift to the city of Amritsar from the site of the Jallianwala Bagh where the memorial is actually located. Thus, the public perception about the nature of the horrendous events which unfolded on April 13, 1919 at the Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar is massacre and public men and academicians are catching up.

The Amritsar Massacre was a great incentive to Indian nationalism and led to the complete loss of trust in the British Raj among the Indian population. It transformed the Congress socially, politically and geographically.¹³² By early June 1919, Herbert Fisher, President of the Board of Education, admitted in the British Parliament that the "old image of India as being silent, stationary, unperplexed, and unvexed by all the agitations of political life, has now long ceased to correspond to the realities of to-day" and "the feeling of nationality in India is in widest commonalty spread".¹³³ The British publicists talked of Indian disunity and dissension. India grew daily in consciousness of her unity.¹³⁴ It became an important part of the collective psyche of a whole generation of Indians both in Punjab and elsewhere. It fed into how the Indian people understood the British rule.¹³⁵

Historiography crystallizes a conceptual grid on the bases of evidence and interpretation. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre is one such historically concrete case of British brutality. There have been a plethora of terms, concepts and categories applied to the massacre which show confusion and lack of serious analysis. There are general historical works with a

broad Indian span and specific works focusing on the massacre. The imperialists described the Jallianwala Bagh massacre and associated happenings as 'disturbances', 'episode' and 'tragedy'. Their works remain under the shadow of Winston Churchill who considered it 'singular and in sinister isolation' and 'un-British'. Broadly, the nationalists followed the pattern and emphasized 'tragedy' as the dominant character of killings by General Dyer. Mostly, the category of massacre is mentioned in a generic sense but finally two terms are focused on such as 'tragedy' and 'episode' and thus coming close to the edge of Imperialist historiography. Most of them share the commonality that the British rule was 'benign' with the myth of 'civility'. Significantly, they follow the paradigm of rebellion and a surge towards independence. Terms like 'episode', 'happenings', and 'event' betray historical depth; terms like 'tragedy' are halfway towards 'massacre'. Indexes of historical works indicate the application of these terms. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, consensus enriches historiography. Since 2015, as the centennial of the massacre was approaching, commonality is coming up about the nature and reality of the massacre. Media, public men and academicians are catching up with the public perception. Mist is clearing up and theoretical bases of the massacre are getting surer and sharper.

Notes

- ¹ David W. Blight quoted by Mark A. Greene, "The Messy Business of Remembering: History, Memory and Archive", *Archival Issues*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 2003-2004, p. 96. See also, Joan Tumblety (Ed.), *Memory and History: Understanding Memory as Source and Subject*, (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 1-10.
- ² Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Tr. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellaur), (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2004), p. 72.
- ³ Quoted by Mark A. Greene, "The Messy Business of Remembering: History, Memory and Archive", *Archival Issues*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 2003-2004, p. 100.
- ⁴ Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Tr. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellaur), p.72.
- ⁵ James H. Murphy, "The Politics of Historiography", *Rhetoric Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Autumn 1988, p.5.

- 6 Ignacio Olabarri quoted in Alun Munslow, *Deconstructing History*, (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 18.
- 7 Joas Lawrence, "The Historiography of the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: 'an essential but unacknowledged strategy of empire' ", *The South Asianist*, Vol. 7, 2020, pp. 18-21.
- 8 S. Gopal, "Churchill and India", *Sarvepalli Gopal: Imperialists, Nationalist, Democrats: The Collected Essays*, (ed. Srinath Raghav), (Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2013), p. 137.
- 9 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Nationalism and the Imagination*, (London: Seagull, 2010), p.40. See also, Eric Hobsbawm, "The Nation as invented Tradition", *Nationalism*, (Eds. John Hutchinson & Anthony D. Smith), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), pp. 76-82.
- 10 "Army Council and General Dyer", House of Commons Debate, *Hansard*, 8 July 1920, Vol. 131, cc. 1705-819. See also, C.A Bayly, *Origins of Nationality in South Asia: Patriotism and Ethical Government in the Making of Modern India*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 293.
- 11 "Punjab Disturbances: The Case of General Dyer", House of Lords Debate, *Hansard*, Vol. 41, cc. 311-77.
- 12 Middle French and Old French denotes 'macacre' to butcher or butchery: *The New International Webster's Comprehensive Dictionary of the English Language*, (Naples Florida: Typhoon International Co., 2003), p. 783. *Matteuca* means 'to bludgeon': J. Semlina, "In consideration of Massacre", *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 2001, p. 378.
- 13 J. Semlin, "In consideration of massacre", *Journal of Genocide Research*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 2001, p. 378.
- 14 Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1907), (first published 1896), pp. 18, 144-45.
- 15 Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, pp. 12-15, 21.
- 16 Mark M. Smith, *Sensory History*, (Berlin: Berg, 2007), Ch. II.
- 17 Peter Denney, "The Sounds of Population Fail: Changing perceptions of rural poverty and plebian noise in 18th century Britain", *Experiences of Poverty in late Medieval and early England and France* (Ed. Anne M. Scott), (Farnham: Ashgate, 2021), p. 299.
- 18 The Government of Punjab submitted a Report to the Government of India on October 11th, 1919 and received in England on December 18th, 1919: *Report on the Punjab Disturbances, April 1919*, (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1920). The Home Department, GOI, Resolution No. 2168 dated October 16,

1919 decided 'to appoint a committee to investigate the recent disturbances in Bombay, Delhi and Punjab'. This Committee was headed by Lord Hunter: *Disorders Inquiry Committee*, (Calcutta: Govt. Printing, 1920), pp. v, 166-168. *The Tribune*, Lahore, also followed this concept of 'disturbances': 12, 13 May 1920.

- ¹⁹ Winston Churchill speaking in the House of Commons in the Debate condemned the idea of 'frightfulness' and called it 'an extraordinary event, a monstrous event, an event which stands in singular and sinister isolation' and finally settled it as an 'episode': "Army Council and General Dyer", House of Commons Debate, *Hansard*, 8 July 1920, Vol. 131, cc. 1705-819.
- ²⁰ "Punjab Disturbances: The Case of General Dyer", House of Lords Debate, *Hansard*, 19 July 1920, Vol. 41, cc 222-307.
- ²¹ K.M. Panikkar and A Pershad (Eds.), *The Voice of Freedom: Selected Speeches of Pandit Motilal Nehru*, (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1961), pp.527-531. K.D Malviya, *Open Rebellion in the Punjab*, (Allahabad: Abhyudaya Press, 1920), Appendix B. p. 18. *The Tribune*, Lahore, also labeled as 'the tragedy': 1 May 1920.
- ²² 'The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was a calculated act of inhumanity': *The Congress Punjab Inquiry 1919: Report of the Commissioners appointed by the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress*, (Bombay: Secretary of Commission of Inquiry, 1920), Vol. I, pp. 58, 158.
- ²³ By the end of April 1920, Amritsar contributed Rs. 1.36 lakh; Lahore, Rs. 90,000; Rawalpindi, Rs. 20,000; Ferozepur, Rs. 20,000; Gujranwala Rs. 11,000 and Sialkot, Rs. 9000: *The Tribune*, Lahore April 29 May, 1, 1920. However, Surjit Hans says that the memorial was built largely with non-Punjabi money; "Jallianwala Bagh: The Construction of a Nationalist Symbol", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds.), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, (Delhi: Pargati Publications, ICHR, 2000), p. 144. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982), (first published 1934-35), p. 715. It took a long time. The land of the Jallianwala Bagh was purchased from its 34 individual owners for Rs. 50,000. Jawaharlal Nehru became Chairman of the National Memorial Trust. Its construction began in November 1957 and was completed at a cost of Rs. 9,25,000: V.N. Datta, *Amritsar: Past and Present*, (Amritsar: Municipal Committee, 1967), p. 183.
- ²⁴ Valentine Chirol, *India: Old and New*, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1921), p. 179.
- ²⁵ Caroline Elkins, *Legacy of Violence: A History of the British Empire*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2022), p. 94.
- ²⁶ Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994), (first published 1983), p. 2.

- ²⁷ Prakash Ananda, *A History of the The Tribune*, (New Delhi: The Tribune Trust, 1986), p. 266.
- ²⁸ *Punjab Disturbances, April 1919: Compiled from the Civil and Military Gazette, Lahore*, (Lahore: The Civil and Military Gazette Press, 1919), pp. 2-11, 13. It was reprinted again on 8 May 1919.
- ²⁹ K.M. Panikkar and A Pershad (Eds.), *The Voice of Freedom: Selected Speeches of Pandit Motilal Nehru*, pp. 3-40. The 'shooting at Amritsar' had become a common expression: *The Tribune*, Lahore, 11 April 1920.
- ³⁰ Ramachandra Guha, *Gandhi: The Years that Changed the World (1914-1948)*, (Gurgaon: Penguin Random House, 2018), p.95.
- ³¹ Ruchi Ram Sahni (1863-1948), a scientist, educator, businessman, social reformer, politician, and public intellectual participated in exchanging correspondence between the Congress leaders and the British bureaucrats after the Jallianwala Bagh massacre: Ruchi Ram Sahni, *A Memoir of Pre-Partition Punjab* (Ed. Neera Nanda), (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. xvii, 314-15.
- ³² K.D. Malaviya, *Open Rebellion in Punjab*, pp. 1-6, 10, 20-21, 46, 60.
- ³³ Pandit Pearay Mohan, *The Punjab "Rebellion" of 1919 and How it was Suppressed: An Account of the Punjab Disorders and the Working of the Martial Law*, (Ed. Ravi M. Bakaya), Vol. I, (Delhi: Gyan Publishing House, New 1999) (first published in 1920 (Lahore: Khosla Brothers), pp. xiv, xviii, xix.
- ³⁴ Pandit Pearay Mohan, *The Punjab "Rebellion" of 1919* (Ed. Ravi M. Bakaya), Vol. I, pp. 63-65, 141-142. The work is important as a source book as it provides relevant documents, proceedings and information about the Punjab in 1919: Vol. I, Appendices I-V and Vol. II, Appendices VI-VII and Supplement I, II.
- ³⁵ B.G. Horniman, *Amritsar and Our Duty to India*, (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1920), pp. 7, Ch. IX, XII.
- ³⁶ B.G. Horniman, *Amritsar and Our Duty to India*, p. 117.
- ³⁷ B.G. Horniman, *Amritsar and Our Duty to India*, pp. 117-118.
- ³⁸ Alfred Nundy, *Indian Unrest 1919-1920*, (Dehradun: The Garhwali Press, 1921), p. 113.
- ³⁹ Alfred Nundy, *Indian Unrest 1919-1920*, p. 110, 134.
- ⁴⁰ The section in the book is entitled "The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre": H.N. Mitra (Ed.), *Punjab Unrest before and After*, (Calcutta: N.N. Mitter, 1921), pp. 120-23.
- ⁴¹ Valentine Chirol, *India: Old and New*, pp. 177, 180.

- ⁴² Michael O'Dwyer, *India as I Knew It*, (New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 2004) (first published 1925), pp. 314, 322-23.
- ⁴³ About 1000 were killed and 2000 wounded. The massacre led to popular uprisings in Punjab and other provinces, which were ruthlessly suppressed by the British colonialists: V.I. Lenin, "Third Congress of the Communist International (June 22-July 19, 1921)", *V. I. Lenin: Collected Works (December 1920-August 1921)*, Vol. 32, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1973), (first published 1965), pp. 455, 561. See also, K. Antonova, G. Bongard-Levin and Kotovsky, *A History of India*, Vol. 2, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978), 164.
- ⁴⁴ Approximately, 2000 were killed, even more were wounded, many of them fatally: V. Alexandrov, *A Contemporary World History (1917-1945)*, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1986), pp. 367-368.
- ⁴⁵ C. Sankaran Nair, *Gandhi and Anarchy*, (Madras: Tagore & Co., March 1922), pp. 54-56. C. Sankaran Nair became a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council on 2 November 1915. He resigned in July 1919 from the Viceroy's Executive Council in the aftermath of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre. Michael O'Dwyer stated after the trial that he had brought the case with the intention of vindicating Dyer. The Case was heard before Mr. Justice Henry Alfred McCardie in the Court of King's Bench over five weeks from 30 April 1924 onwards. One and half years were spent. It was the longest and only case heard in the English Court on the happenings of 1919. Sankaran Nair lost the case: Raghu Palat and Pushpa Palat, *The Case that Shook the Empire: One Man's fight for the Truth about the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, (New Delhi: Bloomsbury, 2019).
- ⁴⁶ C. Sankaran Nair, *Autobiography of C. Sankaran Nair*, (Chennai: Lady Madhavan Nair, 1966), p. 386.
- ⁴⁷ Nanak Singh, *Khooni Vaisakhi: A Poem from the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre, 1919*, (Translated from Punjabi by Navdeep Suri), (Noida: Harperperennial, 2019); See also, Vishav Bharti, "After Massacre came onslaught on Patriotic Poetry", *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, 4 April 2019.
- ⁴⁸ E.J. Thompson, *The Other Side of the Medal*, (New Delhi: Life Span Publishers, 2010), (first published 1925), pp. 81-82.
- ⁴⁹ E.J. Thompson, *The Other Side of the Medal*, pp. 1-2, 14, 79.
- ⁵⁰ E.J. Thompson, *The Other Side of the Medal*, pp. 105, 111-112.
- ⁵¹ Edward Thompson, *A Letter from India*, (London: Faber & Faber, 1932), p. 98.
- ⁵² Edward Thompson and G.T. Garratt, *Rise and Fulfillment of British Rule in India*, (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1976) (first published 1934), pp. 610, 680. See

- also, A.B. Keith, *A Constitutional History of India (1600-1935)*, (London: Methuen & Co., 1936), pp. 275-76; In the Index, the 'episode' is put as 'incident', p. 509.
- ⁵³ Will Durant, *The Case for India*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1930), pp. 72, 132-136.
- ⁵⁴ George Dunder, *A History of India from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1980) (first published 1936), pp. 607-08.
- ⁵⁵ M.K Gandhi, *The Experiments with Truth*, (Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House, 1972) (first published 1927), pp. 358, 360-62.
- ⁵⁶ Lajpat Rai, *Unhappy India*, (Calcutta: Banna Publishing Co., 1928), pp. 452-53.
- ⁵⁷ Jabez T. Sunderland, "The Truth about the Amritsar Massacre": Extract from *India in Bondage: Her Right to Freedom*, reproduced in Shiv Kumar Gupta (Ed.), *Jallianwala Bagh and the Raj (Select Contemporary Writings and Evidence): Centenary Commemoration Volume*, (Chandigarh: Mohindra Publishing House, 2019), pp. 42-58.
- ⁵⁸ R.G. Pradhan, *India's Struggle for Swaraj*, (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1995), (first published 1930), pp. 146-48.
- ⁵⁹ Jawaharlal Nehru, *An Autobiography*, (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1980) (first published 1936), p. 42. Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, pp. 379, 689, 714-15.
- ⁶⁰ This observation is based on the official publication *India in 1919*: R. Palme Dutt, *India To-Day*, (Calcutta: Manisha, 1979) (first published 1940 in England by Victor Gollancz; it was banned), pp. 337-38.
- ⁶¹ Nirad C. Chaudhri published his account in London in 1951. He was 'horrified and infuriated' by the disproportionate severity of the punishment in Punjab in 1919: *Autobiography of an Unknown India*, (New Delhi: Jaico, 2017) (first published in India 1964), p. 443. Prakash Tandon, *Punjabi Century*, (New Delhi: Hind Pocket Book, 1972) (first published 1961), p. 122. Khushwant Singh calls it 'shooting' at Amritsar to 'disperse': *History of the Sikhs (1839-1988)*, Vol. II, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1991) (first published 1966), pp. 163-166, 224.
- ⁶² Nirad C. Chaudhri, *Thy Hand Great Anarch: India 1921-1952*, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1987), pp. 52-54. However, the Index has an entry 'Amritsar massacre' while it is not in the text, p. 965.
- ⁶³ Leonard Mosley, *The Last Days of the British Raj*, (Bombay: Jaico, 1971), (first published 1961), pp. 77-80
- ⁶⁴ Percival Spear mentions it at page 139 but details are given at page no 191: *A History of India*, Penguin Books, London, 1979 (first published 1965); However, he also calls it 'episode' in the Index, page no. 452 and in the text it was 'a

prohibited meeting': *The Oxford History of India (1740-1975)*, (Delhi: OUP, 1983) (first published 1965), p. 341. David Thomson calls it 'a massacre' in the text: *England in Twentieth Century*, (London: Penguin Books, 1975) (first published 1965), p. 75.

- ⁶⁵ Durga Das, *India from Curzon to Nehru and After*, (Delhi: Rupa, 1975) (first published 1969), pp. 64, 65, 72, 89. Moreover, the Index includes massacre but in parentheses.
- ⁶⁶ V.N. Datta, *Amritsar: Past and Present*, pp. 82-83, 87.
- ⁶⁷ V. N. Datta, *Jallianwala Bagh*, (Ludhiana: Lyallpur Book Depot, 1969).
- ⁶⁸ V. N. Datta, *Jallianwala Bagh*, Chapter III, pp. I, 169, 172, 179-183. In this mode, see also, S.R. Bakshi, *The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy*, (New Delhi: Capital Publishers, 1982). Colonel Josiah Wedgwood argued that the massacre has 'destroyed our reputation throughout the world': *Hansard*, House of Commons Debate, 22 December 1919, Vol. 123, c. 1232.
- ⁶⁹ Raja Ram, *The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: A Premeditated Plan*, (Chandigarh: Panjab University, 1969), Chapter VI.
- ⁷⁰ Raja Ram, *The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: A Premeditated Plan*, p. 102.
- ⁷¹ Raja Ram, *The Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: A Premeditated Plan*, Chapter.VII.
- ⁷² Terence R. Blackburn, *A Miscellany of Mutinies and Massacres in India*, (New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation, 2007), p.172
- ⁷³ Bipan Chandra, Amales Tripathi and Barun De, *Freedom Struggle*, (New Delhi: National Book Trust, 1980), (first published 1972), pp. 130-131.
- ⁷⁴ Published in *The Sikh Review*, Calcutta, April 1974: Reprinted in Shiv Kumar Gupta (Ed.), *Jallianwala Bagh and the Raj (Select Contemporary Writings and Evidence): Centenary Commemoration Volume*, (Chandigarh: Mohindra Publishing House, 2019), pp. 100-114
- ⁷⁵ Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*, (Delhi: Tarang Paperbacks, 1983), (first published 1975), pp. 46-47.
- ⁷⁶ Helen Fein, *Imperial Crime and Punishment: The Massacre at Jallianwala Bagh and British Judgment (1919-1920)*, (Honolulu: The University of Press of Hawaii, 1977), p. 22.
- ⁷⁷ Alfred Draper, *Amritsar: The Massacre that Ended the Raj*, (Delhi: Macmillan, 1981), pp.87-89. See also, Derek Sayer, "British Reactions to the Amritsar Massacre (1919-1920)", *Past & Present*, Vol. 131, No. 1, May 1991, pp. 130-64.

- ⁷⁸ He refers to the Hunter Commission which in fact was the Committee. He is silent on calling it an 'episode', 'tragedy' or a 'massacre': *Modern India (1885-1947)*, (Delhi: Macmillan, 1999) (first published 1983), pp. 189-195.
- ⁷⁹ He refers to the Hunter Commission not the Committee: He skips any term or category to the massacre: Philip Mason, *The Men who Ruled India*, (New Delhi: Rupa, 2002) (first published 1985), pp. 286-288.
- ⁸⁰ Stanley Wolpert, *Massacre at the Jallianwala Bagh*, (New Delhi: Penguin, 1988). This trend was initiated by Rupert Furneaux in his work *Massacre at Amritsar*, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1963).
- ⁸¹ Peter Heehs, *India's Freedom Struggle: A Short History*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) (first published 1988), pp. 86-89.
- ⁸² Bipan Chandra, Mridula Mukherjee, Aditya Mukherjee, K. N. Panikkar and Sucheta Mahajan, *India's Struggle for Independence*, (New Delhi: Penguin Books, 1990) (first published 1987), pp. 11, 182-184.
- ⁸³ J.S. Grewal, *The Sikhs of the Punjab*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
- ⁸⁴ Gursharan Singh, Parm Bakshish Singh, Davinder Kumar Verma and Raj Kumar Ghai (Eds.), *Jallianwala Bagh: Commemoration Volume*, (Patiala: Punjabi University, 1994).
- ⁸⁵ V.N Datta, "Introduction", *Jallianwala Bagh: Commemoration Volume* (Eds. Gursharan Singh, et al), pp.1-2, 10, 13.
- ⁸⁶ Among those who call massacre include: V.N. Datta, Derek Sayer, Gurcharan Singh, V.P. Bajaj calls it carnage: those who call it a tragedy include, Ravinder Kumar, K.L. Tuteja, Prem Singh, Satya M. Rai, Madanjit Kaur, Raja Ram, Raj Kumar; those who use Jallianwala Bagh, Amritsar, Conspiracy include, Surjit Hans, Kaushik Banerjee and Jatinder Barn, Shiv Kumar Gupta, A. Gauba, Nazar Singh. Sikander Singh focused on Udham Singh and Gursharan Singh on Imperial Terrorism: *Jallianwala Bagh: Commemoration Volume* (Eds. Gursharan Singh, et al).
- ⁸⁷ M.L. Ahluwalia, "Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: A Tragedy or Massacre", *Jallianwala Bagh: Commemoration Volume* (Eds. Gursharan Singh, et al), pp.141-147.
- ⁸⁸ Raja Ram, "Factors Responsible for Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy", *Jallianwala Bagh: Commemoration Volume* (Eds. Gursharan Singh, et al), pp. 190-93.
- ⁸⁹ Thomas Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 222.

- ⁹⁰ Gursharan Singh and Balraj Saggar (Eds.), *Who's Who: Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy*, (Chandigarh: Punjab State University Text-Book Board, 1996), preface, pp. 7, 11.
- ⁹¹ V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, (Delhi: Pargati Publications, ICHR, 2000), pp. 1-14.
- ⁹² Those who called tragedy include Ravinder Kumar, Satya M Rai, Kamlesh Mohan, Hari Singh, K.K.N, Kurup, J.S Grewal and Indu Banga, Nandita Haksar, S.R Singh; Jallianwala Bagh was used by Mohinder Singh, Sujit Hans and K.L. Tuteja; Gursharan Singh on imperial terrorism; Suranjan on Calcutta and S. Kavita on crime control and surveillance in Punjab: V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*.
- ⁹³ Satya M. Rai, "The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy: Its Impact on the Political Awakening and Thinking in India", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, pp. 25-37.
- ⁹⁴ Gursharan Singh, "The Imperial Terrorism in Punjab: Its Nature and Implications (1919-1925)", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, pp. 38-50.
- ⁹⁵ Kamlesh Mohan, "The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy: A Catalyst of Indian Consciousness", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds.), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, pp. 73-75.
- ⁹⁶ J.S. Grewal and Indu Banga, "The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy: The Official Attitude and its Significance", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, pp. 114-24. Moreover, J.S Grewal maintains silence about the Jallianwala Bagh massacre in his general history: *The Sikhs of the Punjab*.
- ⁹⁷ K.L. Tuteja, "Jallianwala Bagh and the Indian National Movement", V.N. Datta and S. Setter (Eds.), *Jallianwala Bagh Massacre*, pp. 211, 230.
- ⁹⁸ However, it includes Testimony of General Dyer before the Disorders Inquiry Committee, 1919-20: Ian Copland, *India (1885-1947)*, (New Delhi: Pearson Education, 2007), p. 48. pp. 94-95.
- ⁹⁹ Niall Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain made the modern world*, (London: Penguin, 2008), (first published 2003), p. 333. However, its Index contains 'Amritsar massacre', but it is missing in the text, p. 406.
- ¹⁰⁰ Aitzaz Ahsan, *The Indus Saga*, (New Delhi: Roli Books, 2005), pp. 371, 396.
- ¹⁰¹ Jim Masselos, *Indian Nationalism: A History*, (New Delhi: New Dawn Press, 2005), pp. 158-159.
- ¹⁰² Nick Llyod, *The Amritsar Massacre: The Untold Story of One Fateful Day*, (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012), pp. 173, 176, 179.

- ¹⁰³ Rajmohan Gandhi, *Punjab: A History from Aurangzeb to Mountbatten*, (New Delhi: Aleph, 2013), pp. 285, 289, 425.
- ¹⁰⁴ Amandeep Bal, *A Nationalist Muslim in Colonial Punjab: Life and Times of Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew*, (Chandigarh: Unistar, 2015), Ch. III (entitled Rowlatt Agitation to Jallianwala Bagh Massacre), pp. 29-49, 142.
- ¹⁰⁵ Walter Reid, *Keeping the Jewel in the Crown: The British Betrayal in India*, (Gurgaon: Penguin Random House, 2016), pp. 33, 38-39, 119. In the Index, it is put under the Amritsar massacre.
- ¹⁰⁶ Shashi Tharoor believes that an apology over the Jallianwala Bagh massacre might work best as a 'significant gesture of atonement': *An Era of Darkness: The British Empire in India*, (New Delhi: Aleph, 2016), pp.198-200, 280.
- ¹⁰⁷ Mark Condos, *The Insecurity State: Punjab and the Making of Colonial Power in British India*, (Delhi, Cambridge University Press, 2017), pp. 3, 14.
- ¹⁰⁸ Kishwar Desai, *Jallianwala Bagh, 1919: The Real Story*, (Chennai: Context, 2018), pp. xii-xiv.
- ¹⁰⁹ Kishwar Desai, *Jallianwala Bagh, 1919: The Real Story*, pp. 50, 66, 68, 73.
- ¹¹⁰ Kim A. Wagner, *Jallianwala Bagh: An Empire of Fear and the Making of the Amritsar Massacre*, (Gurgaon: Penguin Random House, 2019), pp. xvi-xviii. See also, Kim A. Wagner, "Calculated to Strike: The Amritsar Massacre and the Spectacle of Colonial Violence", *Past & Present*, Vol. 233, No. 1, November 2016, pp. 185-225.
- ¹¹¹ Kim A. Wagner, *Jallianwala Bagh: An Empire of Fear and the Making of the Amritsar Massacre*, pp. 1-13, 169, 265. The Index proves details of massacre under the entry of Amritsar Massacre and the Jallianwala Bagh remains site for further information. He has followed Alfred Draper's work *Amritsar: The Massacre that Ended the Raj*. However, this shifting remains problematic with wider connotations about the historical sanctity of the site.
- ¹¹² Parminder Singh, *Saka Jallianwala Bagh: Samraj ate Lok Lehar*, (Jalandhar: Desh Bhagat Prakashan, 2019).
- ¹¹³ Parminder Singh, *Saka Jallianwala Bagh: Samraj ate Lok Lehar*, Chapter VII, pp. 233-34.
- ¹¹⁴ Rajesh Ramachandran (Ed.), *Martyrdom to Freedom: 100 Years of Jallianwala Bagh*, (New Delhi; Rupa, 2019), pp. xi-xvii.
- ¹¹⁵ Bhupendra Yadav, "Many Narratives of the Massacre", Rajesh Ramachandran (Ed.), *Martyrdom to Freedom: 100 Years of Jallianwala Bagh*, pp. 30-36.
- ¹¹⁶ Nonica Datta, "A Conspiracy that Stirred a Nation's Consciousness", Rajesh Ramachandran (Ed.), *Martyrdom to Freedom: 100 Years of Jallianwala Bagh*, pp.

- 37-46. However, the volume contains article of V.N. Datta published in *The Tribune* on April 13, 1975 wherein he keeps it just as Jallianwala Bagh, pp. 216-220.
- ¹¹⁷ "The Jallianwala Bagh Tragedy", *The Tribune*, Lahore, 29 May 1920. The circulation of *The Tribune*, Lahore, increased to 7000 in 1920 with yearly subscription Rs. 25 and in advance payment at Rs. 20. The paper concentrated on Indian politics and agitations against the British: Prakash Ananda, *A History of the The Tribune*, p. 77.
- ¹¹⁸ Amandeep Bal (Ed.), *Re-Imagining Jallianwala Bagh Massacre: Centennial Commemoration (1919-2019)*, (Amritsar; Guru Nanak Dev University, 2020), pp. 12-41 (Kamlesh Mohan).
- ¹¹⁹ Shiv Kumar Gupta (Ed.), *Jallianwala Bagh and the Raj (Select Contemporary Writings and Evidence): Centenary Commemoration Volume*, (Chandigarh: Mohindra Publishing House, 2019).
- ¹²⁰ Rakhshanda Jalil (Ed.), *Jallianwala Bagh: Literary Responses in Prose & Poetry*, (New Delhi: Niyogi Books, 2019).
- ¹²¹ Sadat Hasan Manto and Madan Gupta, "An Episode from 1919", *Indian Literature*, Vol. 30, No. 1, January-February 1987, p. 34.
- ¹²² Nanak Singh, *Khooni Vaisakhi: A Poem from the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre 1919*, (trns. By Navdeep Suri), p. 57. See also, Nanak Singh, *Khooni Vaisakhi* (Ed. Navdeep Singh Suri), (Amritsar: Lok Sahit Prakashan, 2019) (first published 1920). See also, Gurvinder Singh, "Jallianwala Bagh da Khooni Saka ate Punjabi Kavik Suran", *Wahgha* (Punjabi Magazine), No. 9, 2020, pp. 30-35.
- ¹²³ *UGC Sponsored National Seminar on the Massacre that Shook the Empire: Re-Visiting the History of Jallianwala Bagh*, BBK DAV College for Women, Amritsar, 30 March 2019; *National Seminar on Remembering Jallianwala Bagh Massacre of 1919*, Panjab University, Chandigarh, 5-6 April, 2019; *National Seminar on Reinterpreting the Jallianwala Bagh Massacre in the Contemporary Context*, Punjabi University, Patiala, 9 April, 2019; *ICHR Sponsored National Seminar on Jallianwala Bagh Massacre was an Error of Judgment or a Premeditated Plan*, SPN College, Mukerian, Hoshiarpur, Punjab, 11 April 2019.
- ¹²⁴ Gobind Thukral and Swarajbir, *The Punjabi Tribune*, Jalandhar, 14 April 2019.
- ¹²⁵ *Wahgha* (Punjabi magazine), Amritsar, No. 9, 2020.
- ¹²⁶ *The Times*, London dated 16 December 1919 called it "massacre" and *The Daily News*, London dated 20 December 1919 put it as "imperial atrocities": Excerpts reproduced by *The Tribune*, Jalandhar, 13 April 2019.

- ¹²⁷ Punjab Government, *The Tribune*, Jalandhar, 3, 5,6 March 2019; Haryana Government: *The Tribune*, Jalandhar, 6 March 2019; Himachal Pradesh Government, *The Tribune*, Jalandhar, 9 March 2019.
- ¹²⁸ Amandeep Singh Madra and Paramjit Singh, "13 April, 1919, Jallianwala Bagh", *Amritsar: A City in Remembrance*, (Ed.) Gurmeet S. Rai, (Noida: Om Books International, 2021), pp. 166-181.
- ¹²⁹ Gurmeet S. Rai (Ed.), *Amritsar: A City in Remembrance*, pp. 110, 123, 144, 206, 208, 212, 277.
- ¹³⁰ Sukhdev Singh Sirsa and Sarabjit Singh (Eds.), *Jallianwala Bagh: Remembrance and Resonance*, (Chandigarh, Sapatrisi Publication, 2022).
- ¹³¹ See the references of these scholars in the notes.
- ¹³² Pierce A. Grace, "The Amritsar Massacre, 1919: The Irish Connection", *History Ireland*, Vol. 18, No. 4, July-August 2010, p. 25. John Gallagher, "Nationalisms and the Crisis of Empire, 1919-1922", *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3, 1981, p. 362.
- ¹³³ Sukumar Dutt, *Problem of Indian Nationality*, (Delhi: Low Price Publications, 2004) (first published 1924), p. 184.
- ¹³⁴ E.P. Thompson, *The Other Side of the Medal*, pp.100-101.
- ¹³⁵ Salil Misra, "The Legacy of Jallianwala Bagh", *The Tribune*, Chandigarh, 16 December 2018.