

The accused engaged with various persons in a conspiracy, having murder of officials as one of its objects in pursuance of which various acts took place, notably the despatch of the pistols, and the murder of Mr. Jackson took place in consequence of the abetment. The accused is therefore guilty of abetment of murder and liable to be punished with punishment provided for the offence.

The fact relied upon by the accused that he did not know Anant Kanhere or any of Kurve's gang who engaged in the conspiracy of murder is no defence, for section 108, Explanation 5, provides as follows : —"It is not necessary to the commission of abetment by conspiracy that the abettor should concert the offence with the person who commits it. It is sufficient if he engages in the conspiracy in pursuance of which the offence is committed.

True Copy.

(Signed) M. R. JARDINE,  
Clerk of the Crown,  
High Court, Bombay,  
3rd February 1911.

The third day of February 1911.

E. P. WHITE,  
Acting Personal Assistant  
to the Deputy Inspector-General of Police.  
Criminal Investigation Department.

---

#### NO REMISSION OF SENTENCE FOR SAVARKAR BROTHERS

[FROM H. D. SPECIAL VOLUME NO 60-D (a) OF 1919.]

The Government of India wrote a letter dated 28th February 1919 to the Superintendent Port Blair of their desire to extend clemency to prisoners on the day of the Signature of Peace, after the termination of the first world war.

The Chief Commissioner, Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Superintendent Port Blair, sent in reply to the above the following case history of the Savarkar brothers.

## I

Serial No.	Convict No.	Names.	Offence.
1	32778	Vinayak Damodar Savarkar	121, 121A, 109, 302.
2	31011	Ganesh Damodar Savarkar	124A, 121.

## II

No.	Name.	Conduct in jail.	Present attitude.
31911	Ganesh	His behaviour until 1914 was bad and he was frequently punished chiefly for refusal to work and for possession of forbidden articles. For the last 5 years his conduct has been very good, his only offence having been a minor one in November 1917 for which he was warned.	His present attitude is one of submission to authority but he has never shown any disposition to help in the work of the Jail in the way that the three Bengalees have done. He does the light work of rope making assigned to him and spends the rest of his time in reading. He is not communicative and I have therefore no knowledge as to whether he has renounced his former political views.
22778	Vinayak Damodar Savarkar.	Punished 8 times during 1912, 1913 and 1914 for refusing to work and possession of forbidden articles. For the last 5 years his behaviour has been very good.	He is always sauve and polite but like his brother, he has never shown any disposition to actively assist government. It is impossible to say what his real political views are at the present time.

In a third chart are given the details of the physical appearance and other information about the two brothers. Important points in these are :—

*Vinayak Damodar—*

Sentenced on 24th December 1910. Transportation for life (25 years).

(2) Sentenced on 30th January 1911. Transportation for life (25 years).

*Sentencing Court.*—Special Tribunal, High Court, Bombay. Age when convicted 26 years. Height 5' 2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.

*Ganesh Damodar*—

Sentenced on 8th June 1909.

(1) Transportation for life, (2) two years R. I. (Concurrent) by Sessions Judge, Nasik. Age 29, Height 5'-2 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>

#### NOTE ON THE SAVARKAR BROTHERS

The following note by the Judicial Department gives important information about Savarkar Brothers : —

"Vinayak Damodar Savarkar and his brother Garesh Damodar Savarkar were the leaders of the secret society founded in Nasik known as Mitra Mela which subsequently developed into the Abhinav Bharat or Young India Society. The Society had branches at Poona, Pen, Bombay, Yeola and Aurangabad. The object and methods of this society have been described in the judgments of the special Branch of the Bombay High Court on the cases known as the Nasik Conspiracy case and the Nasik abetment of murder case. Briefly, the object of the society was to overthrow the present British Government in India. The methods adopted were political assassination, the dissemination of seditious and revolutionary ideas by means of lectures and pamphlets, and the secret collection of arms to be used when opportunity arose.

2. Vinayak, the more dangerous of the two brothers, went to England about the middle of 1906 as the recipient of a scholarship given by Shamji Krishna Varma, the founder of the India House at High Gate. Before he left India he made an inflammatory speech at Nasik at which he described his country as steeped in mire of dependence. In London he took up his residence at the India House. and from 1907 to 1909 was a very active member of the group of the Indian revolutionists residing there. For a considerable time he translated into Marathi the life of Mazzini with an introduction in which he pointed out how Mazzini relied upon the Youth of the country to obtain independence and described Mazzini's programme of instruction of war. He was author of the revolutionary book called the Indian War of Independence in which he described the Indian Mutiny. He also wrote a pamphlet called "Oh Martyrs" in praise of rebels who fell in the Mutiny and distributed copies of it at a meeting organized by him at the India House in celebration

of the rebels. It was he who despatched to India a parcel containing 20 Browning automatic pistols, one of which was used by the murderer of Mr. Jackson, the Collector of Nasik. He was friend of Dhingra, the murderer of Sir Curzon Wylie, and subsequent to the execution of Dhingra he was preaching the sale of photographs of Dhingra in the form of picture postcards. He was prosecuted under sections 121 and 121A, Indian Penal Code, for attempting to wage war and for conspiring with others to overawe by criminal force or the show of criminal force the Government of India and the Local Government, and convicted under both these sections and sentenced to transportation for life. He was also prosecuted under sections 302 and 109, Indian Penal Code, for abetting the murder of Mr. Jackson and sentenced to another term of transportation for life.

3. Ganesh Savarkar, as has been said above, was one of the leaders of the secret society at Nasik and carried on active propaganda of disseminating sedition by means of inflammatory pamphlets. Books dealing with military topics, bomb making and explosives were found in his house when searches were made in 1908 and 1909. He knew the despatch by his brother Vinayak of the Browning Pistols which have been referred to above and had made arrangements for their reception in India, but before their arrival, he was prosecuted in connection with two of the most inflammatory pamphlets of the secret society for attempting to wage war against the King and for sedition, under sections 121 and 124A, I.P.C.. and was sentenced to transportation for life (*vide* judgment at p. 207 of C 1329/09) under section 121 and to 2 years' rigorous imprisonment under section 124A, both sentences to run concurrently. The latter sentence has already expired. As to his former sentence his case falls under clause (ii) of paragraph 4 of the Government of India's letter, and the balance of his sentence can be suspended, if the Bombay Government are disposed to recommend this course, on the condition that he pledges himself to abstain from political agitation or conspiracy in future.

4. The petition submitted by Ganesh Damodar Savarkar to the Bombay Government in 1910 was rejected by Government letter No. 1152, dated 26th February 1910. Similarly the petitions submitted by the wives of the two convicts to the Government of India in 1915 on behalf of their husbands were rejected by the Government of India's letters No. 2328, dated 28th July 1915 and No. 3452, dated 11th October 1915. Another petition to the Bombay Government in 1919 from the wife of Ganesh Damodar Savarkar was also rejected by Government memorandum No. 1028, dated 8th February 1919.

5. In 1911, Vinayak D. Savarkar applied to the Bombay Government for certain concessions in connection with his sentences. By Government letter No. 2022, dated 4th April 1911, his Application was rejected and he was informed that the question of remitting the second sentence of transportation for life would be considered in due course on the expiry of the first sentence of transportation for life.

#### NO REMISSION

The Bombay Government sent the following telegram to the Superintendent, Port Blair on 4th June 1919 : —

' Your 232 of 20th May. Bombay Government do not recommend any remission of the sentences passed upon Ganesh Damo-dar Savarkar and Vinayak Damodar Savarkar.' "

---

#### SAVARKAR BROTHERS EXCLUDED FROM ROYAL AMNESTY

[FROM H. D. SPECIAL VOLUME NO. 60-D (b) OF 1919-1920.]

#### *India Government on proposed Royal Clemency*

The Government of India sent to Bombay Government a telegram No. 2545, dated 4th December 1919. The important portion of the telegram is as under :—

"The Secretary of State proposes that the passing of the Government of India Bill should be accompanied by a Royal Message to the people of India and that the occasion should be marked by an act of Royal clemency to political prisoners and by removal of all restrictions now imposed under the Press Act, the Defence of India Act, the Seditious meetings Act Regulation III and other similar enactments and ordinances ; the intention is that whatever exceptions are made they should be as few as possible. The power of Government under the legislation would continue unaffected for use in case of necessity.

By the term ' other similar enactments and ordinances' the Government of India understand Ingress into India Ordinance, Madras Regulation II of 1819 and Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827, but not the Foreigners Act or our Foreigners Ordinance.

Will you please inform the Government of India of local Government's views immediately ? Matter very urgent. We have promised reply to Secretary of State 9th. The hope underlying the suggested policy is that frank manifestation of clemency and trust may disarm hostility and promote success of Reforms. Government of India feel sure that local Government will give full weight to such consideration and at the same time take full account of danger of disorders".

---

The Bombay Government sent telegram No. 1413, dated 8th December 1919 in reply to the above telegram : —

" Government of Bombay are unable to entertain any sanguine anticipation of substantial results from proposed Act of clemency in present political situation. Public feeling aroused as a result of proceedings of Hunter Committee, return of Tilak and announce-ment by him of policy of intensive agitation. Whatever concessions may be made, postponement of Turkish settlement and other circumstances have created political atmosphere unfavourable to success of proposal. Government of Bombay are, however, prepared to accept general policy of Amnesty subject to following remarks.

Political Prisoners as defined in your telegram. Government agrees to grant of free pardon to all such prisoners for crimes committed in jurisdiction of Bombay Government, with exception of Savarkar Brothers who were both leaders of the Nasik Revolutionary Society and determined and dangerous conspirators .....The view of the Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola is that having regard to the fact that the act of clemency is to be that of His Majesty and the object is to produce a favourable atmosphere for the introduction of the Reforms it is necessary from the Oriental point of view that the Amensty should be on a most generous scale especially in regard to convicted persons during the recent disturbance".

Government of Bombay sent another telegram No. 1439, S/D, dated 18th December 1919 :

—  
" The following persons will be affected by Government of India's recommendation regarding proposed amnesty.

Persons imprisoned for offences against State :—

*Admitted* : (1) K. S. Chandwadkar,  
(2) H. D. Mariwala,  
(3) Durgadas B. Advam,  
(5) Jethmal Parsram.

*Excluded* : (1) Ganesh Damodar Savarkar.

For reasons already explained Government of Bombay regards following as excluded *ipso facto* by terms of amnesty apart from special reasons. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. Also all persons convicted by Ahmedabad, Kaira and Akola Tribunals."

Government of India sent the following reply to the above on 30th December 1919 : —

Government of India agree that the Savarkar brothers should not be released under the Royal Amnesty. This is in reply to your telegram No. 1413, S. D. of 8th December 1919.

---

#### THE ROYAL PROCLAMATION OF DECEMBER 1919

In Bombay Government Gazette Extra-ordinary, dated 24th December 1919, we get a Royal Proclamation by the King Emperor George V. The following is the summary of the proclamation : —

*Paragraph 1.*—Reference to Acts of 1773, 1784, 1833, 1858, 1861 and 1909—The Act of 1919 entrusts the elected representatives of the people with a definite share in Government and points the way to full responsible Government hereafter.

*Paragraph 2.*—Mention of what Queen Victoria, King Edward VII and he himself declared between 1858 and 1910.

*Paragraph 3.*—Britain's desire to make it possible for India to take the control of her domestic affairs on her own shoulders.

*Paragraph 4.*—Recognition of the political awakening and political aspirations of the people of the country.

*Paragraph 5.*—Hope that the new legislatures shall succeed.

*Paragraph 6.*—An appeal to forgive and forget for removing all bitterness and creating an atmosphere of goodwill for the

success of the reforms. Declaration of Royal clemency to political offenders.

*Paragraph 7.*—Reference to Chamber of Princes.

*Paragraph 8.*—Intention of sending Prince of Wales to visit India to further cordiality of relations between the King and his subjects.

---

#### REACTION OF THE PRESS

The following is an extract from the Report on Indian Papers published in the Bombay Presidency for the week ending 24th . January 1920 : —

*Comments on effect given to the Royal Clemency*

(*Mahratta*, 25th January 1920.)

"From the information supplied to us by Dr. N. D. Savarkar it seems that a cruel wrong has been done to the Savarkar brothers in the Andamans by their being excluded from those who have received the benefit of the Royal Amnesty .....Dr. Savarkar informs us that his brothers had petitioned the Government of India once in 1915 and at another time in 1918, clearly stating to Government that (we quote the words from the Barrister's letter). ' If the reforms are effected and if at least the Viceregal Councils are made to represent the voice of the people, then there would be no hesitation on my part to make the beginning of such a constitutional development a success, to stand by law and order which is the very foundation and basis of Society in general and of Hindu policy in particular.' What more did the Government want than this clear and definite assurance ? It (the Royal Proclamation) gave the Viceroy a definite mandate to release those who are, willing to respect law in the future. Of course it left the Viceroy discretion enough to keep dangerous men in jail for public safety. But we are sure that men like the Savarkar brothers who are willing to respect law cannot be a danger' to the public, end the terms of the Royal Proclamation, therefore, clearly applied to their case. It left no choice to the Viceroy so far as the brothers were concerned and we think that in excluding the Savarkar brothers from the benefit of the Royal amnesty, the Viceroy has acted against the Royal Mandate. We are also informed that the brothers are not keeping good health and are losing in weight considerably. Considerations of health also thus demanded their



release. It is, therefore, obvious that justice, mercy, expediency and health demanded the release of these unfortunate brothers."

---

#### QUESTIONS IN THE BOMBAY COUNCIL

Mr. D. V. Belvi, LL.B., asked question No. 15 in the Legislative Council regarding the above paragraph in the Maratha. The Government replied that "no such representations as are referred to in the article have reached this Government" and that the Bombay Government did not recommend either of the Savarkar brothers for clemency in view of the recent Royal Proclamation.

---

#### COULD GANESH SAVARKAR ALONE BE GIVEN AMNESTY ?

The Government of India, on representation made by Mr Khapar-de with regard to the case of the Savarkar Brothers, asked the Bombay Government by their letter No. 516, dated 24th February 1920, whether G. D. Savarkar should be released or at least be transferred to a jail in India. The letter concludes, as under : —

" 4. I am to enquire whether His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that there is sufficient ground for discrimination between the two cases, and if so, whether he would recommend that Ganesh Damodar Savarkar should be released and on what conditions.

(Signed) MACPHERSON."

The Government of Bombay sent their firm " No " to the above letter.

The Government of India then again wrote letter No. 1193, dated 20th May 1920 to the Government of Bombay, stating that " a petition has recently been received from Vinayak Damodar Savarkar praying for the release of himself and his brother. I am to enclose a copy of this and ask that the Government of India may be favoured with the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council thereon, especially in regard to the suggestion of conditional release, mentioned in paragraph 7 of the petition.....

"In conclusion there has been considerable agitation for the release of at least one of the Savarkars and from the information on record, it seems that the Government of India contemplated the possibility of their release on such occasion as the amnesty.

It may be observed that if Ganesh is released and Vinayak retained in custody, the latter will become in some measure a hostage for the former, who will see that his own misconduct does not jeopardize his brother's chances of release at some future date.

"I am accordingly to request that the case of Ganesh may be re-examined in the light of the observations now made and that the Government of India may be informed whether His Excellency the Governor in Council would recommend his release, and if so, on what conditions."

---

VINAYAK SAVARKAR'S PETITION

The petition of V. D, Savarkar referred to in the above letter is as under:—

CELLULAR JAIL,  
PORT BLAIR :  
30th March 1920.

To

THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE ANDAMANS.

Sir,

In view of the recent statement of the Honourable Member for Home Department to the Government of India, to the effect that " the Government was willing to consider the papers of any individual, and give them their best consideration if they were brought before them" and that " as soon as it appeared to the Government that an individual could be released without danger to the State, the Government would extend the Royal Clemency to that person"; the undersigned most humbly begs that he should be given a *last chance* to submit his case before it is too late. You, Sir, at any rate would not grudge me this last favour of forwarding this petition to His Excellency the Viceroy of India especially and if only to give me the satisfaction of being heard, whatever the Government decisions may be.

I. The Royal proclamation most magnanimously states that, " Royal clemency should be extended to all those who were found guilty of breaking the law, through their eagerness for Political progress ". The case of me and my brother are pre-eminently of this type. Neither I nor any of my family members had anything to complain against the Government for any personal wrong due to us nor for any personal favour desired. I had brilliant career

open to me and nothing to gain and everything to lose individually by treading such dangerous paths. Suffice it to say that no less a personage than one of the Honourable Members of the Home Department had said, in 1913 to me personally ..... "Such Education, so much reading; ..... You could have held the highest posts under our Government". If in spite of this testimony any doubt as to my motive does lurk in any one, then to him I beg to point out, that there had been no prosecution against any member of my family till this year 1909 ; while almost all of my activities which constituted the basis for the case have been in the years preceding that of the prosecution, the judges and the Rowlatt Report have all admitted that since the year 1899 to the year 1909 had been written the life of Mazzini and other books, as well as organized the various societies and even the parcel of arms had been sent before the arrest of any of my brothers or before I had any personal grievance to complain of (*vide* Rowlatt Report, pages 6 etc). But does any one else take the same view of our cases ? Well, the monster petition that the Indian public had sent to His Majesty and that had been signed by no less than 5,000 signatories had made a special mention of one in it. I had been denied a jury in the trial : now the jury of a whole nation has opined that only the eagerness for political progress had been the motive of all my actions and that led me to the regrettable breaking of the laws.

II. Nor can this second case of abetting murder throw me beyond the reach of the Royal clemency. For (a) the Proclamation does not make any distinction of the nature of the offence or of a section or of the Court of Justice, beyond the motive of the offence. It concerns entirely with the motive and requires that it should be political and not personal (b) secondly the Government too has already interpreted it in the same spirit and has released Barin and Hemu and others. These men had confessed that one of the objects of their conspiracy was " the murders of prominent Government officials" and on their own confessions had been guilty of sending the boys to murder magistrates, etc. This magistrate had among others prosecuted Barin's brother Arabind in the first " Bande Mataram" newspaper case. And yet Barin was not looked upon, and rightly so, as a non-political murderer. In my respect the objection is immensely weaker. For it was justly admitted by the Prosecution that I was in England, had no knowledge of the particular plot or idea of murdering Mr. Jackson and had sent the parcels of arms before the arrest of my brother and so could not have the slightest

personal grudge against any particular individual officer. But Hemu had actually prepared the very Bomb that killed Kennedy and with a full knowledge of its destination (Rowlatt Report, page 33). Yet Hemu had not been thrown out of the scope of the clemency on that ground. If Barin and others were not separately charged for specific abetting it was only because they had already been sentenced to capital punishment in the Conspiracy Case, and I was specifically charged because I was not and again the international facilities to have me extradited in case France got me back. Therefore I humbly submit that the Government be pleased to extend the clemency to me as they had done it to Barin and Hemu whose complicity in abetting the murders of officers etc., was confessed and much deeper. For surely a section does not matter more than the crime it contemplates. In the case of my brother this question does not arise as his case has nothing to do with any murders, etc.

III. Thus interpreting the proclamation as the Government had already done in the cases of Barin, Hemu etc., I and my brother are fully entitled to the Royal Clemency " in the fullest measure". But is it compatible with Public Safety ? I submit it is entirely so. For (a) I most emphatically declare that we are amongst " the microzymes of anarchism " referred to by the Home Secretary. So far from believing in the militant school of the Bukanin type that I do not contribute even to the peaceful and philosophical anarchism of a Kropotkin or a Tolstoy. And as to my Revolutionary tendencies of the past : it is not only now for the object of sharing the clemency but years before this I have informed of and written to the Government in my petitions (1918, 1914) about my firm intention to abide by the constitution and stand by it as soon as a beginning was made to prove it by Mr. Montague. Since that the Reforms and then the Proclamation have only confirmed me in my views and recently I have publicly avowed my faith in and readiness to stand by the side of orderly and constitutional development. The danger that is threatening our country from the North at the hands of the fanatic hoards of Asia who had been the curse of India in the past when they came as foes, and who are more likely to be so in the future now that they want to come as friends, makes me convinced that every intelligent lover of India would heartily and loyally co-operate with the British people in the interests of India herself. That is why I offered myself as a volunteer in 1914 to Government when the War broke out and German-Turko-Afghan invasion of India became imminent. Whether you believe it or not, I am

sincere in expressing my earnest intention of treading the constitutional path and trying my humble best to render the hands of the British Dominions a Bond of Love and Respect and of Mutual help and such an empire as is foreshadowed in the Proclamation with my hearty adherence. For verily I hate no race or creed or people simply because they are not Indians, (b) but if Government wants a further security from me then I and my brother are perfectly willing to give a pledge of not participating in politics for a definite and reasonable period that the Government would indicate. For even without such a pledge my i'ailing health and the sweet blessings of Home that have been denied to me by myself make me so desirous of leading a quiet and retired life for years to come that nothing would induce me to dabble in active politics now. (c) This or any pledge e.g., of remaining in particular province or reporting our movements to the police for a definite period after our release—any such reasonable conditions meant genuinely to ensure the safety of the State would be gladly accepted by me and my brother. Ultimately I submit that the overwhelming majority of the very people who constitute the State which is to be kept safe from us have from Surendranath the venerable and veteran moderate leader to the man in the street the Press and the Platform, the Hindus and the Muhamedans, from the Punjab to Madras, been clearly and persistently asking for an immediate and complete release declaring it was compatible with their safety—nay more, declaring it was a factor in removing the very " sense of bitterness " which the Proclamation aims to allay.

IV. Therefore the very object of the Proclamation would not be fulfilled and the sense of bitterness removed from the public mind, until we two and those who yet remain have been made to share the magnanimous clemency.

V. Moreover all the objects of a sentence have been satisfied in our case. For (a) we have put 10 to 11 years in jail; while Mr. Sanyal who too was a lifer was released in 4 years and the riot case lifers within a year ; (b) we have done hard work in mills, oil mills and everything else that was given to us in India and here ; (c) our prison behaviour is in no way more objectionable than of those already released ; they had, even in Port Blair, been suspected of a serious plot and locked up in jail again. We two on the contrary have to this day been under extra rigorous discipline and restraint and yet during the last six years or so there is not a single case even on ordinary disciplinary grounds against us.

VI. In the end I beg to express my gratefulness for the release of hundreds of Political Prisoners including those who have been released from the Andamans, and for this partially granting my petitions of 1914 and 1918. It is not therefore too much to hope that His Excellency would release the remaining prisoners too, as they are placed on the same footing, including me and my brother. Especially so as the political situation in Maharashtra has singularly been free from any outrageous disturbances for so many years in the past. Here, however, I beg to submit that our release should not be made conditional on the behaviour of those released or of anybody else ; for it would be preposterous to deny us the clemency and punish us for the fault of someone else.

VII. On all these grounds I believe that the Government hearing my readiness to enter into any sensible pledge and the fact that the Reforms, present and promised, joined to the Common danger from the North of Turko-Afghan fanatics have made me a sincere advocate of loyal co-operation in the interests of both our nations, would release me and win my personal gratitude. The brilliant prospects of my early life all but too soon blighted. have constituted so painful a source of regret to me that a release ' would be a new birth and would touch my heart, sensitive and submissive to kindness so deeply as to render me personally attached and politically useful in future. For often magnanimity wins where might fails.

Hoping that the Chief Commissioner, remembering the personal regard I ever had shown to him throughout his term and how often I had to face keen disappointment through that time, will not grudge me this last favour of allowing this most harmless vent to my Despair and will be pleased to forward this petition, may I hope with his own recommendations, to His Excellency the Viceroy of India.

I beg to remain.  
Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,  
(Signed) V. D. SAVARKAR,  
Convict No. 32778."

---

#### BOMBAY GOVERNMENT AGAINST THEIR RELEASE

After receipt of the copy of the above petition, together with Mr. MacPherson's demi-official letter No. 1193 of 20th May 1920,

Government of Bombay sent a reply on 19th June 1920. The following are pertinent extracts from this letter :—

*Paragraph 1.*—Acknowledges receipt of Government of India's letter and copy of Savarkars' petition.

*Paragraph 2.*—Restatement of Bombay Government's decision of excluding Savarkar brothers from the Clemency.

*Paragraph 3.*—" Government have now re-examined his (Ganesh) case in the light of the observations made in your letter of the 20th May 1920 and Vinayak's petition dated 30th March, 1920, but they are constrained to say that they are unable to change their former opinion which was arrived at after very careful consideration. In the first place Government are unable to accept the argument that because Barindra Kumar Ghose and his two confederates have been released in Bengal, therefore the Bombay Government should release Ganesh Savarkar ..... The most recent secret reports on the activities of Barindra do not encourage this Government to believe that the extension of the amnesty to criminals of this type has been in any way useful.

4. " As for release on adequate guarantee, Government think that conditions in such cases are useless.

5. " In deference, however, to the wishes of the Government of India, the Bombay Government will be ready to consider the case in a year's time.....".

Government of India ultimately wrote to the Chief Commissioner Andaman and Nicobar Islands their letter No. 2845, dated 12th July 1920, as under :—

" In reply to your letter No. 67, dated 9th April 1920, forwarding a petition from V. D. Savarkar praying for the release under the amnesty of himself and his brother, I am directed to say that His Excellency the Viceroy is not prepared at present to extend to them the benefit of the amnesty, and to request that the petitioner may be informed accordingly."

---

#### NOT EVEN TRANSFER TO A BOMBAY JAIL

The Government of Bombay by their letter No. 1106/36, Home Department, dated 29th February 1921, informed the Government of India that the Governor in Council was not in favour of the

transfer of the Savarkar brothers from Andamans to a jail in the Bombay Presidency, as that would lead to a recrudescence of agitation in their favour.

JAIL HISTORY TICKET OF V D. SAVARKAR

(FROM H. D. SPECIAL VOLUME No. 60 (D) F, PAGE 27.)

*History Ticket.*

Convict No. 32778 Class 3 C. No. of Block 2. Date.	No. of Corridor—Top.  Entry.
30th August 1911	6 months solitary confinement until further orders.
14th August 1911	Letter from Secretary to Government Educational Department to the effect that the Degree of B.A., conferred on him has been cancelled.
30th August 1911	Petition for clemency.
3rd September 1911.	Petition rejected.
15th January 1912	Removed from Solitary Confinement.
11th June 1912	One month's separate confinement for writing letters to others without sanction.
11th July 1912	Removed from separate confinement.
10th September 1912.	Seven days standing handcuffs for having in possession a letter written to another convict.
29th October 1912	Petitioner to be released from Cellular Jail because he has been in 16 months and that his conduct has been better.
4th November 1912.	Petition rejected.



23rd November 1912	One month's separate confinement for being in possession of a note written by another convict.
18th December 1912	Informed of his brother's address: 98, Premchand Burat Street, Bow Bazar, Calcutta.
23rd December 1912	Removed from separate confinement.
30th December 1912	Refused to eat his food all day.
1st January 1913	Do.
2nd January 1913	Ate his food this morning.
14th November 1913	Permitted by the Hon. Member of Home Department to write a petition : Petition made and sent to Medical Superintendent.
16th December 1913	Absolutely refusing to work.
17th December 1913	One month's separate confinement without work or books.
17th January 1914	Removed from S. C, Rope making.
8th June 1914	Absolutely refusing to work. Seven days standing handcuffs imposed.
15th June 1914	Completed S. H, cuffs.
16th June 1914	Absolutely refusing to work. Four months chain gaug imposed.
18th June 1914	Absolutely refusing to work. Ten days cross bar fetters imposed.
19th June 1914	Asks for work put in rope making.
29th June 1914	Removed fetters.
16th July 1914	Convalescent gaug.
10th September 1914	Asks to make out a petition to C.—C. granted.

14th September 1914	Petition forwarded through Medical Superintendent.
16th October 1914	Chain gaug fetters removed.
1st December 1914	Government rejected prisoner's proposals in the petition.
18th May 1915	Convalescent gaug (Discharged on 11th June 1916 on admission to hospital).
5th July 1916	Brother's address : N. D. Savarkar, Goregaonkar's 1st Chawl, ground floor, Girgaum, Bombay.
28th October 1916	Promoted to 2nd class with effect from 2nd November 1916.
2nd October 1917	May write a petition to Government of India.
1st February 1918	Informed that Secretary has placed his petition (in which he prays that a general amnesty be given to all political prisoners) with the Government of India.
1st January 1919	To continue as a hospital patient for purposes of diet and treatment.
30th May 1919	Interview with wife and brother Dr. Savarkar one hour.
31st May 1919	Interview with wife and brother Dr. Savarkar 1¼ hours.
24th January 1920	Petition to Jails Committee.
6th April 1920	Petition to Government of India forwarded to C. C. for disposal, forwarded to Government of India.
14th July 1920	May do some clerical work in his Varandah.
19th August 1920	Reply received from Government of India " The Viceroy is not prepared at present to extend to him the benefit of amnesty."

28th September 1920	Savarkar desires either to be made a foreman or to be given definite clerical work. The former is at present not possible. The latter should be granted as far as possible.
4th November 1920.	Appointed a foreman on probation in charge of oil godown.
10th February 1921	Recommended to be made pucca.
2nd May 1921	Embarked on s.s. Maharaja for transfer to join Bombay Presidency.

---