

## **Ghadar Movement: Har Dayal and His Ideological Formulations**

**Rashid Manzoor Bhat**  
M.Phil, Research Scholar,  
Department of History,  
Jiwaji University, Gwalior-474011  
Email: [rsdbhat@gmail.com](mailto:rsdbhat@gmail.com)  
Cell No.: 7006744994

### **Abstract**

*Ghadar Party, which played a vital Role in the freedom struggle of India, was started as a Movement by Indian Immigrants on the West (Pacific) Coast of North America at the beginning of the First World War. About 8,000 of these immigrants, 95% of them Sikhs, left Canada and the United States of America for India, to free India from the British rule. They were led by intellectuals like Har Dayal and Sohan Singh Bhakna. Har Dayal was the chief 'Man of Words' of the Ghadar movement. His ideological formulations were cast in the mould of a rather loose framework of ideas which prevailed among the Indian revolutionaries of that period. These may be drawn from his propaganda writings and his reflection in some of his articles, including the earlier ones reprinted by the Ghadar press. His leadership of the movement ended early. Ram Chandra who succeeded Har Dayal as the editor of the movement's chief organ with an altered name of Hindustan Ghadar, functioned in a more or less similar ideological framework.*

**Keywords:** Har Dayal, Ideology, Ghadar, Organisation, Mutiny, Rebellion

### **Introduction**

Ideology is taken here as a 'framework of consciousness' i.e. a more or less integrated set of ideas and beliefs, which provided to the adherents an explanation of the desired social and political order and a stimulus for action required for affecting the change. It may be generally developed in response to a perceived challenge. An ideology of revolutionary change may, therefore, provide an approach to analysis and explanation, a basis for identity and solidarity, and a choice of the required shape of organisation and the strategy to be adopted.<sup>1</sup> It may not, however, necessarily preclude the existence of divergent ideas and beliefs within a broadly integrated framework.

In studying the ideological framework of mass movements it may be pertinent to go beyond the ideas and beliefs advocated by the ideologues and intellectuals, to the substance and idiom of what the common people grasped, the manner in which those ideas were 'translated into the mother tongue'.

## **Literature Review:-**

**A.C Bose's** work *Indian Revolutionaries Abroad 1905 to 1922 in the background of International Developments* follows the work of Sareen. He studied Ghadar records in London, Berlin and Delhi within the broad framework of International politics.

**Tilak Raj Sareen's** work *Indian Revolutionary Movement Abroad 1905 to 1921* gives a good account of the aims, objectives, organization, strategy, operational principles and international relationships of Ghadar.

**Randhir Singh's** work *Ghadar Heroes: A Forgotten story of the Punjab revolutionaries 1914-1915* is based on authors interviews with a few Ghadar leaders and records the role of Sohan Singh Bakna an illustrious Ghadar personality.

## **Objectives:-**

1. To explore ideology of the Ghadar Movement.
2. To analyse the leadership of Har Dayal.

## **Methodology**

An interpretive and analytical methodology is adopted for the study, "Ghadar Movement: Har Dayal and his Ideological Formulations". It is primarily a fact finding venture on the basis of exploratory method. This study evaluates the ideology of the movement. The descriptive and historical approaches are adopted to validate the objectives.

## **Ideological Formulations of Har Dayal**

Har Dayal derived his inspiration from a wide variety of sources. Early in his youth he was influenced by the Arya Samaj and the Hindu extremist nationalists and advocated a 'Hindu nationalism'.<sup>2</sup> His association with Indian revolutionaries such as Shyamji Krishnavarma, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar and Madam Cama appeared to have contributed significantly to his revolutionary orientation. The writings of Mazzini and also of Marx influenced him.<sup>3</sup> The syndicalist and anarchist movements also claimed for a time his active involvement. He became the secretary of the San Francisco branch of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) movement<sup>4</sup> and founded the Bakunin Institute of California which he proudly described as 'the first monastery of anarchism'.<sup>5</sup> One noticed in him a marked

propensity for an equally fanatic advocacy of paradoxical notions on important issues of identity, solidarity, nature of organisation and revolutionary strategy. Little attempt was made to seriously discuss and resolve the contradictions. Lajpat Rai described him as 'more impulsive than consistent in his thought and action...quite an uncertain item'.<sup>6</sup> indeed Dayal himself stated at a moment of reflection in November 1914: 'I am too erratic and explosive to be institutionalised'.<sup>7</sup> He, therefore, brought to use an assortment of diverse arguments and heterogeneous beliefs.

One of the fundamental premises of his argument for a revolutionary change was that the British rule had ruined India and resulted in misery and degradation for its people. Being absolutely fed up with British rule, the people of India were no longer prepared to suffer the oppression and tyranny and were ready to rise in revolt. In two of the regular features of the *Ghadar* viz. *Angrezi Raj Ka Kacha Chittha* (A Balance Sheet of the British Rule) and *Ankon Ki Gawahi* (Evidence of Statistics) and in his articles and pamphlets,<sup>8</sup> he spot-lighted the economic ruin augmented by the British and oppression by the bureaucracy and police. The main items on the agenda consisted of accounts relating to the drainage of Indian wealth into England; excessive expenditure on armed forces and wars of imperial extension; high rates of taxation and decline of indigenous production; recurrent famines and staggering death tolls; and neglect of education, sanitation and public health. The dubious agrarian policy of the government was held responsible for the persistent exploitation of the Indian peasant.

The British rule, it was stressed, was maintained through administrative high-handedness, excessive legal restrictions on civil liberties, press gagging measures, arrest of political leaders, and detentions without trial. Incidents of torture of detainees by the police were cited to support the charges.<sup>9</sup> Thus it was said, 'We call it British Vampire and not British Empire'.<sup>10</sup>

The substance of the whole description was based mainly on the writings of the British and Indian liberal democratic critics of administration such as William Digby, H.M. Hyndman, Alfred Webb, C.J.O' Donnel, Rev. Sunderland, Dadabhai Naoroji and G.K. Gokhale. The arguments which had become common in the armoury both of the 'moderates' and the 'extremists' in India and which had been used primarily to demand reforms in British administration were here used to develop a conviction that Indian and British imperial interests were basically irreconcilable. What was needed, therefore, was a surgical operation i.e., a violent revolution to end the British rule. The description was passionately interspersed with epithets like *thuggee*, *badmashi*, 'a band of thieves', 'dacoits' and so on,<sup>11</sup> to stress upon their contempt for the British and to drive the ideas home to the less sophisticated audience.

Har Dayal was particularly inclined to emphasise the moral degradation of the Indian people caused by subjection to foreign rule. In his article, 'The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race', his argument turned mainly to the danger to Hindu tradition and moral order. He virulently decried the situation, whereby 'the beef-eating Europeans', who were mere cobblers and coolies in England, had ousted high caste *Brahmins* and *Kshatriyas* from

positions of leadership in the Hindu society. He, therefore, warned: 'If the social conquest is completed, there is no hope for our nation'.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, the argument in another pamphlet, *Ghulami Ka Zehar* (The Poison of Slavery) which also focused on moral degradation, was basically secular in appeal. It was not only the British rule which was condemned but also the social system in which the native *Raja* and *Zamindar* were equally responsible for injecting the poison of slavery in the minds of the honest hard-working peasants and labourers.<sup>13</sup>

A specific reference was also made to the particular grievances of the Muslims in India. Writing in *Ghadar* on that topic, it was pointed out that they had been the special target of British oppression. Muslim states were conquered and aristocratic families were ruined. The British economic policy caused the greatest havoc to the Muslim weavers of Dacca and Murshidabad. Muslim newspapers like the *Al Hilal*, the *Tauhid*, the *Zamind ar* and the *Rafah-e-Aam* were not allowed to run freely.<sup>14</sup> The break-up of the Ottoman empire was put up as yet another act of British imperial policy and the Muslims of India were exhorted to avenge the injustice done to their Muslim brothers. The Pan Islamist movement was regarded as a holy war against the 'Christian Kafirs'.<sup>15</sup>

Among the goals to be achieved, complete political independence was, of course, the primary objective. There could be no compromise on that point. In that respect, the Ghadar movement anticipated the direction which the nationalist movement in India was to adopt several years later. The *Ghadar* condemned the contemporary mendicant approach of the Indian National Congress and particularly attacked the 'moderates' such as Gopal Krishan Gokhle for allegedly misleading the nation.<sup>16</sup> As for the shape of desired social and political order which should be established in India after removal of the British, The Ghadar ideologues had not given a serious thought to it, though occasional ad hocish allusions were made to a variety of intended objectives.

Har Dayal's conception of political programme of revolution did not include what system would replace the existing arrangement. Years earlier, in the first issue of his *Bande Mataram* (September 1909), he had proposed a three-stage plan of action, which would help his country to 'again establish itself as a member of the community of nations'. The first stage was to be of moral and intellectual preparation; second, of war; and the third, of reconstruction and consolidation. 'After Mazzini, Garibaldi; after Garibaldi, Cavour. Even so it must be with us', he emphasised, 'Virtue and wisdom first; then war; finally independence'. Emily Brown says it was 'the first coherent statement of *Hardayalism*'. Lajpat Rai, who coined the term 'Hardayalism' to describe the ideas of Har Dayal's variety of Indian nationalists, thought the lack of any positive and constructive political programme was a prominent mark of 'Hardayalists'.<sup>17</sup> It was not that they were not aware of the need, but the thinking about alternative order appeared much less important.

Mazzini's writings were rather avidly read by the educated Indian patriots of that period, and they would have noticed his insistence upon having a positive programme. It did

not, however, acquire a priority with them. One may notice that in a book, *Life of Mazzini*, found on Sachindranath Sanyal, one remark of Mazzini on the weakness of the *Carbonari* was particularly underlined by the reader. In that, Mazzini had concluded: 'It was this want of a positive programme that was responsible for that failure of the *Carbonari*'. Surely it had caught the attention of the readers amongst whom it was circulated. A note was, however, added in pencil, by its side: 'but the programme may not include the form of government after revolution'.<sup>18</sup> It may not be far-fetched impression that consideration of most of the Indian revolutionaries of that age, including Har Dayal and Ram Chandra, was similar to that of Sanyal. Lajpat Rai, therefore, remarked that in their belief, 'Someone would rise Sphinx like, who will establish some form of national government'.<sup>19</sup>

A few years before he assumed the leadership of the Ghadar movement Har Dayal had also expressed to one of his friends a somewhat considered opinion about political propaganda: 'Place a clear issue before the people; "Such is your state, this is the cause, remove the cause". Depend upon it', he wrote, 'plain speaking carries conviction to the heart, while sophistry only perplexes honest men'.<sup>20</sup> That was precisely what he and Ram Chandra attempted to do. But 'plain speaking' became a way of by-passing the difficult task of preparing a coherent framework of the alternative order. Their writings in *Ghadar* and other pamphlets included, nevertheless, references to several ideas.

Living in USA, a profession of believed American political ideals of democracy, liberty and equality came usefully at hand. These were the ideals which had, as Har Dayal emphasised, moved the Americans to wage an armed revolution against the British rule of George III. Ram Chandra, therefore, stressed that *Ghadar* weekly was started solely for the purpose of advocating the principles of political freedom upon which the independence of USA was founded.

In his letters to the American newspapers, the goal of the Ghadar movement was given as 'nothing less than the establishment of a republic; a government of the people, by the people and for the people in India'.<sup>21</sup> The writings in the *Ghadar* included the arguments and advocacy of liberty made by American liberals such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Patrick Henry and Woodrow Wilson.<sup>22</sup> That line of reasoning served to win the moral support of Americans which was highly valued by Har Dayal and his circle of Indian students. That also appeared to provide a somewhat romantic illustration to the followers of the shape of the alternative order of things that should follow the end of British rule. Curiously, even though a major factor which contributed to the founding of the Ghadar movement in USA was the oppression and discrimination of Indian immigrants, yet there was hardly any reference made to that problem in *Ghadar* weekly. Har Dayal and Ram Chandra did not only avoid any criticism of American people or the US authorities on that count, but also frequently acclaimed the support the Americans gave to the cause of India's freedom. The liberty which Indian patriots enjoyed to carry on their struggle was upheld as an ideal of freedom to aspire for.

In an article, 'The Meaning of Equality', Har Dayal also dwelt on the economic dimension of freedom. It was essential not only to have freedom of thought and political equality but also economic equality. 'Spiritual equality does not feed the hungry', he emphasised, 'true equality is a function of economic equality'. The peasants and artisans were the ones who created all the wealth, most of which was expropriated by others, and it were the former who deserved a major share of the nation's wealth. Given a certain fascination for anarchist thinking, Har Dayal also condemned the very existence of property and power of any kind. Power, whether of state, religion or wealth was evil, he said; 'it was the source of all exploitation and must be abolished'.<sup>23</sup>

Alongside the profession of these heterogeneous, liberal, syndicalist and anarchist notions, however, any sort of rule by any class of Indians appeared a better arrangement than the existing subjection to foreign rule. The princely states in India were identified, for example, as not only independent parts in India, but also as examples of a better political arrangement. It may appear intriguing that Har Dayal passionately argued that the people living in these principalities were 'more prosperous' than the millions who lived in British India. These were the states where 'national honour' had been maintained. Thanks to the armed struggle the Indians waged in 1857, Har Dayal affirmed, at least some parts of India remained independent.<sup>24</sup> The argument for a second rebellion of the same kind did not, evidently, preclude the establishment of many similar principalities ruled by different Princes once the British were expelled.

A strong belief in the support of Indian Princes in the national struggle against the British was a significant element in the writings of Indian revolutionaries at that time. One of Savarkar's various pamphlets contained a very specific appeal: 'Advance then, O' Princes of India, boldly and bravely—there is nothing but your chains to lose'.<sup>25</sup> Bhagwan Singh was glad to claim that twenty five per cent of Indian Princes had already pledged support to the Ghadar movement and another fifty per cent who had sympathy with the movement were waiting for an opportune moment.<sup>26</sup> That of course was a gross delusion. What was significant, however, was failure to recognise that after 1857, these princes were the major support of the British rule. Furthermore, it was not a matter of concern for those revolutionaries or the Ghadar leaders whether largely authoritarian and feudal principalities did at all go well with the advocated ideals of liberal democracy and economic equality.

Paradoxical formulations were also conspicuous in the discussion on social questions in two earlier articles which were reprinted together in the form of a pamphlet by the Ghadar press. The Hindu caste system, for example, came for a virulent condemnation at one place. It was regarded as that fatal drug of inequality with which the torpor of death fell upon that society.<sup>27</sup> Surprisingly, that argument was supported by a verdict that the ideal social order would be the one which approximated to the legendary Vedic period of Indian history, because, as Har Dayal affirmed, practical equality existed only in that society where there were no governors and no governed, no priests and no laymen, no rich and no poor. At

another place in the same publication, the caste system was not only supported but more than that, its defence was advanced as a 'question of national self respect'.<sup>28</sup>

Conflicting notions were similarly advanced apparently to suggest that all Indians had a common cause in ending the British rule. 'Whereas a considered stress was laid on the historical factors and common sufferings of Hindus and Muslims suggesting a national unity against the British, emphasis was also simultaneously put on the particularised values of the two. The above mentioned article, for example, glorified the separate values of the 'Hindu race', and included insinuating references to Mohamedian invaders which had implicit suggestions of Muslims being regarded *mlechha* or foreigners.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps, he was conscious of this contradiction and the only way suggested to resolve it was that they should forget their religious differences and fight against the foreign enemy. Following the *Risorgimento* ideal of Mazzini the solidarity of all Indians was sought to be achieved through approving references to separate identities of Jats, Rajputs and Khans; Marathas, Bengalis and Punjabis; Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims.

Frequent references were also made to the revolutionary movements of that time in Ireland, Russia, China and Egypt, with a view to suggest their affinity with and support for the Ghadar movement. The revolutionaries of those countries were described as 'Ghadarites' and the success of 'Mexican Ghadarites' was acclaimed as a victory of the forces of revolutionary change in the world.<sup>30</sup>

Har Dayal showed a special fascination for the Russian revolutionary movement. Addressing the luncheon gathering on the eve of launching of *Ghadar* weekly, he dwelt largely on that movement and claimed that Indian revolutionaries had been the 'pupils of Russian revolutionaries'.<sup>31</sup> His ideals, however, were not the leaders like Lenin, or other Bolsheviks but the anarchists, who killed Czar Alexander, and propagandists such as Alexander Herzen,<sup>32</sup> a nineteenth century intellectual whom E.H. Carr described as 'the first Norodnik'.<sup>33</sup> Har Dayal thought his *Ghadar* would use the weapon of propaganda for revolution in India in the same manner as *The Bell*, jointly edited by Herzen and Ogarov from London, had done for the Russian revolutionary movement. His article on 'The Indian Peasant', reflected a romantic idealisation of the peasant on the lines of the Norodink belief invented by Herzen.<sup>34</sup> The moralist and subjectivist streak of *Narodnaya Volya* (People's Will) had a strong appeal in Har Dayal's conception of the revolutionary struggle. The evening when he was served the warrants of arrest, his subject for lecture was the Russian revolutionary movement, wherein he hailed the assassination of Czar Alexander as an act which had done considerable good to the human race. Preaching anarchism was a major change levelled against him by the US authorities.

The fascination for dramatic deeds of individual terrorism remained prominent in the none-too-serious thinking of the Ghadar ideologues regarding the strategy for revolution. The nature of the struggle advocated in the inaugural issue of *Ghadar* and frequently repeated thereafter was that of armed uprising of 1857. Har Dayal emphasised on the participation by

the masses and patriotic elements among the soldiers from the British Indian Army. His writings and exhortations showed that he had not given a serious thought to whether it should necessarily be a well organised assault or a spontaneous popular outburst. Nor did Har Dayal, Ram Chandra or any other appeared to make a distinction between revolution, *coup d'etat*, rebellion and revolt.

A significant element in the network of their beliefs consisted of alluded hopes of the certainty of their success in the revolutionary struggle. These hopes were related to the character of the people who constituted the core of this movement and the believed favourable unfolding of the international political situation. It was argued that the 'Ghadar' of 1857 failed mainly because the Sikh regiments had then fought on the side of the British. Now the brave Sikhs were the main force behind the projected second 'Ghadar'. Many of these people were ex-army men and most of them had connections in the British Indian regiments and they could win over a large part of the Indian army to turn their weapons against the British at a crucial time.<sup>35</sup>

Another element was a belief that in the impending big war, Britain would be involved in a life and death struggle. Once the main body of British armed forces were engaged on various fronts in Europe, it would be the most fateful opportunity for launching the rebellion in India and wiping out the residual loyalist mercenaries. Germany, it was believed, would give all support to their struggle. Britain was also going to have further trouble in Ireland and Egypt, they thought. It was suggested that the awakening of the Egyptians was highly auspicious for India, because the key of the Suez Canal was in their hands. A strong belief that 'Nemesis is at the heels of England',<sup>36</sup> was a source of strength. Alongside the ideas of mass struggle, exhortations were frequently made to 'kill the tyrants' and to follow the example of revolutionary terrorists of Bengal.

Har Dayal changed his ideas on individual terrorism very quickly. During his brief association with the Industrial workers of the world in mid-1912, he appeared to have completely discarded his earlier fascination for terrorism and condemned it as 'a mixture of heroism and folly'. It was regarded as 'a waste of force', which 'gives the other party a chance for needless persecution'.<sup>37</sup> But the bomb attempt on the life of Lord Hardinge on 23 December had once again revived the old spirit. During the summer of 1913, he appeared more inclined towards political education of the masses to prepare for an eventual popular armed revolution. On 23 December 1913, the first anniversary of that bomb attempt, however, Har Dayal issued a commemorative pamphlet entitled *Shabash* (well done). Divided into three sections: 'The philosophy of the Bomb'; 'The bomb: A Useful weapon' and 'The Praise of the Bomb', this pamphlet exhorted the readers to 'kill, wound and disgrace the rulers with bombs, guns, clubs, shoes, bricks, stones, fists and slaps'.

## **Conclusion**

The passionate appeal of his rhetoric apart, Har Dayal's references to the movement's objectives and the nature of struggle were also often tangential. In his writings in the *Ghadar* weekly from 1 November 1913 the primary objective was given as nothing short of the end of British colonial rule in India through an armed mass struggle. In the above mentioned pamphlet *Shabash*, however, the apparent objective appeared to be to frighten the government to stay-put and make some concessions to Indians. In the given framework of inconsistency about strategy and the nature of struggle to be waged, there was little likelihood of a clear-cut preference for a particular type of revolutionary organisation. The ideologues hardly ever discussed the issue. The real strength of these ideological formulations lay in providing a strong basis for solidarity and collective spirit against an identified enemy who had to be knocked out.

**Notes and References:**

1. Manoranjan Mohanty, *Revolutionary Violence: A Study of the Maoist Movement in India*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1977, pp. 10-11.
2. Lajpat Rai pointed to Har Dayal's strong belief that the English were undermining Hindu character and destroying their social consciousness and 'national individuality', and stated that 'He would not even mix with Mohammadians and Christians.....He further aimed at establishing an order of Hindu ascetics to preach his ideas'. *Young India* (1916, rpt., New Delhi: Publications Division, Government of India, 1968), p. 166. Har Dayal's article, 'Social conquest of the Hindu Race', pointed to his profound fascination for the restoration of the glory of Hindu race and the values of legendary Vedic age.
3. His article, 'Karl Marx: A Modern Rishi', was the first ever writing by an Indian on Marx or his ideas. *Modern Review*, March 1912, pp. 273-86.
4. In his prestigious address to a meeting of the IWW in the summer of 1912, he called for a solidarity of the labourers of the whole world and even decried patriotism which, he said, was devised to divide the labourers into their various countries and thus into a false division of society. Cited in Emily Brown, *Har Dayal*, p. 111.
5. Indulal Yajnik, *Shyamji Krishnavarma*, Bombay: Lakshmi Publications, 1950, p.16; Dharamvira, *Har Dayal and the Revolutionary Movement of His Times*, p.163; and Emily Brown, *op. Cit.*, 116.
6. Lajpat Rai, *Young India*, pp. 166-68. Darisi Chenchiah stated in his recollections of his days with Har Dayal, that 'it was a peculiar characteristic of Har Dayal to change his ideas rapidly and act upon them', 'The Ghadar Party 1913-18: An Authentic Report', Part I, p.12.
7. His letters to Van Wyck Brooks, cited in Brown, *Op. Cit.* pp. 111-12.

8. Notably, *A Few Facts About British Rule in India*, San Francisco: Hindustan Ghadar Press, 1915.
9. *Ghadar*, 1 November 1913 and F. Mackerness, *Methods of Indian Police in the Twentieth Century*, San Francisco: Hindustan Ghadar Press, 1915. See also D.C.I.'s Report 15 July 1916, Home Political B, *Proceedings*, July 1916, No. 443.
10. Har Dayal's Speech at Astoria, *The Astorian* (Portland), 3 June 1913.
11. *Hindustan Ghadar*, 4 April 1915. See also Home Political B, *Proceedings*, October 1915, Nos 206-38, Appendix III, File p. 121.
12. Har Dayal, *The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race and Meaning of Equality*, San Francisco: Ghadar Press, 1914, p.6.
13. Har Dayal, *Ghulami Ka Zehar*, (Urdu), San Francisco: Hindustan Ghadar Press, 1916.
14. *Ghadar*, 8 November 1913.
15. *Ibid*. See also, Report of the D.C.I., 3 August 1915, Home Political B, *Proceedings*, August 1915, No. 552.
16. See in particular, *Hindustan Ghadar*, 22 August 1915; also *Ghadar*, 1 November 1913.
17. Emily Brown, *Har Dayal*, pp. 75-76.
18. Exhibit 62. *Benares Conspiracy Case*, Home Political A, *Proceedings*, April 1916, No. 471.
19. Cited in Emily Brown, *Op. Cit.*, 76.
20. Cited in Isemonger and Slattery, *An account of the Ghadar Conspiracy*, p.1.
21. Mark Naidis, "The Propaganda of the Ghadar Party", *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. XX, No.3, (August 1951), p.251. Ram Chandra's letter to *The Times* (London), 24 April 1917 (intercepted by the Police), Home Political B, *Proceedings*, September 1917, Nos. 195-198. See also Bhakna, *Jeewan Sangram*, p.44; and 'Tundilat', 'account of the Ghadar Party', p.28.
22. Naidis, *Op. Cit.* pp.251-52.
23. Har Dayal, *The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race and Meaning of Equality*, pp.7-8.
24. *Ghadar*, 8 November 1913.
25. See copy in Home Political (Deposit, *Proceedings*, April 1911, No.7.
26. Extracts from *Daily Manila Bulletin*, 5 March 1915, in Home Political B, *Proceedings*, April 1915, Nos. 416-19, File, pp. 20-21.
27. Har Dayal, *The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race and Meaning of Equality*, p.7.
28. *Ibid*, p.6.
29. Condemning the Indian National Congress for forgetting India's great heritage, it was alleged that 'it is so devoid of national self respect that it has now and then invited Europeans, *who did not know Sanskrit*, who despise our shastras and eat beef, to preside over its deliberations...an assembly of *Hindu* 'Patriots' in British India under the leadership of an Englishman, a member of the conquering race. Could we imagine a meeting of *Hindu* patriots under the presidentship of *Shahabuddin Gori* in the year 1200 A.D. or a National Congress of *Hindus* held in the year 1660 under Shaista Khan'? Har Dayal, *op. Cit.*, p.6. (Emphasis added).

30. *Ghadar*, 1 November 1913.
31. *Ibid.* See also his replies to the interrogating by the US Immigration Inspector on 26 March 1914, in Brown, *Har Dayal*, p.156.
32. Home Political A, *Proceedings*, June 1914, Nos. 75-76. See also *Roosi Ghadrion Ki Dastanen*, San Francisco: Hindustan Ghadar Press, 1917.
33. E.H. Carr, *Studies in Revolution*, (London: Macmillan, 1950, p.69.
34. Har Dayal, 'The Indian Peasant', *Modern Review*, May 1913, pp. 506-9.
35. Dharamvira, *op. Cit*, p.188 and Chenchiah, *op. Cit, part II, passim.*; See also 'Tundilat', *op. Cit.*, pp. 80-82.
36. *Ghadar*, 1 November 1913.
37. His interview with *The Bulletin* (San Francisco), cited in Brown, *op. Cit.*, p.111.