‘The Fate of 330 Million Indians’: Racial Exclusion, State Repression and the Ghadar Party across the British and American Empires

Seema Sohi
University of Colorado-Boulder, USA

The Ghadar movement came within ‘an ace of causing widespread bloodshed’. The *Komagata Maru* and the outbreak of the World War I became critical time of mobilization against the ‘continuous journey’ clause. The British officials used the *Komagata Maru* and the Indian anti-colonial movement that it fueled to justify the passage of politically repressive policies and practices in India. However, the tragic fate of the *Komagata Maru* provided greater proof of brutality and injustice of British rule. It further provided impetus and inspiration to Indians to work for freedom. However, with the United States’ entry into the World War I in 1917, the US Justice Department indicted dozens of Indian anti-colonialists, most of whom were affiliated with the Ghadar party, for violating the nation’s neutrality laws. The policies clearly exposed the hypocrisy of British imperialism as well as the racially discriminatory practices of the US and Canadian governments. The exclusion of Indian migrants from the white settlers’ countries became a site from which to challenge British claims to liberalism and universality.

In the aftermath of the First World War, the British officials assembled the East Indian Sedition Committee to investigate the “sedition” that had shaken the foundation of the British Raj during the War. The Committee’s findings placed special emphasis on the Ghadar Party - a revolutionary movement founded on the Pacific Coast of the United States in 1913 - when explaining the causes and concerns regarding the wave of revolutionary activity that swept across India in the early decades of the twentieth century. In fact, the Committee viewed that, “it [was] evident that the Ghadr movement in the Punjab came within an ace of causing widespread bloodshed.” The Committee further went on to quote authorities in the Punjab who had concluded that if the British Indian Government had not passed a series of repressive policies intended to quickly crush the threat of revolution across India, “the Ghadr movement could not have been suppressed so rapidly; and delay of preventive action and retribution in such a case would have increased yet more the amount of disorder to be coped with”.[1]

Though the frustration and anger of Indian migrants to the racially discriminatory treatment they received when attempting to move to different jurisdictions of the British Empire had been building for nearly a decade before the First World War began, what occurred during the summer of 1914 propelled

these migrants to revolutionary action? That summer, 376 Indians aboard a ship known as the *Komagata Maru* sailed into the waters of British Columbia determined to test the legality of the continuous journey law, a Canadian immigration policy that denied entry to anyone who had not come by "continuous journey" from their country of birth or origin. In fact, with a view to prohibit Indians from entering Canada, the policy was implemented knowing that there was no steamship line that ran directly from India to Canada at the time. Indians began challenging the law as soon as it was implemented in 1908 by arguing that, in traveling to Canada from Hong Kong - where the majority of Indian migrants stopped *en route* to the British Columbia - they had never left the jurisdiction of the British Empire and thus had traveled by continuous journey from their "country" of citizenship. Under the leadership of Gurdit Singh, a wealthy Sikh businessman who had spent the last twenty-five years in Malaya, Singapore, and Hong Kong, the *Komagata Maru* set sail for Canada from Hong Kong in April 1914. When the *Komagata Maru* sailed into the Vancouver harbor on May 23, 1914, the Canadian officials ordered the ship to anchor offshore. Immigration inspectors went on board to examine the passengers, admitting twenty who proved their claims of Canadian domicile and issuing deportation orders to the rest.[2] While the Canadian officials had hoped that their refusal to land the passengers would end the matter, the *Komagata Maru* remained in the Vancouver harbor for a total of eight weeks, resulting in a highly publicized affair that captured the attention of Indians across North America, Africa, Europe, and India. The eyes of Indian anti-colonialists across the world were on the British Columbia, where Indians in Vancouver and on board the *Komagata Maru* were boldly challenging racial discrimination by demanding that, as fellow subjects of the British Empire, they were entitled to the same rights and protections as the white Canadians who excluded them.

One observer of these events was Jawala Singh, a prosperous agricultural entrepreneur in California's San Joaquin Valley known amongst Indian migrants on the Pacific Coast as the "Potato King." Jawala Singh's farm was one of the centers of revolutionary anti-colonial organizing in North America. He had an active history of anti-colonial activism in the United States. Moreover, he had contributed significant amounts of his profits to the Indian independence struggle. Jawala Singh also helped to establish and fund the Guru Gobind Singh Sahib Educational Scholarship program, which provided three-year scholarships to promising students to attend American universities in the hopes that, upon completion of their studies, they would return to India and contribute to the growing movement for India's political and economic independence. Jawala Singh was a key figure in the formation of the Ghadar Party and served as the Party's first Vice-President. After a few weeks, the *Komagata Maru* was forced to leave the Vancouver harbor, he donated his property to the Ghadar Party. On August 29, 1914, he led about seventy of his countrymen, including fellow Ghadar Party leader Kartar Singh Sarabha, on board the *SS Korea* bound for Asia.[3] The *SS Korea* was the first ship to carry Indian revolutionaries from North America after the outbreak of the First World War. For Indians in North America who had grown increasingly angry and disillusioned by their experiences with

racial discrimination, exclusion, and political repression on the Pacific Coast. The summer of 1914 - with both the *Komagata Maru* and the subsequent outbreak of the First World War - became a critical time of mobilization. Though the Ghadar Party had focused mainly on publishing and distributing revolutionary periodicals in its first year, the outbreak of the War launched the Party into full revolutionary action. Heeding the call of their leaders, who boldly proclaimed that the need for British troops in Europe presented an opportune moment to organize uprisings in both India and British imperial outposts, at least one thousand Indians from British Columbia, Washington, Oregon and California joined seven thousand Indians from Panama, the Philippines, Hong Kong and Shanghai and boarded ships bound for India hoping to overthrow the British Raj during the World War I.[4]

It has been put forth in this paper that the *Komagata Maru* must be understood as a critical moment in both Ghadar anti-colonial mobilization and in the history of British, Canadian, and the U.S. efforts to repress Ghadar activism during the early decades of the twentieth century. In fact, the *Komagata Maru* was the most publicized Indian challenge to restrictive immigration laws in North America. Consequently, it became the platform upon which Indians demanded the right of mobility across the empire as British subjects while simultaneously exposing the hypocrisies of British promises of imperial justice. Moreover, the chartering of the *Komagata Maru* and the two-month standoff that followed in the Vancouver harbor were bold and defiant acts during which the Indian passengers on the ship and Indian migrants already living in North America dramatized the injustices of British rule by linking the fate of Indians seeking entry to Canada to the broader movement for self-rule in India. Viewed by both the Ghadar activists and the British officials as an important symbol for those battling against racial oppression and colonial subjugation across the world, the *Komagata Maru* demonstrates the lengths to which the British Government would go to repress anticolonial revolt. Thus, the *Komagata Maru* is part of a much broader story of Indian anti-colonialism and state repression during the early decades of the twentieth century. Indian resistance to imperial immigration policies marked them, in the eyes of British and U.S. officials, as deviant subjects and subversive agitators. Convinced that Indian anti-colonialists had the potential to embolden colonized subjects and racialized minorities across the globe to overthrow the racial and imperial world order, the U.S. Immigration, Justice, and State Department officials collaborated with the British authorities by forging their own exclusionary regime, thus sharing intelligence, enacting deportation proceedings and closely monitoring Indian migrants for evidence of political activism. Historiographies of Indian migration during this period have largely treated these anti-colonialists as a part of a small overseas outpost of the Indian independence movement. I argue, however, that in simultaneously contesting the British colonialism *and* the U.S. and Canadian racialization and exclusion, these anticolonialists provoked anxieties amongst the U.S. officials concerned about the spread of movements for freedom and racial equality across the colonized world. As such, the U.S. officials cast Indian anti-colonialists as menacing threats to the United States, a nation that had

recently claimed a place for itself on the imperial stage when it colonized the Philippines and repressed the revolutionary movement for independence during the U.S.-Philippine War from 1899-1902. Just as the British officials used the *Komagata Maru* and the Indian anti-colonial movement that it fueled to justify the passage of politically repressive policies and practices in India, the U.S. officials pointed to the ship to demand the implementation of racially restrictive immigration laws and antiradical policies in the United States during the World War I years and beyond.[5]

Traversing Imperial Spaces: The Komagata Maru and Ghadar Mobilization

During the winter of 1913, the Vancouver branch of the Khalsa Diwan Society sent a letter of protest to Ottawa to both outline its grievances and to inform Dominion officials that, because Indian requests to repeal the Continuous Journey provision had been repeatedly ignored, the Society was sending a delegation to Ottawa, London, and India to press its case. According to British police authorities, the delegates "were dangerous men" determined to "stir up mischief in India."[6] When the delegation reached England, they requested an interview with the Colonial Secretary, Lewis Harcourt, who refused to see them. As the Ghadar Party leader Sohan Singh Bhakna later explained, Lewis Harcourt's unwillingness to meet with the delegation was interpreted as a clear insult and "an expression of a conceited and arrogant policy of British imperialism towards Indians and their demands." To Indian anti-colonialists, the British official's response also proved that the British Government was supporting the Dominion's exclusionary policy against Indians in order to construct Canada as a "white man's" country.[7]

Thus, after imperial authorities refused to recognize the delegation in Ottawa and London, the men proceeded to Punjab in the summer of 1913, where they described to fellow Punjabis the widespread exclusion and discrimination that they were experiencing on the North American Pacific Coast. The British police officials, F.C. Isemonger and James Slattery, pointed out that "at the time the exact importance of the visit of these delegates to India was not fully realised, but it is now apparent that it formed a distinct step in the development of the revolutionary movement and was intended to establish a link of sympathy between Indians at home and emigrants abroad."[8] The Lieutenant-Governor of Punjab, Sir Michael O'Dwyer, later claimed that the delegates were "advance agents" of the Ghadar Party, whose "object was to arouse public opinion in India to the hardships of the Canadian immigration laws." Michael O'Dwyer later claimed that a year after the delegates returned to Canada "the Ghadr storm had burst over the Province". Moreover, he was convinced that the leaders of the delegation had actively been spreading sedition in the Punjab during their visit.[9]

Nevertheless, the members of the delegation presented their grievances before an unresponsive Viceroy of India and Indian National Congress leaders. In October 1913, they returned to the British Columbia on the SS *Panama Maru* with forty-three Indians, thirty-nine of who had never been to Canada. The

Canadian immigration inspectors used the continuous journey provision to deny them entry to the Dominion and the migrants hired attorney J. Edward Bird to appeal their cases. Bird successfully took up their case to the British Columbia Supreme Court, where, much to the alarm of Canadian officials, they were released on a technicality.[10] The *Seattle Post-Intelligencer* reported that the Court's decision was the culmination of a three-year fight "in which the Hindus have carried their petitions not only through the Canadian courts but to the foot of the Empire's throne in London."[11]

However, the ruling alarmed U.S. immigration authorities and congressmen, who worried that if Canada relaxed its immigration laws, it would "be possible for thousands of Hindus" to gain entry to the Dominion and then cross the border into the United States, resulting in, according to Washington Congressman Albert Johnson, "an invasion that may occur in numbers positively startling."[12] Moreover, news of the thirty-nine migrants who had successfully, if only temporarily, challenged Canadian immigration laws in the late fall of 1913 reached Indians across East Asia, who had been searching for a way to get into North America, but rather found it nearly impossible after the implementation of the continuous journey law. In fact, many had left the Punjab hoping to enter the United States through the Philippines. But the U.S. immigration officials had closed this route to the U.S. mainland during the summer of 1913. In response, Indians enacted legal proceedings in Seattle and San Francisco and a political campaign along the entire Pacific Coast to challenge the U.S. imperial immigration policy.[13]

In fact, the U.S. Bureau of Immigration first became aware of the movement of Indians from the Philippines to the U.S. mainland a decade after the U.S. colonization of the Philippine Islands, when nineteen Indians from Manila arrived in Seattle in December 1910. In response to Canada's passage of the Continuous Journey Policy in 1908, the U.S. immigration inspectors stepped up their efforts to prohibit the entry of Indians. Although the U.S. Congress would not pass an exclusionary law prohibiting Indian migration until nearly a decade later, known as the 1917 "Barred Zone" Act, yet, the U.S. immigration officials began utilizing the "likely to become a public charge" clause of immigration law to deny entry to Indians arriving at the Pacific Coast ports as soon as the continuous journey provision was passed. This immigration policy allowed immigration inspectors to deny entry to any migrant believed to have a likelihood of becoming a "public charge." The U.S. immigration inspectors claimed that racial prejudice against Indians on the Pacific Coast was so high, that it would be difficult for them to find employment and they were, therefore, likely to become public charges. When challenged by Indian migrants to provide an example of an Indian who had in fact become a "public charge," immigration inspectors were unable to come up with a single name. Nonetheless, they continued to use the public charge policy to exclude nearly fifty per cent of incoming Indian migrants at the Pacific Coast immigration stations between 1909 and 1917. In 1908, about 1,710 Indians entered the United States, more than in any previous year. In 1909, however, due to the Immigration Department's manipulation of the public charge clause, officials excluded 331

Indian migrants and allowed entry to only 377.[14] In 1911, 517 migrants gained entry, while 862 were excluded, and during the next five years, the U.S. immigration inspectors admitted less than 600 Indians. The Federal immigration officials felt confident that local inspectors would continue to use the public charge clause to exclude as many Indians as they could until the Congress passed an immigration law to prohibit their entry entirely.[15] Because it was now so difficult to gain entry at U.S. mainland ports, many Indian migrants began traveling to the Philippines first, where it was much easier to be landed. Indians from the Philippines soon began arriving in Seattle and San Francisco, citing the U.S. immigration laws that stated that any immigrant admitted to the Philippines had been lawfully admitted to the United States and could not be subjected to a second examination under existing immigration law, or, as migrant Mohamed Khan told a very startled U.S. immigration inspector, "I came from American territory [Manila, Philippine Islands] to American territory" [Seattle, Washington] with the understanding that I "had a perfect right to come over here."[16]

Thus, between 1910 and 1913, hundreds of Indians sought to circumvent discriminatory immigration policies and practices at the U.S. mainland ports by taking alternate routes across the American empire and insisting that their admittance to the Philippines meant that they were legally entitled to move freely within the U.S. borders.[17] At first, the U.S. immigration authorities were not sure how to proceed. Commissioner-General of Immigration, Daniel Keefe and Seattle Immigration Inspector Ellis DeBruler claimed that these men should be deported. But in a March 1911 memorandum, Secretary of Labor Charles Nagel, the highest-ranking authority on the U.S. immigration matters, stated that he did not believe he could deport the migrants in question. As Nagel explained, because they had already been admitted to the Philippines they could not "be subjected to a second examination when applying at a mainland port because they have already been examined and landed by authorized officials at a Philippine port [and] are therefore *within the 'United States.*'"[18]

In June 1913, however, the newly appointed Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson and the newly appointed Commissioner-General of Immigration Anthony Caminetti used their executive powers to amend existing immigration policy without congressional approval, making it nearly impossible for Indian migrants to gain entry to the U.S. mainland from the Philippines. Specifically, they implemented a new rule that required all migrants reaching the U.S. mainland ports from Puerto Rico, Hawaii, or the Philippines to be re-examined upon landing. Migrants arriving at mainland ports would be permitted to land provided they were not members of the excluded classes or "likely to become public charges" at the time they were admitted to the insular possessions if they proceeded to the mainland. If immigration officials believed that the incoming migrants were likely to become public charges, they were to arrest and deport them for entering the United States in violation of the law.[19] In December 1913, the *Washington Post* published an article detailing Commissioner-General Caminetti's recent trip to the British Columbia to meet with the Canadian officials about the problem of Indian migration and the threat of Indian

revolutionaries in the Philippines. The article celebrated the U.S. immigration officials for protecting the nation by "endeavoring to prevent a secret organization, with headquarters at Manila, from flooding the Pacific Coast States with Hindu laborers."[20] It was argued that within two years, Manila would be a critical site of Ghadar organizing. In May 1915, the British Consul-General in Manila wrote to the Viceroy of India to report that Ghadar Party leader Bhagwan Singh was reportedly engaged in disseminating revolutionary propaganda to Indians, addressing small meetings, and collecting money for the Ghadar cause in the Philippines.[21]

By the time the *Komagata Maru* was making its way to the British Columbia, the U.S., the British, and Canadian officials had been working closely together in an inter-imperial surveillance and deportation campaign against the Ghadar Party leader Har Dayal. They were deeply troubled by the rise of the Ghadar Party.[22] They were convinced that the *Komagata Maru* was linked to the party, particularly because as the ship made stops in Shanghai, Moji, and Yokohama to pick up additional passengers, the Ghadar Party leaders boarded the ship to speak with the passengers, including Balwant Singh, the *granthi* of the Vancouver *gurdwara* in Moji and Bhai Bhagwan Singh and Mahommed Barkatullah in Yokohama.[23] Bhai Bhagwan Singh and Maulvi Barkatullah spoke to the passengers about the anticipated confrontation they would have with the Canadian authorities, distributed the most recent copies of *Ghadar*, and delivered a rousing speech instigating the passengers to rise up against the British Government in India.[24] On May 21, the *Komagata Maru* sailed into the Victoria harbor. The next day, Bhagwan Singh and Barakatullah arrived in San Francisco and immediately went to the Ghadar Party headquarters, which convinced the Canadian, the U.S., and the British officials that there was a link between the *Komagata Maru* and the Ghadar Party.[25]

The U.S. officials were alerted to the *Komagata Maru* voyage over a month before its arrival in Canadian waters and were troubled by the ship's implications on the U.S. and Canadian restrictive immigration policies. During the Congressional hearings in April 1914 to discuss the exclusion of "Hindu laborers," Congressman Albert Johnson of Washington questioned Tishi Bhutia Kyawgh Hla', Secretary of the Hindustan Association of the United States, about the *Komagata Maru*. Bhutia unabashedly told the U.S. officials that the passengers aboard the ship intended to test the legality of Canadian laws.[26] Moreover, newspapers along the Pacific Coast also closely watched the unfolding developments in the Vancouver harbor during the summer of 1914. On the day the ship arrived in Vancouver, the *Fresno Republican* reported that for Canadians, like the "South Africanders, the Hindu race problem is even more vital than would be the break-up of the British Empire. It may take not only 'orders in council,' but even British grenadiers to compel Canadians to accept a turbaned influx from Asia."[27] Less than three weeks after the arrival of the *Komagata Maru*, Commissioner-General Caminetti sent the Secretary of Labor Wilson numerous newspaper clippings and reports about the ship's journey. Caminetti expressed alarm that if the agitation over the *Komagata Maru* resulted in a modification of Canadian immigration laws, the U.S. government would "at

once be confronted with the necessity for additional safeguards to prevent Hindus who enter Canada from promptly drifting into the United States." Further, Caminetti warned that if the *Komagata Maru* passengers successfully contested the logic of imperial immigration policy, "the Hindus will, of course, again turn their attention to the possibility of entering [the] continental United States either directly or through the Philippine Islands."[28] While the U.S. immigration officials had asked several steamship companies not to allow Indian passengers seeking to travel from the Philippines to the Pacific Coast on board their ships, the *Komagata Maru* illustrated that there was nothing to prevent Indians from chartering their own ships and traveling to the U.S. ports. Caminetti further pointed to the *Komagata Maru* to push the U.S. Congress to pass comprehensive legislation to exclude Indians. His concerns prompted Secretary of Labor Wilson to write John L. Burnett, Chairman of the Congressional Committee of Immigration and Naturalization, warning him that Indians "who were determined to gain entry into Canada, notwithstanding the legal barriers confronting them" were "precipitating a crisis" by chartering their own vessel to test the Canadian immigration policy.[29]

As soon as the *Komagata Maru* arrived in Vancouver, Indians in the British Columbia began sending cables to India's Viceroy and Secretary of State as well as the Canadian government. Imperial offices in London, India, and Ottawa began receiving protests from Indians all over the world threatening the British Empire "with disruption should Canada and other self-governing dependencies be permitted to exclude Hindus." In June 1914, a British official in London wrote to the Canadian Governor-General about the *Komagata Maru* and asked him "to avoid [the] use of force" which he worried "would have extremely bad effects in Punjab."[30] Exploiting such fears, Gurdit Singh, the man responsible for chartering the ship, sent a telegraph to the Governor-General warning that the return of the passengers would create a "bad impression" amongst Indian soldiers stationed across the Empire as well as within India.[31] Meanwhile, Indian migrants along the Pacific Coast were also organizing and demanding that the *Komagata Maru* be allowed to land. In a meeting before hundreds in Vancouver, anticolonial leaders Bhag Singh and Hussain Rahim encouraged Vancouver Indians to donate money in order to send a message to the British and Canadian governments that the *Komagata Maru* was not only "about 376 Hindustanis on the ship but the fate of 330 million Indians."[32]

As the *Komagata Maru* sat in the waters of Vancouver harbor, British spies, Canadian immigration officials, and Indian informants closely monitored Indians in Washington, Oregon, California, and the British Columbia. Informants reported that Indians were organizing seditious political meetings, in which they were linking immigration cases to plans for revolution, prompting the Canadian and the British officials to warn that the *Komagata Maru* voyage was from the outset politically motivated. On June 26, 1914, Thomas Erskire of the British Consulate in Portland, Oregon wrote to the British Embassy in Washington, D.C. to report that Indians in Astoria, whom he referred to as part of the "Indian revolutionary society" known as the Khalsa Diwan Society, had held several meetings to discuss the affair.[33] Hopkinson warned the Canadian

and the British officials that Indian agitators were under the impression that such disaffection and anger would "lead to the consummation of their plans, namely a mutiny in India to which end they have for some years been at work."[34]

Therefore, after the *Komagata Maru* was forced to leave the Vancouver harbor in July 1914, the British statesman Austin Chamberlain wrote to the Canadian Prime Minister Robert Borden, to express his concerns about the ship's effect on the Sikhs, from whom, as Chamberlain explained, "many of our best soldiers are drawn and on whom, from the Mutiny onwards, we have been accustomed to rely with confidence for whole-hearted support of the British Raj." Chamberlain warned that, as a consequence of the Canadian government's treatment of the Sikh passengers aboard the *Komagata Maru*, "for the first time in their history, there has now been serious discontent among them and this has been largely due to, or at least made possible by, the exploitation of their grievances" in immigration matters.[35]

The British officials were gravely concerned about what they viewed as the threat of Sikh subversion in North America, particularly amongst former Indian soldiers. The British officials had good reason to fear the circulation of anticolonial tracts addressed to the Sikhs in North America, where nearly fifty per cent of migrants had served in the British Indian Army or as police officers in colonial territories across East Asia. These men believed that their military and police service on behalf of the British Empire, guaranteed their rights as British subjects and these would be protected abroad. However, when they arrived in the B.C., they were deeply disillusioned to find out that, rather than being rewarded for their service to the British Empire, they were the targets of racial exclusion, discrimination, and even violence.

Therefore, the forcible removal of the *Komagata Maru* from the Vancouver harbor in July 1914 set off a wave of violence from the British Columbia to India, culminating in the Budge Budge massacre outside of Calcutta. On September 26, the *Komagata Maru* arrived at the mouth of the Hughli River near Calcutta, where it was met by authorities from the Department of Criminal Intelligence (DCI) and a number of Punjabi police officers who searched the cabins, steerage, and the passengers' luggage, looking for arms, ammunition, and copies of the *Ghadar*. They found nothing and the ship was allowed to proceed up the Hughli towards Calcutta. Fearing that stories of their treatment in Canada would inflame rising anger against British rule in India, the British officials instructed the ship to dock at the industrial town Budge Budge, fourteen miles outside of Calcutta. Utilizing the Ingress into India Ordinance, which the British Indian government had passed on September 5, 1914 to empower officials to detain returning emigrants and to restrict the liberty of any person entering India if such action was deemed necessary for the protection of the State, the officials ordered the passengers to board a special train guarded by police officers that would take them directly to the Punjab. Moreover, the British Government wanted the ship's passengers to be kept under the watchful eyes of officials to insure that they were kept isolated from the public and would not spread word of their mistreatment in the British Columbia.[36]

While 62 of the passengers complied and boarded the train, the remainder began to march toward Calcutta under Gurdit Singh's leadership. According to a 1918 report of the committee appointed to investigate revolutionary conspiracies in India during the First World War, the passengers were "full of the seditious doctrines which they had been taught on the journey, and had been led by Gurdit Singh to believe that their ends could only be gained by force." On their way to Calcutta, the passengers, who intended to deposit the *Guru Granth Sahib*, the Sikh holy book that they had with them on board, at the local *gurdwara* as well as lay their grievances before the British officials. They were stopped by troops and ordered to march back in the direction of the ship. Along the way, they were subjected to the abuse of police officers, who repeatedly kicked them and, according to the British and Indian officials who later investigated the case, "used more force than was necessary in preventing attempts to stray."[37] They were then ordered to board the *Komagata Maru* again and told that they would be sent on the train to Punjab in the morning. The passengers refused to set foot on a ship that had come to symbolize their imprisonment and subjugation under the British rule. They instead sat down on the ground and began reciting *rehras,* the Sikh evening prayer. Gurdit Singh later claimed that as they prayed, police forces attacked them, prompting the passengers to forcefully resist and culminating in a massacre that left twenty Sikh passengers, two local Indian residents of Budge Budge, two British, and two Indian policemen dead.[38]

For Indian anti-colonialists in North America, there was no greater proof of brutality and injustice of the British rule than the tragic fate of the *Komagata Maru*. That summer, Ghadar Party leaders Ram Chandra, Bhagwan Singh, and Mahommed Barakatullah traveled from the Canadian to the Mexican border framing the *Komagata Maru* as a symbol of the powerlessness of a colonized people and channeling Indian resentment over the treatment of the passengers to encourage Indians to "return to India to mutiny."[39] Moreover, the Ghadar Party used the incident to mobilize Indians on the Pacific Coast and its ranks grew in response to the ship's plight. As Ghadarite Darisi Chenchiah later wrote, "although the passengers of the *Komagata Maru* were simple peasants who had left their hearths and home in search of a living, the insults that were heaped upon them, the atrocities that they had to face, the inspiring sympathetic touch they received from the toilers of the world has given them a new outlook of life."[40] The Ghadar leader Sohan Singh Bhakna argues that the British government's refusal to protect the rights of the *Komagata Maru* passengers inspired thousands of Indians to work for Indian freedom. As Bhakna explained, Indians on the Pacific Coast had done all they could to aid the passengers of the *Komagata Maru*, "but this inhuman and insulting treatment of their fellow countrymen put an end to their endurance," and many came to believe that "a government which made the *Komagata* incident possible had no moral right to exist."[41]

By early December 1914, the officials estimated that nearly 1,000 Ghadarites had returned to India from the United States, Canada, and parts of East and Southeast Asia.[42] One such migrant was Jawanda Singh. He was a candid and

genial young man who had traveled from his village in the Punjab to Vancouver in July 1907 alongside his brother. For the next seven years, they worked as laborers in the British Columbia. In the summer of 1914, Jawanda had a revolutionary awakening when he witnessed the fate of the *Komagata Maru*. At a meeting organized by Indian leaders in Vancouver to discuss the affair, Jawanda Singh implored his countrymen to break free from the shackles of British rule. He decided from that day on that he would devote his life to the cause of Indian independence. Once the First World War began, he left Canada for the United States and joined the ranks of the Ghadar Party. He returned to India to contribute to the movement to overthrow the British rule.[43]

Mula Singh's mobility across the U.S. and the British Empires also demonstrates how the experience of migration to North America politicized Indians to become anticolonial activists. Born in Amritsar, Mula Singh left India as a soldier for the British army and spent four and a half years as a sepoy in the 28th Punjabi Regiment in the Malay States. He then left for Shanghai and joined the Municipal Police and later worked as a watchman in Shanghai and Manila. Mula Singh had been a passenger on board the SS *Minnesota*, the ship that sparked a legal battle after carrying dozens of Indians from Manila to Seattle in May 1913. Mula Singh later said that it was during the four-month period that he and his fellow passengers from the *Minnesota* were detained by the U.S. officials that they became anti-colonialists. According to British police officers F.C. Isemonger and James Slattery, who were appointed by the British Indian Government to produce an official report on the Ghadar Party, the treatment of the detained passengers from the Philippines produced a deep sense of "bitterness among the Indians already in Canada and the U.S.A." Ultimately, Mula Singh was able to secure entry to the country and he found work in the rail yards and lumber mills of the Pacific Northwest, all the while taking part in the Ghadar meetings. So strong was his revolutionary fervor that he was among the first shipload of revolutionaries to reach India after the outbreak of World War I alongside the Ghadar Party Vice-President Jawala Singh on the SS *Korea*. After landing in Colombo, he made his way to the Punjab and arrived in Amritsar on December 1, 1914, where he was later arrested.[44]

After going into hiding as a consequence of the Budge Budge massacre, Gurdit Singh sought to defend himself and to challenge the British Indian Government's official version of events that unfolded in the summer of 1914. In 1928, Gurdit Singh published his own account of the *Komagata Maru* affair, titled *Voyage of Komagata Maru or India's Slavery Abroad*. The only way for Indians to find an alternative account to the official story of the *Komagata Maru* was through radical anticolonial publications being smuggled into India from North America.[45] Gurdit Singh used his account to provide both a counter-narrative to the events surrounding the *Komagata Maru* and the Budge Budge massacre and a broader historical understanding of the impetus behind Indian migration, which he rooted in imperialism, economic exploitation, and racial subjugation. He took the British government to task for implementing economic and agricultural policies that produced poverty and famine in India, thus forcing Indians to seek employment abroad. He wrote, "British Domination in India is

another name for the disguised British exploitation of the soil, both of its wealth and intellect . . . the people have no opportunity or provisions to be trained in any useful and profitable art or industry. We do, therefore, stand in need of emigrating to far off lands."[46]

The British and the Canadian officials acknowledged that the *Komagata Maru* affair, followed almost immediately by the outbreak of the War in Europe, had greatly assisted "the campaign of sedition and revolution which was being actively conducted at this time on the Pacific Coast by the 'Ghadr' party." During official investigations of the "war-time conspiracies" that would erupt in India during the next year, the British officials emphasized that revolutionary activity in the Punjab "could be traced directly to dissatisfaction roused over the *Komagata Maru* affair in the British Columbia."[47] Further, the officials reported that the anger of Indians on the Pacific Coast "strengthened the hands of the Ghadr revolutionaries who were urging Sikhs abroad to return to India and join the mutiny" that they insisted was about to begin.[48] As such, the *Komagata Maru* and the Budge Budge massacre "clearly showed," according to British authorities, "the necessity for strong action in dealing with revolutionary suspects from America and the Far East."[49]

In response to imperial anxiety about the movement of Indians across the Pacific, the British Indian Government passed the Ingress into India Ordinance in September 1914, which allowed the Government to restrict the movements of Indians returning to India by indefinitely detaining them or confining them to their native villages. According to a report later filed by the East Indian Sedition Committee, because it was "abundantly" clear that there were "bodies outside India conspiring to promote seditious violence within it," it was necessary to give the Government increased power and authority under special war legislation that would allow it to protect the State's "safety, interests or tranquility."[50] In March 1915, the British Indian Government passed the Defense of India Act, which empowered any civil or military authority "to restrict the movements of suspicious characters" and included a critical provision that allowed for the appointment of Special Tribunals for trying revolutionary crimes, from which there could be no judicial appeals.[51]

Michael O'Dwyer, the Lieutenant Governor of Punjab later referred to the Ghadar movement as "by far the most serious attempt to subvert British rule in India" during the War.[52] According to Viceroy Charles Hardinge, the powers authorized by the Defense of India Act were necessary for the public safety, for "there existed on the Pacific Coast of America a revolutionary organization which had endeavored to create trouble in India."[53] The British officials thus used the return of Indians from the United States, Canada, and across East Asia with newfound political ideals and aspirations, to implement legislation that gave the British Indian Government special powers to deal with revolutionary threats and paved the way for a new wave of repressive laws in India. At the same time, events during the summer of 1914 emboldened the U.S. officials to demand more forcefully the exclusion of Indian migrants from entering the country and to authorize immigration and justice department officials to expand a surveillance apparatus intended to suppress the Ghadar anticolonial organizing

from the United States.[54] Immediately following the entry of the United States into the First World War in the spring of 1917, the U.S. Justice Department indicted dozens of Indian anti-colonialists, most of whom were affiliated with the Ghadar Party, for violating the nation's neutrality laws.[55] The defendants were accused of conspiring "to produce mutiny and rebellion and the overthrow of the British Government in India" and were charged with violating Section 13 of the Criminal Code, which said that "whoever begins, sets on foot or provides the means for the carrying on of any military expedition or enterprise against a power" with which the United States was at peace, was guilty of a felony. In the "Hindu Conspiracy" trial in San Francisco that followed from November 1917 to April 1918, the U.S. Attorney John W. Preston described the Indian anticolonial movement in the United States not as a legitimate struggle for independence but as a menacing global "conspiracy."[56]

The Justice Department officials used the trial to argue that U.S. borders were far too porous and that foreign radicals who were hatching revolutionary plots on the U.S. soil threatened the country's safety and prosperity. The uncovering of an alleged "Hindu conspiracy" proved to those who had long agitated for restrictive immigration laws targeting Indians that exclusion was indeed imperative to national security. As such, the repression of Indian anti-colonialism shaped and justified the expansion of restrictive immigration laws and politically repressive practices and policies in the United States, both of which were viewed as essential to stifling all forms of dissent.

Conclusion

Contrary to imperial claims of the blessings of British subject-hood, Indians realized that the British government's unwillingness to protect them from racial exclusion and discrimination in Canada and the United States reinforced the racial hierarchies that kept them subjugated around the globe. As Gurdit Singh later wrote, the "ugly manifestations" of racism in the British Dominions "proved the utter hollowness of the equality-cult of the Western democracies." Pointing to the "colour-prejudice, and the badge of inferiority imposed upon all coloured races" in British colonies, Singh warned that discriminatory immigration laws from Australia to British Columbia would bind the "coloured races" together "with a tie of common indignation," from which to contest the British Empire's support of white settler countries determined to enforce white supremacy through racially restrictive immigration policies.[57]

By seeking entry to the U.S. mainland and Canada from imperial territories like the Philippines and Hong Kong, Indians exploited loopholes in the U.S. and the British imperial immigration policies and argued that their admission to these imperial outposts meant that they were legally entitled to move freely within each Empire. Moreover, the Indians organized transnational political campaigns in which they linked the fates of Indian passengers on these ships to the broader movement for self-government in India, prompting the U.S. and the Canadian officials to warn that Indians were challenging and exploiting immigration policies to advance revolution. As Sohan Singh Bhakna saw it, the

refusal to recognize the petitions and appeals for justice had clearly exposed the hypocrisy of British imperialism, as well as the racially discriminatory practices of the U.S. and the Canadian governments. Persistent acts of discrimination against Indians had convinced Indian migrants that reformist methods were ineffective and should be abandoned in favor of an active struggle for Indian independence.[58] The Ghadar Party leaders further capitalized on widespread Indian frustration and bitterness at the extralegal and unjust actions of the U.S. and Canadian immigration authorities to mobilize Indians across the Pacific Coast. Ram Chandra connected the return of the *Komagata Maru* passengers to similar injustices that Indians were facing in Fiji, British Guiana, and South Africa and framed every outpost of the British Empire as unjust and tyrannical. As Chandra wrote, these struggles were making Indians everywhere realize "that there is only one cause for India's degradation and humiliation in the world and that is British rule."[59]

If British imperialists hailed British law as a legal and just apparatus that proved the universality of the Empire, then the exclusion of Indian migrants from white settler countries, exemplified most vividly by the *Komagata Maru*, became a site from which to challenge British claims to liberalism and universality.[60] For Indians in North America, the *Komagata Maru* was both the culmination of their struggles against racial discrimination and exclusionary immigration practices for nearly a decade *and* the source of widespread mobilization of Indians from the British Columbia to California to overthrow an empire that refused to treat them as equal British subjects.

Notes

1 East Indian Sedition Committee, *Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate Revolutionary Conspiracies in India* (1918).

2 Eric Morse, "Some Aspects of the Komagata Maru Affair, 1914," *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report* (May 1936), p. 102, Folder 5, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection.

3 "List of Gadar Martyrs," Hindustan Gadar Party Memorial Committee, Folder 26, Box 6, South Asians in North America Collection.

4 "The Day of Liberty for India has Come," *Ghadar* (no date given), "Ghadr Extracts," Box 1, Neutrality Case Files; Historians have estimated that between one and two thousand Indians left North America for India at the start of the War. See Joan Jensen, *Passage from India*: *Asian Immigrants in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), p. 217; John W. Spellman, "The International Extensions of Political Conspiracy as Illustrated by the Ghadr Party," *Journal of Indian History,* Vol. 37 (April 1959), pp. 32-35; Kalyan Kumar Banerjee, *Indian Freedom Movement*: *Revolutionaries in*

America (Calcutta: Jijanasa, 1966), p. 27; Gary R. Hess, "The Forgotten Asian Americans: The East Indian Community in the U.S.," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 43 (November 1974), p. 8; Emily C. Brown, *Har Dayal*: *Hindu Revolutionary and Rationalist* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1975), p. 22; Randhir Singh, *The Ghadar Heroes: Forgotten Story of the Punjab Revolutionaries*, 8, Folder 11, Box 4, South Asians in North America Collection; Jane Singh, "Echoes of Revolution," *The Role of Literature in the Ghadar Movement*, Dissertation (Berkeley: University of California, 1990), p. 27.

5 For more on this see Seema Sohi, *Echoes of Mutiny: Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anti-colonialism in North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

6 F.C. Isemonger and J. Slattery, *An Account of the Ghadr Conspiracy (1913-1915)* (Lahore: Superintendent Government Printing, 1919), p. 5.

7 Sohan Singh Josh, *Baba Sohan Singh Bhakna: Life and Founder of the Ghadar Party* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1970), p. 21.

8 F.C Isemonger and J. Slattery, *An Account of the Ghadr Conspiracy (1913-15)*, p. 9; Jensen, *Passage from India*, p. 129. There are some inconsistencies in the record as to who exactly was part of the delegation. While it is certain that Teja Singh was one member, conflicted reports include Narain Singh, a leader of the Sikh Temple in Vancouver, Balwant Singh, the Priest of the Vancouver Sikh Temple, Bhag Singh, whose family, like Balwant Singh's had recently been admitted under the family reunification struggle, and Sundar Singh, the editor of the *Aryan*.

9 Michael O'Dwyer, *India as I Knew It, 1885-1925* (London: Constable, 1925), p. 191.

10 Hugh Johnston, *Voyage of the Komagata Maru: The Sikh Challenge to Canada's Colour Bar* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 20; Solicitors for South Asian petitioners, Vancouver to Prince William Patrick Albert, Governor-General, November 7, 1913; Memorandum from W.D. Scott to Mr. Mitchell, November 25, 1913, File 536999, volume 384, Records of the Immigration Central Registry File Series, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa (hereafter cited as Immigration Central Registry File Series); Jensen, *Passage from India*, p. 129.

11 Quoted in *Hearings Before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to discuss the passage of additional legislation to exclude Asians*, House of Representatives, 63rd Congress, 2nd Session, December 6 and 9, 1913, Part 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913).

[12] Albert Johnson in *Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to discuss the passage of additional legislation to exclude Asians* (1913).

[13] Ray Gardner, "When Vancouver Turned Back the Sikhs," *McCleans Magazine*, November 8, 1958, p. 64, Folder 1, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection; Hugh Johnston, *Voyage of the Komagata Maru*, p. 23.

[14] Commissioner-General Daniel Keefe to Acting Secretary, April 7, 1913, File 53173/40, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; *Hearings on the Restriction of Hindu Laborers*, pp. 68-69. The literacy test was vetoed by President Cleveland in 1897, President Taft in 1913, and President Wilson in 1915. All argued that the literacy test was a radical departure from the country's historically open immigration policy.

[15] Proceedings of the Asiatic Exclusion League, San Francisco, October 1911, File 52961/10; Daniel Keefe to Acting Secretary, April 7, 1913, file 53173/40; and U.S. Department of Labor, "Hindu Migration to the U.S.," January 23, 1914, file 52903/110C, Records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; Joan Jensen discusses this "legal theory" in a paper she presented at the Symposium on Indian Immigration at U.C. Berkeley on June 23, 1979 titled, "The Great White Wall: East Indian and American Immigration Policy, 1900-1946," quoted in Emily C. Brown, "Revolution in India: Made in America," *Population Review*, Vol. 25 (1981), p. 42; Gary R. Hess, "The Forgotten Asian Americans: The East Indian Community in the U.S.," *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 43 (November 1974), p. 582.

[16] Herbert W. Myers to Commissioner of Immigration, December 19, 1910, File 53154/2-2V, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[17] Henry Marshall, Brief for all seven aliens, presented to Department of Labor, December 30, 1913, File 53627/89, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[18] Secretary of Commerce and Labor Charles Nagel to W.P. Dillingham, Chairman, Committee on Immigration, U.S. Senate, February 10, 1911, File 53173/40, my emphasis; Memorandum by Secretary of Commerce and Labor Charles Nagel, March 7, 1911, File 53154/2-2V, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[19] Memorandum from Commissioner General to the Acting Secretary, December 1913, File 53627/39-39C; "U.S. Officials Amend Immigration Regulations," "Expect Battle in Courts" *Washington Post*, June 20, 1913, File 53173/40; Brief presented by John McNab and

Timothy Healy, Attorneys for Appellants, In the Matter of the Arrest of "22 Hindoos," September 1913, File 53627/39-39C, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; Also see Harold S. Jacoby. "Why So Few East Indians? A Study of Social Renitence," University of the Pacific, Stockton, no date of publication given, p. 9, Folder 11, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection.

20 "Plot to Import Hindus," *Washington Post*, Dec. 4, 1913, File 52903/110B, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

21 "Sedition in the Far East (Report on the Movements of Bhagwan Singh)," B. Oct. 1915, Nos. 206-338, in A.C. Bose, *Indian Revolutionaries Abroad, 1905-1927: Select Documents* (New Delhi: Northern Book Centre, 2002), pp. 261-262.

22 For more on the U.S. Immigration Department's efforts to deport Har Dayal see Seema Sohi, "Repressing the 'Hindu Menace': Race, Anarchy, and Indian Anti-colonialism in Bald, et. al., *The Sun Never Sets*: *South Asian Migrants in an Age of US Power,* (Eds. Vivek Baldet. al), (New York: New York University Press, 2013), pp. 50-74.

23 Superintendent of Immigration (Canada), "Statement of Incidents Connected with the arrival at Vancouver on the 21st of May, 1914, of the *Komagata Maru* with 376 Hindu passengers on board; their stay at Vancouver, and their departure in the *Komagata Maru* on the 23rd of July, 1914," folder 40, volume 1139, Records of the Office of External Affairs, RG 25, National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, (hereafter cited as Records of the Office of External Affairs); "Hindus Have Arrived Off Victoria, B.C.," Montreal paper (title unknown), May 22, 1914, File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; Hugh Johnston, *Voyage of the Komagata Maru*, pp. 32-34.

24 "Report of the *Komagata Maru* Committee of Inquiry," (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1914), p. 59; Jane Singh, "Echoes of Revolution: The Role of Literature in the Gadar Movement," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Berkeley, 1990), p. 13.

25 Gurdit Singh quoted in "Komagata Maru Leaves for Here," Vancouver newspaper (title unknown) May 22, 1914, File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; "Note on the Hindu Revolutionary Movement in Canada" (1919), volume 384, File 536999, Records of the Immigration Central Registry File Series.

26 *Hearings on the Restriction of Hindu Laborers*, p. 152.

[27] "Aggressive India," *Fresno Republican* (May 23, 1914), File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[28] Caminetti to Secretary of Labor, June 12, 1914, File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[29] Secretary of Labor W.B. Wilson to John L. Burnett, Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, July 3, 1914, File 53139/8; A. Caminetti to Secretary of Labor, June 12, 1914, File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[30] Mr. Harcourt, London to Governor-General, June 24, 1914, folder 40, volume 1139, Records of the Office of External Affairs.

[31] Gurdit Singh to Governor General, July 8, 1914, folder 40, volume 1139, Records of the Office of External Affairs.

[32] Rahim and Singh quoted in Darshan Singh Tatla, ed., *A Guide to Sources: Ghadar Movement* (Amritsar: Guru Nanak Dev University, 2003), p. 26; "Hindu Cargo Examined," "Twenty Returning to Canada Will be Allowed to Land," Ottawa newspaper (title unknown), May 24, 1914, File 52903/110D; "Trouble Brewing," "Searchlights Play on Komagata to Reveal Hindus' Movements," *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 22, 1914, File 52903/110D; "Canada Will Exclude Hindus," *Fresno Republican*, May 23, 1914, File 52903/110D, Records of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service; Husain Rahim, "Mass Meeting of the Hindustanees Regarding Komagata Maru," *The Hindustanee*, June 1, 1914, MG 30 E281, Manuscript Group 30, Kartar Singh Fonds; Eric Morse, "Some Aspects of the Komagata Maru Affair, 1914," *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report* (May 1936), p. 104, Folder 5, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection.

[33] Thomas Erskire, British Consulate, Portland, Oregon to Colville Barclay, British Embassy, Washington D.C., June 26, 1914, Folder 40, volume 1139, Records of the Office of External Affairs.

[34] E. Blake Robertson to Hon. J.C. Doherty, August 10, 1914, folder 40, volume 1139, Records of the Office of External Affairs.

[35] Chamberlain quoted in Tatla, *A Guide to Sources*, p. 23.

[36] *Report of Committee Appointed to Investigate Revolutionary Conspiracies in India* (London: Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918), p. 63; Hugh Johnston, *The Voyage of the Komagata Maru*, p. 97.

[37] *Komagata Maru* Committee of Inquiry. *Report of the Komagata Maru Committee of Inquiry* (Calcutta: Superintendent Government Printing, 1914); *Report of Committee Appointed to Investigate the Disturbances in the Punjab, etc.* (London: Majesty's Stationery Office, 1920), p. 87.

[38] Darshan Singh Tatla, *A Guide to Sources*, p. 13.

[39] *Ghadr*, August 4, 1914, "Ghadr Extracts," box 1, Neutrality Case Files; "Urge Hindus to Aid Uprising in Native Land," *Fresno Republican*, September 24, 1914, folder 18, box 7, South Asians in North America Collection; Jane Singh, "Echoes of Revolution," 14; Joan Jensen, *Passage from India*, p. 190.

[40] "Note on the Hindu Revolutionary Movement in Canada" (1919), File 536999, volume 384, Records of the Immigration Central Registry File Series; Darisi Chenchiah, "History of the Freedom Movement in India: The Ghadar Movement, 1913-1918," no page number given, folder 3, box 4, South Asians in North America Collection.

[41] Randhir Singh, *The Ghadar Heroes*, p. 12, Folder 11, Box 4, South Asians in North America Collection.

[42] Jane Singh, "Echoes of Revolution," p. 36; Khushwant Singh, *A History of the Sikhs*, Vol. II*: 1839-1964* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), p. 183.

[43] "Desh Bhagat Yadan," folder 17, box 5, South Asians in North America Collection.

[44] F. C. Isemonger and J. Slattery, *An Account of the Ghadar Conspiracy (1913-15)*, p. 91.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

[47] *India Sedition Committee Report*, 1918, quoted in Eric Morse, "Some Aspects of the Komagata Maru Affair, 1914," *Canadian Historical Association Annual Report* (May 1936), p. 108, folder 5, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection; "Note on the Hindu Revolutionary Movement in Canada" (1919), File 536999, Volume 384, Records of the Immigration Central Registry File Series.

[48] *Report of Committee Appointed to Investigate Revolutionary Conspiracies in India* (London: Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918), p. 63.

[49] F.C. Isemonger and J. Slattery, *An Account of the Ghadr Conspiracy (1913-15)*, p. 64.

50 *Report of Committee Appointed to Investigate Revolutionary Conspiracies in India*, (1918), p. 87.

51 Randhir Singh, *The Ghadar Heroes*, 19; Khushwant Singh, *A History of the Sikhs*, Vol. II, p. 183.

52 Michael O'Dwyer, *India As I Knew It (1885-1925)*, p. 189.

53 Lord Hardinge quoted in Ram Chandra, *India against Britain*, pg. 8, box 1, folder 32, South Asians in North America Collection.

54 For more discussion see Seema Sohi, *Echoes of Mutiny*.

55 Joan Jensen, *Passage from India*, p. 222.

56 *United States of America vs. Franz Bopp, et al., defendants*. Reporters' transcript [of Trial of Ghadr Party conspiracy] in the District Court of the United States for the Southern Division of the Northern District of CA, First Division, November 20, 1917 - April 23, 1918 (London: India Office Library and India Office Records, Photocopying and Microfilming Section, 1968); Joan Jensen, *Passage from India*, p. 214.

57 Gurdit Singh, *Voyage of Komagata Maru or India's Slavery Abroad*, pp. 58-59.

58 Sohan Singh Josh, *Baba Sohan Singh Bhakna*, p. 24.

59 Ram Chandra, *India Against Britain. A Reply to Austin Chamberlain, Lord Harding, Lord Islington and Others*, Folder 32, Box 1, South Asians in North America Collection.

60 Sukanya Banerjee, *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in the Late-Victorian Empire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), p. 14.