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The Ghadar movement stood for the revolutionary overthrow of British rule in India. It had a two-pronged strategy: to expose the racial discrimination of the American, Canadian and the British Governments towards Indians and to evoke national pride for the liberation of India from British rule. A galaxy of personalities worked towards this aim. They suffered and sacrificed their lives. Har Dayal, in particular, gained revolutionary prominence in the shortest possible time. Historians have positioned him at the centre of the Ghadar movement. However, his long silence, as the Ghadar movement unfolded, requires an appraisal. His return to England and pleadings to the British authority for help him return to India requires a fresh look. How did the British develop amnesia in the case of Har Dayal?

Introduction

Historiography of the Ghadar movement delineates a saga of sufferings and sacrifices which the people passed through under state suppression. In fact, the Ghadar movement expatriate Indians living in Canada embarked on their ambitious plan of overthrowing British rule. Though a ‘quixotic mission’, yet it provided an important moment in the development of India’s national movement.1 It is also viewed as a dramatic action filled episode in India’s struggle for freedom and as a saga of patriotism, bravery and heroic sacrifices.2 Moreover, it was the first non-religious and non-communal organised national revolutionary movement of Indians. In other words, it was secular and democratic to the core, patriotic in the real sense of the word; they were nationalists committed to a revolutionary overthrow of British rule.3 It attracted all the communities to its fold and later influenced other revolutionary groups in the country to shed their religious bias.4 Moreover, the Ghadarites as a body raised the slogan of complete independence and worked for a republican government in India for the first time. They made sacrifices for the fulfillment of their mission.5

History is a process of struggle in which results are achieved by some groups directly or indirectly at the expense of others. The losers pay. Suffering is indigenous in History.6 Moreover, every organic development of the peasant masses is linked to and depends on movement among the intellectuals.7 By the end of the 19th century, famines and rural debt had impoverished the peasantry and rendered the artisans out of gainful employment. The middle peasants, ex-soldiers, artisans and craftsman began moving beyond the Punjab and Indian
borders for seeking employment. In fact, most of them were moving out due to financial distress. The British Empire provided an outlet in the South East Asian, and East African colonies for military police and security guards and in domestic help. Average income was about Rs. 9 per month. From 1904 onward, the Hong Kong agents of the Canadian Pacific Railways attracted Indian immigrants. By 1910, there were more than 10,000 Indian immigrants working in lumber mills, factories and agricultural farms covering an area of over 1200 miles from Vancouver in the British Columbia province of Canada to Calexico in South California in the USA. By the end of 1912, the number of Indian immigrants on the Pacific Coast had reached 20,000. However, about 98 per cent among them were the Punjabis and out of them 75 per cent were ex-soldiers. Though, many Indian settlers earned a good deal of money by trade and business, yet the Indian workers as a class were looked down upon in North America. Everywhere they were insulted and despised. A number of political organisations sprang up at different times and under different groups of individual leaders. The Hindustani Association slowly became the centre of grouping political activity and heated discussion. The Ghadar Movement provides space for the study of masses and leaders. In fact, large number of individuals on the Western Pacific Coast of America joined together in the formation of a number of social and political organisations. Their efforts culminated in establishment of the Ghadar party in a meeting at Astoria (Oregon) on the April 21, 1913. Two personalities stand prominent: Sohan Singh Bhakna, the first President of the Ghadar party and Lala Har Dayal, the first General Secretary. Both have been sufficiently chronicled. However, they differ in one significant way: their life-long commitment to the cause and the vision of the Ghadar movement. The present attempt is to delineate the situational prominence of Har Dayal in America and the somewhat queer silence for long time from an intellectual who took rational and ethical positions at a time when the Ghadar movement was brutally smashed. Without Har Dayal, the Ghadar movement continued to inspire the revolutionaries who worked both at organizational and individual levels. It gave rise to new leaders who were from among the masses and with courage and conviction.

**Har Dayal: Early Life and Intellectual Formation**

Har Dayal was born in a lower class Kayastha family in Cheera Khana (Delhi) on October 14, 1884. His father, Gauri Dayal Mathur, a scholar of Persian and Urdu, was employed as a copy Reader in District Court at Delhi. Kayastha, an intermediate caste, falls roughly between two upper varna. Har Dayal had no compunction about placing himself in the highest caste ranking. He retained the subtle air of superiority and authority often characteristic of higher caste Indians. His father was not a man of wealth. His income was modest and the status in the bureaucracy relatively low. The house was a small edifice. Moreover, Gauri Dayal had a large family of seven children, four sons and three daughters which he maintained with great difficulty having meagre income. Har
Dayal was the sixth child. In his early life, Har Dayal was influenced by his father. He also grew up to be a good scholar of both Persian and Urdu. He received the first and most decisive impulse of his traditional Hindu culture from his mother. Lords Rama and Krishna were worshipped by all at home. In his childhood, he was an avid reader of the Ramayana by Tulsidas. The family lived comfortably in the shadow of the Islamic monuments of old Delhi. He developed his love of Urdu.

At the age of four, he was sent to Cambridge Mission School, Delhi and passed his middle school examination at the age of 12 and matriculation at the age of 14. He completed his Bachelor of Arts degree from St. Stephen’s College, Delhi and M.A. degree in English Literature from Government College, Lahore in 1903 with first position. He did an M.A. History from the same College at Lahore. Har Dayal, at the age of 17, was married to Sunder Rani, the daughter of the wealthy Lala Gopal Chand, Naib Nazim (a magistrate) at Barnala in the Patiala State. His infant son lived only for 10 months. His daughter Shanti was only five years old when he left India in 1908.

Har Dayal took a keen interest in public affairs. He established the Kayastha Sabha for elderly persons. He was a member of the Young Men’s Christian Association. In Lahore, he joined the Rationalist Society. In his student life, he was ‘a free thinker’. Moreover, he developed a soft corner for the Brahmo Samaj which, however, could not last long. During 1903-05, he joined the Arya Samaj at Lahore. Lala Hans Raj, Lala Lajpat Rai and Bhai Parmanand had lasting influence on his attitude. He had two ideals: R. C. Dutt and R. P. Paranjpye. He was equally influenced by V. D. Savarkar.

Har Dayal was selected for a State Scholarship in 1905 carrying 200 Sterling each for three years, granted by the Government of India to promising young Indian scholars who were expected to join the government service after the completion of education in England. He was the first Punjabi or North Indian. The British ‘praised him highly’. The Principal of St. Stephen’s College, Delhi dispelled a rumour that Har Dayal was suspected of disloyalty to the British Government. He joined St. John College, Oxford in September 1905 taking European History and British India as a special study. At Oxford, he was declared a Boeden Sanskrit Scholar. He was also designated Casber Exhibitioner in History. These honours carried with them stipend in the combined amount of £130. He visited India House, established by Shyamji Krishnavarma (1857-1930), who was also editor of the Indian Sociologist. He met V.D. Savarkar (1883-1966), Virendranath Chattopadhya (1880-1942). At this juncture, Har Dayal was initiated into the Abhinava Bharat and took an oath.

Unexpectedly, in the summer of 1906, he turned up in Delhi against the wishes of his family members. He persuaded his wife to accompany him back to England. In the fall of 1907, he resigned his scholarship. However, he was diffident in giving reasons for his resignation. With a persistent official prodding, he felt “sorry” to the President of St. John’s College for his inability to finish his studies. He was also receiving two other scholarships, one of pounds 80 and other of 50. He also gave up these two scholarships and left the
University. In January 1908, he booked a third class passage. He, along with his wife arrived in Punjab from Colombo. On his way to the Punjab, he met B.G. Tilak and G.K. Gokhale at Pune. Leaving his wife at Patiala, he went to Lahore where he stayed in a rented room on the second floor in Sutar Mandi. He dressed like a Sadhu in white. He bought some parched grams, had no cot-bed and slept on a mat.²⁹ He also lived for some time with Lala Lajpat Rai in Lahore. He regularly contributed to the Modern Review (Calcutta) and The Punjabee (Lahore).³⁰ He returned to Europe in August 1908 and never came back to India. After visiting London, he went to Paris. There, he came in contact with Egyptian and Russian revolutionaries. He also came into close contact with Karl Marx’s grandson Jean Lonquet. In September 1909, at Paris, he edited Bande Mataram, a monthly journal. In 1910, he left Paris and went to Algiers for health reasons.³¹

**The American Milieu, Intellectualism and the Ghadar Salience**

In early 1911, Har Dayal went to the United States away from the long shadow of the British Empire. From Boston, he proceeded to California and Berkeley. He established friendship with Dr. A.W. Ryder, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of California and with Dr. Stuart Leland of the Stanford University at Palo Alto, California. Both of them were well versed in Eastern Philosophy.³² He continued to have correspondence with Madame Bhikhaji Rustom K. R. Cama (1861-1936). He joined the faculty as a lecturer in philosophy for the semester (8\(^{th}\) January-15 May). At Stanford University, he got in touch with different socialist and anarchist groups. He was introduced to Marxism which induced him to write a biographical sketch of Karl Marx.³³ He propounded anarchism at San Francisco. He resigned from the assignment in September 1912 due to his advocacy of anarchist views. He became the Secretary of the San Francisco Radical Club and founded the Bakunin Institute of California.³⁴ In fact, he had a temporary crush with anarchism. In the summer of 1912, he returned to the nationalist fold as he was tremendously excited over an attempt on the life of Viceroy, Lord Hardinge in Delhi on December 23, 1912. In 1912-13, Har Dayal became the Secretary of the San Francisco branch of the Industrial Workers of the World.³⁵

Har Dayal was travelling a lot, rather in a restless way. He became expressive and turned out to be a prolific writer with a particular bent of mind. Modern Review, Calcutta was a vehicle to convey his ideas. His first contribution in 1909 was a telling one as it was labelled “The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race”. He put forth the idea that the Brahmans had acquired dominance over non-Hindus by controlling institutions and thought processes of the people. He linked this with the rise of the British in India and called them Brahmans.³⁶ The other themes that attracted him were “Women in the West” wherein he argued that by joining the liberal professions, women ‘could establish equality with men’ in the West.³⁷ He turned to European thinkers and philosophers such as Saint Francis, Saint Rose, Rousseau, Voltaire, Marx, Bakunin, and Mazzini. He contributed a brief biography of Karl Marx: A Modern Rishi.³⁸ With his interest
in Marxism and Socialism, he focused on “The Wealth of the Nation” and put forth the view that ‘true wealth consists in the intellect and character of the citizens’. 39 His article on the “Indian Peasant” places him above all other writings relating to people or classes. He put his views categorically stating that ‘the peasant is over-taxed, underfed and ill-clad’; the Indian peasant needs ‘a voice to sing his woes’. Apparently, he was moving closer to the peasants, artisans and labourers working in the fields and factories in California or North America.40

By the end of 1912, Har Dayal was ‘a figure to be reckoned with’ in official circles in London, Delhi, Calcutta and Simla. Moreover, the publicity made him a big man to the expatriate peasants and farmers.41 He met Bhai Jawala Singh and impressed upon him to establish the Guru Gobind Singh Scholarships.42 However, when Har Dayal arrived in the United States, he ignored invitations to lead the immigrant Indians on the Western Coast in their fight against oppressive legislation. He argued that he had been caught upon the labour movement and the social revolution. However, attack on Lord Hardinge thrust him back on to the revolutionary stage.43

At the beginning of 1912, a meeting was held at Portland (Oregon) and attended by Bhai Harnam Singh from Bridal Veil (Oregon), Pandit Kanshi Ram and Ram Rakha from St. John (Oregon), by Sohan Singh Bhakna and Bhai Udham Singh Kasel from Monarik Mill. It resulted in the formation of the Hindustan Association of Pacific Coast with office in a rented house at Portland (Oregon). Sohan Singh Bhakna, G.D. Kumar and Pandit Kanshi Ram were elected President, General Secretary and Treasurer respectively.44 Moreover, Pandit Kanshi Ram and others in Oregon, in the early part of 1913, invited Har Dayal to join them in organizing a new association to supplant Indian Independence League. Har Dayal put them off until May 1913.45 Michael O’Dwyer acknowledged that ‘seditious movement had been at work for some years to corrupt the Indian immigrants, chiefly Sikhs’. Har Dayal found ‘the ground prepared and set to work to sow the seed’.46

A number of factors were operating as the Indian immigrants working in Oregon, California and Washington were now beginning to develop political consciousness; the US Presidential election in 1912 galvanised the Indians to have an organization in the year of depression and increased unemployment; night attacks at St. John (Oregon) made Indian workers insecure. At Takoma (Washington), Indians decided to fight back rather than flee harassment. It created confidence among the Indians in Oregon and California.47 In winter 1912, Sohan Singh Bhakna and Bhai Udham Singh Kasel came to Bhai Kesar Singh at Astoria (Oregon). They canvassed him to form an association there which would become another branch of the Hindustani Association. Bhai Kesar Singh, Munshi Karim Bakhsh and Sri Munshi Ram were elected President, Secretary and Treasurer. Meanwhile, Shri G. D. Kumar, a prominent leader fell ill. So, Lala Thakur Das advised Sohan Singh Bhakna and Pandit Kanshi Ram to send for Lala Har Dayal from California and to entrust the work of the association to him. A letter was sent to Har Dayal who promised to come on
December 25, 1912. Two days before his arrival, he dispatched a letter giving March 1913 as a time of his arrival. Har Dayal came to St. John (Oregon) on March 25, 1913 along with Bhai Parmanand of Lahore. On March 31, 1913, the first meeting of the Association was held at Bridal Veil (Oregon). Lala Har Dayal and Kansi Ram came to attend it from St. John. They decided to set up the branch of the Association. Next meeting was held at Linton (Oregon) on April 7, 1913. On April 14, 1913, another meeting was held at Wina (Oregon). Bhai Udham Singh Kasel was elected Secretary. It was decided that next meeting would be at Astoria. Har Dayal was much impressed by these gatherings. Next meeting, as per schedule, was commenced on Sunday, April 21, 1913 at Astoria in a mill. Representatives gathered there. A resolution was passed for a political formation called Hindi Pacific Association; its aim was armed struggle against the British; it was to have headquarters at San Francisco which was a sea port and a centre of the revolutionaries; it was decided to publish a paper titled Ghadar in Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi and other languages; there would be annual elections; membership fee was one dollar per month minimum; no religious discussion was allowed, religion was considered a personal faith. Sohan Singh Bhakna was declared its president, Bhai Kesar Singh Thathgarh its Vice President, Har Dayal its General Secretary and Pandit Kanshi Ram as Treasurer.

A meeting took place at Portland (Oregon), at the end of May 1913 with Har Dayal presiding it. It was agreed to sponsor the publication of a revolutionary paper and the funds were to be solicited. Thus, the Hindu Association of the Pacific Coast came into existence. Harish K. Puri rectifies it as the Hindi Association of the Pacific Coast as all other accounts call it Hindi. However, a public declaration of the launching of the movement was made in a well-attended public lecture by Har Dayal at the Finish Socialist Hall, Astoria on June 4, 1913. Local newspaper took note of his severe indictment of British rule. For the Ghadar paper, a sum of Rs.9000 was collected. It first appeared on November 1, 1913. It was claimed the paper worked as ‘magic on the minds of the people’. With increased demand of the paper, a larger press was purchased and installed. About 20 patriots worked day in and day out. Small booklets and pamphlets were also printed. By late 1914, the Ghadar was being issued in English, Urdu, Hindi, Gujarati, Pasthu, Gorkhali and in Gurmukhi, the latter being largest in circulation. It reached most of the Indian settlements all over the world such as Canada, Japan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, China, the Malay States, Singapore, British Guiana, Trinidad, the Hondras, South and East Africa. Thousands of copies were also sent to India. It echoed Benedict Anderson’s assertion that ‘print knowledge live by reproducibility and dissemination’. It sent the message of revolution far and wide which surprised the British intelligence agencies. Everything appeared under Har Dayal’s name and he got all the credit.

Escape, Ethics and the Empire
Reception of the Ghadar paper and the political excitement it created raised concern and caution among the American and British intelligence agencies. Within months, the British decided to remove Har Dayal from the scene. It was assumed that with him gone, the Ghadar party would collapse. The British Council had complained to the American authorities. On 25 March 1914, Har Dayal was served with a warrant of arrest. He was arrested by the American authorities in San Francisco on the charge of being an anarchist and an undesirable alien. He was released on bail because an American lady provided surety of $1000 in the form of a plot of land. The Ghadar party, however, paid back the amount. Har Dayal feared that his name would be linked to the assassination plot of Lord Hardinge. He jumped bail and ‘escaped’ or ‘fled’ to Switzerland. He shifted from Switzerland to Berlin in January 1915 and worked there till February 1916 with the Germans and the Turks for the common cause of India and Germany.

With the World War I going on, the Germans were anxious to utilize revolutionaries from India against the British. Har Dayal arrived in Berlin on January 27, 1915. He worked in the Berlin India Committee. At the end of March 1916, he was deputed by the Committee to proceed to Turkey to help in organizing the Suez Mission. Har Dayal could not get along with the German Government officials and decided to leave. He was put under suspicion. He resigned from the Berlin Committee on February 19, 1919. From there he went to Sweden.

Har Dayal entered Sweden in October 1918, a month before the Armistice was declared. He arrived in Stockholm. He penned down his personal experiences in “Forty Four Months in Germany and Turkey (February 1915 to October 1918) describing the Germans as ‘semi-barbarous’, and rooted for English or French imperialism. He passed a scathing judgment: “the history of Germany during the last 48 years (since the unification in 1870) has been a record of folly ending in failure. This was a German crime ending in a German catastrophe”. In 1922, he published Our Educational Problem. These were the collection of articles he published over a period of time. He condemned the British educational system and declared that ‘Sanskrit is the only national tongue for all India’. In Sweden, he studied music, painting and sculpture. He lectured on Music, Politics and Economics; he taught Indian Philosophy at the University of Uppsala. He had command over a number of languages. In November 1926, he met Agda Erikson, a Swedish social worker and philanthropist. In 1932, he acknowledged her as his wife while his first wife was living in India.

In March 1927, Har Dayal requested the British government for amnesty and sought permission to move to London. On October 10, 1927, he reached London. In 1928, he decided to work for a doctoral degree on the Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London. In 1932, he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. He worked on his book Hints on Self Culture which was published in 1934. In 1937, his other work Twelve Religions and Modern Life was published. On October, 25, 1938, a letter was sent to Har Dayal stating that he was granted
permission to return to India. He went to America for a brief period. In December 1938, he received the official letter at Philadelphia (USA) from the British Government. On March 4, 1939, he died at the age of 55 years and 4 months. His last words in his last lecture were: “I am at peace with all”. Thus, for twenty years, he had two concerns: to pursue ethics and return to the heartland of the British Empire, England. As he got the permission to return, the circle of his anti-colonialism was complete. It is for the researchers to mine out his mind.

A Critical Appraisal

Broadly speaking, Har Dayal’s life has been studied by scholars from three domains: as a person, an intellectual and a revolutionary. He has been a favorite of biographers who see his persona as a thinking person with variegated shades. In fact, he is the enigma of biographers, historians and ideologues. Biography as a genre of history has a long pedigree. It can be taken as a first draft of history. Plutarch in Lives evoked moral edification; Thomas Carlyle reduced history as ‘the biography of great men’, and Jules Michelet considered history as ‘the essence of innumerable biographies’. British philosopher of history, R. G. Collingwood calls it ‘poetry at its best’ and ‘an obstructive egotism, at its worst’. However, E.H. Carr tries to rescue biography as a form of history. Essentially, biography treats man as an individual and history takes man as a part of the whole. Good biography makes bad history. In other words, man as a microcosm is a part of social macrocosm. It is for the historian to maintain balance and provide meaning to the social forces catalyzed by the actions of certain individuals. Har Dayal is no exception.

Har Dayal fascinates his biographers who try to chisel out his personality and bring out his persona. So far, Emily Brown remains his best and balanced biographer. Her treatment of Har Dayal is telling and transparent. She studied Har Dayal at the doctoral level at the University of Arizona where she titled her study as ‘A Portrait of An Indian Intellectual’. She submitted her dissertation in 1967 successfully and preferred to put the study to the public in 1975 in a book form under the title "Har Dyal: Hindu Revolutionary and Rationalist". What a turn or a publisher’s trick? However, both her works begin with Har Dayal: “The relation of the man to his message is a vexed question to study’. She admits that she was ‘confronted with the virtual impossibility of satisfactorily exploring and evaluating either the man or his message’. In fact, she had picked the thread from Dharm Vira, arguably the second best biographer of Har Dayal who is clear in what he says about his dramatis persona. Dharm Vira, who was the Editor of Hindu, published from Lahore, contributed a biographical and analytical sketch of “Dr. Har Dayal” in Punjab’s Eminent Hindus published in 1943. Dharm Vira had a personal acquaintance with Har Dayal which is both a strength and a weakness as well. After a long evocation, Dharm Vira puts the question: what is the touchstone of man’s greatness? He answers that by stating it is provided by man’s fundamental principles. Har Dayal was ‘an extraordinary person in as
much as there was no change in his inner spirit’ and his ‘inner spirit was one of Hindu nationalism’ and he believed that ‘Hindustan belongs to the Hindus and Hindu culture alone could rule over it’. When Har Dayal started the Ghadar movement and worked hard for it, the same spirit was there ‘in the Hindu garb’. One can say that Dharmavira appropriated Har Dayal for sectarian purposes and Har Dayal was perceived as above such shades. However, Dharmavira turned vocal with his contribution on “Lala Har Dayal” in the Diwali special issue of the Organizer (1965), a known mouthpiece of the RSS. He dropped ‘Dr.’ and added Lala to the title as if ‘Dr.’ was pedantic to the readers and Lala more popular. He extended this theme in his biography Lala Har Dayal and Revolutionary Movements of His Times published in 1970. R. C. Majumdar, a doyen of communal historiography, wrote its Foreword in which he hit the nail on the head about ‘changing attitudes of Har Dayal towards the Germans and the British which puzzled his friends and evoked comments and unfriendly criticism even from those who held him in high esteem’. However, a caveat was added that ‘Har Dayal probably did not die a natural death but he was assassinated’. Dharmavira continues with talking about the ‘inner spirit’ of Har Dayal and ended the biography with his usual conclusion that Har Dayal was ‘a great man, a very great man indeed’. Emily C. Brown, a well-known biographer of Har Dayal, while introducing the man and his message, considers him ‘elusive’ in personality with abrupt changes in his actions and attitudes. She evokes Dharmavira, biographer of Har Dayal discussed above, and reiterates that Har Dyal did not ‘really change, that his inner spirit remained the same’. How are we to locate and situate ‘inner spirit’ in historical time? However, Dharmavira makes it easier for us to understand as Har Dayal had ‘memory and no forgettory’. His brain was ‘working very fast’ and the ‘physical manifestation of the mental process was visible’. Moreover, he was a ‘man of ability with a ready pen, a ready tongue, an excellent sense of humour in private life and intrepid social courage’. He had ‘an expression of enameled self-assurance and never self-indulgent’. Moreover, he had ‘an ardent nature, a cool temperament and a robust intellect’: a patent in himself as an Indian. Thus, biography often turns into hagiography in the hands of those who want to wish away the social and historical context of their dramatis personae. Har Dayal’s academic achievements and intellectual prowess are continuing themes in accounts by his biographers and associates and a matter of record in British official documents. A plethora of justifications float around: high level of intellectuality add up to more than a rather phenomenal memory; he was of an encyclopedic trend of mind and capable of creative and provocative thought and his English papers were retained as models of excellence. He came to be known as the ‘Great Har Dayal’ for his phenomenal memory and establishing records.

As stated earlier, he resigned his scholarship in 1907. The India Office in the official notification forfeited the scholarship without stating any ground. However, Shyamji Krishnavarma linked the resignation of his scholarship to the idea that Har Dayal strongly believed that ‘no Indian who really loves his
country ought to compromise his principles and barter his rectitude of conduct for any favour whatever at the hands of the alien oppressive rulers of India’. However, he was a changed man and appeared to be a recluse and Spartan. He preached ‘pure and unalloyed Hindu Nationalism which he considered to be the foundation of practical independence for Hindustan’. He replied to his readers in Hindi and Sanskrit. However, he was not able to achieve much as a social reformer, so he left India again in 1908. This argument has also been given political colour. He became politically active, though implicitly. In late January and early February 1908, he is thought to have taken up the role ‘as a self-styled political missionary’. The presence and propaganda of Har Dayal gave ‘a fillip to the political movement’ in Punjab. His arrest was seen to be ‘imminent’ and he turned panicky. He put a question to himself: “Will it be of any good if I remain here in Hindustan and get myself arrested or should I go to an independent country like France and make that the centre of my activities”. He decided to leave India in the month of August 1908.

Har Dayal is often credited with foundation of the Ghadar Party. In fact, much of work had been done during the formation of the Hindi Association of the Pacific Coast in 1912 without Har Dayal: the weekly paper in Urdu Hindustan was to be published; education of youth in America for ‘national’ work in India had been decided and discussion of politics in meetings was allowed. Sohan Singh Bhakna, G.D. Kumar and Pandit Kanshi Ram were elected President, General Secretary and Treasurer respectively. Over time, a number of meetings were held at different places. In fact, the meeting held on April 21, 1913, at Astoria (Oregon) was held only to formalize the coming of the Ghadar though the name was to be Hindi Association of the Pacific Coast. It was in this meeting that Har Dayal appeared as a central figure and got all the credits. The weekly Ghadar was to be published in Urdu, Hindi and other Indian languages and its first issue appeared on November 1, 1913. Thereafter, the Hindi Association was popularly known as the Ghadar Party. Har Dayal presented a revolutionary programme to the Indians according to their inclinations. Thus, the fruit was ‘fully ripe and with just a touch of Har Dayal, it dropped into his lap’. However, his role in the Ghadar movement in North America and its direction of development in India remains problematic both for his crusaders and critics. Both desire to set the facts in a proper context which, after all, is the domain of history as a discipline. Dharmavira writing a chapter on Ghadar uses the subtitle “Setting of the Drama”, that Lala Har Dayal was going to enact or share with. In San Francisco, Berkeley or Oakland, everybody called him Lalaji, as a form of affection and esteem. Har Dayal, in an official student publication of the University, contributed an article entitled “The Hindu National Movement”. In the paper The Astorian (June 5, 1913), while speaking on “Condition in India”, Har Dayal put forth the view that ‘the Hindus were the pioneers of Aryan civilization’. He turned to hardships of the people: ‘the
taxation is oppressive beyond calculation. The land tax swallows up the large part of farmer’s earnings’. He predicted that ‘the revolutionary force has been gathering force. Its aim is the abolition and the Government has adopted a very severe policy of repression. Spies abound everywhere in India. Within ten years, a great upheaval of the down-trodden masses led by the educated classes may be confidently predicted’.88 That was the Ghadar moment of Har Dayal in the USA. Bhai Parmarand, V.D. Savarkar and the Sedition Committee (1918) believed that ‘the Ghadar as a revolutionary movement was the working of Har Dayal’. He started ‘his journal The Ghadar’. The earlier movement ‘merged itself into the Ghadar movement’. Thus, Har Dayal had fully appropriated the Ghadar movement. All others were to follow the leader who chastised the Sikhs to give up wine and donate money for the sacred cause. Several of the ‘unlettered Punjabis became political poets’. Har Dayal published Ghadar Di Goonj.89 However, Emily Brown is very convinced about the role of Har Dayal in the Ghadar, which she considers ‘the political mission’. He reached the USA in February 1911. In the first year, he did little more than ‘extol simple virtues of Indians’, the publicity had made him ‘a big man to the expatriate peasants and farmers’. He is credited of having founded the Ghadar Party in May 1913 under the label Hindu Association of the Pacific Coast. It was ‘an uneasy coalition between Hindu intellectuals and Sikh farmers, peasants and lumber mill workers’.90 Har Dayal followed the organization pattern established by V.D. Savarkar when he formed the Free India Society in England. Within the party, there was even a more exclusive group. The Yugantar Ashram was split between two different locations, party and paper at 436 Hill Street and the Ashram at 1324 Valencia Street, San Francisco. Har Dayal appeared as ‘a front man’, as publisher, editor and everything else. The Sikhs remained in the background. Like Dharmavira, Emily C. Brown associates Ghadar with Har Dayal publishing Ghadar Di Goonj. The British were more concerned about the subscribers as it had a ‘deadly effect among the Sikh immigrants’.91 In fact, in her account, Har Dayal appears everywhere to be challenging the British and shepherding his flock. All other characters of the Ghadar are just shadows. It leaves much space for researchers to contest such claims.

In 1966, Khushwant Singh referred to ‘friction between Hindu intelligentsia and Sikh workers’ as Sikhs looked down upon the Hindus as English speaking Babus. The Hindus treated the Sikhs with the same level of contempt as lawyers generally treat their rustic clientele. It is in this context that Bhai Jawala Singh and Har Dayal took the initiative in organizing the immigrants at Stockton.92 The peasant’s attitude towards the intellectual is double and appears contradictory. He respects the social position of the intellectuals but sometimes affects contempt for it.93 In Singh’s view, Har Dayal appeared in Stockton and then escaped to Switzerland, an account which is quite opposite to that given by Dharmavira and Emily C. Brown. His is an account of those who suffered and bore the brunt rather those who just vexed anger. However, in the same year, Khushwant Singh with Satindra Singh carried the account further under the title Ghadar 1915: India’s First Armed Revolution. Most of the Sikhs were illiterate
and most of the leaders were educated Hindus or Muslims. It contributed to make the Ghadar the most powerful terrorist movement in the history of India’s freedom movement as well as the first one to rise above communal considerations. There was a network of Indian organization in Canada and the United States. Har Dayal appears as General Secretary and Editor of the Ghadar. Har Dayal jumped the bail and “fled” to Switzerland and the Ghadarites left for India to wage a war against the British.

In the 1970s, Harish K. Puri began his doctoral work on the Ghadar movement though his interest developed in 1968 after a meeting with Sohan Singh Bhakna, an important ‘organic’ leader of the movement who exuded ‘the spirit of revolution and idealism’. The work was published in 1983. Echoing Dharmavira and Emily Brown, he says that ‘Har Dayal awakened to the opportunity of organizing a revolutionary movement’ after knowing attempt made in Delhi on the life of the Viceroy Lord Hardinge on December 23, 1912. He penned a pamphlet *Yugantar Circular* (Circular of New Era), turned lyrical and owned it as ‘our resurrection’. Har Dayal was ‘astute enough’. He advised the Indians “not to come into conflict with the Government of United States; use the freedom and direct their fight against the British”. Puri tries to maintain a balance between the followers and Har Dayal which Dharmavira and Emily C. Brown were not able to present. However, his chapter on “Ideology of the Movement” reveals the essential argument of this study: Har Dayal was the chief ‘man of words’ of the Ghadar Movement. According to Puri, Har Dyal is alleged to have said, “We call it British vampire and not British Empire”. Har Dayal, as Editor ‘lived, worked, ate and slept there with all the others setting by personal example a high standard of conduct and simple living for others to emulate’. He was ‘delighted to have with him splendid fellows who worked there without any thought of recompense’. Both Har Dayal and Ram Chandra, his nominee as the Editor of the Ghadar, ‘functioned in a more or less similar ideological framework’. Thus, Har Dayal was reduced to the level of Ram Chandra who faced various charges of financial bungling later on. In a similar vein, Dharmavira had considered ‘Pandit Ram Chandra as the leader of the Ghadar movement’. However, the ‘successor had little of the great leader’s spirit and none of his genius’. Without the ‘commanding genius of Har Dayal, influence of the movement was less dominant’. With Jatinder Singh Hundal’s contribution, the pendulum has swung to the other extreme. He says that ‘the contribution of Har Dayal was negligible at best. His weak and immaterial relationship with Ghadar Lehar from 1912-14 was eventless and unproductive’. The point is that Har Dayal was providing air to the views of Indian immigrants and the people responded. The Ghadar movement sustained without him.

The biographers and scholars have tried to do justice by studying Har Dayal as a person and a thinker. In California, the Indians had put faith on the leadership of Har Dayal. He was invited and given prime responsibility. However, as the course of events unfolded, most of the Ghadarites were left surprised. Sohan Singh Bhakna, the first president of the Ghadar party,
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retrospectively tried to clear the mist and mystery of Har Dayal. He states: at the
time of formation of the Hindi Association of the Pacific Coast in April 1913,
he was sharing his views with Bhai Parmanand, Pandit Kanshi Ram in the
presence of Har Dayal. Bhai Parmanand said openly, “Bhaiji, there is no doubt
about the qualifications of Har Dayal, but it is difficult to do any work at his
trust as no one knows, when he runs away leaving the work behind”; Bhakna
replied back, ‘Bhaiji don’t worry, we know our work. It turned out to be true.
Har Dayal lacked both determination and seriousness’. Har Dayal was
appointed Editor of the Ghadar with headquarters at San Francisco. Up until
October, he did nothing about the paper. Written complaints were lodged to the
President who sent a letter to Har Dayal who replied back that “he is unwell and
it would be better if a new person is appointed”. He demanded money for the
publication of the paper which was sent to him. In the initial stage, an amount
of $3000 was deposited in the name of the Committee for the management of
the paper. Harnam Singh Tundilat who worked in the Ghadar paper
establishment has told us that Kartar Singh Sarabha handed over $200 which he
received from home for his studies to Har Dayal.

With the publication of the Ghadar paper on November 1, 1913, the police
and intelligence officers became active and assertive. A case was leveled against
Har Dayal. He was arrested and sent to jail pending bail. The Committee decided
that Har Dayal must escape from America which he did. However, before leaving, Har Dayal appointed his close associate Ram Chandra as the Editor of the
Ghadar paper. Yet, he told Bhakna separately that “Ram Chandra is not a
proper person. Take note of him”. It proved to be true too, Bhakna reminisced.
However, departure of Har Dayal did not impact the Ghadar movement in any
way. In fact, the Ghadar paper was managed by the board consisting of Ram
Chandra, Mohan Lal, Pandit Jagat Ram, Kartar Singh Sarabha and Harnam
Singh Tundilat. Moreover, Kartar Singh Sarabha had a strong hand in running
of the Ghadar paper. The others were Prithi Singh, Mehboob Ali and Inayat
Khan. Sohan Singh Bhakna mentions that the Muslims had a grudge against
Har Dayal as he had rejected a Muslim boy and preferred his brother-in-law for
the Guru Gobind Singh Scholarship instituted by Bhai Jawala Singh in America.
Har Dayal’s brother-in-law was just a good-for-nothing person. Talking about
his arrest, Har Dayal remarked to the American press that Government worked
under the British pressure. In fact, on his arrival in America in 1911, he had
considered America as “the master of the future”. While referring to the Sikhs
indirectly, he also said that the ‘timid, shabby and ignorant’ have been
transformed in America’ as this ‘greatest democratic state (USA) in the world’s
history burns up all cowardice, servility, pessimism and indifference’. He left
America without any hope and yet those whom he called ‘the timid and coward’
peasants moved to India to wage a war!

Har Dayal was inconsistent in his positions. In Berkeley, in 1913, he
admonished the students to acquire knowledge of sociology and give up the
study of metaphysics and theology. He recommended French, Spanish and
Italian. In 1922, with respect to learning the English language in India, he
considered it ‘most pernicious’ and ‘an absurdity’. He advocated Sanskrit as ‘the eternal refuge and glory of the Indian people’. In 1925, he got his ‘political testament’ published in *The Pratap*, Lahore. It got wide circulation in the *Times of India*: ‘I declare that the future of the Hindu race of Hindustan and the Punjab rest on these four pillars: (i) Hindu Sangathan; (ii) Hindu Raj; (iii) Shuddhi of Muslims; and (iv) conquest and Shuddhi of Afghanistan and the frontiers.’ This was written at the time when a series of communal riots had taken place in North India which took a heavy human toll. Also by this time, Har Dayal was also keen in going to England.

Michael O’Dwyer, Lt. Governor of the Punjab, called Har Dayal, ‘the most sinister figure’ in the revolutionary movement. He threw up scholarship in 1907 and ‘devoted his undoubted talents to revolutionary work’. The British looked for the cause but Principal of St. Stephen’s College, Delhi informed the Government that ‘accusations of disloyalty appear to be groundless’. The Government overlooked the report of CID, filed in 1904 which mentioned that as a student of Government College, Lahore ‘a sense of revolt had taken place deep root’ in the mind of Har Dayal. James Campbell Ker, the British Intelligence officer, called Har Dayal ‘a very clever young man’. He had six months to run the course when he resigned his scholarship. So, he had not ‘done it badly out of it as he had held it for two years and a half’. Moreover, he had always been well off for money mostly received from his wife’s family. India Office officials saw Har Dayal as the “Garibaldi” in the nationalist movement. Michael O’Dwyer gave a severe indictment to Har Dayal’s association with the Germans: ‘the Indian conspirator, with his low cunning, abnormal vanity, inborn aptitude for intrigue was at home in (Germany).’ Michael O’Dwyer published his work in 1925 at a time when Har Dayal was planning to return to England. Har Dayal was arrested in San Francisco on March 25, 1914. He immediately decided to escape with the intention that he would work for revolution in a free country. He escaped to Switzerland. Michael O’Dwyer noted that Har Dayal was ‘clearly in the confidence of Germany’. In a meeting at Sacramento on December 21, 1913, “Har Dayal told the audience that Germany was preparing to go to War with England and that it was time to get ready to go to India for the coming revolution’. Michael O’Dwyer gives weight to this argument by stating that his ‘advice was acted on promptly after the outbreak of the War’. However, he had different plans for himself as he stated in the same meeting at Sacramento, “If I am turned out of this country, I can make preparation for the mutiny in any other country. I shall have to go to Germany to make arrangements for the approaching Ghadar”. In fact, he had left the Punjab in 1908 with a similar plea when his arrest was almost imminent. The Judges of the *First Lahore Conspiracy Case* and later on the *Sedition Committee* (1918) commented that Har Dayal while ‘inducing his dupes to go to a certain fate had kept himself and his leading lieutenants out of danger’. The British Intelligence officials admitted that ‘the disappearance of Har Dayal from San Francisco did not result in any slackening. On the contrary, the arrest and flight of Har Dayal gave fresh incentive to the revolutionary movement’.
By January 1915, Har Dayal was still in Switzerland engaged in writing a book on philosophy. He was also studying Spanish. In this context, he is taken as ‘an armchair revolutionary’. Har Dayal was ‘unsuited’ for practical work. Propaganda was his forte.\textsuperscript{118} With the outbreak of World War I, Indo-German coordination began with a view to mobilize Indian revolutionaries against the British. Har Dayal became member of the India Berlin Committee, also called the Indian Independence Committee. There is, however, little evidence to show that he played a significant role.\textsuperscript{119} In India, Michael O’Dwyer considered Har Dayal ‘a leading figure’ in Berlin in close touch with all the outlaying branches in Lahore, Delhi, Calcutta, in Canada and the USA and in Kabul.\textsuperscript{120} This was the running theme in all the Lahore Conspiracy Cases.\textsuperscript{121} He took the credit everywhere. However, the Germans noticed that Har Dayal ‘lacked enthusiasm’. Moreover, he was temperamentally authoritarian and uncompromising. Soon, he fell out with the Germans and ‘faded out of prominence’.\textsuperscript{122} In fact, Har Dayal spent most of the War period squabbling with the Indian Independence Committee and the German authorities.\textsuperscript{123} With the entry of the USA into the War in April 1917, the American Government initiated proceedings against those involved in the German-Ghadar Plot, also known as the Hindu Conspiracy. In April, 1918, a San Francisco federal jury found 29 defendants guilty of conspiracy to violate the neutrality laws.\textsuperscript{124} Just like the Lahore Conspiracy Cases, one name that figured large in all the evidence presented was that of Har Dayal, who was relaxing at the expense of the German Government at the best German spas, far from the reach of American and British justice.\textsuperscript{125}

During the Great War, in October 1914, Har Dyal suddenly ‘vanished’ from Constantinople, where he had been assigned to work with other Indian exiles and the Turkish Government to organize an expedition of deserted Indian troops \textit{via} Afghanistan to India. He reappeared in Geneva. He was again sent to Constantinople to organize a mission to Kabul. He quickly became at odds with his colleagues. He was considered anti-Muslim. In summer 1915, he left for Berlin \textit{via} Budapest.\textsuperscript{126} Any funding from Germany was uncertain after the World War I broke out. Har Dayal quickly understood that being seen as an ally of Germany was not beneficial to him and travelled to Sweden. He reached Stockholm (Sweden) in October 1918. After the Armistice, he stayed on in Sweden. In late December 1918, he petitioned to the Swedish authorities that he was prevented from returning to India. He feared that the German Government was too weak to protect him. He assumed that he would discontinue his political work. He begged to be granted permission at least until the end of the War. In case the Swedish Government declined his petition, he would travel to Holland or Spain. If such permission was denied he would commit suicide. In desperation and without wasting time, he immediately sent a letter to the Swedish Government that ‘it would be foolish and useless to carry on revolutionary propaganda against England’.\textsuperscript{127} It was, in effect, the ‘end of the revolutionary’. He received 1000 Marks ($250 in US dollar) as expense money for his trip from Vienna. After his arrival, he requested from the German Government 1000 Kronen ($300 US currency) a month for his livelihood and an extra 1000 Kronen
for the purchase of winter cloths. He was rewarded 10,000 Marks in early 1919. Meanwhile, a report appeared on December 4, 1918 in the San Francisco Call and Post in which Har Dayal said that “German imperialism is a great menace to the progress of humanity”. In March 1919, he expressed his views in the New Statesman stating that “the British and French Imperialism in its worst forms is a thousand times preferable to German and Japanese Imperialism”. He believed that consolidation of the British Empire was a necessity and in the best interests of the people of India. In 1920, he got his book Forty Four Months in Germany and Turkey published in London. In fact, in 1919, he had requested Professor T.W. Arnold for a potential publisher and for ‘some financial aid’. He condemned German imperialism and expressed hope for French and British Imperialism. He called the British ‘truthful people who had a moral and historical mission in India’. The Government of India had his pronouncements translated into Hindi and distributed the copies in India as a propaganda material in favour of the British Empire. The book was translated into several Indian languages. However, the Government refused to allow Har Dayal back into India and called his book ‘a strategic lie’.

The wages of the Ghadar Revolution were phenomenal. It was well grounded in the reality of lived experience, practical, and not just on paper. The colonial State decided to ‘crush it as promptly as possible’ for the successful prosecution of the Great War. The Ghadar men were tried by the Special Tribunal appointed on April 26, 1915, also known as the Lahore Conspiracy Cases, in nine batches. The trials of the first batch began on April 26, 1915. In all, 291 persons were tried and sentenced as follows: death to 42 and 114 transported for life, 93 others were awarded varying terms of imprisonment, and 42 were acquitted. No one appealed against the punishments. Regarding the jawans of the 23rd Cavalry, 18 were court-martialed, of whom 12 were hanged. Sentences on others were commuted to life imprisonment. Out of all others who faced trial, 306 persons got life imprisonment, 145 the death penalty and another 77 got imprisonment of various terms and confiscation of their properties. Out of all of them, 99 per cent were the Punjabis. The shadow of the Ghadar loomed large in April 1919. All of the emigrants were put under surveillance because they gave ‘cause for anxiety’. As the long process of trials and tribulations of the Ghadarites continued, one name was often repeated in the so-called ‘conspiracy’ proceedings: Har Dayal. The colonial authorities martialed ‘all the evidence from the paper Ghadar for prosecution’. During the period of the trials, Har Dayal was away in Europe and stayed in studied silence, pondering over his own security and salvation. However, an unexpected and avid observer expressed his anger and anxiety to clear the void in the larger context. Lala Lajpat Rai. He, while in America, had observed the unfolding of the Ghadar as a movement while maintaining a distance for obvious reasons: He says, “The Sikhs on the whole proved to be purer, more unselfish and disciplined. I have not yet come across a single Sikh revolutionary whom I considered guilty of misappropriation or misuse of revolutionary funds. On the other hand, most of them always lived a life of self-abnegation, putting themselves invariably in positions of danger.”
Lala Lajpat Rai was clear about the mind of Har Dayal as the latter ‘kept himself in background and avoided danger’. Har Dayal always considered Lajpat Rai as his master whose mind he could not read. Both had interlude with the peasantry though in different locales. Har Dayal was the scion of a well-off, well placed and socially conscious family for whom learning and public service was everything. His birth, position and upbringing were in diametric opposite to the Punjab peasant folk with whom his life became intertwined in the New World.

In 1927, Har Dayal moved to England. He continued to write communications for the Hindu communal press in India. Sohan Singh Josh condemns Har Dayal’s ‘backward somersault’ as he turned ‘loyalist and stabbed his companions from the front’. Har Dayal was ‘an indeterminate intellectual who deserves severe indictment’. His apology from the British was ‘a tragic end of a petit bourgeoisie intellectual’. Once he left the USA, he never turned towards his Ghadar constituency. He returned to his scholastic pursuits loaded with ethical values, salvation and Hindu nationalism.

Conclusion

By way of summing up, Howard Zinn reminds us that ‘the history of radical movements can make us watchful for narcissistic arrogance, the blind idealization of leaders, the lure of compromise when leaders of a movement hobnob too frequently with those in power.’ Reinhard Koselleck tersely explains that ‘in the short run history may be made by the victors. In the long run, the gains in historical understandings have come from the defeated.’ The Ghadar movement certainly has not finally lost out either; its struggle is very much on. The Ghadarites had absolute clarity concerning their strategic aim: revolutionary overthrow of British imperialism. All their activity subordinated to this strategic aim. It was the fruit of a very particular synthesis: of populations, of issues of contextual frames and of ideological frames. It was overwhelmingly a workers’ movement, in which, the line between workers and intellectuals had become rather smudged. The Ghadar movement provides rich material to explain the strength and weakness of a radical movement when so many suffered and sacrificed for a cause and a vision. The leaders and adherents invested so much in Har Dayal to the level of blind idealization, who to their utter dismay, followed a different trajectory of survival and thought. His appropriation of the Ghadar vision - peasants and workers struggle for social and economic equality in foreign and motherland - is problematic: both in terms of salience and silence. Undoubtedly, he was evocative, prolific and prophetic who envisioned Hindu revivalism for the purity of Aryan Civilization. He never looked at the fate of the Ghadarites, a short period in his life, who still face the Hamletian dilemma: to own or not to own him. It is time to unlock this dilemma and demystify his position for better understanding of the Ghadar movement.

Acknowledgement: My heartiest thanks to Professor Autar Singh Dhesi for reading through earlier drafts and providing insights out of his family
experiences regarding the fortune and fate of the Punjabi pioneers in North America]
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